

BALANCING FINANCES, THE MISSION, AND PUBLIC TRUST IN THE
AMERICAN ART MUSEUM:
CONTROVERSY AT THE SOLOMON R. GUGGENHEIM MUSEUM AND THE
BARNES FOUNDATION

By
GABRIELLE RAE KARCHESKI

A Thesis Submitted to The Honors College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Bachelors degree
With Honors in
Art History

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

MAY 2013

Approved by:



Dr. Kate Palmer Albers
Department of Art History

**The University of Arizona Electronic Theses and Dissertations
Reproduction and Distribution Rights Form**

The UA Campus Repository supports the dissemination and preservation of scholarship produced by University of Arizona faculty, researchers, and students. The University Library, in collaboration with the Honors College, has established a collection in the UA Campus Repository to share, archive, and preserve undergraduate Honors theses.

Theses that are submitted to the UA Campus Repository are available for public view. Submission of your thesis to the Repository provides an opportunity for you to showcase your work to graduate schools and future employers. It also allows for your work to be accessed by others in your discipline, enabling you to contribute to the knowledge base in your field. Your signature on this consent form will determine whether your thesis is included in the repository.

Name (Last, First, Middle) <i>Karcheski, Gabrielle Rae</i>	
Degree title (eg BA, BS, BSE, BSB, BFA): <i>BA</i>	
Honors area (eg Molecular and Cellular Biology, English, Studio Art): <i>Art History</i>	
Date thesis submitted to Honors College: <i>5-23-13</i>	
Title of Honors thesis: <i>Balancing Finances, the Mission, and Public Trust in The American Art Museum: Controversy at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and the Barnes Foundation</i>	
The University of Arizona Library Release Agreement <p>I hereby grant to the University of Arizona Library the nonexclusive worldwide right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation or thesis and abstract (herein, the "licensed materials"), in whole or in part, in any and all media of distribution and in any format in existence now or developed in the future. I represent and warrant to the University of Arizona that the licensed materials are my original work, that I am the sole owner of all rights in and to the licensed materials, and that none of the licensed materials infringe or violate the rights of others. I further represent that I have obtained all necessary rights to permit the University of Arizona Library to reproduce and distribute any nonpublic third party software necessary to access, display, run or print my dissertation or thesis. I acknowledge that University of Arizona Library may elect not to distribute my dissertation or thesis in digital format if, in its reasonable judgment, it believes all such rights have not been secured.</p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, make my thesis available in the UA Campus Repository!	
Student signature: <i>Gabrielle Karcheski</i>	Date: <i>5/23/13</i>
Thesis advisor signature: <i>[Signature]</i>	Date: <i>5/10/13</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> No, do not release my thesis to the UA Campus Repository.	
Student signature: _____	Date: _____

Abstract:

In modern American society, the public has come to hold high expectations of art museums. Art museums are seen as the great temples of our era, repositories and protectors of culture, purveyors of taste, and spaces for public education and enlightenment. With such importance, the public assumes that these institutions are removed from politics and economic concerns and trust them to maintain their integrity and authority; however, museums constantly struggle with both finances and politics, causing them to adopt new practices to earn funding that appear to contradict their missions for public education, access, and enlightenment. Recent tactics like increased commercialism and appeasement of donors, especially, have led the public to question the museum's dedication to preserving public good and the museum mission.

This paper analyzes this controversy through the use of two case studies from the 2000's: the exhibition of Giorgio Armani fashion at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and the relocation of the Barnes Foundation. In both cases, the institutions faced economic hardship and chose to challenge public trust to survive. The Guggenheim created a show for a donor, Giorgio Armani, appearing to have leased its exhibition space. Likewise, the Board of the Barnes Foundation chose to break the founder's Indenture to relocate to the center of Philadelphia from a small suburb to avoid bankruptcy and dissolution. While both institutions directly broke public trust and provoked controversy, however, this analysis determines that they ultimately upheld their missions and benefitted the public through their actions.

Table of Contents

Part I: Introduction to Museum Controversy and Public Trust	
Introduction.....	3
Museum Responsibilities in Education and Protecting Public Interest.....	4
Public Trust.....	8
Lack of Regulation in Museum Behaviors.....	10
The Birth of Controversy.....	11
How Museums have Adapted to the Landscape.....	12
Shifts to Increased Commercialism.....	13
Museum Economics.....	14
Funding, Money Allocation, and where it leaves the Museum Mission.....	17
Developing the Art Museum: Blockbusters and Superstar Museums.....	18
Part II: Case Study of the Barnes Foundation.....	
The History of Dr. Barnes and His Foundation.....	21
Dr. Barnes's Mission.....	22
The Indenture.....	24
Glanton and the beginning of controversy and financial crisis.....	24
Controversy under Dr. Bernard Watson.....	28
Breaking the Indenture.....	29
Criticism.....	32
The Barnes, Reborn in Philadelphia.....	33
Part III: Case Study of the Giorgio Armani Exhibition at the Solon R. Guggenheim Museum.....	
The Show.....	40
The Rise of Controversy.....	43
Upholding the Museum Mission.....	46
Benefits of the Blockbuster.....	48
Part IV: Conclusion.....	
	51

Part I:**Introduction:**

In the United States, and throughout the Western world, art museums have assumed great responsibility in their service to the public, as the protectors of history, purveyors of taste, and sacred temples honoring the pinnacles of human creativity and creation. Charged with the tall order of acting as guardians of thousands of years of culture, however, museums have increasingly received more attention from the public, and in turn, more criticism. Museums must balance the fulfillment of their missions and their duty to the public with complex politics and methods of survival in a society that does not often place priority on the development and maintenance of arts institutions. For this reason, museums have had to adapt in different ways to survive, yielding to external influences and financial demands through increased marketing, new kinds of exhibitions, and what many critics identify as “commercialization.” These institutions face a constant battle in the pursuit of economic and ethical stability, in which they must maintain relationships with surrounding communities and fulfill their obligation to humankind, while finding ways to support their endeavors and continue their missions to sustain public trust.

Unfortunately, balance can be hard to achieve within these institutions. Several museums have recently garnered widespread doubt and disapproval for challenging public faith and compromising their fundamental values to manage financial needs. In this paper, I will analyze two cases from the 2000’s involving such art museums, in which the institutions were accused of jeopardizing their own missions and breaking public trust for financial gain. The Barnes Foundation, the object of my first case study,

faced bankruptcy and dissolution until the Board of Trustees developed a scheme to move the Foundation from the small suburb of Merion, Pennsylvania, into the more accessible and profitable center of Philadelphia, despite an Indenture set out by the founder intended to guard the institution from any kind of change or relocation. The disregard of the Foundation's Board for donor intent was viewed as a direct affront to public trust, provoking questions over museum ethics and devotion to the protection of public and donor interest. As a second example, I will evaluate the controversy surrounding the exhibition of Giorgio Armani clothing at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York, a show that followed a sizable financial donation from Armani himself. The show raised questions of museum principles and public trust when it appeared that the institution, and its integrity, had essentially been bought.

I will begin my examination of these museum controversies with a discussion of museum importance and responsibility then move into explanations of current systems of financial support for museums, providing background for the case studies and a demonstration of the conditions in which they are working. Then, through this investigation of museum responsibility, public trust, financial influences, and the two case studies, I will show that the Barnes Foundation and The Guggenheim, though they challenged public faith, provided necessary responses to external forces and financial concerns that ultimately aided the serving of their missions and publics.

Museum Responsibilities in Education and Protecting Public Interest

Though museum roles have changed over time, the museum, by definition has long been dedicated to the education of the public and development of culture, expected to abide by certain standards of behavior in society. Named for the Muses of Greek

mythology, the daughters of the gods Zeus and Memory, the museum found its most fundamental purpose in the connection of thought and history and appeared as a public institution dedicated to education during the Enlightenment (Lowry 140). Museums flourished at the end of the 1800's in the United States, beginning a museum "boom," during which "[...] the idea of the public art museum as a site of learning and uplifting pleasure—a palace that offers its treasures to all who enter [...]"—prevailed (Duncan 49). The museum had, indeed, become an accepted place of learning and spiritual stimulation, and while the definition of "museum" has since transformed in certain aspects, its mission has largely remained focused on edification of the public and guardianship of culture and history for the community at large. Today, as defined by the International Council of Museums, for example:

A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment (ICOM).
Though this definition blankets all museums, the main theme remains clear: providing access to knowledge and enlightenment. A museum's purpose may vary, based on its classification, but it is expected to collect, protect, study, show, and express the significance of the artifacts of cultural history to the public. In this sense, museums are expected to constantly work for the edification, illumination, and betterment of society (ICOM).

The art museum specifically, plays a unique role in modern society. As Glenn D. Lowry, the art historian and current director of the Museum of Modern Art, writes, art museums represent semi-religious, nearly sacred spaces, being the "cathedrals or temples of our time," because of their ability to conjure interaction with the spirit and provide a

sense of rejuvenation for the soul (Lowry 140). Art history professor and author Carol Duncan agrees with this point of view. In her book *Civilizing Rituals*, Duncan explains the significance of the museum as a “ritual space” that invites visitors to participate in art historical narratives as “pilgrims” (12). The museum space, she contends, allows for a sense of “liminality” that can be “transformative” and affecting, and she writes that ultimately, “visitors come away with a sense of enlightenment or a feeling of having been spiritually nourished or restored” (13). In her writing, Duncan, like Lowry, concentrates on this idea of the museum’s power of connection and ability to inspire or refresh the human spirit.

A third academic and past director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, Philippe de Montebello, similarly emphasizes the multi-faceted importance of the museum in modern society. In his essay “Art Museums, Inspiring Public Trust,” he explains that beyond academic representation and the communication of human history, the art museum is charged with the great task of providing opportunity for the “[...] pure reverie that an unencumbered aesthetic experience can inspire” (155). As he explains, the museum must both communicate the creative and social history of humanity and allow for the exploration of the soul that art and its presentation can encourage (155). Art museums, as Lowry, Duncan, and de Montebello all support, contain some of the most significant creations of humankind, relics that can move the mind, stir the soul, and present commentary on society as well as the past. They “help shape our understanding of ourselves and can either reflect and validate existing social values or underscore their absence” (Lowry 142). Not only do museums possess the power to embody the human experience and promote the study of history to further comprehension of humanity, but

they can also reflect societal values and ills, giving representation to greater public problems and the human experience.

Playing such a significant role in society, art museums have expanded across the nation, gaining importance and attention and embracing varied roles. Glenn D. Lowry, the art historian and director of the Museum of Modern Art mentioned before, is a particularly important voice in the study of museums, having a vast amount of first-hand experience with the politics, economics, ethical concerns, and history of these institutions. As he explains in his essay “A Deontological Approach to Art Museums and the Public Trust,” museums have long been considered a symbol of civilization, but today, they are “[...] highly successful enterprises that are now universally acknowledged as the preeminent civic institutions of our time” (131). It seems that every American city, from small to expansive, features at least one museum, or plans to build one in the near future (131). In the United States, there are approximately 3,500 art museums, patronized by about 68 million people every year (131). These museums serve a gamut of purposes and have come to represent something great in our society, being monuments of progress and human ingenuity. In recent years, however, despite aims to preserve culture and disseminate knowledge, the art museum has extended its role beyond the more limited purposes it once served (McClellan 230). The art museum, in fact, is a living organism that has had to adapt and respond to its surroundings, exploring different avenues for public education and cultural exploration (Lowry 131). Albert Ten Eyck Gardner, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, explained this development, claiming:

[The museum] is in fact a modern hybrid with the mingled characteristics of the cathedral, the royal palace, the theater, the school, the library, and according to

some critics, the department store. As the emphasis or activity shifts, the character of the organization changes. Thus when the museum serves as a place of entertainment, it takes on the dramatic quality of the theater, when it is used for scholarly purposes it can become an ivory tower, when its educational activities are stressed it becomes a school. In the family of social institutions invented by man, the place of the museum is not fixed. It is pliant and develops in many directions, or sometimes moves simultaneously in several directions (qtd in Lowry 138).

Here, Gardner is explaining the range of development seen in modern museums, who have responded to their communities and the needs of society in various ways. Art museums, like other institutions, can serve a number of purposes, from focusing on scholarship to entertaining; however, along these varied paths, serving the public and protecting cultural heritage have remained central, as the public stays at the core of the fundamental museum mission in education and enlightenment.

Public Trust:

Because of their significance in society, goals for the well-being of culture, and intimate relationship with the public, art museums have assumed a great duty in society and have established reputations based in veracity. These institutions interact constantly with and rely on the public, and due to the established idea of the museum mission being rooted in education and enlightenment, the community has grown to expect a certain level of trustworthiness in these institutions to fulfill their promises. This trust, however, is a multifaceted idea that encompasses the museum's ability to serve the public and abide by standards for cultural welfare, concepts that involve different opinions and a myriad of expectations for each institution. Glenn D. Lowry provides an important perspective in museum relations with the public and this idea of trust. Having directed one such institution that has long been pressured by high expectations, the Museum of Modern Art in New York, Lowry is extremely familiar with museum politics, economics,

and their convergence with the public. In his study of public relations, Lowry explains “trust” is a “[...] term that implies both a set of responsibilities—to preserve, protect, and enhance property on behalf of the public—and a code of conduct to ensure that this responsibility is discharged with the highest degree of skill and diligence” (Lowry 134). This means, essentially, that museums are presumed to owe the public honesty and integrity in both their behaviors and the fulfillment of their responsibilities, if they hope to best serve their public. Coming from the director of one of the most well known museums in the United States, Lowry’s opinion is significant, as it points to an understanding by museum officials of their responsibilities to the public and the great weight of their actions in these delicate relationships.

Philippe de Montebello, a similarly important museum director attaches to Lowry’s definition of trust the idea of authority (Montebello 154). As he explains, authority is comprised of “the quality projected by the institution as a result of its acknowledged seriousness of purpose, scholarship, respect for the works of art, and integrity as spokesman for their place, time, and creator” (154). The manner in which the museum presents itself, as he claims, and its sense of license is vital in its generation of public trust (154). The museum must communicate its intentions, seriousness, level of study, and a sense of appreciation for the art and its importance, while acting as a representative of the works, their creators, and histories (154). De Montebello writes that this sense of authority ultimately indicates the museum’s “purity of [...] intentions” (154). Without this feeling of trust and understanding that the museum is acting for the benefit of the people, from the communication of its integrity and authority, a museum

loses its relevance, and artworks would similarly be diminished and considered less significant (Winestein).

The art museum ultimately derives its value from this trust and its authenticity. Art museums serve the purpose of caring for and presenting the most important works of human creation, communicating their significance and “[...] shaping [...] understanding of why works of art deserve [...] attention and respect” (Lowry 139). When a person enters a museum, he or she expects to be shown the most significant works available, chosen by the careful hands of curators and museums administrators, with integrity, scholarship, and focus on serving the museum mission and their public. This is because, as the International Community of Museums, from before, put it in their definition of “museum,” the public expects authenticity and integrity in the “acquisition, conservation, research, communication, and exhibition [of] the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity” (ICOM). Museums provide viewers with the opportunity to see valuable pieces of art,

[...] while visitors place their trust in the integrity of the curators. It is exactly this confidence that the presentation of art in a museum is motivated by well-regarded scholarship, rather than commercial or political interest, together with a belief in the objects’ authenticity, that allows people to surrender completely to the aesthetic and spiritual power of art (Winestein).

A sense of trust and authenticity must be created within the museum to contribute to the experience. Without this trust between the museum and its public, the institution and its works, in turn, lose validity, and people are less able to give in to the power of art, fully enjoy it, and achieve the enlightenment it seeks to provide.

Lack of Regulation in Museum Behaviors

Despite these high expectations of museums to fulfill their duties to the public, however, there are few official regulatory systems and rules that define how they are supposed to behave, leaving accountability to the museum to realize public expectations (Lowry 135). This gives the maintenance and care of ethics and public trust directly to the institution (135). Therefore, museums officials must be cautious in their understanding of what they can and cannot do, based upon the expectations of their audiences, preconceived societal standards, and the institution's mission (135). With such a high level of responsibility, a museum must make smart, astute decisions and remain judicious in its approach to operations, programming, marketing, and its many decisions, as each move is subject to scrutiny (Montebello 155).

The Birth of Controversy

Out of this void in the regulation of museum behaviors and the proliferation of public assumptions, controversy often arises, because museums, like other public entities, must find ways to survive in a competitive, market-driven atmosphere. Glen D. Lowry again expresses the plight of art museums and considers the begrudging comprehension that these public temples operate in a tumultuous economy, subject to greater market forces and external pressures. As he writes:

We want our art museums to be places of repose and contemplation; venues of discovery and learning, awe and wonder, where we can become absorbed in the beauty of art. We do not expect them to have to deal with labor disputes and the harsh realities of the work place, and when [...] they do, we expect them to act in a way that is consistent with the values espoused by the art they display (Lowry 134).

As Lowry explains, much of the public has preconceived ideals that these institutions of art and learning are somehow distanced from basic economic factors and hardship, but they are, in fact, constantly trying to reconcile outside forces that influence their

behaviors with their core purpose and values. Because of such external factors as funding, labor disputes, and economic conditions, museums have had to change and grow in different ways as a response, especially in modernizing and developing urban centers (134). Lowry explains that museums today are rarely like the silent temples of the past and are instead becoming complex and busy entities with growing audiences, staffs, and collections of art (134). Museums must, in finding and embracing their changing identities as politics and commerce enter the equation, strike a precarious equilibrium between their behaviors and societal expectations to maintain trust with visitors (Winestein).

How Museums have Adapted to the Landscape

External factors, like finances and politics, have recently greatly influenced museum development and methods of survival, which has animated debates and provoked greater criticism from the public. Like other non-profits, museums “[...] operate in a highly charged environment where they have to constantly balance the pursuit of their core mission with the practicalities of managing large budgets and multiple responsibilities, from exhibition programs to libraries and restaurants” (Lowry 134). They have expanded and must manage more than ever, but as they grow, in their collections, shows, and physical spaces, they are cast more into the public eye. Increases in status have led to greater scrutiny, and it has become clear that art museums, like other public entities that must balance public interest and their own survival, are not perfect (132). Museums must sometimes make questionable decisions, and, therefore, do not always comply with public ideals or maintain propriety as the classic high temple of the arts, “[...] whether [by] allowing a sponsor to effectively buy an exhibition, or ceding

curatorial control to a donor or collector, or programming exhibitions solely to generate income, or entering into arrangements that involve real or perceived conflicts of interest” (132). There are a number of examples in which museums have behaved in unsavory ways, supposedly selling out or giving up control, integrity, and their own authority for economic reasons, from the Brooklyn Museum of Art to the Smithsonian (132). From acts that pursue financial stability over the museum mission, controversy arises.

Shifts to Increased Commercialism

Glen Lowry addresses the emphasis of museums critics on the ways in which these questionable practices have manifested as increased commercialism and greater focus on money in museums across the country. Many art historians and critics, like Roberta Smith, Michael Kimmelman, and others suggest that museums are, in a misguided effort, trying to compete with leisure activities (Lowry 131). In trying to appeal to moviegoers and sports enthusiasts, for example, museums have employed commercial strategies, distorting acceptable practice by bringing together the seemingly conflicting ideas of business and fine art (131). Some critics see museums as separate from commerce, though they operate in a vast and ever-changing economy. *New York Times* art critic Roberta Smith, in her article “Memo to Art Museums: Don’t Give Up on Art,” describes this shift toward commercialism as an identity crisis, in which art museums seek to be “anything but art museums,” due to the influence of popular culture and finances (Smith). Smith believes that museum officials seem to worry that art, itself, is not a powerful enough draw to maintain financial safety, societal significance, and audience interest, so institutions have resorted to business methods to gain attention and support (Smith).

Increasingly commercial goals in museums, however, have exasperated challenges to public trust. As Lowry explains, “[...] the inexorable democratization and commercialization of art museums [...] has resulted in a crisis of confidence [...],” where the public has grown suspicious of true institutional intentions (Lowry 131). While people often hope that a museum will fulfill its goals and protect public interests, problems emerge where finances and art intersect. A recent debacle at the Smithsonian Institution exemplifies this conflict between economics and the organization’s mission. In this 2001 case, the Catherine Reynolds Foundation pledged a thirty-eight million dollar donation to form an “American Achievers” exhibition program at the Smithsonian, in which the contributor, Catherine Reynolds, would have ultimate approval rights over the honorees and display (145). There was a quick and adamant response to the terms of the donation, as many felt that the donor’s input could jeopardize the intellectual integrity of the institution and its collections (145). In recent years, similar examples have abounded, showing the complex relationship between the museum mission, finances, and the public. The balance of the three is precarious, especially in an increasingly globalized and entertainment-driven world, and museums have attempted to test the limits of decorous traditional procedure (145). Despite their many obstacles and an exploration of potential business practices, however, the public has been largely unwilling to negotiate and recognize the necessity for adaptation of expectations and museum policies (135).

Museum Economics

Contradictions of public trust have been worsened greatly by a common lack of understanding of museum economics. Though museums share traits with other public organizations, American economist, Harvard professor, and past advisor to President

Reagan, Martin Feldstein claims that museums have to operate differently than other cultural centers, as they have the responsibility of guarding and preserving the physical evidence of culture, rather than simply displaying it (1). According to Feldstein, who is well versed in American economics and organizations, museums allocate their money to three main areas: operations, the accumulation of art, and construction and repairs (2). Operation budgets largely maintain employees, including curators, guards, conservators, and other staff, who are vital to daily activity (2). Technology, in this arena, does not help to reduce the costs of personnel as it does in other businesses, because, for museums needs, people are necessary (3). This means that operating costs increase as wages rise. As for the acquisition of art, different museums have varying approaches. In general, however, the purchase of new works of art can be extremely difficult, as a museum possesses many costs in other areas (3). As a result, museums often rely on gifts, loans, or the sale of some of their own pieces in order to diversify or expand their collections. Finally, spending on construction projects can be necessary as a means of increasing the museum's space for display and for improved preservation (3). While funds for construction projects are often easier to generate, they can, in turn, increase operation costs due to larger facilities (3).

To support their goals and daily operations, museums rely on a range of sources for funding, but for many, adequate financial backing can be difficult to earn and maintain. Most major art museums use combinations of income from donors and admissions, profits earned in museum retail stores and eateries, national endowment funds, and small contributions from the government (4). This combination of resources is not always sufficient, and many art museums have grown reliant on private donors. In

a survey of the hundred largest museums in the United States, it was found that private monetary donations, from both individuals and corporations, add up to approximately one-third of operating costs (5). Other museums, excluding the largest surveyed in the country, depend almost solely on appropriations from private benefactors, but, despite incentives for tax deductions and charitable opportunity, donors can be difficult to attract (Frey 1031). In some cases, to appeal to donors, museums must relinquish some power to them (1031). These donors often have their own ideas and stipulations regarding the use of their monies and properties, so many museums choose to abide by donor wishes to maintain good relations and funding (1031). Greater pressure to conform to the standards of their wealthy backers have led to betrayals of devotion to institutional integrity and cast public opinion into doubt because, by prioritizing the veneration of donors and their requests, the museum jeopardizes its own authority and sometimes disappoints the public in the process.

Combined with other sources of funding, including admissions fees and endowments, even private donations can be inadequate in supporting the museum. In the same study by Feldstein of the hundred largest American museums, it was found that admission fees only generate about five-percent of a museum's revenue and that federal funding has historically been very limited (Feldstein 4). Money from endowments similarly provides about a sixth of the funding needed for operation, but for long-term goals and as costs rise, endowments can quickly become insufficient (6). As a result, art museums often have very limited funds available because they operate in a realm aimed toward "public good," with fewer tangible benefits to society (7). A hospital, on the

other hand, may receive greater funding, as its importance is more immediate and visible (7). This leaves museums as a last priority in the funding of American society.

Funding, Money Allocation, and Where it Leaves the Museum Mission

Managing limited resources, financial crises, and a lack of societal precedence, museums have to make careful decisions as to where to allocate their funds. Often, in order to expand in one realm, a museum must curtail another (Feldstein 7). A sizable donation, for example, could support a number of programs, so officials must choose where the money would best reflect public interests, like in the founding of an outreach program for disadvantaged students as compared to continuing a lecture series for educators (7). Museum officials, therefore, must constantly weigh the advantages and disadvantages of their choices because, in the country's contemporary economy, there is rarely enough money for museums to realize every aspect of their mission (9). As economist Martin Feldstein argues, the simple fact is that market forces alone cannot support museums entirely (10). Their survival relies on a complex number of factors, being largely influenced by society (10). To make up for consistent gaps in budgets, museums are driven to reduce costs or fundraise in controversial ways, like by adhering to donor wishes and sacrificing certain elements of integrity, because they are simply not provided with enough governmental or societal support to accomplish all their aims (10). Museums are held to the high standard of protecting public interest and culture, but there is not adequate public support for them to thrive financially in this environment.

To survive in such a harsh climate, marred by so many financial and societal pressures, museums have been forced many times to challenge public trust by turning to popular tastes and goals for growth over focus on institutional integrity. Today,

museums are larger and more internally intricate than ever, in physical size, finances, and labor (Montebello 157). These institutions require larger budgets than ever before, but as discussed earlier, adequate funding has been difficult to maintain as encumbrances continue to expand (157). Growth has created a cycle of increased exhibition, programming, staffing, and other elements, which requires and affects greater patronage and the need for financing (158). Philippe de Montebello described this continuing cycle of enterprise, writing:

[...] the continuing pressure to keep the public coming [...] calls for subjects of a popular nature. Over and beyond this temptation to choose exhibition subjects primarily for their popular appeal, the trap in which museums are now caught, is that in order to maintain financial equilibrium, the dizzying momentum in the activity level must be sustained (Montebello 158).

Museums, as he claims, become caught in a fast-paced cycle to maintain activity, expanding and continually attracting more visitors through development and popular appeal. This cycle creates further pressures, outside of already complicated operations and financing, to increase pace and attract larger and more diverse crowds with popular subjects and the creation of greater public appeal.

Developing the Art Museum and its Popularity: Blockbusters and Superstar

Museums

Economist Bruno Frey similarly examined the role of popular appeal in art museums and identifies two main late twentieth and twenty-first century movements as a means of keeping pace: the rise of “superstar museums” and the creation of special exhibitions, or blockbuster shows (Frey 1035). As author Andrew McClellan defines it, a blockbuster exhibition is simply a “[...] large-scale show full of masterpieces and accompanied by extensive publicity [...]” (McClellan 212). These blockbuster exhibitions can be extremely lucrative, as they attract astounding numbers of visitors and

allow museums to raise prices and funds (Frey 1034). Blockbuster shows have saved a number of museums from financial disaster, as the success of exhibitions holds power over “ [...] attendance, ticket sales, membership, shop revenues, activity in the café, the private use of the building for business or social purposes, [and] [...] virtually everything quantifiable[...].” (McClellan 213). In addition to these lucrative special exhibitions, other museums have expanded to adopt the “superstar” model described by Frey. These famous Superstar museums, including the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the National Gallery in London, and others, draw high volumes of patrons and feature world-renowned pieces and artists (Frey 1036). Such superstar museums are typically more developed, due to high demand, expectations, and greater financial resources and donations, and have a great effect on their surrounding economies (1037). To remain on top, however, these Superstars must invest a great amount of effort and resources in blockbuster shows and the development of more programming and special events (1037). Though these trends in special exhibitions and superstar museums seemingly embrace a more business-like model, museums are still expected to serve their missions and the public as high arts institutions. With greater resources, they may be more capable of accomplishing their public and cultural goals, but here, again, the intersection of finances and art can be troublesome.

Because of greater economic and social pressures, many museums have had to adopt new operational methods that at times seem to compromise their fundamental values in public service, as a result. Critics and the public have increasingly questioned museum methods for earning revenue and attracting donors and visitors, denouncing their ways as devious and commercialized, but in some cases, these actions are necessary. As

Feldstein points out, “There is a distressing contrast between the cultural importance and artistic treasures of our nation's leading museums and their very modest operating budgets” (Feldstein 10). Society, despite its immense expectations of the museum as a nearly sacred ground, believes its trust to be breached by ingenuous actions, when, really, many of these controversial institutions have been forced to adapt in these ways due to lack of funding and cultural support.

In the following sections, I will discuss two examples of contemporary museums that have had to pursue divisive routes of action to gain financial stability out of necessity. The Barnes Foundation and the Giorgio Armani exhibition at Guggenheim, my two case studies, demonstrate the need for museums to challenge public trust in the contemporary American economy, by taking steps to secure funding that have seemingly jeopardized integrity and relations with the public as a response to greater financial and societal pressures. Despite public concern over institutional authority, I will show that without pursuing such controversial methods, both art museums would not have been able to continue their missions in the future or thrive. Their actions merely reflect their greater goals for the public and demonstrate a necessary response for survival in a society that does not give adequate support to the arts and arts funding.

Part II: Case Study 1: The Barnes Foundation

The case of the Barnes Foundation provides an example of the breach of public trust as an attempt for survival for the institution, as a modern American museum. In this case, after years of controversy and lawsuits, the small Foundation and its incredible collection were moved from their original location in a suburb of Philadelphia to the center of the city in 2012, directly breaking the founder's indenture and provoking a vast

amount of contention. The blatant disregard for the founder's wishes and concern over funding by the Foundation's Board seemed a direct affront to public trust, throwing into question the protections for donors and pieces and the Foundation's respect for institutional integrity. Their actions, however, can be viewed as a necessary response to financial crisis and an adaptation to surrounding society that, in the end, benefitted the public. The move ultimately increased public access to the collection, raised awareness, and generated new funds and programming to more effectively pursue the institution's original mission.

The History of Dr. Barnes and His Foundation

The Barnes Foundation, has a long history, being a source of intrigue and scandal since its founding in the 1920's. Dr. Albert C. Barnes, its founder, grew up poor in Philadelphia but amassed a large fortune as a pharmaceutical mogul (Dolkart 10), selling and producing the medication Argyrol through the A.C. Barnes Company (Anderson 2). His fascination with art steadily grew with his wealth, and he frequently travelled abroad to look at and purchase new pieces for his personal collection of modern art (Dolkart 11). Barnes had a keen eye and began collecting pieces of Impressionist and post-Impressionist masters, styles that were not widely accepted or understood at the time, with the help of artists and other collectors like Leo and Gertrude Stein and dealers like Durand-Ruel and Guillame (11). After a decade of acquisition, and having accumulated over 700 pieces of art, Barnes established the Foundation in 1925 in his mansion in the Philadelphia suburb of Merion (9).

Called "the Medici of the New World" by one dealer, Barnes voraciously continued his acquisition of art and opened the collection to the public as an organization

for learning (Dolkart 11), not a museum or a gallery, but instead as “a nonprofit institution dedicated to advancing Barnes’ own brand of art education and appreciation” (Anderson 2). The collection, now valued at more than \$6 billion, includes 180 paintings by Pierre-Auguste Renoir, 69 by Paul Cézanne, the highest concentration in the world, 60 by Henri Matisse, 44 by Pablo Picasso, 18 Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and 14 by Amedeo Modigliani (5). It also features important pieces by Charles Demuth, William Glackens, Maurice Penderghast, Chaim Soutine, Paul Gauguin, and early modern, African, and Native American art, with Pennsylvania German crafts (Watson 6-9). In his galleries, Barnes arranged the works in meticulous, aesthetically designed “ensembles,” disregarding organization by time period, style, and origin, and instead combining the “fine, decorative, and industrial arts [...]” (Dolkart 24). Through these unique arrangements, he hoped to engage the public and his students in conversation of the “universal language of art” (17).

Dr. Barnes’s Mission

With the founding of the institution, Barnes established a set of goals, which he included in an indenture to guide the management of the Foundation’s future. His main purpose, as stated in the Indenture, was the “promotion of the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts” through the “development of critical thinking [...] and educational reform” (Dolkart 17). He hoped to create greater understanding and respect for art, and for this reason, the Foundation held classes in art history and art appreciation, a model emulated by later educational institutions (Rudenstine 121). His approach to the study of the arts was unique, based on “visual experience,” evaluation, and discussion of art and its past, as well as an exploration of the emotion behind the

pieces (Dolkart 25). In his studies and classes, he provoked students to consider the artists' inspirations and attempt to "see as the artist sees" (27). In this environment, Barnes's students were able to glean a better understanding of the arts, enjoying his extensive collection of works.

As part of his educational mission for the Foundation, the public was a central focus. Barnes, when he founded the institution, sought to provide access to the public, considering the poor, working classes, and students who might not normally have the opportunity to interact with and learn about this art (Rudenstine 117). In a 1930's interview for *The New Republic*, Barnes explained his position, demonstrating his belief in art being universal and something that should be enjoyed by everyone. He claimed that the institution would provide "a sensible use of leisure in a class of people to whom such doors were usually locked" (117). To bring these common people in, Barnes intended to open the galleries to the public two days every week for no charge (117). To ensure this would continue, he specified in the Indenture that "the plain people [...], men and women who gain their livelihood by daily toil in shops, factories, schools, stores, and similar places shall have free access to the art gallery" (118). His emphasis here, and throughout the Indenture, was on the public and the working classes. As he explained, the working class would be welcome to partake in the Foundation's study of art and its appreciation, having access to pieces of culture they would not otherwise see. Despite his democratic aims initially, however, the Foundation grew more exclusive over time and drifted from its mission (118). The Foundation's methods and small staff began to neglect interaction with the public, and visitorship became limited to select groups of

“insiders” and Barnes’ established students (121). This was in large part due to the institution’s removed location and greater restrictions on visitation (121).

The Indenture:

Despite the Foundation’s growing exclusivity, Barnes hoped to continue his educational mission following his death, through the creation of an indenture that would guide the running of the Foundation in the future. The Indenture, written in 1922, set out specific bylaws and instructions that were intended to protect the collection and the founder’s ideals, but its provisions were as detailed and meticulous as Barnes’ art arrangements in his galleries, becoming a hindrance in the years after his death (Anderson 28). Through the document, Barnes had set out \$6 million from his own accounts and A.C. Barnes Company stock as an endowment, including a clause that prohibited the investment of outside monies following his death (28). The endowment, in fact, could only be invested in “federal, state, and municipal bonds” (28). He prohibited fundraising through special events and even fixed the salaries of employees. Finally, he stipulated that control over the Foundation would be left in the hands of five trustees, chosen by his intended successor, Lincoln University (28). As part of the document, he decided that if the Foundation could no longer operate independently, by its own earnings and endowment, it should be dissolved and the objects given to “an existing and organized institution in Philadelphia or its suburbs” that maintained comparable public and educational goals (29).

The beginning of controversy and financial crisis

Following Barnes’ death in 1951, the Barnes Foundation experienced many years of mismanagement and internal corruption, but in the 1990’s, the most recent controversy

commenced, propagated by conflicts with the strict Indenture that the founder had created. Richard Glanton, a lawyer, board member, and counsel for Lincoln University, was given the position as Chair of the Board in 1990, beginning an era of public skepticism, as he attempted to repair the internal damage that had been done since the founder's death (Rudenstine 157). Glanton immediately recognized the dire financial situation of the Barnes and sought to remedy these issues to save it from what he and his financial advisors identified as "inevitable insolvency" (157). Estimating a need for \$30 million that year alone for operation and new expansion and renovation projects, Glanton pled for changes to the Indenture to raise funds, but there was outcry over the breaking of the founder's legal stipulations, and many court cases ensued (157).

Glanton's fundraising strategies were met with severe opposition, but many of the projects were, in fact, advantageous. As explained by author, educator, and supporter of the arts Neil L. Rudenstine, Richard Glanton's projects were successful in significantly raising funding and visibility for the institution. Rudenstine provides an important opinion on the Barnes Foundation, analyzing the history, finances, and controversy surrounding the organization in his book *The House of Barnes*. Though not a museum official, Rudenstine provides a voice in defense of the arts and looks at the benefits of increasing access to the collection for the good of the public, speaking from his extensive experience in academics and the arts (ARTstor). Rudenstine has been known for promoting humanities and the arts, as seen during his ten years as President of Harvard, in his education and time as a professor, and serving as chairman of the organization ARTstor (ARTstor). Therefore, his explanation of the Barnes controversy provides a

thorough exploration of the Foundation's support for its mission and public and cultural welfare.

As Rudenstine explains, Glanton disrespected donor intent for good reason. Against the Indenture, which prohibited the removal of the art from its original location, Glanton organized a travelling show, which outraged some, by closing the Foundation and sending pieces from the permanent collection on a world tour, during which time institutions would have to pay a large fee for rights to display the pieces (Rudenstine 159). The collection was sent to Europe, Japan, Canada, and through United States, earning more than \$17 million dollars and gaining fans in a performance that demonstrated what Rudenstine identifies as the "power" and "magnetism" of the collection (159). At the National Gallery, the exhibit was seen by 500,000 visitors, in Tokyo, 1 million, and in Paris, 1.5 million. It was praised by prominent members of society, including ambassadors and Supreme Court judges, as well as the public (159). The success of the travelling show was a testament to the prestige of the collection and elevated awareness, funds, and the profile of the Barnes Foundation and its reputation.

In another fundraising effort, Glanton published a catalogue of the greatest works in the collection, which earned more funding and exposed more individuals to the artworks, and held a celebratory dinner on the Barnes premises, which intensified arguments between the combative Merion Township and the Foundation (Rudenstine 160). Neighbors continually complained, and sued, over new traffic and increased attention and visitors to the area (Argott). Thousands of museumgoers began to visit Merion each week to view the historic Barnes, and the neighborhood was infiltrated with buses, tourists, students, and large tour groups (Argott). The once small museum was

quickly becoming a commercial attraction and seemingly outgrowing its limited space in the affluent residential neighborhood (Argott). Complaints from the Township grew, and Glanton had to defend each publicity move in court and continue to disobey the Indenture to try to gain financial security for the struggling institution (Rudenstine 160).

In another illegal step, Glanton attempted to open the galleries to the public 6 days a week, throughout the year, increasing the entrance fee to \$10, so that the Foundation could earn a large part of its annual spending (161). He hoped, through extended hours, to receive about 115,000 visitors per year, but protests by the community and control by the Indenture stifled his plans (161). The Foundation was legally limited to opening for two and a half days each week, which would result in about 48,000 guests per year, less than half of the patronage for which Glanton had hoped (161).

Despite efforts to save the sinking foundation, the public met Richard Glanton's methods with vast contention, and the institution seemed condemned (Rudenstine 160). Glanton was in and out of court for the duration of his term, and the controversy continued, as Rudenstine described it, like "[...] a game of legal ping-pong with many actors in the drama: Glanton, the neighbors, the students, the township commissioners, the zoning board, the federal courts, the Montgomery County Orphans' Court, and the Superior Court of Pennsylvania" (162). The Foundation was "doomed by [the] Indenture," in Rudenstine's opinion, because the stipulations were so specific that they prevented the institution from adapting to the modern world.

In 1998, an audit of the Foundation revealed just how outdated the financial restrictions in the Indenture had become. Expenses had increased by 1000% since the most recent update of the document in the 1950's, and Glanton and the board members

did not see how the Foundation could continue to function with its allotted funds (Rudenstine 162). For that year, the Foundation expected a deficit of approximately \$4.5 million, which advisers predicted would worsen (162). It seemed that the “longer term finances of the Foundation were irremediable” because the Foundation could not support itself or its staff (163).

The Barnes Foundation was clearly in crisis, and as Rudenstine explains in his book *The House of Barnes*, Glanton had taken all the steps he could, each with much difficulty, and time seemed to be exasperating the issues. “Payrolls had to be met, art had to be guarded, essential functions had to continue, and all of these required money, on schedule, in a way that met professional standards. Under these conditions, it was not clear how long the Foundation could continue to operate” (Rudenstine 164). The Foundation had to carry on in the midst of financial turmoil, and legal issues with breaking the Indenture and public retaliation were marring the advancement of the organization. Glanton, however, did move the institution toward progress. Though his methods directly violated the Indenture and challenged public trust, Glanton successfully held social and fundraising events, sent the exhibition on tour, created a catalogue for the public, installed a parking lot onsite, completed a renovation project, and installed climate control in the building, the first steps toward the larger aim of protecting public property and the institution (164).

Controversy under Dr. Bernard Watson

Controversy continued for another decade under the direction of the new chair Dr. Bernard Watson, who pursued the burgeoning struggle that led to the relocation of the Barnes Foundation into the city of Philadelphia. Assuming the position of chair of the

board of trustees in 1999, when the Foundation was in crisis, Watson immediately created a plan for the coming years but discovered that he could not generate enough income for the museum through outside investments (Rudenstine 168). Many potential donors did not see the Barnes as a worthy venture, recognizing its financial instability, the ongoing controversy with its neighbors, and the exclusivity of the institution (167). A few large organizations, including the J. Paul Getty Trust, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Luce Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trusts contributed large grants for specific projects to archive and evaluate certain parts of the collection, but these funds did not aid in operation costs or any of the institution's immediate problems (169). Instead, it appeared that the Barnes Foundation was plummeting further into debt and losing sight of its goals for the future of art education for the public.

Breaking the Indenture

In September 2002, Watson and the board of trustees appealed in court for permission to break the Indenture to move to Philadelphia, “[...] where the prospects for substantial funding and strong support for the Barnes were evidently strong” and where continued problems with Merion, with the neighbors and residential zoning restrictions could be put to rest (171). Abiding by legal standards, the relocation of the Barnes Foundation could only be deemed legitimate if its original location was inhibiting its ability to continue its mission (Argott). Philadelphia seemed to promise a brighter future, where the Foundation could receive more support from the public and escape the obstructive limitations of Merion and its citizens (Rudenstine 171). In the Indenture, Barnes had created a stipulation about this, in which he claimed that the institution should be “dissolved” and the items distributed to surrounding Pennsylvania entities in the case

that the mission was failing (171). With such an incredible and renowned collection, however, dissolution seemed a tragedy. As repeated by art historians and even Matisse upon his 1930 visit to the Foundation, there have been no comparable private collections like the Barnes (Argott). To lose the Foundation would be tantamount to losing one of the single most influential collections in the modern world. So, like many museums administrators before him, Watson was faced with the decision to break public trust or follow donor intent, by moving “[...] to a supportive location and a sympathetic constituency—where there was a prospect of revitalizing the Barnes and raising necessary funds on a continuing basis [...]” or dissolving the institution (Rudenstine 171). Philadelphia seemed the best option. Based on Barnes’ initial goals, the city of Philadelphia held “[...] promise of greater openness and accessibility in a ‘democratic’ milieu [...]” and seemed to promise survival to the suffering institution (174).

Watson and the board of trustees brought their case to the Orphans’ Court of Montgomery, before Judge Stanley Ott in 2002, beginning a long revision process (Rudenstine 179). Ott, who had previous experience with the Barnes, hoped to protect the founder’s mission (180). He delayed the decision and heard from many analysts and multiple sides to ensure that there was sufficient evidence that the Barnes could be sustained and prosper in the city (182). Ott, in his conclusions, estimated that the Foundation, even with a sale of certain properties, would be left with an endowment that was \$50 million below what they required to survive (183). From a financial standpoint, Philadelphia seemed a viable option, but Ott was careful in his assessment, also considering fulfillment of the Barnes mission.

Like many, Ott recognized that Barnes' intentions were, at times, confusing—the man had wanted the educational project to continue, supposedly for the public, but had made his program extremely exclusive toward the end of his life (Rudenstine 184). Beneath this reclusiveness, however, lay a continuing care for public good and equity in art education, based in the Barnes' own foundation (184). One piece of evidence, for example, embodied his desire to make the gallery more welcoming to the public after his death (184). In a letter to a friend in 1923, Barnes wrote, “[...] I want to prepare the way for the gallery to be a public one after my death,” alluding to increasing public access to his collections (184). Barnes seemed to change his position during his lifetime, gravitating more toward the exclusivity of the Institution later, but throughout the Indenture, and in communications like this letter, Barnes expressed a mindfulness of the public.

Considering Barnes' aims, Judge Ott and the board of trustees attempted to combine his seemingly conflicted ideals. They decided to reform the foundation into one that would be open to a diverse public while also maintaining a program that would provide education for a small number of students, who would have private access to the galleries at certain times (Rudenstine 184). A building in Philadelphia seemed advantageous to accomplish this, as it would be more centralized and accessible, have funding, and lack the restrictions to hours experienced in Merion, meaning that the gallery would be able to share its time between students and the greater public (185). Ott ruled in favor of the Barnes' relocation, and in addition, allowed that the Indenture be dismantled, meaning that the trustees would be able to charge admission fees, tour the artworks, and even deaccession them if they saw fit (Anderson 220). In the city, the

Foundation would have more freedom and expected more opportunity for funding and investors, who could contribute to expanding and improving educational programs, things that, for the Board, meant the continuance of the Foundation's mission (Rudenstine 185).

Criticism

From the perspective of the public, however, the Foundation's actions seemed a clear breach of trust. There were a range of opponents, including Merion citizens, Barnes students, intellectuals, academic groups, museum administrators, and the media (Rudenstine 186). The case caused uproar in the art world, especially, and encouraged a significant amount of public involvement, objection over the decision to disobey the Indenture of the founder, and accusations of conspiracy due to ethical concerns (Argott). As one critic claimed, it seemed to be "the largest act of vandalism since the Second World War" (Kenicott). Not only had the Foundation broken the Indenture and disregarded donor intent, but it seemed to critics that the institution had chosen the more profitable route over integrity (Kenicott). By 2011, Philadelphia institutions and individual supporters had given about 100 million dollars to the Foundation for the move, and many critics believed that the large donors, Pew, Lenfest, and Annenberg had somehow forced the relocation by withholding funding until a move was secured (Argott). Along with supposedly accepting bribes, the Foundation's board would have to relinquish some powers to these organizations (Argott). When the deal was made for relocation, the court ruled that the board would have to be made up of fifteen people, rather than its original five, seven of which would be approved by Lenfest and Pew (Anderson 220). The court ruling, however, claimed that trustees would be decided based on merit, by their "integrity" and "potential value to the Foundation" (qtd 220).

Along with doubt over the museum's integrity due to ostensible financial exploitation, opponents also criticized the plans for the new building, and media portrayals were particularly harsh. Because the original mansion in Merion had been so central to the Barnes' identity, students of the Foundation and others cited the importance of its Merion location (Rudenstine 181). Many felt that relocation would destroy the unique, removed atmosphere, an intrinsic part of the experience (181). For them, the move was insensitive toward the Foundation's singular character and the donor's vision (181). In dramatic media portrayals, including newspaper articles, a documentary, and books, the museum was demonized. Headlines like "Bogus Barnes Foundation: Fake Galleries, Phony Populism" and "Art Held Hostage" appeared across the nation. Art critics and authors claimed that the relocation was a decision made out of "ignorance" and greed, while the artworks were essentially stolen and public trust broken (Rudenstine 186). These reactions, however, reflect a lack of understanding of the complexity of museum politics and finances and were shortsighted in their disregard for the benefits of a move.

The Barnes, Reborn in Philadelphia

Despite dissatisfaction with its relocation and believed disrespect for public trust, The Barnes Foundation upheld its mission for the welfare of the public through these actions, and this "subversion of donor intent," as some called it (Argott), was justified. Not only would the new location in Philadelphia provide financial stability and community support for a foundation that was running a high deficit and a debt of \$70,000, but, through the relocation, the Barnes Foundation was able to further its

original mission, as laid out by the founder (Rudenstein). As Rudenstein pointed out, the board maintained the interests of the people in their pursuit of funding:

Throughout, the board's central focus was on the goal of fulfilling the Foundation's fundamental purposes: to expand and diversify or 'democratize' access to the Barnes collection and its educational programs while also finding a location where the Barnes could expect to be strongly and predictably supported from a financial as well as a 'community' point of view (192).

During the controversy, though their methods seemed dubious, the board of trustees sought funding and a new location in order to maintain the ideals created by Barnes, seeking to continue his mission for education and the public good.

The changed location and modernized building for the new Barnes, in fact, seem to forecast success. Despite the adversity the Foundation had to overcome to relocate, the Philadelphia building, opened in May of 2012, remains true to the original facility in many ways and simultaneously provides new opportunity for visitors and the institution. Author and New York Times art critic Roberta Smith praised the change, claiming, "a museum, reborn, remains true to its old self, only better." Though set in a 93,000-square-foot new building, designed by Tod Williams Billie Tsien Architects (Booker), the architects and curators honored Barnes by preserving most of his original design in 12,000 square feet at the heart of the facility (Smith). The primary twenty-four galleries maintain the founder's same arrangements, signature mustard-yellow walls, and wood moulding, and the organization of the art replicates "the scale, proportion, and configuration of the original Merion gallery" (Booker). Only one piece was moved from its initial arrangement for better viewing, Henri Matisse's *La Bonheur de Vivre* (Smith).

As Smith writes in her review, the new building provides a "sensitive" re-creation of Dr. Barnes's Foundation, with new liberation for the museum and the pieces through

modernized amenities (Smith). The building is now complete with two eateries, modern classrooms, event and lecture halls, a studio for conservation projects, a large special exhibitions hall, a gift shop, and an atrium, built around the replication of the original space (Rosenbaum). Improved climate control and lighting that mixes artificial and natural elements better complement the works and ensure their preservation, abiding by the museum's original mission to protect this cultural property for the public and the future (Smith).

In Philadelphia, the \$150 million building is set on a 4.5-acre property in the center of the city, where it has already added to the economy and culture of the community. This new museum is built along Benjamin Franklin Parkway in Philadelphia, enhancing the "cultural campus" or "museum mile" that includes such institutions as the Franklin Institute, the Academy of Natural Sciences, the Rodin Museum, the city's science museum, the Free Library, and several art universities and their galleries, including Moore College of Art and Design (Strauss). This has created a high concentration of cultural and educational institutions in a small area, which is especially beneficial for students, as Philadelphia, in 2005, had the highest number of art students for its population in the entire United States (Strauss). Other institutions on the Parkway have also benefitted from Barnes tourists, seeing 28 percent more visitors in a period of seven months following its opening (Salisbury). Additionally, hotels in the area report an increase in room reservations, which have risen to numbers seen before the recession (Salisbury). With such benefits as the new building and its location in the cultural center of Philadelphia, the Barnes move has fueled excitement over tourism income potential for the city and educational opportunities (Anderson 220).

Perhaps most important, the new Barnes, has also preserved the mission of its founder, finding a way to continue the educational and public project he began ninety years ago. As stated in the Indenture, the main purpose of the Barnes Foundation had been to promote “education and the appreciation in the fine arts” (Rudenstine 172). Though the actual Foundation had implemented his ideas in different ways throughout the years, the Indenture indicated a strong sense of democracy and emphasized the “spreading” of art and knowledge (172). He claimed, many times, to want his organization to “be operative for the spread of the principles of democracy and education” for the “the plain people,” ideas that the Foundation has continued in the present (172). In their mission statement today, The Barnes Foundation quotes its founder from 1922, aiming to maintain “the promotion of the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts.” In order to further this mission, they claim that they will support and provide education in and admiration of the arts “[...] through the preservation, presentation, and interpretation of the collections of Albert C. and Laura L. Barnes” (*Barnes*).

One way in which the Barnes Foundation has visibly carried out this mission is through the accessibility of the new facility and its welcoming of the public, or the “plain people,” as Barnes called them. In its first seven months, the Institution received nearly 217,000 visitors, 8.5 percent above predictions (Salisbury). The board expects an annual patronage of 250,000 people, four times the amount accommodated in Merion (Rosenbaum), where it received approximately 60,000 annual guests (Rudenstine 160). The Merion location was restrictive and kept many members of Philadelphia from equal participation. As Rudenstine writes, “The collection was fabled, but few had ever seen it

[...]” (160). Now, hundreds of thousands of people will have access to some of the greatest artworks in history, being welcomed as the “plain people” that Barnes originally wanted to include, in a facility that can accommodate more visitors, is easier to reach, and has extended hours (Rosenbaum).

These visitors have, so far, ventured to the Barnes from around the world, from Mexico City, to Berlin, to Portland, as discovered by reporter and art critic Stephan Salisbury (Salisbury). Many were drawn by the incredible art and by the controversy surrounding the institution, but numbers look promising for the future (Salisbury). Since May, director and President of the Foundation Derek A. Gilman claims that there was a single day during which the gallery was not at capacity, directly following Hurricane Sandy (Salisbury). Along with the welcoming of the general public, as Dr. Barnes once intended, the new facility has encouraged increased membership. In Merion, the Foundation had 400 members, but now claims 25,043 members (Salisbury).

The Barnes Foundation, in extending public access, has continued to pursue the educational goals of Dr. Barnes. The Foundation is “still a school,” as Kimberly Camp, CEO of the Barnes, claims, with focus on educational programming (Strauss). The institution had been extremely limited in its reach in Merion, despite original intentions for public education (Rudenstine 173). In one study of students during the 1980’s, it was discovered that the student body had been mainly limited to upper-middle class white women from the Philadelphia suburbs, with very little diversity and few claiming residence in the city of Philadelphia (173). The removed location and high expense of courses at the Foundation greatly reduced the variety of students and patronage and hindered the original democratic aims of Barnes to include the working classes (174).

The new location, in comparison, provides much greater access and more variety in programs to encourage diversity in its student body and attendance (*Barnes*). As indicated on the Foundation's website, the institution now offers workshops, semester, and yearlong courses about specific artists, formal elements, architecture, art analysis, and other topics. One course, for example, "ArtNow!", taught by John Gatti explores the current state of art and its relation to "cultural, social, political, and ideological issues," a class in which students learn through exploration of the Barnes collection, lectures with modern artists, art dealers, academics, and professionals, and visits to other museums (*Barnes*). In addition, the Barnes Foundation now offers greater community programming. The Foundation advertises the regular presentation of children's art films, poetry and story readings, musical performances, documentary film screenings, and lectures, expanded from the limited programming available at the Barnes in Merion (*Barnes*). Dr. Barnes, in fact, had planned lectures and performances in his original facility, but they were often only attended by elite members of society, those that Barnes included in his small circle of friends (Rudenstine 112).

Today, however, much of the programming does not limit attendance by invite or cost. Programs like the "ArtTime Pajama Tour" for children and the film screening "Borom Sarret and Black Girl" are open to the public and display the range of programming currently offered to the masses and designed to pique different interests to include more than Barnes's elites (*Barnes*). Outreach is furthered through a K through 12 program that provides visiting and outreach arts opportunities to schools, and the Merion campus remains open for continuing arboretum classes, begun in the 1920's by Barnes (*Barnes*). Through such public programming and educational courses, the Barnes

Foundation has upheld the founder's original mission and developed it further, successfully boosting public access, education, and exposure to the arts for the public.

The Barnes Foundation provides a prime example of a modern museum's response to its situation. Though the institution directly broke public trust on multiple occasions, breaching the Founder's original Indenture and causing controversy with the public, its actions were justified to save a dying museum and ultimately benefitted the public and furthered its mission. Early attempts to gain revenue by board members and Richard Glanton, though they were not successful in the long run, helped to sustain the original Barnes for a time. Financial problems worsened for years following the founder's death, however, causing greater controversy as the museum floundered. Finally, in the early 2000's, relocation became the only viable solution. The final court case permitted the Barnes to move to an urban center in which it could flourish, with more visitors, greater access, expanded educational programming, and boons to the surrounding city. The Barnes Foundation, though seemingly disingenuous in its actions, was acting in response to greater internal and external pressures. Despite appearances, the move promoted greater diversity in patronage and provided increased access to the incredible aesthetic and educational resources of the Barnes, supporting the mission of Dr. Barnes, in inclusion, public edification, and the preservation of culture.

Part III: Case Study of the Giorgio Armani Exhibition at the Solon R. Guggenheim Museum

In a second case of museum controversy, the integrity of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum was cast into question when directors chose to test the limits of public expectation to fulfill funding needs and a desire for prestige, by staging a

retrospective exhibition of the fashion of Giorgio Armani that followed a \$15 million dollar donation from the designer, himself. This 2000 exhibition led to questions over the museum's sense of ethics, as its officials had seemingly disregarded responsibility to the public and to art. By allowing the designer to provide a donation before his own exhibition, the museum appeared to have essentially leased its exhibition space to Armani and, wielding power as a protector of culture, the museum, in effect, elevated the designer's work to high art, claiming its merit in an art historical context. Many critics wondered, however, whether their choice of subject matter was grounded in their belief in the designer as an artist or swayed by money. The show, though different in its purpose and being a singular example of a temporary exhibition, demonstrates some of the same characteristics as the relocation of the Barnes. The Guggenheim's Armani show was, like the Barnes move, a direct response to greater internal and external factors that, in the end, benefitted the public and upheld the museum's mission through the exploration of the diversity and potential for art and the creation of public interest.

The Show

As a twenty-fifth anniversary retrospective of Armani's works, the Giorgio Armani exhibition was shrouded in a sense of glamour, seen in its "blockbuster" quality, display design, and surrounding publicity. From October 20, 2000, to January 17, 2001, the four-month blockbuster exhibition entitled "Giorgio Armani: Exploration of the Seminal Designer's Vision" drew a significant amount of attention to the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York City (Guggenheim). According to the museum, the show was designed by the "acclaimed visual and theatrical artist" Robert Wilson and other famous curators, including Germano Celant (Guggenheim). It was comprised of a

series of 400 Armani garments, explanatory texts, and accompanying photographs to celebrate the development of his work over 25 years and acknowledge his importance as a designer and cultural icon, with pieces arranged thematically through the Frank Lloyd Wright rotunda and attached tower galleries (Guggenheim).

In their arrangement, the collection communicated a sense a sense of drama to emphasize Armani's "significance within the cultural landscape" and the power of his work (Guggenheim). Curators included Germano Celant, Harold Koda, and a number of others, who all have extensive experience in museum display of high-profile fashion and costume design, including Haute Couture and Christian Dior exhibitions (Guggenheim). In this display, Armani's clothing was grouped by theme, with focuses on androgynous styles, Eastern and African inspirations, his "non-color" palette, designs for the Academy Awards, and other shared motifs (Guggenheim). Each garment on display was accompanied by original sketches and photographs, showing the designs' and designer's progress to the final pieces and promoting a sense of scholasticism and artistry in the pieces (Guggenheim). To complement the artist's collection further, the curators utilized juxtapositions in wall colors and lighting, suspended mannequins, large, transparent curtains, and mud-textured flooring and wall decoration (Guggenheim). The exhibition even made use of sound, playing different music in its thematic sections, such a classical music in the main area, modern Celtic music in the tweed section, and Asian tunes near the Japanese-inspired pieces (Biggs). The Museum described this theatricality as a "kaleidoscopic [...] and spectacular environment in which to experience the multifaceted aspects of Armani's collection," a space to enjoy the glamour and creativity of such fine art (Guggenheim).

The exhibition consisted of some other features, as well, including additional educational materials and programs to involve the public, which worked to promote the museum's high opinions of the designer. There was a gamut of accompanying published works, like a large catalogue (Guggenheim). This catalogue features large-scale photos of his works from different fashion photographers, essays by different leaders in the fashion industry and Hollywood about Armani's extensive influence in society, and curatorial texts that discuss Armani's work and contextualize it within his surrounding culture (Celant). Through this combination of elements, the catalogue helps to advance the image of the designer, highlighting his enduring impression on contemporary society with the use of both fashion and art historical discussions and images as a framework (Celant).

The Guggenheim pursued a number of marketing techniques and increased programming to promote the show and create enthusiasm. A large cocktail party, for example, attracted members and others to the exhibition's inauguration (Vogel), and to increase patronage, the museum also held a series of lectures about Armani's clothing with the curators and other distinguished speakers (Guggenheim). Other programming included events like a public screening of *American Gigolo*, a film that features the designer's clothing (Guggenheim). Additionally, the museum provided daily tours for visitors, and family programs such as "Armani Fashion: Work, Play, and Personality," talks, and activities were used to introduce both children and their parents to the work of the iconic designer (Guggenheim). With its many features, from expanded programming to written materials, the Guggenheim constructed a sense of awe around the exhibition and the designer himself.

The Rise of Controversy

Out of this wildly popular exhibition rose a great a great amount of controversy regarding the source of funding for the show and the museum's true values. Museum officials did not initially acknowledge that Armani had just pledged a donation of \$15 million to the Guggenheim to be disbursed over the course of a few years (Vogel). When asked about the negotiations, officials claimed that the donation was merely "global partner sponsorship," intended for use in any Guggenheim project, anywhere in the world (Vogel). They denied that the show was designed as an exchange for the monies received; however, as one of Armani's big advertisers, *Instyle Magazine*, was the official sponsor of the exhibition, the public began to question the museum's integrity and whether the space could be, in a sense, rented (Vogel). For both Armani and the magazine sponsor, such exposure in the museum setting could serve as a form of advertisement, raising public dispute over the Guggenheim's intentions.

In American society, museums do have a long history of intimate interaction with corporations, in which shows have been paid for by the companies and designers displayed, but this, of course, creates ethical dilemmas when sponsors stand to gain from attendance and are given power in the design of show, meaning that museum integrity is threatened (Vogel). For the Guggenheim, this was not new territory (Biggs). In the past, the museum had aligned itself with other brand names, including Hugo Boss to create the self-titled Hugo Boss Prize, which honors worthy artists annually, and BMW, which received a show of BMW products, entitled *The Art of the Motorcycle* (Vogel). The Guggenheim had also grown notorious for the business-based models for museum financing and consequent appearance of commercialism by its director, Thomas Krens

(McClellan 229). His shows, including the Armani retrospective, seemed inundated by commercialism, an element that many critics found offensive (229).

The Giorgio Armani show received great amounts of attention and mixed reviews from fans and critics, where some praised the exhibition and designer and others questioned the Guggenheim's dedication to promoting the welfare of culture and the public. The main complaints centered on the perceived sense of commercialism that pervaded the exhibition and the institution. In surrounding years, however, many museums similarly gave into financial pressures, drawing attention to institutional practices through highly publicized and corporate-sponsored shows (Vogel). The Brooklyn Museum of Art, for example, mounted a large, popularized show entirely from the private collection of a main sponsor, Saatchi, and acknowledged the collector and donor throughout the exhibit and in the title, "Sensation: Young British Artists from the Saatchi Collection" (McClellan 229). Similarly, the Museum of Modern Art staged "Contemporary Voices: Works from the UBS Art Collection," a 2005 exposition that featured a seemingly random assemblage of pieces that the UBS financial company had promised to the museum (230). Corporate sponsorship was clearly on the rise at the time of the Guggenheim's presentation of Armani designs, but as many critics explained, the set-up of the Armani exhibition was saturated by commerce. Artist and critic Emma Biggs, for example, emphasized, in her review, the underlying messages regarding fashion and materialism (Biggs). The show, borne of commerce, seemed to encourage excitement over material culture and economics by simulating a shopping experience and celebrating material goods, like clothing (Biggs).

The rotunda became a space for impressive ball gowns and suits, “adding even more luster, if such a thing is possible, to the fashion designer's name” (Vogel), and according to *New Yorker* art critic Judith Thurman, the building acted much like a department store (Thurman). Thurman analyzed the interior of the facility, itself, as replicating aspects of store purchasing experiences, encouraging viewing, movement and admiration specifically of clothing, or material items, to create desire (Thurman). The building, she wrote, seemed “[...] ideal for a high-end retail showroom [...]” and advertisement for the designer in a highbrow setting (Thurman). For her, the drama produced in the displays was similarly overwhelming, like in a room filled with elegant black and gold designs that “glow[ed] like a light box” (Thurman). Thurman contended that the exhibition ultimately translated as a large shrine to Armani’s fashion, encouraging viewers to “[...] worship Armani’s virtuosity in a vacuum,” with a lack of helpful program notes, a great amount of “puffery,” and the omission of some of his most important and everyday designs, like in the design of uniforms. In her opinion, there was an overall lack of context provided to viewers and that the exhibition focused on the designer’s greatness in a very one-sided and extravagant manner. For Thurman and other critics, this show and its commercial presentation and nature seemed to challenge museum ethics and damaged the sense of trust in the institution by focusing more on commercialism and finances than public good (Loughery).

Other reviewers cited problems in the overcompensation of the museum to justify the exhibition. While Armani’s great influence in the fashion world must be acknowledged, some critics, like Emma Biggs, wondered whether the museum was attempting to offset controversy over their source of funding by elevating the designer’s

status and his works to the level of high art. As Biggs wrote, through the museum catalogue, the designers of the exhibition sought to legitimize the installation for visitors and readers, explaining excessively fashion's significance in the modern world and its relation to art history (Biggs). The dramatic presentation of the works added to this sense of justification and seemed to force a sense of gratitude on viewers for the designer's contributions (Biggs). Throughout the exhibit, there were scrimms that abstracted the silhouettes of the viewers, reminding them of the designer's great study of the human body (Biggs). There were also displays, as Biggs wrote, that "[described] and [explained] the significance of his influences, interests, trips abroad; they even obligingly, if absurdly, place his color preferences in an art-world context [...]," comparing his colors to artists like Ad Reinhardt and Mark Rothko (Biggs). Most of all, the boards reminded the museum-going public why the work should be considered important (Biggs). Clearly, there seemed to be repetition of the artist's significance, leading many critics to believe that the museum was attempting to justify their choice in subject matter through overcompensation, an element that led to greater scrutiny for the Guggenheim.

Upholding the Museum Mission

The efforts of the museum, however, and choice of subject for the exhibition, did align with the museum mission. As the Guggenheim states, their mission is:

[...] to promote the understanding and appreciation of art, architecture, and other manifestations of visual culture, primarily of the modern and contemporary periods, and to collect, conserve, and study the art of our time. The Foundation realizes this mission through exceptional exhibitions, education programs, research initiatives, and publications, and strives to engage and educate an increasingly diverse international audience through its unique network of museums and cultural partnerships (Guggenheim).

As the Guggenheim mission statement claims, the institution seeks to celebrate multiple forms of “visual culture” and promote understanding of those many “manifestations” of art. Fashion was the form, in this case, and the museum encouraged appreciation of it through its display, programming, and educational efforts for the understanding of Armani’s body of work. To present the pieces and emphasize their artistry, the Museum used a sense of drama, to provoke interest and thought, and to educate visitors, the museum provided sketches and informational texts in the exhibition, created additional printed materials, and held public lectures, with both the curators and guest speakers (Guggenheim). There were even family programs to increase appreciation of the arts amongst diverse groups and across varied age ranges (Guggenheim).

Especially important in this mission statement is the Guggenheim’s proclaimed focus on the study of different forms, or “manifestations,” of art. The presentation of Giorgio Armani clothing represents a museum foray into honoring other types of “visual culture,” being fashion, in this case. Aligning with their mission, their presentation of Armani’s fashion attempted to create “appreciation” for a diversified form of art, a form that has been considered a lesser art, an “arte minore,” in much of the world (Biggs). Though skeptical of the overcompensation by the museum, discussed earlier, Emma Biggs pointed out the importance of the inclusion of fashion in art history. According to Biggs, the museum was successful in acknowledging the uniting and artistic aspects of fashion. The Guggenheim, she wrote, successfully identified fashion as:

[...] the creativity of the street [...]. It’s democratic, it’s urban, sub-cultural, and multi-ethnic. [...] Haute couture may be elitist, but it expresses our dreams and fantasies. [...] Fantasy is a creative expression of desire. Our desires document us. We are what we want (Biggs).

Fashion, she explains, is powerful in its connection with the public. It is something with which everyone can relate, and, even in its most abstract and high-end forms, like haute couture, it represents society. Essentially, as Biggs explains, fashion, like other forms of art, represents human desire, a defining feature of humanity. For this reason, the Guggenheim upheld its mission in its dedication to presenting a different manifestation of art, and despite controversy, the Guggenheim has, in multiple cases, like with Armani, challenged conceptions of high art, bringing consideration of other art forms to the public (Biggs).

Director Thomas Krens claims, in the catalogue, that since his appointment as director of the Guggenheim, the institution had consistently sought to follow this mission (Krens). Krens and his staff hoped to show important art, across a range of media, including design, fashion, and new media, (Krens). Though he is often criticized for his business-like approach to museum management, Krens is credited with producing some of the more innovative and controversial practices and shows in the last century, including the exposition of the BMW motorcycle and the retrospective of Norman Rockwell in Las Vegas (McClellan 221). Like these shows, the Giorgio Armani exhibition followed the goals set out by the institution, through its mission statement, and the pledge of Krens to diversify the modern conception of art and its powers.

Benefits of the Blockbuster

Though the Guggenheim was not bankrupt or in dire financial crisis like the Barnes Foundation, the New York-based museum was reacting in a controversial but necessary way to greater internal and external pressures, like politics and the economy. The show, ultimately, benefitted the public and upheld the Guggenheim's mission,

attracting diverse crowds, raising income, and supporting the institution's aims to provide excellent exhibitions of different art forms to a large public. As a show with wide appeal, the exhibition attracted vast crowds, being the third most attended show in the Guggenheim's history (Itzkoff) and one of the top ten most attended shows of 2001 in the world, with 319,486 guests in 4 months (*theartnewspaper*). Author and art historian Andrew McClellan identifies the Armani show as a "blockbuster exhibition", or a "[...] large-scale show full of masterpieces and accompanied by extensive publicity [...]" (McClellan 212). Such exhibitions, like the Armani retrospective, can be lucrative, as they attract attention and large numbers of visitors to the host museum, an average of 4,062 visitors per day in this case (*theartnewspaper*).

Often, these blockbuster exhibitions, like the Armani show, are a response to popular culture and societal interests, as museums are increasingly more surrounded by newer forms of entertainment and must find ways to stimulate interest (McClellan 212). Blockbuster shows have become vital in saving a number of museums from financial struggles, as the success of exhibitions holds power over everything from attendance and ticket sales to visibility (212). As a blockbuster show, the Armani collection served its purpose, drawing large crowds, interest, and revenue to a museum that was struggling financially and competing with entertainment venues (229). A study of the museum's finances from 1999 to 2000 revealed that the museum had to sell some of its permanent collection to fund the pursuit of its mission (Kramer). In fact, "[...] they were [...] facing a radical retrenchment in programs, in staff and in the very existence of the institution," (Kramer) trying to adapt and survive in a society that does not adequately fund arts programs (McClellan 230). For this reason, Krens embraced a business model in his

management of the museum (221). Using his formal education in art history and finance, Krens recognized the need for adaptation of the museum (221). As he explains, “[Museums] are in the entertainment business and competing against other forms of entertainment,” and therefore, they must emulate, in some ways, the capitalist and recreation and enjoyment-driven society in which they live (221). Without some conformity to the desires of society, museums have difficulty surviving (230). This practice, however, must be rational and maintain a sense of institutional integrity to protect the greater, long-term interests of the public and their cultural history (231). For the Guggenheim, due to financial concerns and societal trends, the blockbuster model was a necessary response to gain revenue and relevance.

The show may have promoted a great amount of controversy and challenged public trust in ostensibly compromising museum integrity, but the museum maintains that its decision was independent of the donation. A deputy director for the Guggenheim, Judith Cox, claimed, "The money Armani is giving us is to support capital projects and international programs. They're not sponsoring the exhibition." When asked whether the Guggenheim would have put together the same show if Armani had not donated such a substantial sum to the institution, she said, "Absolutely. We would do this exhibition regardless. The two things are completely separate" (Vogel). According to officials, the Guggenheim contacted Armani first, pursuing their mission through the exhibition and celebration of other forms of art for public edification and enjoyment (Vogel).

Seen in this exhibition at the Guggenheim, museums have increasingly had to challenge notions of ethics in order to survive in modern society. Armani's show at the Guggenheim Museum was ultimately a response to a culture that is driven by

entertainment and the economy, and, despite the controversy the exposition caused by challenging public trust, the museum upheld its mission and promoted the study and appreciation of varied forms of art for the public's own benefit. In its adoption of a business-driven stance, the Guggenheim has often been questioned. Thomas Krens has become known for his staunch business models and commercial plans for the museum, having promoted the blockbuster shows that have come to define the Guggenheim and the expansion of the institution into Berlin, Spain, Venice, Brazil, Russia, and other areas of the world (Mathur). Krens has been a leader in a new movement of museums toward both "corporatization" and globalization, embracing commercial culture and reacting in a smart way (Mathur). The museum is traditionally expected to remain neutral and unbiased, but, as seen here and in the case of the Barnes Foundation, museums cannot afford to remain stagnant (Mathur). Lack of funding, challenges to relevance, and their mission for the protection of important pieces of cultural heritage drive museums like the Guggenheim to transform and maintain pace with surrounding society (Mathur). Though controversial, the actions of the Guggenheim Museum were, in fact, a direct response to external and internal pressures of financing and societal inclinations, and an attempt to survive, exemplifying common practices now seen throughout the museum world (Mathur)

Part IV: Conclusion

As seen in these two case studies, of the Barnes Foundation and the Armani retrospective at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, art museums across the contemporary United States are often forced to act in controversial ways to survive and further their missions in a changing society. They must uphold the public's trust, but like

in the Barnes and Guggenheim, this faith is sometimes challenged in order to adapt and work toward furthering museum goals to serve that public and their cultural history. In both cases, the museums made compromising decisions. The Barnes Foundation breached public trust by directly disregarding the founder's wishes, as per the Indenture, and relocated, abandoning the original building, part of the Barnes' identity and the public's image of the institution. Similarly, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum breached trust by putting on a blockbuster exhibition honoring a donor, giving the appearance that they had been bought out, rather than acting with integrity.

Both museums challenged the faith of their patrons, but public trust is a complex issue. These museums demonstrated, through their behaviors, a supposed lack of integrity and authority, main facets of trust, but it has become a growing trend amongst museums to test the traditional practices and expectations for advertising, sources of income, activities and programs, and their greater societal goals in order to survive in the contemporary world. They operate without official guidelines for ethical behaviors and must instead establish their own identities and moral codes in the way that they feel able to best serve their publics (McClellan 223). There have been recent efforts and panels created to promote a more solid idea of professional procedures for museum financing, but a lingering ethical gray area promotes bouts of controversy (Vogel). Because of this lack of a clear code of conduct, museums must police themselves and are trusted to independently make decisions for the good of the public. Their ideals, however, can become compromised or goals muddled in a fast-paced economy and entertainment-driven society. For the Guggenheim and the Barnes Foundation, ideals were cast into doubt, but their actions were a direct response to their surroundings.

Museums today, including the Barnes and Guggenheim, are entering a “new era,” as author and economist Saloni Mathur explains, operating in a modernizing global world of international markets and connections, defined by the “increased mobility of people, capital, goods, and ideas, the revolution in computer and communications technologies, [...] and display-based phenomena” (Mathur). In such an environment, museums have had to conform in certain ways to remain relevant. Many officials, like Thomas Krens at the Guggenheim and the Board of the Barnes Foundation, found ways to include these new societal focuses in their efforts, through the adoption of commercial models, technologies, and entertainment-based values. In the Armani show at the Guggenheim, for example, the museum attempted to maintain a high level of interest through the relatable subject of fashion, a sense of drama, and opportunities for involvement. The Barnes, likewise, created interest through increased visibility and development of their facilities and programming, incorporating commercial ideas into their new building in Philadelphia. Not only did these methods help the museums keep pace with society, but they were profitable, promoting museum survival in a difficult economic situation.

This situation arises due to a significant lack of funding for such organizations. Financial crises have spurred a variety of responses as means of survival. Where there was once funding opportunity from a number of generous individuals for philanthropic reasons, since the 1970’s, museum funding has become reliant on complex combinations of support from government bodies, corporations, and organizations, with museums barely faring (Alexander). Desperation for financial support within these institutions has resulted in the internal transformation of museums. Like the Guggenheim and The Barnes, museums have had to adapt, and today, “[...] no museological context [is] wholly

uncontaminated by the circuits of capitalism [...]” (Mathur). Many museums, in response to these outside pressures, have had to adopt new models of operation, embracing business-like strategies in order to stay afloat alongside entertainment attractions and to earn funding. A study by Victoria D. Alexander between 1960 and 1986 revealed that the main changes that occurred due to shifts in funding were manifested in transformations of internal museum structures, especially in stepping away from a “[...] curatorial model towards a management (or perhaps, an education or an entertainment) model [...],” a trend that has continued until the present (Alexander). As shown by Thomas Krens and the Barnes Board, it has been necessary in some cases to adopt business models and pursue a certain level of entertainment value in order to earn revenue.

The Barnes and the Guggenheim have been blamed for increased commercialization and the breach of public trust, but they have intelligently employed two of the trends discussed by economist Bruno Frey, using the lucrative blockbuster and superstar museum formulas to thrive in an unsupportive economy. The Barnes embraced commercialism through the expansion of their facility and its reputation in a new location by assuming the superstar museum model, a model in which the institution is shrouded in a sense of fame, reverence, and, sometimes, controversy. The Guggenheim, on the other hand, adopted the blockbuster show as a means of survival, displaying popular subjects, like Armani clothing, to earn greater numbers of visitors, revenue, and visibility. Though criticized, in the end, both museums took the steps necessary to uphold their missions and protect public interests. The relocation of the Barnes prevented dissolution of the organization and provided new opportunities for community education and public

accessibility, staples in Barnes' original mission. Similarly, the Guggenheim promoted its mission through a popular show to earn money for further programming and invited the greater public to reconsider traditions and expectations of high art. While it is apparent in these two cases that finances can compromise integrity, commercialism has had some benefits, including the popularization of museums and art, income and development for surrounding communities, huge numbers of new and different visitors, diversified exhibition subjects, and increased interest and understanding of museum importance, in some cases, where they had once been considered "stuffy" and removed from the general population (McClellan 224).

These studies, however, highlight the vague comprehension of regulation by which museums must abide. The public expects that the museum makes responsible decisions about its collections, display, programming, authenticity, and purpose (Lowry 143). In the public mind, exhibitions and activities are strictly "[...] the result of a fundamental commitment to the artists and ideas these exhibitions and programs represent," so the museum faces the hard task of "[...] balancing expectation with institutional needs" (145). They must pursue a devotion to public and cultural welfare, while finding means to survive, as independent organizations. When society cannot help fulfill their financial needs, as at the Barnes and Guggenheim, public expectations must be challenged, and museums must find creative ways to adapt. The Barnes and the Guggenheim, in their respective relocation and exhibition efforts, were simply transforming and responding to the trends of modernized society and economic hardship to continue the progress of their missions, earn financial support, and remain relevant.

Of course, as important cultural institutions, the Guggenheim and the Barnes Foundation, like other museums, have a significant responsibility to the people they represent. Museums like these must maintain their relationships with the public and sustain their instrumental role in society, as they guard the edification, enlightenment, unity, and spirituality that drive human progress and development. Without museums, the evolution of human culture is diminished and forgotten, so, it is the great obligation of these institutions to span the divide between encouraging patronage through entertainment and accessibility and preventing the diminution of the educational and sacred value of the museum through corruption. The Guggenheim, as was seen with the Armani Exhibition in 2001, and the Barnes Foundation in its 2012 relocation, advanced into this abyss, challenging tradition, while maintaining institutional values that, ultimately, served the public. While they maintained their promise to the people and culture, we should perhaps take a closer look at American society because, in our reluctance to support the efforts of the museum, we have created the environment in which the institutions struggle and are forced to conform or rebel. As a society, we should reconsider our values, but until then, “In [this] society, unwilling to adequately fund arts organizations, fundraising is a necessary evil, fraught with potential for abuse and peril for museums guided by high ideals” (McClellan 230). It seems that until society changes and seeks to support the arts, museums, like the Guggenheim and the Barnes, will have to pursue controversy to survive.

Works Cited

- Alexander, Victoria D. *Museums and money: the impact of funding on exhibitions, scholarship, and management*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996. Print.
- Anderson, John. *Art held hostage: the battle over the Barnes collection*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2003. Print.
- Argott, Don, dir. *The Art of the Steal*. Dir. Joyce Sheena. 2009. Film. 20 Nov 2012.
- "Barnes." *The Barnes Foundation*. Barnes Foundation, n.d. Web. 20 Nov 2012.
- Biggs, Emma. "What does it mean? Armani at the Guggenheim." *Modern Painters*. 14.1 (2001): n. page. Web. 3 Feb. 2012.
- Booker, Bobbi. "Legendary Barnes Collection Opens in New Venue." *Philadelphia Tribune*. (2012): n. page. Web. 1 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.phillytrib.com/lifestylesarticles/item/4150-legendary-barnes-collection-opens-in-new-venue.html>>.
- Celant, Germano, Harold Koda, and Thomas Krens. *Giorgio Armani*. New York: Guggenheim Museum, 2000. Print.
- De Montebello, Philippe. "Art Museums, Inspiring Public Trust." *Whose Muse? Art Museums and Public Trust*. James Cuno. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. 151-169. Print.
- Dolkart, Judith F., Bernard C. Watson, and Derek Gillman. *Masterworks: The Barnes Foundation*. New York: SkiraRizzoli, 2012. Print.
- Duncan, Carol. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- "Exhibition Figures in 2003." *theartnewspaper.com*. The Art Newspaper. Web. 3 Mar. 2013. <<http://www.theartnewspaper.com/attfig/attfig03.pdf>>.
- Feldstein, Martin. *The Economics of Art Museums*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. 1-10. Print.
- Frey, Bruno S., and Stephan Meier. "The Economics of Museums." *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*. Ed. Victor A. Ginsburg and Ed. David Throsby. Vol 1. Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V., 2006. Print.
- Guggenheim. "Giorgio Armani." *Guggenheim*. The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, 2000. Web. 3 Feb. 2012. <<http://www.guggenheim.org/new->

- york/press-room/releases/press-release-archive/2000/698-september-25-giorgio-armani>.
- Guggenheim. "Mission Statement." *Guggenheim*. The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, 2000. Web. 9 Jan. 2012.
- International Council of Museums, . "Museum Definition." *ICOM*. Icom. Web. 2 Jan. 2013. <<http://icom.museum/the-vision/museum-definition/>>.
- Itzkoff, Dave. "Wright Exhibition Sets Guggenheim Attendance Record." *New York Times*. (2009): n. page. Print. <<http://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/08/27/wright-exhibition-sets-guggenheim-attendance-record/>>.
- Kennicott, Phillip. "'The Art of the Steal' highlights one-sided nature of some documentaries." *Washington Post*. (2010): n. page. Print. <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/04/AR2010030405778.html>>.
- Kramer, Hilton. "Guggenheim Is Bust-Why Isn't Krens Getting the Boot?." *New York Observer*. (2002): n. page. Web. 6 May. 2013. <<http://observer.com/2002/12/guggenheim-is-bustwhy-isnt-krens-getting-the-boot/>>.
- Loughery, John. "The Future of Museums: The Guggenheim, MoMA, and the Tate Modern." *Hudson Review*. 53.4 (2001): n. page. Web. 8 Oct. 2012.
- Lowry, Glenn D. "A Deontological Approach to Art Museums and the Public Trust." *Whose Muse? Art Museums and Public Trust*. James Cuno. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. 129-149. Print.
- Mathur, Saloni. "Social Thought & Commentary: Museums Globalization." *Anthropological Quarterly*. 78.3 (2005): n. page. Web. 12 Nov. 2012.
- McClellan, Andrew. "Commercialism." *The Art Museum from Boullée to Bilbao*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008. Print.
- Smith, Roberta. "A Museum, Reborn, Remains True to Its Old Self, Only Better." *New York Times* 18 May 2012, n. pag. Web. 02 Nov. 2012.
- "Neil L. Rudenstine." *ARTstor*. ARTstor Inc., n.d. Web. 6 May 2013. <<http://www.artstor.org/our-organization/o-html/staff-rudenstine.shtml>>.
- Rosenbaum, Lee. "Bogus Barnes Foundation: Fake Galleries, Phony Populism." *Huffington Post*. (2012): n. page. Print.

- http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lee-rosenbaum/bogus-barnes-foundation-f_b_1531230.html>.
- Rudenstine, Neil L. *The House of Barnes*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2012. Print.
- Salisbury, Stephan. "Barnes attendance exceeds expectations." *philly.com*. (2013): n. page. Web. 6 May. 2013. <http://articles.philly.com/2013-01-28/news/36579125_1_barnes-foundation-attendance-billie-t sien>.
- Smith, Roberta. "Memo to Art Museums: Don't Give Up on Art." *New York Times*. (2000): n. page. Web. 20 Sep. 2012. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2000/12/03/arts/art-architecture-memo-to-art-museums-don-t-give-up-on-art.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>>.
- Strauss, Robert. "Art coup in Philly." *Los Angeles Times* 31 May 2005, n. pag. Web. 04 Dec. 2012.
- Thurman, Judith. "Man of the Cloth: Armani at the Guggenheim." *New Yorker* 06 Nov. 2000. n. pag. Print.
- Vogel, Carol. "Armani Gift to the Guggenheim Revives Issue of Art and Commerce." *New York Times*. 15 Dec 1999. n. pag. Web. 4 Jan 2013. <<http://www.nytimes.com/1999/12/15/arts/armani-gift-to-the-guggenheim-revives-issue-of-art-and-commerce.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>>.
- Winestein, Anna. "In Museums We Trust." *Journal of Visual Culture*. 1.3 (2002): n. page. Web. 5 Dec. 2012.