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ABSTRACT

The aim of the dissertation is to reinterpret the history of American Museums based on the research question of how the meanings of education in American museums have been constructed and have shifted within particular historical, social, economical, and cultural contexts. In pursuit of this question, historical analysis dependent on recent developments of scholarship is used. By reconsidering events and conditions that preceded those of today, this study is intended not only to illuminate similarities but also to examine how different some contexts and circumstances may be. This study also attempts to situate the examples of particular museums in the larger contexts from which they arose and within which formative events took place.

First, the genesis of the idea of the American museum within its historical context is examined. In investigating the origin of the American museums, the concept of the museum is traced from the ancient time to the twentieth century. Second, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City is discussed as an example the museum during the period of economic depression in the 1930s. The aesthetic movement of modernism, New Deal Relief programs, and progressive
educational movement during the 1930s contributed in the construction of the meanings of education at the MoMA. Third, as an example representing the museum movement during the 1970s, the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (HMSG) is described. With the shift of social context of the late 1960s, new government funding in support of the arts (NEH and NEA) and the postmodern movement in the fields of aesthetics and education shaped the meaning of education at the HMSG. Finally, this study concludes that the identity of American museums did not emerge suddenly, but had a long and complex history, which shapes what American museums are today. Additionally, the detailed events and shifts described in this study suggest that the meanings of the American museums were constructed with reference to social changes, economic needs, aesthetic theories and general educational reform movements.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE PROBLEM

The notion that education should take place in the museum is a distinctly American idea that has now become widely accepted among scholars.\(^1\) In the prevailing view (Taylor, 1945; Alexander, 1988; Orosz, 1990; Tomkins, 1989), most European museums had considered their mission that of an agency for the storage and preservation of the genius of art objects to serve scholars or the elite.\(^2\) It was the American museums that fully opened their doors to the general public with the idea

---


\(^2\) The opinion of European museums has occasionally been accepted by the museum historians; however, this position, in my opinion, seems to overlook the diverse phenomena of the museum movement in Europe. In fact, the South Kensington Museum, which will be discussed in Chapter 2, was not the merely an institution for the preservation of art objects, but an active educational institution for the public.
that their task was aesthetic and art education in the dissemination of culture. It has generally been said that American museums historically emphasized the third function, among the traditional basic functions of museums: collecting, conserving, and interpreting artifacts. Obviously, the third function was oriented to public-spirited education.

The idea that museums should have a responsibility to the public was born of the same ideals that had produced a new nation by, for, and of the people. It was mandated that the mission of 'education' had to be written into the formal charter of museums established after 1870. This reflected politically savvy about the means of promoting democracy in the nation. In a newly founded nation with a deficiency of schools and increasing numbers of immigrants, there was a demand that museums teach citizens civic virtue and cultural nationalism (Orosz, 1990, p. 51). This role represents an attempt to fulfill a number of moral and aesthetic obligations pertaining to education in a democracy. According to a statistical report, by 1930, most major American cities had at least one public museum (Lilla, 1985, p. 85). It is in the present century that staff and departments devoted solely to education have begun to appear in museums. Museums in the United States today place emphasis on education as a serious and central function of museums. They are involved in a whole host of activities that are related broadly to education and the museum audience: for instance, program and exhibit
development, school field trips, teacher training, community outreach, volunteer management, and visitor studies. It seems that these educational activities continue to expand today.

In spite of these historical facts, the historical materials on American museums have not been read in the context of their educational aspects. Histories of museums in the United States have typically focused on issues concerning who founded the collections and various exhibitions in which artworks have been displayed. Although education has been a cornerstone of many institutions, it has not received an adequate place in the historical record. The educational perspectives seems to have remained largely absent from museum studies and art education literature. This is not to say that there are no existent publications focused on the educational perspectives of museums, but that these publications have tended to be grounded in quite practical needs, or to reflect critical commentary focused strongly on theory, but lacking a practical foundation and overlooking the perspectives of education in the museums. Additionally, with few exceptions, it is true that the history of American museums has been described chronologically and encyclopedically to tell us from whence they might have come, and how they are presently evolving. Yet, these works have not explained why the museums in the U.S. have changed differently within the wider historical, social, and cultural contexts from
which they arose.

In my view, the historical records on museums in the United States should be read in light of the needs of the present situation, as through such questions as how today’s art museums have taken the form of education for the public in the experience of the arts. This way of conceptualizing phenomena in the present through resources from selected historical materials has been described as the notion of ‘problematization’ (Castel, 1994, p. 238; Foucault, 1977, p. 31). To write history in this way is to consider the history of a problem in terms of how it is seen in the present (p. 238). In this context, reading the historical archives has suggested to me a question as to why I write ‘this’ history in ‘this’ particular way. This question leads me to rewrite the history of art museums on the basis of contemporary interests. Based on my interest in the historical dimension of American art museums, I ask the following research question. How have art museums in the United States constructed and shifted the meanings of education within the historical, social, and cultural contexts?

1.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Michel Foucault’s focused view of history made me rethink the way I should interpret the history of art museums in the United States.
He challenges conventional historical knowledge and provokes critical self-reflection within the field of historical research. The following issues defined by Foucault have directly or indirectly had an effect in shaping the fundamental idea of historical research in this dissertation: first, the relation of the present to the past; second, the status of history as involving the investigation of historically constituted discourses; third, the idea of multiple meanings of a text depending on the contexts; and fourth, the intertwinements of historical writing with questions of power (Foucault, 1972; 1984a; 1984b).

Foucault sees reason and truth to be relative, rather than absolute, and he proposes that reason and truth have historical, social, and cultural contexts. The common-sense world in which we live is not taken as a given, but is questioned in all aspects. He rejects the traditional philosophical tenet that an absolute rationality exists, and proposes that what was regarded as rational at one time will not be necessarily regarded as rational at another time, i.e., that forms of rationality have a historical specificity. Foucault asserts that:

Even the stupidities, the failures, the absurdities, the “weak links” of the existing order of things are capable of a positive utility within the strategic field. For this and other reasons a certain prudence is advisable regarding revolutionary strategies which utilise these phenomena as levers for the realisation of a programme which is more rational, more intelligent, and hence more acceptable and better than that of the prevailing regime. . . What if instead of stigmatising the unacceptable in order to supplant it by the acceptable, one were to call in question the
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very rationality which grounds the establishment of a regime of acceptability and the programmatic logic whereby the "unacceptable" is regularly restored to the "acceptability" of a norm? It is at the points where the role of a whole species of rationality and the status of a whole regime of truth can be made to open itself to interrogation that the possibility of a profounder logic of revolt may begin to emerge. (Foucault, 1980, p. 257)

This citation marks a major shift in thought that touches the arena of knowledge. The once prevalent view that knowledge is objective and verifiable has been widely challenged by the notion that knowledge is socially constructed and shaped by the multiple contexts of historical, social, and cultural conditions.

In addition, Foucault denies the notion of a continuous, progressive, and developmental history. Instead, he proposes a view of the past that emphasizes discontinuity, rupture, and displacement (Foucault, 1974, p. 4). He views the writing of history in terms of a notion of 'discontinuity.' For him, discontinuity should be used both as a tool of the historian, and in the description of the object that is being investigated (Foucault, 1972, p. 9). In traditional history, discontinuity is considered a stigma since it is that part of the past that must be eradicated by means of explanation. Traditional history presents itself "in the form of dispersed events – decisions, accidents, initiatives, discoveries" that must be "rearranged and reordered so as to reveal the essential continuity of events" (Foucault, 1972, p. 8). For Foucault,
history is concerned with the "descent rather than the evolution of
events" (Foucault, 1984b, p. 81). Unlike evolution, Foucault's notion
of descent never reaches some point of origination, but seeks "the
moment of arising" of a phenomenon as a result of a struggle of opposing
forces (p. 83). Here, Foucault's point is that there could be other
beginnings, so far undiscovered by the historian. He emphasizes the
'breaks' and 'ruptures' which signal abrupt endings and painful new
beginnings and change. It may be impossible to prioritize the importance
of the beginnings identified. What he refuses is that there is ever only a
single origin. Thus, according to him, beginnings can be plural.

For Foucault, history shows us diversity rather than universality,
discontinuous modes of acting as human subjects. Writing history is one
way one can bring to awareness those restrictions upon our present
subjectivities that perhaps should be transgressed. The past does not
merely help us to understand the present, but helps us find the courage
to imagine the telling of radically different fictions of who we are or who
we might become.

I am well aware that I have never written anything but fictions.
I do not mean to say, however, that truth is therefore absent. It
seems to me that the possibility exists for fiction to function in
truth, for a fictional discourse to induce effects of truth, and for
bringing it about that a true discourse engenders or
'manufactures' something that does not as yet exist, that is,
'fictions' it. One 'fictions' history on the basis of a political
reality that makes it true, one 'fictions' a politics not yet in
existence on the basis of a historical truth. (Foucault, 1980, p.
193)
For Foucault, a sense of the past involves a self-critique from the position of the present, with new forms of subject. In Foucault's sense, historical writing should be a self-reflective form of work, reflecting upon how the present is always folding into the future, and how the historian might be transformed in the act of writing history. He denies the possibility of history as the neutral attempt to describe reality in discourse. History is a motivated discourse about the past, never a neutral exercise in objective or coherent description. Our only grasp of 'the past' is through our own discursive interventions, and these necessarily contain our own perspectives embedded in them. Foucault's work draws attention to the role of discourses in history. However, a more important dimension of his work considers the implications of power and self-reflexivity that attend upon any historical practice. Foucault states that history manifests "the form of a war rather than of a language: relations of power, not relations of meaning" (Foucault, 1980, p. 114).

In summing up, Foucault questions the traditional view of history, which pursues the founding origin of things and seeks to impose a chronology, an ordering structure, and a developmental flow from the past to the present. In addition, he touches on the question of knowledge and maintains that truth and knowledge are not fixed, but potentially in flux, and, thus, constructed by historical, social, and cultural contexts.
Seen from Foucauldian notion of history, the writings on museums by David Murray (1904; 1949; 1970), Alma S. Wittlin (1949; 1970), Germain Bazin (1967), and Edward Alexander (1979; 1983) should be included in the canon of traditional history. Their works are bolstered with encyclopedic accounts that attempt to produce a chronological description of the evolution of museums. Murray and Wittlin investigated the development of museums and wrote about their findings with various examples drawn from collectors, collections, and institutions. Bazin sought the genesis of the museum and described the development of art museums chronologically. Alexander describes single individuals as collectors or focuses on the history of single institutions by assembling documents to provide a descriptive biography of those collectors or institutions encyclopedically. All of these works are written from within traditional historical perspectives that are dependent on the narrow focus of description used to support particular themes within an already existing fixed museum identity. They pursue a concern about what really happened in the past by collecting facts and presenting them in chronological order.

Set against the encyclopedic tradition with its aspirations to comprehensiveness and universality, Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (1992) has attempted to investigate art museums from the perspective of critical
history. She adopts Foucauldian notion of history and discusses the concept of 'effective history' to justify the research methodology used in her study of art museums. She asserts that effective history is a view of the past that emphasizes discontinuity, rupture, displacement, and dispersion. Instead of attempting to find generalizations, effective history looks for differences, for change. The differences between things, rather than the links, are seen as critically important (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, pp. 10-11). Relying on a critical perspective in the study of the history, Hooper-Greenhill attempts to investigate when and how European museums of the past changed, and in what way and why long-standing practices were ruptured and abandoned. From her case studies on museums in the historical context, she asserts that there is no essential identity for museums but that museum identities are subject to “constant change as the play of dominations shifts and new relations of advantage and disadvantage emerge” (p.191).

In short, Hooper-Greenhill's reinterpretations of the past for European museums are dependent on the 'historical specificity' of political, cultural, and economic relations. She asserts that there is the possibility of a plurality of histories and analyzes shifts in the play of powers within museum structures.³

³ Hooper-Greenhill is dubious of a unique origin for the development of museums in the historical context. For instance, she questions the generally accepted view of the 'Medici Palace' in fifteenth-century Florence as the genesis
My historical research on art museums in the United States has been influenced by Hooper-Greenhill’s and Foucault’s views of the effective history. Hooper-Greenhill’s work is not within the parameters of the traditional history of museums: those that seek to unite each segment of the past to obtain the single, objectively true narrative. Her works challenge the traditional view that truth is objective and verifiable, and propose that truth and knowledge are constructed and shaped by the multiple contexts. Her interpretation of the history of art museums in Europe opens new horizons for the critical assessment of their history. Bazin, Alexander, Murray, and Wittlin’s texts gave me the greater picture of the developmental flow of art museums from the past to the present. However, in reading their texts, I did not discover the history of error, rupture, and change. They fail to remark on critical points made by the documents themselves. They describe and order the structure smoothly that retains its dependence on absolutes. They seek the layers of events in the developments of the past. In contrast, Hooper-Greenhill’s approach to the history of art museums makes me aware of the importance of rereading the past in order to rediscover new beginnings of European museums. She analyzes power relations within museums related to the collecting subject, who makes decisions as to what maybe viewed, how art objects should be seen, and when this is possible. Finally, she proposes multiple origins of the European museums (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, pp. 85, 86, 190).
and change in the historical context, and implicates the political practice in the history of museums.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to reinterpret the history of American museums based on the premise that the meanings of education in American museums have been constructed and changed within particular historical, social, and cultural contexts. In the pursuit of this hypothesis, the traditional view of history and of the history of art education in the museum context will be questioned and new ways of writing about and understanding the history of art museums will be sought. In fact, in the traditional educational context, the history of art education has been focused on the schooling or post-secondary institutions, without including museums as alternative educational sites. Education in museum contexts had been considered a marginal area by historians of art education. However, since the Penn State conferences on the history of art education in 1985 and 1989, educational historians have shifted their attention beyond the schoolhouse walls (La Pierre & Zimmerman, 1997, p. 60). This represents a conceptual shift from an art education that addressed the requirements of the classroom to an educational perspective that places it in the larger context of the worlds of art and education. Despite this shift in the educational context, little attention has been given to rereading the history of art museums. Believing that the research on the history of art museums has been done,
scholars are seldom concerned about this subject. However, this opinion depends mainly on the traditional view of history, which acknowledges the existence of only one history of art museums. Therefore, rather than focusing on continuity and similarities in the evolution of art museums in the United States, this dissertation will emphasize why and how particular American art museums have experienced rupture and been changed in the experience. These changes signify abrupt endings and painful new beginning. This perspective on the history of American art museums shows that the meaning of education in the museums has changed according to the shift of contexts.

1.3. METHODOLOGY

1.3.1. Design of the Study

The plural methods were chosen for this study because the use of multiple methods has the advantage of strengthening the validity of research findings. The unity of method is based on the premise of the unity of truth and knowledge and the belief that the application of this premise to the diversity of facts will yield the rational unity that lie behind that apparent diversity (Apperly, 1997, p. 12). However, this monolithic method seems to limit the diverse possibilities for
experiencing the world. Against this monolithic method, Foucault asserts the value of employing a variety of methods in order to become aware of "the multiplicity of force relations" (Foucault, 1978, p. 92). Since method and experience share a close interior relationship, openness towards method is at the same time openness towards experience. Alan Apperley asserts that

the existence of a plurality of methods then both facilitates and names a plurality of possible experiences. On this basis the utilisation of a particular method clearly rules out 'a whole dimension of experience'. But on the other hand the adoption of a method might make it possible to experience the world in a way that one has not yet experienced it. Openness towards method, then, is at one and the same time openness towards experience. (Apperley, 1997, p. 22)

Multiple methods of analysis are employed in this study: (1) historical method; (2) qualitative textual analysis. The historical research used in this study is dependent on recent developments of scholarship in pointing out the historian's role in selecting, judging, and interpreting data. The logical consequence of this analysis has been the recognition that all interpreters of texts speak from historical, social, and cultural traditions that inevitably shape their treatment of data. By remembering the events and conditions that preceded those of today, it is possible not only to illuminate similarities but also to examine how different some circumstances may be. It is also possible to situate the examples of museums that I mention in this dissertation in the larger contexts from
which they arose and within which the events take place (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994).

The qualitative textual analysis covers a wide range of analyses, from more or less intuitive and interpretive essays to systematic and strict content analyses (Rosengren, 1981, p. 11). Content is a function of form and code, and meaning is a product of a system of relationships. Documents so defined are converted into 'texts' to be read and interpreted (Foucault, 1974, p. 47). In analyzing the content of the documentation of the American museums, this dissertation carefully reconsiders the formulation of written texts and their conventional interpretation. To some extent, since the conventional canons of interpretation of the museums reflect dominant values that refer to the quality of collections and curators' perspectives of exhibitions, they tend to obscure the value deemed marginal, i.e., the educational aspects of the museums.

By adopting a multiplicity of methods, this study puts into practice one of its central theses: that meanings in relation to the museums arise out of multiple contexts. Meanings, values, and concepts associated with the museums are not fixed in a lexicon of culture, but rather they are socially constructed and always potentially in flux, subject to change with changes in historical, social, cultural, and economical conditions. In analyzing the American museums in the historical context, this study,
in particular, focuses on two museums: the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City and the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (HMSG) of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D. C. These museums were founded for the purpose of promoting modern and contemporary art in two different cities. However, the MoMA was a private museum established by several philanthropists of the late 1920s, whereas the HMSG was a national museum that was founded by the U. S. government. The history of these museums has been derived from museum documents and from an understanding of relevant cultural knowledge and social forms, and the reality that education in these museums has been socially constructed within the immediate historical conditions. Thus, this dissertation is divided into the following chapters.

Chapter Two discusses the genesis of the idea of the American museum within the historical context. In investigating the contexts that shaped the American museums, the long history of the museum from ancient times to the twentieth century is discussed. The question “in which museum traditions did the American museum traditions originate?” is examined. Then, several issues among the historians of American museums are discussed in order to clarify the identities of America’s own museums. How these identities were shaped is discussed within the particular contexts of social, historical, and cultural conditions in the United States during the 1870s.
Chapter Three delves deeper to look at how the external contexts, social, economic, and cultural factors, influenced the shifts in the nature of the educational mission for the public in the museums in the United States between the 1930s and mid-1950s. Those shifts are traced through the various approaches to support the thesis that the meanings of education in a museum, in particular, in the MoMA, are constructed from multiple contexts. The MoMA's founders in the late 1920s are discussed to account for the radical tendencies in its styles of collecting. How did the economic and social contexts of the 1930s (Great Depression and New Deal Relief Program) affect the administration and the meaning of education in the Museum? To consider this question, Artemas Packard report, Victor D'Amico's role, the Educational Department, and educational programs, are explored. This investigation shows that the MoMA's effort to educate the public was clearly tied with the general educational reform known as progressive education, in the 1930s. Specifically, we discuss John Dewey's ideal of education and educational programs of the MoMA. The Museum's educational practices are also discussed in relation to the funding sources during the 1930s, because difficult economic conditions, created by insufficient funding status contributed to the Museum's decision to be an educational institution. Finally, this chapter discusses the method of displaying artworks in the exhibitions of the Museum. The techniques for displaying the artworks
were developed within some externally constructed discursive fields, such as cultural movements, which predominantly took the form of modernism before the 1960s.

Chapter Four deals with a new beginning in the history of the American museum as an institution with regard to particular purposes and responsibilities for its operation. This new beginning was defined in the 1960s. In the field of education, progressive educational theory was dying out. In the art world, abstraction came to be replaced by the postmodern style of art. Furthermore, in this era of economic growth, museums came to have multiple sources of financial support. These shifts in the external contexts led to the construction of new definitions of education in the American museum, in particular, the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (HMSG). Rapid social upheaval during and after 1960s--modernization, the expansion of middle classes, and the civil rights movements--created a new environment in the cultural field. Formerly, marginalized groups of people were considered important visitors of the Museums, and new government endowments were established to support this trend. These shifts in the social and cultural field also brought about new practices in education for the public. In addition to educational programs and practices, the exhibitions of the HMSG are considered in relation to the new artistic movement, postmodernism. The new aesthetic theory is briefly mentioned, in order
to give focus to the discussion on methods of displaying the artworks in the exhibition. This new modification of the displaying artworks of the HMSG demonstrates the sense in which meanings of the artworks are negotiated between the museum and the visitor.

Finally, Chapter Five summarizes the implications of these analyses for our understanding of the meanings of education in American museums within the historical context. This chapter attempts to compare two different museums of modern and contemporary art, in terms of social contexts, funding structures, educational practices and educational reforms of their times, and their respective strategies for displaying exhibitions which were constructed within the contexts of social, political, and cultural conditions of the time.

1.3.2. Location of Research and Method of Data Analysis

Historical research needs reliable information from primary and secondary sources in order to construct a historical narrative. To obtain primary materials on art museums, I traveled to such research resources: the Archives of American Art in the Smithsonian Institution in New York, the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution Archives in Washington, D. C., the Library of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the Library of the Museum of Modern Art, the
Museum of Modern Art Archives, and the Library of The Ohio State University. In these research archives and libraries, museum administrators’ annual reports, letters, newspapers, and written materials on exhibition and education programs were collected.

History is not purely referential but is rather constructed by historians. Written historical literature both reflects and creates relations of power. Its standards of inclusion and exclusion, measures of importance, and rules of evaluation are not objective criteria but politically produced conventions. What we know as history reflects in a certain degree the results of past politics (Scott, 1989; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 317). In this sense, a meaningful history of the American art museum include tasks from collecting data to constructing historical narrative. Data compiled from primary sources does not speak alone but requires interpretation. The interpretation of documents varies according to the specific interests of the interpreter. In this research, in order to create a critical interpretation of the history of art museums in the United States, various primary sources related to my research questions from archives was read critically. These historical materials treated within the particular framework of ‘problematization,’ in order to examine how American art museums have ruptured and changed its educational mission within the contexts of their historical, social, and cultural conditions. In brief, the following connections are analyzed:
Political, Social, Economic, and Cultural Contexts

- Great Economic Depression (New Deal Relief Program)
- Second World War

Art Museums (MoMA, HMSG)

- Progressive Education
- Modernism
- Aesthetic Exhibition

- Educational Programs Exhibitions (Type of Display)

- Baby Boom, Cultural Boom
- Expansion of Middle Class
- Modernization
- Civil Rights Movement
- Government Support for the Arts (NEA, NEH)
- Arts-in-Education Movement
- Postmodernism Contextualized exhibition

Figure 1: Analysis of historical context of American museums
In analyzing those materials, I concentrated on such questions as what causes and effects resulted in a break or rupture in the evolution of American art museums. As a strategy for interpreting the facts of the past art museums in the United States, I first of all look for 'external contexts' which contributed to the existing form of the American art museums. Thus, the historical materials in the broader contexts of political, social, and cultural thought are read critically as an external analysis to the specific reality of art museums in the United States. To gain an understanding of historical, social, economical, and cultural contexts of the United States, I rely to a great extent on secondary sources.

In the following chapters, the discussion of social and political changes during the 1930s and 1960s is mostly owed to the perspectives of Francis F. Piven and Richard A. Cloward (1971). Their interpretation of the relationship between social and political shifts and the meaning of government support for the arts has sometimes been attacked by other scholars; however, in some degree, they are valuable. Stow Persons (1973) and H. Wayne Morgan (1970) provide specific information regarding the upheaval in social classes during the late nineteenth century. The works of Carl N. Degler (1975) and William A. Link & Arthur S. Link (1993) analyze the rapid political, social, and cultural upheaval after 1945, from the historian's perspective. Richard Eells
(1967) and Robert H. Bremner (1960) investigate funding sources for the museums and other institutions since eighteenth century. Additionally, Arthur Efland (1989; 1990), Lawrence Cremin (1961), and Stanley Aronowitz & Henry A. Giroux (1993) provide useful secondary sources for tracing ideas from intellectual history developed through general education.

For the internal analysis, I analyzed data from the annual reports, documentation of exhibitions and educational programs, letters, manuscripts, and typescripts of each museum. The annual reports are written forms of discourse designed to promote the visions of the organization. Each report in the sample was read twice according to the different strategies of the research. One reading was made to obtain general information about the museum. A second reading will systematically examined the museum directors’ and presidents’ statements about museum goals, progress, and mission. The format of the annual reports varied by museum and by year. The Museum of Modern Art did not begin publishing regular annual and biennial reports until 1960. The Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden had not published an annual report of its own. However, information on this museum was included in the Smithsonian annual report. Analysis of the documents of annual reports from within might include analysis of how the museums’ missions have been changed at particular times and what
the main goals of the museums were when the reports were written. In the annual reports, records of changes in the decision-making and power structures, and, sometimes, financial information (budget records) for the museums are included. Annual statements made by museum leaders offer direct indications of museum aims and policies.

The documentation of exhibitions in each museum was analyzed for an understanding of the curators’ intentions in communication with the public. Exhibits are the primary vehicles by which the public encounters the collections of the museums. Further, exhibits reflect the manifold decisions regarding choice of art works, setting, and interpretation. Exhibits, then, may be said to capture a moment in museum history characterized by its own social and cultural contexts. What museums choose to exhibit in both permanent and temporary installation and how that material is shown reflects the nature, politics, and power of the museums within the context of the historical conditions. In the case of the MoMA, the exhibitions in 1930 were analyzed. As an example of an exhibition during the 1970s, the HMSG’s "Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984," is discussed. The investigation of exhibition design throughout the history of a museum

\[\text{The exhibitions in the MoMA which are discussed are: Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh (Nov. 7-Dec. 7, 1929); Nineteen Living Americans (Dec. 12, 1929 – Jan. 12, 1930); Painting in Paris (Jan. 18 – Mar. 2, 1930); Maillol, Lehmbrock, Klee, Weber (Mar. 12 – Apr. 2, 1930); Fourth-six Under Thirty-five.}\]
show that the use of space and art objects is directly related to concerns with the visitors' experience in the museums, as well as the social and cultural contexts of the time.

The education programs of the American museums are analyzed in order to trace the museums' efforts to fulfill its educational mission for the public. In analyzing the primary sources of educational practices of museums, I paid attention to creating a link between the social and educational reform contexts and museum practices. The educational programs of the museums, in particular, the MoMA and the HMSG, have been changed many times and have been socially constructed within the context of historical conditions. Significantly, general educational reforms throughout the history of art education have directly and indirectly influenced museum education. In case of the MoMA, the ideal of Progressive education theory, which was indebted to John Dewey, affected the construction of the meanings of education of the Museum. The HMSG's educational rationale seems not to be clearly elucidated. However, it was my assumption that the HMSG's educational rationale was based on the educational reform movement during the 1970s and 1980s, such as 'Postmodernism' and the 'Arts-in-Education movement.'

Charles Burchfield (Apr. 11 – Apr. 27, 1930); Homer, Ryder, Eakins (May 6 – June 4, 1930); Retrospective (June 15 – Sept. 28, 1930).
The target audiences of the museums, for instance, children, the general public, handicapped visitors, professional artists, and art scholars, are discussed in relation to educational theories.

However, investigations of the educational practices of the MoMA and HMSG were not easy task. For the Museum of Modern Art, it was important to collect and analyze letters, manuscripts, and typescripts from the archive of the Museum. Furthermore, materials regarding the educational practices and mission for the public in the HMSG were hard to obtain. In fact, there were not any published material concerning those issues. The primary sources on educational practices of the HMSG seems to be like small stones in the sand (endless and confusing resources). However, these primary sources provide very important evidence for a discussion of the educational role and programs of the Museum.

Additionally, Director's letters and some memoranda regarding educational programs and grants were carefully considered because the museums' practices of education were occasionally influenced by new funding sources. As external support of the museum moves from individual philanthropy to organizational funding, the museums have become less elitist, more popular institutions. The economical factor of funding sources is directly related to the decisions about exhibitions, widening museums' availability to the public, better utilization of
1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

As Foucault explored a historical event through "a problem expressed in the terms current today" (Foucault, 1988, p. 262), the past is useful in interpreting the present situation. What the past speaks to the present are that there is no fixed view as to the identity of art museums. The realities of art museums have changed many times within the context of historical conditions. Through the analysis of the museums in the United States, I hope to find support for the hypothesis that the meaning of the education in American museums has been socially constructed and has shifted within the historical contexts. In the past, education was a marginal area in the historical study of museums; however, the situation has begun to change today. Currently, in the art museums various educational programs are being developed to give the visitors access to significant artistic experience in the museums. Didactic materials, such as text panels and brochures within the space of the art museums help beholders learn about the purpose of an exhibition. Exhibitions are installed for making multiple contexts of interpretations. In the past, knowledge of the art object was considered
the most important knowledge required in creating an exhibition in an art museum. However, today, knowledge about the visitor is felt to be equally important. The subject positions of the audience are more closely analyzed than in the past. From these approaches to the viewers, we finally arrive at a complete sense of art museums as educational sites.

What are the lessons, then, from an investigation of the history of American art museums? From my investigation, I hope to make invisible historical context of art museums visible. Museum histories have been ignored the educational aspects of museums. Answers to such questions as how art museums have worked, what they have done, and how they have related to the social, economic, and political imperatives that surrounded them might be the first stepping stones for the museum workers in developing educational programs for the public. The socially committed museum professional may feel that his/her project is based on the realm of popularization and dissemination. The professional would, thus, attempt to establish meaningful contact with ordinary people by bringing in appropriate artworks and organizing suitable activities within the scope of museum functions.
Eilean Hooper-Greenhill argues that the reality of a museum is not fixed, but shifts according to its contexts. She criticizes the prevailing view that limits the meaning of a museum mainly as a great building or a nationalistic temple of culture. Rather, she suggests the need for the openness of multiple meanings for museums. The contexts, such as cultural, social, political, and economic contexts are interrelated and work with or against each other in a state of constant flux, so that the meanings of museums are continually being defined and redefined.

This fixed view of the identity of museums has sometimes been firmly held and, until recently, little has disturbed it. But it is a mistake to assume that there is only one form of reality for museums, only one fixed mode of operating. Looking back into the history of museums, the realities of museums have changed many times. Museums have always had to modify how they worked, and what they did, according to the context, the plays of power, and the social, economic, and political imperatives that surrounded them. (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 1)
At the present time, we have seen a major shift in the meaning of museums. Since changes have been extreme and rapid, these changes have thrown previous assumptions about the meanings of museums into disorder. The recent changes have affected most those who felt that they knew what museums were, how they should be, and what they should be doing.

Historically, the meanings of museums change as we look at how and who collected the objects, how these objects were classified and presented, and expectations of how these objects were to be viewed by the public. Generally, the multiple histories of museums tell us that the museums evolved with interplay between the fundamental notions of collecting, classifying, displaying, and viewing. Museums collected objects as a testimony to the physical life of the past. Museums were a depository for things extracted, whether by time itself, or through some literal application of force, for the purpose of a particular utilitarian or religious use (Sherman & Rogoff, 1994).

Classification functioned through the process of the positing of objects. Although histories of museums show that museums sought to characterize their classifications as somehow inherent in the objects they presented, such classification always took place within some externally constructed contexts, such as culture, social conditions, community, and so on. Thus, the classification of an object indicates the choice of a
particular kind of presentation, which provides the object with meaning (Sherman & Rogoff, 1994).

The collection of objects and a system for classifying become objects of display, that is, various types of exhibits. The objects displayed suggest a particular ‘socially-coded’ way of seeing, which leads the objects not only to be seen but to be seen with an understanding of the intangible meanings behind the objects (Bennett, 1995).

The basic concepts of the collection, classification, and exhibitions are not enough in constructing the meanings of museums. In presenting objects within the institutional frame of the museum, museums underlined their own characteristics by separating displayed objects from the world of lived experience. In so doing, museums simultaneously constructed the concept of viewer, that is, public. Here, museums’ collections were considered valuable means of “community service” through their immense educational value (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 2).

The following discussion of the history of the definitions of museums shows how the four notions of collecting, classifying, exhibiting, and viewing evolved. Art museums in the United States were not a transplanted institution of the traditional European type, in which objects are primarily collected and housed, but a newly developed institution which had a long evolution with emphasis on education and public accessibility (See Figure 2). Going back to the history of museums
from classical antiquity to the 20th century tells us that there were shifts in power relations in the society outside as well as within the museums. Furthermore, the meaning of American museums was not constructed without roots, but within their own social, political, and economical contexts—the shifting dynamic of social classes and economic conditions. In order to understand the contexts that shaped the American museum, we will trace the history of the museum from ancient times in Europe to its origins in the United States.

2.2. WHAT IS A MUSEUM?

2.2.1. Ancient and Middle Ages

The ‘mouseion’ of ancient times was a shrine devoted to the muses, the goddesses of the Liberal Arts. It was the first repository of works of art. Later, these shrines developed into or were devoted to the collections of books, as in Eumenes II at Pergamum, which contributed to their luxury and longevity of books. Eumenes II at Pergamum seems to have been a library that had a reception hall for the purpose of academic conferences. Additionally, the word ‘mouseion’ applied to sanctuaries dedicated to institutions of scientific research such as that founded by
Ptolemy Philadelphus. These sanctuaries seem to have been colleges for scholars, a scientific museum comprising rooms devoted to the study of anatomy and installations for astronomical observation. For Romans, the term ‘mouseion’ denoted a villa that served as a site for philosophical discussions (Rawlins, 1981, p. 7; Morikawa, 1985, p. 2; Bazin, 1967, pp. 14-16).

In addition to the villas for philosophical discussions, study center, and libraries that held artifacts, religious buildings of the Middle Ages also could be considered types of ‘mouseion’. The monastic reliquaries and cathedral sacristies, for example, contained collections of religious relics, precious artifacts, and assorted curiosities designed to inspire religious devotion. This notion of maintaining collections of objects contributed ‘powerful’ ideas about objects. They were considered treasures, relics connecting those living with the mighty dead, dedications, and accumulations of social surplus. These ideas have shaped our thinking about the nature of museums (Pearce, 1992, p. 91).

2.2.2. Renaissance

In the Renaissance, the term ‘museum’ was first applied to varied collections of artistic objects as well as to collections of art with religious significance. A new interest in secular history, which viewed antiquities
as the products of man, promoted the collecting of objects. The collections were frequently devoted to a specific area of scholarship, and introduced a sense of historical sequence to the presentation of art (Morikawa, 1985, p. 2). This was the beginning of the emergence of the concept of museums, which appeared under such names as 'cabinet of curiosities' and 'gallery' in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

The Italian 'gabinetto,' the French 'cabinet,' the English 'closet,' the German 'kammer' all designated a small room for displaying curiosities, art objects, books, and lesser pictures, in a decorative scheme. The term 'cabinet,' which was derived from the Latin 'cavea,' at first designated pieces of furniture designed to safekeep and display objects. The words, 'curious,' 'curiosity,' and 'wunder' are related to the meanings of an eagerness to learn, inquisitiveness. A man who was curious was thought to have intelligence and education (Hudson, 1987, p. 21). By the eighteenth century the term 'cabinet of curiosities' was extended to mean a small room where artifacts and specimens were kept and displayed. Such a collection was called 'cabinet de curiosité' in France, 'Kunst und Wunderkammer' (rooms of art and wonder) in Germany, and 'museo' in Italy (Bazin, 1967, pp. 129-39).

The 'cabinet of curiosities' has generally been considered the first museum of Europe by many museum historians. The 'cabinet of curiosities' was made possible by the collecting activities of the French
Medici family. The Medici family was the most successful of the merchant families, at a time in Florence when the rapid growth of banking, trading, and mercantile activities was producing large fortunes (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 24). As their economic power grew, the merchant class needed culture, connoisseurship, and ostentatious display in order to support their social and economic positions. The collection at The Palazzo of Cosimi di Medici (Figure 4) are examples of the earliest of this type of art collection. The Medici family (Figure 5), wealthy merchant bankers, began to collect expensive goods and classical objects, such as sculpture, pictures, manuscripts, fragments of ancient buildings, and coins, focusing especially on ancient Greece and Rome. These were stored and displayed in specially designed spaces within the palace (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 66).

This collecting activity around the mid-seventeenth century can not be considered an accident, but was inevitable with the change in the economic conditions. In the mid-seventeenth century there was a rapid extension of trade. Shipping and navigation improved and facilitated a flow of luxury goods, from the east through Venice and into Italy and Germany. It is this trade that allowed the growth of a wealthy merchant class. Traditionally in Europe the merchants were not the holders of wealth; wealth was held by the aristocracy. It was this economic boom that initiated the collecting frency (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992). The various
items that were collected by the nouveau rich displayed their wealth and social status. Thus, collecting activity was an economic venture and a symbol of social status. The development of the nouveau rich merchant class and the decline of the aristocracy represented the decline of the intellectual and institutional power of the church and the new development of early capitalism (Pearce, 1992, p. 92).

The collections of the ‘cabinets of curiosities’ were arranged partly in response to the size of the pieces and partly to differentiate between natural and artificial (man-made) materials. A seventeenth century text made a distinction between natural and artificial materials:

Now for the materials themselves I reduce them into two sorts; one Natural, of which some are more familiarly known and named amongst us, as divers sorts of Birds, foure-footed Beasts and Fishes, to whom I have given usual English names. Others are lesse familiar, and as yet unifitted with apt English terms, as the shell-Creatures, Insects, Mineralls, Outlandish-Fruits, And the like, which are part of the Materia Medica; (Encroachers upon that faculty, may try how they can crack such shells). The other sort is Artificial, as Utensills, Householdstuffe, Habits, Instruments of Warre used by several Nations, rare curiosities of Art, etc. These are also expressed in English (saving the Coynes, which would vary but little if Translated) for the ready satisfying whomsoever may desire a view thereof. (Tradescant, 1656, a2-a3; Pearce, 1992, p. 95)

Michel Foucault describes the means of composing or exhibiting the objects in the ‘cabinet of curiosities’ collections as ‘flat-table’ displays where knowledge could be discerned through interpretation and similitude. The engraved frontispiece of Musei Wormiani Historia
illustrates the collector’s cabinet filled with ‘flat-table’ displays (Figure 6). The illustration, *Musei Wormiani Historia*, published in Leiden in 1655, was from the engraved frontispiece of Olaus Worm’s catalogue of Worm’s museum. In this illustration, we can see that the objects are placed upon open shelving or are hung from the walls and ceiling. Here, we realize some hidden order in the arrangement of objects. There are sections for horned shells and horns, clothing, large fish and birds, weapons and arrows. An L-shaped bank of shelving is divided into sections with names such as LIGNA (woods), ANIMMALIUM PARTES (animal parts), and CONCHILIATA (shells) (Pearce, 1992).

The collections of the ‘cabinets of curiosities’ were assembled as representative groupings of meaningful objects, with the material ordered to represent knowledge of the world. As Hooper-Greenhill asserts, the collection found in the cabinet of curiosities can be characterized as places for “keeping and sorting the products of Man and Nature and . . . promoting their significance . . . in a program whose aim was nothing less than universality” (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 80). The ‘cabinets of curiosities’ brought objects together within a setting and constructed a discourse where the material things represented all the different parts of existent.

Foucault, in his 1970’s work, considers structures of knowing to trace the changes that took place between the Renaissance and the
The general area of knowledge was not longer of identities and differences; that of non-quantitative orders, that of a universal characterization, of a general taxonomy, of non-measurable mathesis, but an area made up of organic structures, that is, of internal relations between elements whose totality forms a function. (Foucault, 1970, p. 228)

The Renaissance obsession with ordering and naming, and the concern for representing 'similitude' in displays differs from the function of collections in the eighteenth century, when the visible similarity between things was no longer the basis upon which learning was acquired. Instead, collections were based on and organized in a more abstract, three-dimensional manner, in which the inner relationships among collected materials were the focus (Farr, 1944, p. 18). Things, which had been arranged together, were displayed apart, linked to something that had the same morphological features, and could be classed in the same family. The method of display was shifted to order 'series' of similar things. Ordering things in the method of display seems to have been related to ideas of evolutionary theory, that Man progressed through different stages to come to the ultimate level of European culture. It was thought necessary that the viewer encounter a journey in the form of an order of things that revealed itself only to those who, step by step, retraced its evolutionary development.

38
In addition to the ‘cabinet of curiosities’, another type of museum, the ‘gallery,’ was beginning to form, at the end of the sixteenth century. However, these two sorts of museums were not always clearly defined. Sometimes, the definitions were vague. Physically, the ‘gallery’ was larger, a long, and grand hall, while the ‘cabinet’ was a square-shaped room. The gallery had a sumptuous, luxuriously appointed salon where art works formed an integral part of the decoration. Generally, a succession of splendid reception rooms came to be known as galleries so that the term gallery per se assumes a purely utilitarian nature. By the end of the sixteenth century, the word ‘gallery’ designated exhibition areas for painting or sculpture (Bazin, 1967, pp. 129-139).

The gallery housed intricate shelving and glass covered sets of drawers in meticulously organized rooms to display stuffed rarities of animal and vegetal origin. Eventually, it consisted of huge rectangular galleries with barrel vaulted ceilings, which connected corridors leading one into another. The skylights in the ceilings of the gallery allowed the works of art to be occasionally lit by natural light. The galleries housed monumental collections of paintings, sculptures, furniture, and artifacts from churches, palaces and monasteries, created over the centuries from antiquity to the Renaissance and Baroque eras.

The paintings in The Imperial Gallery in Prague (Figure 7) show the manner in which artworks were displayed in the 18th century (Hooper-
Greenhill, 1992, pp. 141-144). The paintings covering the wall from floor to ceiling were arranged symmetrically for visual and decorative effect. Larger paintings were hung on the central wall space, whereas the smaller ones were arranged around them according to topic, rather than historical chronology, artist, geographical conditions, or even date. The arrangement was determined by the morphological features of the paintings. Old and current paintings were displayed together. The horizons of the paintings were considered so that those with different horizons did not appear too near each other (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, pp. 141-143).

Both types of museums, ‘galleries’ and ‘cabinets of curiosities’ were rarely accessible to the general public. Both terms were originally used to describe collections of art and curiosities, but gradually ‘gallery’ became associated with areas devoted mainly to art, while ‘cabinet of curiosities’ came to refer to more eclectic collections. Both the ‘cabinet of curiosities’ and ‘gallery’ traditions were the prototypes of public museums of the eighteenth and nineteenth century in Europe. However, the American art museums might not have been founded, without the collections of specimens and oddities from ‘cabinets of curiosities’ that found their way to the New World. In the United States, scientists, scholars, physicians, and statesmen became assemblers and collectors in shaping ‘cabinets of curiosities.’ Their collections became the
foundations of the first American museums during the eighteenth century. Yet, the 'cabinets of curiosities' were not the only influence in the shaping of American museums. The emergence of public museums after the French Revolution in Europe also contributed to the construction of meanings for the American museums during the late nineteenth century.

2.2.3. The Louvre and The South Kensington Museum

The French Revolution signaled the end the hierarchic society, and at the same time of the old way of thinking, faith in a fixed order ruled by theological-political logic. The new state was a centralized, nationalistic institution inspired by the revolution and based on the social dominance of the bourgeoisie. This shift can be explained as the emergence of democratic culture. After the revolution in France, museums embodied the intellectual as well as social ideals of the enlightenment (Wittlin, 1940).

The notion of private collections housed in the palaces of princes and the representatives of elite social classes gradually shifted to desire to open these collections to the whole population. Thus the museum was viewed as an institution that could expose both the decadence and tyranny of the old forms of control, and the democracy and public utility
of the Republic. Art was no longer private property, but a national
treasure. Consequently, works of art and artifacts formerly kept in
cathedral sacristies, ducal treasure chambers, and princely palaces were

The Louvre, the world's first public museum, was established in
the aftermath of the French Revolution to display national treasures.
Plans to create the ‘Louvre’ had been in existence for many years.
However, the decree of 1789, which nationalized ecclesiastical property,
brought a new urgency to plans for the museum. Under this decree, the
property of the aristocracy and of the royal family was confiscated,
detaching a lot of things from their previous contexts. It was with these
articles that the first ‘museum’ for public consumption was created in
1792, in the galleries of the old royal palace of the Louvre. It was called
Originally called the ‘Palais du Peuple,’ the Louvre opened on August 10,
1793, ‘the first anniversary of the fall of the French monarchy’ (Figure 8).
In 1796 the name of the museum was changed to ‘Musée Central des
Arts,’ and later in 1803 the name was again changed to ‘Musée Napoléon
(Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 172; Alexander, 1983, p. 90). In its first
exhibition the Grande Galleries exhibited 537 paintings on the walls and
184 art objects on tables in the hall. Three-fourths of them came from
the royal palaces, and most of the remainder from churches and religious
orders (Alexander, 1979, p. 24).

In addition to the national treasures Napoleon's wars brought many more objects to the Louvre. As Napoleon conquered Europe, many thousands of objects were removed from their former spaces, in the form of war indemnities and brought to the Louvre (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 173). During Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798, he confiscated superb museum objects, including the Rosetta Stone (Alexander, 1996, p. 25).

The French Revolution, with its egalitarian objectives, led to the conditions for the emergence of a new paradigm of museology, which was realized in the Louvre. According to the new museology, the display methods in the Louvre were new achievements. The treasures were displayed for the public, and artifacts such as sculpture, architecture, tombs, and decorations from the church were arranged in seriated rooms by chronological order. Additionally, the collections were divided into the work of living and deceased artists. Previously, collections had displayed both old pieces and the works of living artists together (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 179, p. 181; Farr, 1994, p. 27).

The paintings in the Louvre were hung between the windows in several irregular rows from the floor to the ceiling. Tables were placed in the center of the museum space to display bronzes, busts, clocks, and other curiosities (Alexander, 1996, p. 24). The paintings were hung
together in geographical and historical groupings and schools of artists, rather than by the morphological similarities of the works themselves. The visible features emphasized in the previous era were no longer the determining factors in establishing the method of displaying objects in the museum. Paintings were hung in 'schools' in order to show their 'histories.' For instance, the Louvre organized and displayed its paintings according to the four schools, the Italian, the Flemish, the Dutch, and the French. Each work of art was given an explanatory text, which gave information about the artist and the subject. This was an entirely revolutionary approach to the method of displaying artwork. There is no record that any previous museum had attempted to present and interpret its paintings in this way. Generally, before the innovation of the Louvre, it was assumed that all audiences were well educated and informed or would pretend to be, and it was also felt that the impression a painting made was the most important consideration (Hudson, 1987, pp. 41-42).

In the nineteenth century, explanations of the world probed for deeper structural relationships between the various orders of existence. This necessarily led back to an interest in the dimension of philosophical questioning and the analysis of relationships (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p.

---

1 Here, 'school' might seem to be an unsatisfactory term when we think of this term in relation to the disciplines of particular artists. Rather, this term was used to refer to the art of a whole country, as in 'the Spanish School,' or 'the French School' (Hudson, 1987, pp. 40-42).
Foucault describes this shift in the fundamental mode of thought:

From the nineteenth century, History was to deploy, in a temporal series, the analogies that connect distinct organic structures to one another. This same History will also, progressively, impose its laws on the analysis of production, the analysis of organically structured beings, and, lastly, on the analysis of linguistic groups. . . . so History, . . . defines the birthplace of the empirical, that from which, prior to all established chronology, it derives its own being. . . . In the nineteenth century, philosophy was to reside in the gap between history and History, between events and the Origin, between evolution and the first rending open of the source, between oblivion and the Return. (Foucault, 1970, p. 219)

This philosophical shift had an effect in shaping the identity of the Louvre in the nineteenth century. In addition, the invention of art history played a role in structuring the museum experiences. As a product of Enlightenment thought, to be sure, 'art history' rationalized the experience of art. Through the history of art, the middle class, the bourgeoisie, could appropriate the experience of art. For the bourgeoisie, cultural achievement and individual genius were the essence of human history. Art history was primarily understood in terms of the claim that history was the history of great men. The museum was organized as an art-historical monument—art expected to speak of individual genius and achievement. Art history could justify the appropriation and exhibition of art by the state: art appeared as art history only in the museum, and only art history made visible the spiritual truths of art. Thus, the museum was the only proper repository of art objects (Duncan &
As seen earlier, the Louvre maintained a collection of art works of great and at the same time became a strongly democratic educational institution by providing greater access to all people. Linda Nochlin asserts that the Louvre was an "apparatus with two deeply contradictory functions; that of the elite temple of the arts, and that of a utilitarian instrument for democratic education" (Nochlin, 1972, p. 8). In keeping with the notion of democratic education, everyone could visit without charge. This was in great contrast to other museums restricted entry to educated people whose interest and good behavior could be assumed (Hudson, 1987, p. 42). Explanatory texts were attached to the works of art displayed in the museum. Inexpensive catalogues were written for the visiting 'citizens,' not for scholars or curators (Hooper-Greenhill, 1992, p. 182; Hudson, 1987, p. 42, 186; Seiling, 1967, p. 109; Bazin, 1959, p. 51). The Louvre became a 'people's museum' in the eighteenth century. However, even though we have defined it as a democratic museum in the context of the eighteenth century in Europe, the Louvre had some limitation in its focus on elegant artworks. The Louvre did not cover the arena of applied arts beyond the fine arts field.

It was the South Kensington Museum in England that attempted to bridge the gap between the fine and applied arts, and between taste and...
industry. Although the Louvre is considered the prototype for European museums, the South Kensington Museum has had a greater effect on the museum movement in the United States as a form of democratic education.

The South Kensington Museum, later to be called the Victoria and Albert Museum (around 1899), was established in 1857 as “the first fruit of the effort to meet the problems of the industrial age” (Newsom, B. & Silver, A. Z., 1978, p. 14). In England, the Industrial Revolution suffered a great decline not only in the craft of the goods produced, but also in their design. This decline in the quality of British goods came to be recognized as a national problem, and poor design was seen as one of the roots of the inferiority of industrial products in the second and third decades of the nineteenth century. There was an urgent need to improve the design process for industrial goods before export trade was adversely effected.

To this end, around the mid nineteenth century, a committee of the House of Commons on Arts and Manufactures recommended the founding of design schools; this resulted in the establishment of the School of Design, which was known as the Royal College of Art. Despite the government’s effort at design reform through establishment of Schools of Design, at the time of the London Exposition of 1851, Britain's industrial products were still inferior in comparison with those of France.
The government began to attempt seriously to centralize control of art/design education. The Crystal Palace Exhibition left a surplus of funds that totalled £150,000. Henry Cole, the principal figure in the development of the Crystal Palace Exhibition, proposed that these funds be used to purchase a site in South Kensington (Knowles, 1997, pp. 64-76). Finally, in 1857, the Iron Building opened—offices, museums, and schools were housed in this building (Alexander, 1983, p. 154) (Figure 8).

The South Kensington Museum (Figure 9) made an effort to meet the pragmatic needs of industry. The Museum was not only linked to nationwide industrial arts training programs, but also sought to inspire artisans to higher levels of craftsmanship through the exhibition of high quality decorative arts. The strength of the connection between art education and industry which developed in the nineteenth century was indicated in a speech given by William Ewart Gladstone, for the opening of an exhibition celebrating art and industry in Dundee, Scotland in 1890:

The industries of the country will derive enormous advantage from the cultivation of art. Beauty is an element of immense pecuniary value. The traditional cultivation of taste and production of beauty in industrial objects, is better known—perhaps best of all known—perhaps—in Italy, and very well known in France... In the enormous commerce of France, the beauty of the objects produced counts from year to year for a great many millions sterling, and these millions sterling would fade into air were the appreciation of beauty and the power of producing beautiful objects taken away... I assure you that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that at the time I was a boy... there was hardly anything this beautiful produced in this country... [Now the] introduction of beauty is
becoming a regular portion of the industrial art. (Stansky, 1985, p. 25)

The South Kensington Museum created programs of art instruction for elementary schools, with the belief that through art instruction in the elementary schools, a large portion of the general public would come to appreciate good design, and the general taste would be elevated. Art instruction consisted of studio activities, especially drawing, which was seen as the key to good industrial design. Additionally, to foster the development of good designers, the South Kensington Museum emphasized the study of the artistic products of the past as the best way to create beautiful objects of utility. For instance, a student who wanted to be a good designer, must understand what had been accomplished by past masters of his specialty. According to Edward Alexander, by the time of Cole's retirement,

the 20 "limp Schools of Design" of 1852, with fewer than 5,000 students, had grown to 122 flourishing schools of art attended by 22,800 in all parts of the United Kingdom and had inspired similar schools in the colonies and in the United States. In addition, where nothing had existed previously, elementary drawing was taught to 194,500 boys and girls in schools for the poor, 538 night drawing classes served 17,200 artisans, and 36,783 students attended 948 science classes. (Alexander, 1983, p. 152)

2 The art curriculum included free-hand drawing from copies (flat examples), free-hand drawing from models, practical geometry, linear perspective, and delineation of large letters, numbers, and diagrams (Nichols, 1877, p. 190).
Additionally, the Museum concentrated on democratic social values in educating the masses and portrayed them in improved entertainment. To achieve its aim as an educational institution, the South Kensington Museum offered an art library, lecture series, night openings, various catalogues and guidebooks with plenty of labels. Additionally, the Circulation Department of the Museum sent out a traveling exhibition of 430 objects and 150 framed drawings and photographs (Alexander, 1983, p. 159).

The South Kensington Museum effected the shaping of American art museums. The product of the South Kensington system would later implement a similar program of art education in Boston and the state of Massachusetts, forging the same connection seen in England between art and industry (Knowles, 1997, p. 82). In fact, the literature (Alexander, 1983, p. 159).

---

3 Around the 1870s, the idea of introducing drawing instruction into state-supported schooling became a controversial issue in the United States. The industrial drawing movement came into being as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution. The working poor were concentrated in the slums of industrial cities. Crime, prostitution, and drunkenness became serious urban problems. This newly recognized misery was often ascribed to the low morals and ignorance of the poor. There was a demand for 'education' as the remedy to both the poverty and the criminal behavior of the people. This concern for moral education intensified as increasing numbers of immigrants came to the United States. Horace Mann viewed 'schooling' as a moral agency that would assure the orderly conduct of society. 'Industrial drawing' was regarded as a way to elevate moral standards: "Drawing may well go hand in hand with music; so may the cultivation of a taste for reading." Walter Smith was one of the key persons contributing to the development of this Industrial Drawing movement, which was centered in the South Kensington Museum. It was felt that 'teaching industrial drawing' to the public could elevate the taste of the public, including
1979; Burt, 1977; Rawlins, 1981) points out that during the nineteenth century, the South Kensington Museum became a model for the American public museum founders. Several American museums in the nineteenth century such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, cited the South Kensington Museum as a model to be imitated and followed.

The influence of works of art is wholesome, ennobling, instructive. Besides the cultivation of the sense of beauty—-in other words, the perception of order, symmetry, proportion of parts,. . . the intelligent contemplation of a great gallery of works of art is a lesson in history, a lesson in biography, a lesson in the antiquities of different countries. . . . It is our aim to have, at no very future period, a museum similar to the Kensington Museum in London. (Orosz, 1990, pp. 233-234; Lerman, 1969, p. 14; Alexander, 1983)

Furthermore, in 1878, when Charles P. Taft lectured on the subject of art museums in a democracy in Cincinnati, he used the South Kensington Museum as his model. He pointed out that the general notion of a museum involved a series of rooms filled with paintings of the old masters; however, he proposed that the South Kensington Museum represented a new and different conception for developing the American museums (Nochlin, 1972, p. 24).

The public art museums, which emerged in the United States in the 1870s, had roots in a long European tradition, especially the innovative and instructional South Kensington Museum in Great Britain.

all levels of common people, rather than focusing on a limited elite group of
Founded at the height of Britain’s industrial revolution, this museum sought to provide technical training to educate designers for British manufacturing, thus making it competitive in the world market. The unpretentious scope, educational objectives, and practical benefits of the South Kensington Museum struck a responsive chord with philanthropic Americans, who were grappling with similar problems that accompanied industrial expansion in their own country. However, even though public art museums in the United States were indebted to the tradition of the European museum, American museums developed their own distinct identities. Since the external contexts of American museums were quite different from those of Europe, the meanings of American museums were differently constructed from those of Europe’s museums, according to America’s own characteristic social and cultural contexts.

2.3. IDEAS ABOUT MUSEUM IN THE UNITED STATES: POPULARIZATION VERSUS PROFESSIONALISM

Kenneth Hudson’s maintains that there was no early museum movement in the United States.
Until the 1880s the museum world consisted of four countries: France, Germany, England, and Italy. There were, of course, collections elsewhere, including some of great importance, but little innovation was taking place outside these four countries. (Hudson, 1987, p. 7)

Early museums in the United States have generally not been seriously considered within the context of the evolutionary history of American museums. In other words, early museums are either considered a very primitive stage in the evolution of museums or merely third-rate imitations of European models. In fact, few studies have been interested in the issue of the early museum movement in the United States. In existing literature, the argument is largely derived from two opposing positions that the dual path museums have taken in their responsibility for both public and scholarly uses.4

The first position, 'Professional Criticism,' criticizes the early American museums of the cabinet type for subordinating the entire goal of the museum to popular entertainment. This position held that the early American museums ignored the legitimate needs of the scholar and directed the level of presentation of the museums to the unrefined populace. This position was first put forward in a paper considered the first formal work in the history of American museums: "Museum-History

---

4 For the analysis on contradictory mission of the museums, between public and scholarly responsibility, this study largely depends on Joel Orosz’s position on history of American museums (Orosz, J. (1990). Curators and culture: An...
and Museums of History," delivered by George Brown Goode to the third annual meeting of the American Historical Association in 1888 (Goode, 1888). Goode's paper marks the birth of professional criticism of the American museums. Goode believed that the museum should contribute to the enhancement of 'professionalization,' serving as a research institution and a handmaiden to science.⁵

The other critique of the early museum, which might be called the 'Democratic Criticism,' was in complete contrast to the first criticism of early American museums. This criticism charges that as museums catered to more scholarly purposes, too little was done for the public; in other words, that the early American museums long overlooked the needs of the general public, serving instead the desires of such elitist groups as highly educated historians, scientists, or artists. Interestingly, this position was also proposed by Goode, demonstrating his ultimate ambivalence on the issues surrounding the purposes of museums. This

---

⁵ Goode spent his early career beginning in 1876, at the Smithsonian Institution, and finally came to be assistant secretary of the National Museum. Under the administration of Joseph Henry, the Smithsonian's first secretary, Goode's contributions enhanced the 'professionalization' that characterized the institution's formative years. Henry argued that the Institution had been established to increase and diffuse scientific knowledge; however, he put much more emphasis on 'increasing' knowledge than on diffusing knowledge. Henry's view of the museum as a research institution strongly influenced Goode's position that the museum should be a research center for science. Goode's opinion was repeated and developed over the years by other critics bent on establishing more professional, scholarly purposes for museum collections.
ambivalence can be explained by the influence of Spencer Baird. Baird championed greater public use of the collections of the museum. In accordance with Baird’s insistence on bringing museums back to the people, Goode began to believe that museums, which catered only to scholars, were violating the egalitarian ethos of America. Every American should have equal access to the artifacts of a museum, and an equal opportunity to ‘learn’ from them. Accordingly, Goode’s democratic criticism also appeared in the previously discussed paper of 1888:

The museum systems of Great Britain are, it seems to me, much closer to the ideal which America should follow, than are those of either France or Germany. They are designed more thoughtfully to meet the needs of the people, and (be) more intimately intertwined with the policy of national popular education. The people’s museum should be much more than a house full of specimens in glass cases. It should be a house full of ideas, arranged with the strictest attention to system. I once tried to express this thought by saying: “An efficient educational museum may be described as a collection of instructive labels, each illustrated by a well selected specimen.” (Goode, 1888, pp. 262-263)

Goode’s ‘democratic criticism’ influenced the later museum professionals. John Cotton Dana, the director of New Jersey’s Newark Museum, authored a series of booklets entitled The New Museum that promoted museums as instruments for popular education and recreation.

---

6The strong conflict between Henry and Baird regarding the purpose of the museum has been discussed in several studies. The power game between them is recorded in written documentation. For instance, Orosz describes the battle between them in his book Curators and Culture (pp. 201-212).
(Dana, 1917). Dana denied the aristocratic background of European museums as an initial model of American museum contexts. He also denied the museums' tendency to value collections over exhibitions and preservation over education. Later, Theodore L. Low published the book *The Museum as a Social Instrument*. He does not acknowledge the first century of the museum movement and attacks the next half century for its emphasis on collections over education (Low, 1942). Francis Henry Taylor, the Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, argues that the American museum was "neither an abandoned European palace, nor a solution for storing and classifying the accumulated national wealth of the past" (Taylor, 1945, p. 21). He consistently asserts that the American museum should be "an American phenomenon, developed by the people, for the people, and of the people" (p. 21).

Both positions, democratic and professional criticisms, maintain that there were no museums worth considering in the pre-1870 era. The museum movement during this era grew in a random fashion and was isolated from the later museum movement in the United States. Both critical positions on the American museum movement during the early era seem to draw simplified pictures, considering early museums as either entertaining sideshows or serious professional spaces.

However, Joel Orosz's analysis (1990) of the early museum movement in the United States gives us a clear picture of the evolution of
the early museum movement. In fact, in his argument he proposes the 'American Compromise,' a balance of scholarship and popular education which was difficult to embody in a single institution. These two ideals are not easily joined and reconciled. However, in the history of the early American museum movement, one ideal would appear at a certain moment of history and then disappear, reappearing and disappearing repeatedly in later years. In Orosz's account, the conflicting poles of 'popular education' on the one hand and 'professionalism' on the other hand was a continuing source of tension in the American museum movement in the early era. However, by 1870, the two forces seem to have been synthesized into a parity: "an institution devoted simultaneously to discovering new truths and educating the public about them" (Orosz, 1990, p. 3). Orosz's argument is persuasive, because his insight refutes Nathaniel Burt's analysis of museums, which had previously been accepted among museum historians. Burt states:

The American museum was and is an idea. The European museum was a fact. Almost without exception the European museum was first a collection. With few exceptions most American museums were first an idea. Many of them were created, and sometimes even their buildings built, before they owned anything at all. Furthermore, almost without exception the larger American museums began with a deliberate appeal to the public. Most of the earlier European museums remained semi-exclusive cabinets and curiosities visible only to a few. The American museum began, and has remained, wide open. (Burt, 1977, p. 23)
Burt's view that the early American museum movement centered merely on the educational purposes for the public lost the power of conviction when confronted by Orosz's argument. Burt does not mention any specific details regarding the time of the birth of the American museums. He seems to generalize the diverse movement of American museums, maintaining that the basis of the American museum was an idea rather than a collection. Burt's analysis of American museums seems dogmatic. He paints the complex movement of the American museums with one stroke of the brush. Yet, Orosz's analysis of the early museum movement in the United States describes a more diverse and complicated museum movement in the early period. Orosz mentions the exact time of the birth of the museum in the United States, and discusses how the American museum in its early stage constructed its own form through what he called the 'American Compromise.'

The idea of the museum in the United States sprouted primarily from general collections that included some art but a greater amount of material related to the natural sciences in Philadelphia, Boston, and Charleston. The forerunner of the museum was the 'cabinet,' which implied a collection of objects belonging to an individual or an organization, and thus not open to the general public. The properties of the early form of museum in the United States were amassed by museum proprietors who envied Europe's cultural primacy in the realms of art,
science, and history, and attempted to promote American achievements in these areas. They were generally self-consciously patriotic in the activities of collecting those curiosities. For instance, in 1730, The Library Company of Philadelphia founded by Captain Charles Swaine began to form a cabinet, in an effort to share mutual intellectual improvement. This private organization arranged and collected fossils, coins, and medals. In 1757, The Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia was established with a collection of skeletons, anatomical specimens, casts, and drawings. These collections were for training physicians, not enlightening the public. However, these acquisitions were opened to the public under restrictive conditions: visitors were admitted only if they could pay the equivalent of a Spanish silver dollar, which was a very expensive admission price at this time (Orosz, 1990, p. 17).

According to Orosz, from 1780 to 1800, the earliest museums in the United States were established on the basis of the ideas of the new citizenry. ‘Intellectual improvement’ was accomplished by the collection and exhibition of objects, by conducting experiments open to the public, and by sponsoring lectures. ‘Moral improvement’ was achieved by the inspiring nature of art and natural history itself (Orosz, 1990, pp. 27-68). It was the wealthy, ‘respectable’ classes who contributed to shaping the museum properties of the early museums in the United States. It was also the ‘respectable’ classes who constructed moralizing conceptions of
education in pursuit of their ideals. Charles Willson Peale's Philadelphia Museum was founded within the social contexts of promoting the intellectual and moral improvement of the general public. The museum, for Peale, was a place representing a world in miniature where order reigned supreme. There, people could learn about the perfection of the Creator, social order, and civic responsibility (Roberts, 1997, p. 23).

The idea of 'popular education' prevailed in later years when the power of the respectable class was declining. The shift to more popular forms of education for the public in the museum contexts became possible with changes in the power structure within the social relationship. Foucault regards 'power' and 'social relationships' as the same thing. He proposes that there can be no existent society without the operation of power, because all social relationships depend on it (Pearce, 1992, p. 231). With the influence from the French Revolution, the power of the respectable classes in America finally collapsed, and the new social class, the 'middle class', emerged. In addition, around 1800, the Federalist Party, the symbol of the respectable classes, was defeated by the Jeffersonian Republicans, who represented the vanguard of mob rule. This political change was not entirely related to politics, but instead was a reflection of a change in economic conditions. The older agricultural market economy was being replaced by a dynamic industrial market economy, which, in turn, destroyed the authority and power of
the respectable class who basically were the landowners (Roberts, 1997, p. 24).

With the emergence of new power of the middle classes, the upper class felt that the respectable classes were faced with the deterioration of their position in society. There was a need to manage the behavior of this growing middle class, which had no history of educational refinement. The museum was viewed as an institution where people (the middle class in particular) could obtain all possible knowledge in order to fulfill the duties of citizenship and thus assure the health of the republic (Orosz, 1990).

With the emergence of new forms of wealth and power associated with the ‘middle class,’ which consisted of physicians, attorneys, prosperous farmers, and merchant proprietors, change came and with it awareness that museums must be an integral part of the ‘educational system.’ From around 1800 to the 1820s, ‘museums’ were viewed as a means of fostering social order and control. Charles Willson Peale was aware that to be relevant to more people, museums should “amuse as well as instruct”:

The presentation of supposedly objective facts to the people so that they could make their own decisions for those who would

---

7 Charles Wilson Peale, painter, inventor and natural philosopher, placed his collection of revolutionary war portraits and natural history specimens on display in the American Philosophical Society’s hall in Philadelphia in 1794.
not or could not learn the museum would at least provide "rational amusement" that would reduce the need for frivolous pleasures or vices. The museum would thus be simultaneously a school in which the sovereign people could learn to make wise choices and a place of wholesome diversion for the thoughtless. (Orosz, 1990, p. 81)

The Peale Museum might be marked as the first museum that conceived of the importance of education for all people. The purpose of The Peale Museum was two-fold: 'education' and 'entertainment'. Regardless of the classes of people, the museum should provide people the opportunity to 'learn' about the science of nature without the trouble of study. Here, the content of this 'education' was to be 'moralistic' in tone. It was felt that the middle classes were too vulnerable to all sorts of moral pitfalls, if left to their own devices. Therefore, the museum should provide 'education' courses that would mold the middle classes and help them to avoid error. In this view, the Museum represented a moral guardian for society.

However, over the course of two decades, Peale's notion of education, which was based on moralism, was be diluted. In the early nineteenth century, the American society was dominated by the rise of the middle classes. Peale's moralistic tone came to be softened, and he focused instead on entertainment for all men (Figure 10). In short, as the society shifted with the rise of the middle classes, Peale's mission for the public changed from education to entertainment (Orosz, 1990).
The concern for moral education emphasized in the Peale Museum allowed it to experiment with popular education. To fulfill the high educational purpose, even though the attendance of the visitors was very low, Peale created a ‘lecture’ program to “bring the Museum into some reputation of its usefulness in diffusing scientific knowledge” (Orosz, 1990, p. 113). Additionally, in an effort to enhance popular education, Peale, in 1821, offered free admission to ‘Teachers of School.’ This effort was the first recorded partnership in the United States between museums and schools for the purpose of popular education.

The significant steps toward making the museum a more educational institution were made possible by the ‘educational reforms’ that took place during the industrial revolution. The majority of the working poor fled to the cities looking for a better life. With the influx of the working poor, crime, prostitution, and drunkenness became serious urban problems. Social reformers soon recognized the miseries of the cities. Unfortunately, they ascribed the conditions to the low morals and ignorance of the poor class. ‘Education’ was demanded as the remedy to both poverty and criminal behavior. Horace Mann (1796-1859) viewed ‘schooling’ as a moral agency that would assure the orderly conduct of society. Mann became the secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education and built a public school system that would have an influence all over the nation (Spring, 1990, p. 94). His long tenure in this office
gave him an opportunity to canvas every shortcoming in the existing 
school system and to promote improvements in instructional, discipline, 
curriculum, textbooks, and the training of teachers (Bremner, 1960, p. 72). Around the 1840s, Mann was propounding the view that raising the 
general level of culture through more and better schools was the 
only sure way of accomplishing a reform of society (Bremner, 1960, p. 71).

Meanwhile, around of the middle of the nineteenth century, in the 
history of the American museum movement a struggle of opposing forces 
emerged. The emphasis on ‘popular education’ briefly declined and a 
new ‘professionalization’ emerged as interest in scientific achievements 
grew. This change may be explained by Foucault’s notion of history. 
Foucault asserts that history is concerned with the “descent rather than 
the evolution of events” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 81), and that this descent 
ever reaches some point of origination, but seeks “the moment of 
arising” of a phenomenon as a result of a struggle of opposing forces (p. 83). Orosz explains that this change was initiated by the launching of 
the United States Exploring Expedition. The Exploring Expedition was 
initially contemplated during Jackson’s second administration and finally 
launched in August of 1838. It was the first large-scale sponsorship of 
scientific expeditions by the United States. One of the ‘scientific’ on that 
voyage was Titian Peale, and during the nearly four years that the five-
boat squadron circumnavigated the globe, he and his compatriots collected literally thousands of natural history specimens. When the Expedition returned in June of 1842, it had given a boost to American science (Orosz, 1990, p. 141).

Largely from the effects of the Exploring Expedition, the concern for increasing specialization of knowledge and thus the ideal of 'professionalism' came to be dominant in the American museums. Newly established museums in the United States emphasized their role as research centers for scholars. This was the decade when James Smithson, Britain's outcast son, had willed his personal fortune of a half million dollars to the United States for "the increase and diffusion of knowledge" (Alexander, 1983, p. 284). This money was used to create what we now know as the Smithsonian Institution.

When Congress passed the Incorporation Act of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846, the desire was to create an Institution that would represent a compromise between the various viewpoints. These viewpoints included the Institution being an observatory, a national teacher's college, a national library, a national museum, a laboratory, and a gallery of art (Alexander, 1983). However, Joseph Henry, the Smithsonian's first secretary, emphasized that the Smithsonian Institution should give its main attention to the 'increase' of knowledge, in enlarging the bounds of human thought by original research, rather than to the diffusion of
knowledge for the general public. Henry's central plan was to support the 'professional science' that would make the Institution a center of scientific research. Establishing a 'museum' in the Smithsonian context was not a part of Henry's 'research center' concept. However, Henry's period was not long-lived. After the conflict between Henry and Charles Coffin Jewett, assistant secretary, the Smithsonian Institution changed from a research institution with a small cabinet to a research-oriented museum.

Therefore, Henry's view of the Smithsonian Institution, which was not only in conflict with that of Congress, but also with the views of the assistant secretary, came to be his downfall. The conflict in the power relations between the secretary and assistant secretary within the Smithsonian Institution led the Institution to focus on popular education. Additionally, this vacillation between 'popular education' and 'professionalism' in American museums from 1800 to 1870 can be explained by shifts in social factors: the advent of popular education by antislavery forces, and the rise of international expositions, which helped popularize the museum idea (Orosz, 1990, pp. 180-187).

Orosz's interpretation of the history of the early American museum movement draws the conclusion that by the 1870s American museums were well on their way to achieving a balance between professional excellence and popular educational purposes for the public. He calls this
arising phenomenon the ‘American Compromise.’ Orosz’s history is very persuasive and reliable because he analyzed a spectrum of primary sources from eleven major American museums that thrived during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. He challenges the prevalent view that the early museum movement in the United States was elitist or popular in nature. Even though his strict periodization overlooks diverse and multiple phenomena in the development of the early museum movement, his analysis of primary sources on museums gave us ample information on previously undiscovered historical experiences of the early museums in the United States.

As mentioned previously, I agree with Orosz’s opinion. However, to a certain degree, Orosz’s argument on the ‘American compromise’ in the history of the museum movement in the United States does not explain the phenomena of the museum movement from the 1870s to the present. We are still not sure how well American museums after the 1870s have embodied the two opposing views, in order to achieve an American Compromise. Even though museum officials occasionally accepted these multiple purposes to justify the collections of the museums, many still continued to prefer one or another. In fact, many research studies (Young, 1995; Williams, 1994; Roberts, 1997) criticize American museums founded long after the 1870s for concentrating on professional uses of the collections of the museum, rather than the popular use of
2.4. SHIFTS OF CONTEXTS IN THE FOUNDING OF AMERICAN ART MUSEUMS

At the turn of the twentieth century, the American belief that it was time to enter a new era prevailed in all areas of human activity, and especially in museum building (Efland, 1990). By the 1870s, the modern art museums were institution devoted to the collecting, presenting, and interpreting art objects. For museum historians, the 1870s truly mark the take-off point in the development of American museums, if we borrow a term from economics (Levi, 1985). According to Orosz, before 1870, American museums were struggling to define their purpose and mission, and were relatively modest compared to their European cousins. However, after 1870, the American museum developed its own identity by embracing the balance of professionalism and popular education (Orosz, 1990, p. 231). Besides Orosz, many researchers such as Karin Elizabeth Rawlins (1981) and Winifred E. Howe (1913), who were involved in the museum history in America, consider the year 1870 as the turning point in development of the American museum, since most of the American art museums sprang up during this particular time: the Metropolitan
Museum of Art in New York, 1870; the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, 1870; and the Pennsylvania Museum (later the Philadelphia Museum of Art), 1876. St. Louis created its Museum of Fine Arts, now the City Art Museum, in 1879, and by 1880 Wellesley and Princeton had their own art centers. Cincinnati founded its Art Museum in 1881. Chicago’s art Institution flourished from 1885. Also established after 1870 were the Walker Galleries (1875), the Minneapolis Institute of Arts (1883), and the Detroit Institute of Arts (1885).

The advent of museums in the United States in the 1870s was stimulated by the multiple contexts of social, economic, and cultural forces. One of the strongest forces was a shift in the economic structure brought on by the Civil War. During the decades following the Civil War, the focus of American life turned to industrialization centered in the urban areas. Strong demand for war goods spurred manufacturing and provided some entrepreneurs with unprecedented opportunities to make fortunes. Significantly, the demand for military equipment gave small businessmen the same power as large scale enterprises, and paved the way for the economic development of the great corporations (Orosz, 1990). Additionally, these changes had an effect on the power relationships between the social classes and the emergence of new patterns of philanthropy, considerations that will be discussed later.
Prior to the Civil War, the 'gentry' class played a central role in American society, by setting the upper-class code of manners and style of living. The 'gentry' sought to distinguish themselves by insisting upon status criteria—family background, social graces, education, cultural and philanthropic concerns and advantageous social contacts abroad—for membership in their group. This class desired to set themselves apart from the new social class that was merely rich (Persons, 1973, p. 1; Morgan, 1963; Miller, 1967).

However, with expanded economic growth, wealthy 'industrialists' emerged as a new social class, threatening the social prestige of the established gentry and gaining power in society. The social-economic elite class, which was propelled by the rapid industrialization after the Civil War, emerged as the center of the social stage with its flamboyant brand of gentility. This group continued to caricature the overt features of gentility, often going to grotesque extremes of ostentatious living (Rawlins, 1981; Tomkins, 1989).

Wealthy 'industrialists' embraced new patterns of philanthropy in the years after the Civil War. Public antipathy to big businessmen spurred their philanthropic giving. Although few citizens would question the right of any man to get rich through his own efforts, uses of wealth that deviated from middle-class standards of morality met with criticism.
The ruthlessness and dishonesty that seemed to accompany capitalist acquisition in this era led to a widespread belief that wealth was incompatible with honesty (Carnegie, 1889; Rawlins, 1981). For instance, Calvin Tomkins (1989) describes the ‘industrialists’ as “malefactors of great wealth” (p. 95).

Both of the social powers, ‘gentry’ and ‘industrialist’, affected patterns of philanthropy and the kinds of reform that would take place in education and other social institutions. Both advocated the founding of museums at the end of the nineteenth century, but did so for different reasons. Whereas the established ‘gentry’ were trying to cling to their waning social perquisites through a sense of cultural and moral superiority, the emerging new social class of ‘industrialists’ sought to utilize the museum as a means for advocating the importance of universal education in democracy in effecting social progress.

Industrialists advocated new forms of philanthropic giving. These self-made men tended to look upon poverty as an avoidable sin; most of the industrialists supported the movement to add public high schools and state universities to the national system of free education (Tomkins, 1989, p. 20).8

---

8 During the 1870s, the industrialists supported the Common school system. They believed that government should intervene to maintain social order through a centrally managed school system. They also advocated strong and central governmental processes in pursuing trade policies that would promote
The industrialists advocated the importance of universal education in a democracy and the power of education in effecting social progress and control in formulating their rationales (Comfort, 1870). They argued that the museum could increase national prosperity by improving manufacturing skills and the principles of good design. Museum education would also elevate the level of public morality and serve as a remedy for the social ills that plagued urban America. Their view reflected the conviction that education was an effective tool for social improvement and control.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art is a good example of a museum founded by the money of the new social class. It realized the purpose of the American compromise by concerning itself with education as a means of social reform. The following examination of the Metropolitan Museum shows how the Museum was established by the industrialists within the contexts of the social reform of the 1870s in the United States.

2.4.1. The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Most of the founders of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Figure 11) were associated with the socio-economic class, the ‘industrialists.’ The

American industries in international competition, particularly, involving the textiles industries (Spring, 1990, p. 98).
founding trustees in the Museum were not men of old and distinguished families, but tended to be 'self-made industrialists' like businessmen, bankers, the city's liveliest merchants, and department-store moguls. They tended to be liberal-minded reformers who had come to prominence in the New York clubs, the Century Club and the Union League, during and soon after the Civil War (Tomkins, 1989; Howe, 1974). At least four-fifths of the members of the original Board of Trustees were from the Century Club and two-thirds were members of the Union League, with membership in the two clubs overlapping. All were men (McCarthy, 1991, p. 117).

Those founding fathers of the Metropolitan Museum were liberal-minded social reformers of the 1870s. Labor riots, racial strife, and immigration threatened to upset the social order of the urban environment in the United States. Around the 1870s philanthropists of the museum feared that millions of immigrants would modify the physical, social and political structure of American cities. They believed that institutions such as schools or museums could effectively enhance the mechanisms of social control and socialization in the community (Rawlins, 1981).

---

9 The Union League Club had been established in 1863 to provide a focus for Unionist, pro-Lincoln sentiment in New York, and was thus politically oriented. Its membership included most of the prominent men of the city, and they were all men of strong social conscience (Tomkins, 1989, pp. 28-29).
The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, which was chartered in 1870, set the patterns for the museum movement that was followed by American museums over the next century. The statement of purpose in the charter of the Metropolitan Museum embodied the 'American Compromise' that was based on a balance between 'professionalism' and 'popular education.' When the Legislature of the State of New York granted legal status to the museum under the name of the Metropolitan Museum on April 13, 1870, the Museum was charged with specific obligations:

- to be located in the City of New York, for the purpose of establishing and maintaining in said city a museum and library of art, of encouraging and developing the study of the fine arts, and the application of arts to manufacturing and practical life, of advancing the general knowledge of kindred subjects, and to that end, of furnishing popular instruction and recreation.

(Howe, 1974, p. 125)

The charter of the Metropolitan Museum states as its goal a synthesis between professionalism and popular education. On the one hand, the Museum was chartered to encourage and develop serious 'scholarship' in the domain of the fine arts. On the other hand, the Museum was legally chartered as an educational institution, rather than as a sumptuous collector of artifacts. It was to serve "popular instruction and recreation" of the people in the fine arts and to encourage application of the principles of beauty to manufacturing. Recognizing the importance of
both professional study and the dissemination of knowledge, the charter of the Metropolitan Museum was geared toward a balance of opposite aims, that is, between professionalism and popular education.

The commitment to public education elaborated in the charter of 1870 put into practiced in a new admissions policy and industrial education. Prior to 1880, the Met's educational efforts consisted mainly of admitting art students free on days when admission was charged to the general public, and sponsoring an occasional lecture for large audiences. However, after 1880, museum professionals began to initiate various educational programs that emphasized the practical and industrial arts. This trend seems to reflect the atmosphere of educational reforms of that time which was prevalent in industrial education in the school setting.10 During the period from 1880 to 1889, the Metropolitan Museum of Art embarked on such cherished projects as an 'industrial art collection' and the 'industrial art schools.' The museum trustees had planned to install permanent exhibits of specimens "illustrating the progress of manufacturing from the raw material to the final art product" (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1879). They believed that the attention to industrial products and processes would improve the skills

10 The educational offerings of the 1870s stressed 'industrial education' and 'moral training,' in the public schools. The industrial drawing instruction which was practiced in the South Kensington system came to be the curriculum of the
of workmen and, as a consequence, American manufacture. However, the only industrial exhibit acquired by the Museum at this time was a series of illustrations on the art of electrotyping. Subsequently, projects involving industrial display were quietly abandoned.

The other educational aim of the museum trustees, that of establishing ‘industrial art schools,’ was established in 1880 and were maintained until the mid-1890s. The schools were made possible by a grant from Gideon F. Reed, whose special interest was industrial education. Free classes in woodwork and metalwork were established with the purpose of upgrading the taste and skills of American workers. When a circular was sent around to a few employees and workingmen to announce the new schools, a gratifying number of applicants responded (Rawlins, 1981). Classes were held twice weekly in the evenings.

Aside from the industrial display that never materialized and the art schools, which were phased out after a decade and a half, ‘lectures’ were the only other educational endeavor at the Metropolitan Museum from 1870 to 1900. The custom of giving lectures at the Museum was inaugurated in 1872, in a lecture to the trustees and their friends about General de Cesnola’s discoveries in Cyprus. Such lectures continued to be given sporadically until 1892, when the Metropolitan Museum
arranged an agreement with Columbia College for the college students to provide a series of free weekly lectures on art to the public. Unlike the industrial collections and industrial art schools, the series of lectures seems to have continued through the next decades (Lerman, 1969, p. 18).

The public’s access to the Metropolitan Museum, in a certain degree, was limited if we compare this with today’s democratic criteria. In the early period of the Museum, the displays of the Museum were not accessible to the working people because the Museum opened its door to the public from ten a.m. until half an hour before sunset on four days of the week and all holidays except Sunday without any charge (Lerman, 1969, p. 48). However, pressure to have the Metropolitan Museum open on Sundays began building up, since the ‘working people’ could not go to the museum on weekdays. Up to this point, the trustees had refused to admit the general public into the Museum on Sundays, because of religious reasons. In reality, they feared that opening the museums on Sundays would cause the loose of financial support of its wealthy and church-going benefactors. In 1881, citizens signed a petition urging that the Museum open its doors on Sunday. In addition, the most powerful state and city departments wanted this change. They proposed increasing appropriations to help pay expenses and threatened to withhold funds should the Museum not open on Sunday (Jonaitis, 1998).
Eventually, on May 18, 1891 the Metropolitan Museum agreed to open “free to the public every Sunday from one p.m. until a half hour before sunset” (Lerman, 1969, p. 71). ‘Sunday opening’ would be maintained at the Museum over the next century. Yet, the case of the controversial argument over Sunday opening reflects the limitations of the educational rationale of that time, in comparison with the criteria of our own time.

As explored above, the Metropolitan Museum was founded as an institution that synthesized the purpose of serious scholarship and popular education, as indicated in the written documentation of the Museum’s charter. Also, the shift of power in social relationships in the United States during the 1870s has been examined as an influence in the founding the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

2.5. SUMMARY

As we have shown, in the museum’s movement throughout its history, the meaning of what a museum should be shifted many times according to the multiple contexts of historical, social, and cultural conditions. The act of collecting objects and the ideal of educating the public in the museums had political, social, or aesthetic dimensions, which cannot be overlooked. According to what criteria are works of art
judged to be beautiful, or even historically significant? What portions of the public should participate in educational activities of the museums? How do the economic and social factors influence the inner administration process of the museums? The answers to these questions are interrelated and different for each time.

In trying to understand the multiple ways of defining museums, we went back to classical times. The following Figure 2 summarizes a history and genesis of evolution of museum ideas which we have discussed in the Chapter 2.
Figure 2: History and genesis of museums
The origin of the museum is often traced back to the 'mouseion' of ancient time, which was first and foremost a study collection with a library attached, a repository of knowledge, a place of scholars and philosophers and historians. In the Renaissance, those whose power and wealth permitted them to engaged in the development of museums in the forms of 'cabinet of curiosities' and 'galleries.' Even though the ideas of the 'cabinet of curiosities' and 'gallery' are landmarks as the starting point for the early genesis of museums, public access to these collections were extremely limited. With the French Revolution, the heightened ideals of the Enlightenment changed the old paradigm of museology. The Revolutionary principles led to conditions suitable for the advent of the public museum. The Louvre permitted the public access to national treasures as a civic right. The Louvre's ideas of the museum as a 'utilitarian instrument for democratic education' were considered the prototype for the museums in the later era. Another museum that served as a model was the South Kensington Museum in England. The South Kensington Museum sought to provide technical training for British manufacturing and to make it competitive in the world market. Its educational objectives were attractive to American philanthropists who were struggling to solve similar problems that accompanied industrial expansion in their own country.
In considering the idea of the museum from the European tradition through the American museum movement to the early twentieth century, it is important to bear in mind that while American museums are descended from the European tradition of museums, there were important differences between the American museum movements and the European museum traditions. While European collections had been heaped together over a long period of time, American collections were amassed comparatively more recently. Europeans collected objects and retained them in the family for several generations before bequeathing them to a museum, whereas in the United States objects typically came from private collections that were amassed over a short period of time before being placed in museums. These differences came into being as a result of the American’s multiple contexts of own social, cultural, and historical conditions. After the idea of the European ‘curio cabinet’ was transplanted to the United States in the 1740s, American museums gradually constructed their own reality, which can be defined as the American Compromise, a balance between professionalism and popular education. It was made possible by the social reforms, educational reform movement, emergence of the new subject position in society, and shifts in economic conditions of the 1870s.

So far, the maturation of the early American museum movement into the modern museum, as well as the influence of the tradition of
European museums was discussed in the Chapter 2. Detailed study of late nineteenth and twentieth century museum movements in the United States are beyond the scope of this investigation. The next chapter will consider the origins and growth of the museum idea in the United States from the early twentieth century to the 1960s, focusing on the broad contexts of the Museum of Modern Art that in New York City as the basis for examination.
CHAPTER 3

CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT:
ART EDUCATION AT THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

Written histories of the Museum of Modern Art (in New York) have typically focused on issues concerning who collectors were, what they collected, and when their works were displayed in various exhibitions (Messer, 1979). The history of the educational efforts of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) has been ignored or considered a 'marginal' area of study by art educators and museum professionals alike. It is true that MoMA concentrated on establishing a permanent collection and making modern art a part of the discipline of art history in the early stages of its development. However, the history of the Museum indicates that the meaning of education changed and became the prominent focus as the social, historical, and cultural contexts changed. It was ten years after the opening of the Museum that the MoMA discussed seriously an educational mission for diverse audiences and established an education department in response to the shift in social and cultural contexts.
Chapter 3 attempts to rediscover unknown and ignored historical experiences and interpret the 'shift' and 'change' in the educational practices and mission of the MoMA from its beginning to the 1950s. The continuity of the development of the history of the Museum was ruptured and the direction and purpose of the educational mission of the Museum changed. The shifts took place because of the changing social and cultural contexts.

In brief, Chapter 3 discusses phenomena arising during four moments in the history of the MoMA: (1) the phases associated with the founding of the Museum (1929-1934), (2) shifts in the educational mission (1935-1938), (3) the practice of Progressive Education at the MoMA with emphasis on Victor D'Amico's approach to art education (1939-1950s), (4) the emergence of a new approach to art education during the mid-1950s.

Interpretation of the historical experiences pertaining to art education at the MoMA from its inception period to the 1960s is conditioned by the historical specificity of cultural, economical, and social contexts of the time. The Museum's mission for 'popular instruction' adopted in its charter shifted at some moments in time due to a broad range of external factors that emerged around the same time. These multiple factors included educational practices as well as trends in both art and society.
3.1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF FOUNDING AND ORGANIZATION OF THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

The MoMA was founded in September 1929 in the city of New York to support the advanced trends in art. For several years previous, the conception of such a Museum had been in the minds of many people interested in the appropriate presentation of avant-garde art. However, when the MoMA opened its doors, many observers viewed this enterprise with caution, because there were contradictory views about modern avant-garde artistic productions and about the concept of a permanent collection, which stressed the custodial functions of museums. During that time, established American museums tended to show only late nineteenth- and twentieth-century art, with very little attention given to modern art. It was true that most collectors preferred investing in art works of secure and permanent value to gambling on the modern art. Many seemed to prefer works reflecting the values of European aristocrats and connoisseurs to art works by unproven contemporary artists in the United States.¹

¹ The issue of philanthropy during the 1920s was related to the patrons’ style of collecting artworks. In the past, women’s philanthropic endeavors provided the primary means through which the majority of middle- and upper-class women fashioned their public roles. Yet, from the time of the suffrage movement to the creation of social settlements, the philanthropic women use with social conscience in order to create new institutions, and to effect social change (McCarthy, 1991, p. xii).
The MoMA came into being through the efforts of women collectors who attempted to collect modern avant-garde art works during the early twentieth century. Especially influential were three women, Lillie P. Bliss (Figure 12), Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan (Figure 13), and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller (Figure 14), who were extremely rich due, in part, to the passage of married women's property laws and to the simple fact that they were wives or daughters of rich men (McCarthy, 1991, p. 112). During the 1920s, these three women took the lead in collecting avant-garde art, which was undervalued and marginalized among traditional collectors and still held at arm's length by the major museum (p. 209). They challenged the conservative style of art collection and eventually came to establish the institution devoted exclusively to modern art, the MoMA. Ironically, within the realm of art in the United States at that time, women, in contrast to men, took the greatest gambles on the art of the future, the untested.

Miss Lillie P. Bliss, one of founders of the MoMA, left her famous collection of modern paintings to the Museum. Her father, Mr. Bliss, was prominent in financial and philosophical circles, and was a patron of the arts. For many years prior to the founding of the MoMA, Miss Lillie P. Bliss had been forming a collection of art that included works of Cézanne, Seurat, Picasso, Matisse, and Modigliani; by the time of Miss Bliss' death in 1931, it was considered one of the finest collections of modern painting. This collection was bequeathed to the MoMA on
condition that sufficient funds be raised through an endowment in order to care for the works of art in the collection.

Mrs. Mary Sullivan, worked as an art teacher in New York before her marriage to Cornelius J. Sullivan, a prominent New York attorney and collector of contemporary art. Sullivan had long been a friend of the adventurous collector of modern art, John Quinn, who was severely attacked by many of his fellow philanthropists because of his preference for modern art. Quinn advised Mrs. Sullivan on the purchase of a number of works from the Armory Show. These works formed the core of her collection (McCarthy, 1991; Lynes, 1973). When Quinn died in 1925, Arthur B. Davies talked to his friends, Miss Lillie Bliss and Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan, regarding the organization of the Museum with the Quinn collection as a nucleus. However, this idea never got beyond the shadow stage, and the Quinn collection was dispersed. When Davies died in 1928, his friends began to carry out his suggestions (Goodyear, 1943, pp. 13-14).

The third important influence on the Museum, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller (Mrs. Rockefeller), had developed an interest in art under the influence of her father, Senator Nelson W. Aldrich of Rhode Island. He was an avid collector of European art, and introduced her to the galleries of Europe when she traveled with him as a young lady. Under her father's influence, she later acquired a taste for modern art and believed that America needed to have a museum devoted to recent art, especially
to that of living artists. Mrs. Rockefeller's concern for the arts of her own time was reflected in her personal collection of paintings, sculpture, and prints by American artists (Hunter, 1984).

These three women, Miss Bliss, Mrs. Sullivan, and Mrs. Rockefeller, began seriously to exchange ideas on forming a new museum for modern art around 1928, when Rockefeller and Bliss met in Egypt. On the return crossing, Mrs. Rockefeller discovered a fellow enthusiast in Mrs. Sullivan, also an acquaintance of Miss Bliss, and there was further discussion. Back in New York, the first action they took was to form a committee for the organization of the proposed museum for modern art (Goodyear, 1943, p. 14).

In founding the proposed museum for modern art in New York City, the three women needed men out in front. They asked A. Conger Goodyear (Figure 15), a collector, and past president of the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo, and former army officer to become chairman of a committee to found the proposed museum. Goodyear accepted this chairmanship. He described this situation in the following way:

In the latter part of May, I received an invitation to lunch with Mrs. Rockefeller. I was mystified but accepted. On the appointed day I found Miss Bliss and Mrs. Sullivan as the only other guests. I had never met any of the three women before.

---

2 By putting a man in charge, Mrs. Rockefeller may have sought not to draw attention to the name Rockefeller (McCarthy, 1991, p. 204). She was averse to publicity, which may have stemmed from the public attacks that had been leveled at her father during his senatorial years and at her husband during the congressional investigation of Standard Oil.
There was some discussion of the possibility of organizing a modern museum, but I still did not understand what it was all about until half way through luncheon, Mrs. Rockefeller asked the two ladies if they felt she should put to me the question they had in mind. They both answered in the affirmative, and I was told that it was proposed that I should be chairman of committee of organization for the carrying out of the general ideas that had been outlined. After some discussion, which included the consideration of other persons for the chairmanship, I agreed to give Mrs. Rockefeller a definite decision within a week. On accepting the chairmanship, I suggested as three other members of the committee Frank Crowinshield, Mrs. W. Murray Crane and Paul J. Sachs. They all agreed to serve. (Goodyear, 1943, p. 14)

When the first official meeting of the Trustees of the Corporation was held in October of 1929, the provisional offices held by members of the Committee were confirmed. Mr. Goodyear was elected President; Miss Bliss, Vice-President; and Mrs. Rockefeller, Treasurer (The Museum of Modern Art, 1931, p. 11).

Goodyear had shown a firm commitment to experimental modern art in 1927 by borrowing a portion of Katherine Dreier’s avant-garde Société Anonume collection in spite of sharp criticism. Her collection, which included works of Marcel Duchamp, was one of the few contemporary collections available at that time for public viewing. Later, Goodyear’s radical perspective on art led him to purchase Picasso’s La Toilette for the gallery, but this alarmed his fellow trustees and Goodyear was forced off the board. Mrs. Rockefeller explains that they choose Goodyear,
because we had been told of [his] efforts in the cause of modern art in Buffalo and that [he] had resigned the presidency of that museum because the trustees would not go along with [him] in [his] desire to show the best things in modern art. (Hunter, 1984, p. 8)

Even though the organization was headed by men, the women held the authority in the administration of the Museum. In short, they exercised control over Goodyear and his decisions. It is known that Mrs. Rockefeller, occasionally overruled Goodyear's decisions. For instance, Rockefeller suggested that Duncan Phillips might be a good addition to the board, one that could "strengthen our position with the younger artists of the country, for whom he has done so much" (McCarthy, 1991, p. 205). Goodyear sought to veto this idea, arguing that Phillips would not be active enough, since he was "so much interested in building up his own collection" (p. 206). Nonetheless, Phillips was invited to serve. Additionally, when the founders, director, and president were to make a decision about the content of the first exhibition of the Museum, the form of the exhibition was finally determined by the founders' suggestions (McCarthy, 1991).
3.2. ESTABLISHING EDUCATION
AT THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

In 1929, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, acting on behalf of the State Education Department, granted a provisional charter for establishing and maintaining in the City of New York, a museum of modern art, encouraging and developing the study of modern arts and the application of such arts to manufacture and practical life, and furnishing popular instruction. (Hunter, 1984, p. 9)

The Regent Charter of the MoMA indicates that the Museum was founded provisionally to determine whether or not there existed a sufficient public interest in modern art in order to justify the establishment of a permanent institution devoted to the collection, exhibition, and study of works of the modern school.

Clearly, the MoMA stressed 'dual purposes' in the mission established in its formal charter: first, to encourage and develop the study of modern arts and, second, to educate the public through 'popular instruction' in modern art. To fulfill the first part of the mission, the MoMA sought to enhance and define the value of modern art through research. Additionally, to fulfill the second part of the mission of the Museum, as a public-relations organization, the MoMA used its artistic
resources to educate and elevate public taste through a tempered messianic spirit. It was concerned with making the public aware of modern art products and, to a certain degree, leading the public to accept its judgment and follow its taste. The popularization of this approach was pursued by the MoMA through its exhibitions and educational programs.

The double nature of the purpose of the MoMA, which included 'popular instruction' in modern art, as well as 'productive scholarship' on modern art, was the central idea supporting the development of the Museum. The Annual Report of 1933-34 (Director's Partial Report) describes these dual purposes: (1) production and (2) distribution (The Museum of Modern Art, 1934, pp. 2-3). The Report goes on to define each area:

1. "Production"
   Basically, the Museum "produces" art knowledge, criticism, scholarship, understanding, taste. This is its laboratory or study work. It is the Director's chief concern. This preparation or "production" work is the "stuff" of which the Museum's prestige is made.

2. "Distribution"
   Once the product is made, the next job is its distribution. An exhibition in the galleries is distribution. Circulation of exhibitions, catalogs, memberships, publicity, radio, are all distribution. (The Museum of Modern Art, 1934, p. 2)

The Annual Report of 1933-34 proposes a relation between production and distribution. The use of the terms, 'distribution' and 'production,' in the Report could be connected to the dual purposes in
the founding the Museum in the late 1920s. The term ‘production’ indicates the first purpose in the Charter of the Museum, to establish a museum to encourage and develop the study of modern arts. On the other hand, ‘distribution’ designates the second purpose of the charter, to educate the public through a ‘popular instruction’ of modern art. Although these dual purposes, ‘production’ and ‘distribution,’ are stressed, the following statement in the Annual Report indicates what the ultimate purpose of the MoMA during the inception period was to create a balance:

A proper balance between production and distribution can be obtained in the Museum only by emphasis on the former. More time and planning and money must be given to production. It cannot be carried on in the atmosphere of a newspaper office. (The Museum of Modern Art, 1934, p. 3)

Even though the mission of ‘distribution’ was an important focus of the Museum, the priority in the mission of the MoMA during the inception period was given to ‘production.’ The Museum staff primarily concentrated on developing a permanent collection, which was definitely a ‘production’ function of the Museum (The Museum of Modern Art, 1934, p. 11).

It would seem therefore that during the period from 1929 to 1933, the notion of ‘distribution’ was understood as ‘exhibition.’ The aim of the Museum was to bring about widespread understanding and appreciation of modern art through impartial presentations ‘exhibiting’ living artists’
works (The Museum of Modern Art, 1932, p. 2). The MoMA’s notion of education during the period from 1929 to 1933 was merely to present the artworks to the public without any supplementary materials or activities. The Museum believed that through exposure to the paintings or sculpture, the public could come to understand and communicate about the artworks of modernism. This attitude about education might be called a passive notion of education. However, as it entered the Great Depression era, the MoMA began to develop educational activities and programs as a part of the distribution function. During the Great Depression era, the notion of distribution embraced the exhibitions and various educational programs and activities which were related to the general educational reforms of the time. First of all, let us look at the notion of distribution, that is, the educational value of exhibitions.

3.2.1. Educational Value of Exhibitions

During this early phase, the MoMA considered the exhibitions as ‘educational media,’ although the artworks were merely exposed to the public in the gallery spaces. There are no records regarding the theoretical underpinning of educational values for the exhibitions during this time. Yet, I assume that the Museum had the perspective that ‘mere exposure,’ allowing the public to see the art works, had educational value. It was supposed that merely experiencing a work of art could
make possible a process of private communion between the visitors and
the work of art. Here, the communication between the visitor and a work
of art would be a form of silent contemplation. A visitor could learn
about or understand the visual elements of the artwork in the Museum
space. The Annual Report of the MoMA in 1931 states that the Museum
had not as yet developed “an elaborate educational system since such
was not a part of its first experimental program” (The Museum of Modern
Art, 1931, p. 18). In fact, The Official Statement of the MoMA simply
analyzes the public’s interest in modern art exhibitions according to their
attendance (The Museum of Modern Art, 1939 A, pp. 15-18). The
apparent high attendance by the public of the particular exhibitions was
considered to represent the success of the educational value of the
exhibitions. The following The Official Statement in Table 1 allowed
comparison of attendance statistics for the exhibitions of the first years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attendance Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh</td>
<td>Nov. 7—Dec. 7, 1929</td>
<td>47,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Nineteen Living Americans</td>
<td>Dec. 12, 1929—Jan. 12, 1930</td>
<td>27,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Painting in Paris</td>
<td>Jan. 18—Mar. 2, 1930</td>
<td>58,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Fourth-six under Thirty-five Charles</td>
<td>Apr. 11—Apr. 27, 1930</td>
<td>9,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burchfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Homer, Ryder, Eakins</td>
<td>May 6—June 4, 1930</td>
<td>11,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Retrospective</td>
<td>June 15—Sept. 28, 1930</td>
<td>16,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Corot and Daumier</td>
<td>Oct. 16—Nov. 23, 1930</td>
<td>29,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Painting and Sculpture by Living Americans</td>
<td>Dec. 4—Jan. 20, 1931</td>
<td>21,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Toulouse-Lautrec and Odilon Redon</td>
<td>Feb. 1—Mar. 2, 1931</td>
<td>20,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Attendance statistics
As seen in the above statistic data from the MoMA archives, the first exhibition on loan to the Museum, contained one hundred works by Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, and van Gogh. It was extraordinarily successful in arousing 'public interest' in the new institution. Nearly 50,000 people attended the one month exhibition after the Museum opened its door to the public on November 7, 1929.

The content of the first exhibition was determined by long negotiations among the women founders (Rockefeller, Bliss) and male trustees (Goodyear, Sachs). While the men trustees wanted to show American painters such as Ryder, Homer, and Eakins, to be followed by one of the European masters Seurat, Van Gogh, Gauguin, or Cézanne, the women founders voted to open with the European group instead. Rockefeller said that the European exhibit would be more 'chronologically appropriate' (McCarthy, 1991, p. 206). Goodyear went to Europe to secure significant loans from dealers, institutions, and private collectors to complement artworks of the Paris Schools obtained at home. When the exhibition opened to the public on November 8, 1929, the exhibition attracted impressive numbers of visitors. In fact, this exhibition attracted the largest audience to attend an exhibition of modern art since the Armory Show sixteen years earlier, where for the first time the public was excited and shocked by the paintings and sculpture of the School of Paris.
The second exhibition of the Museum, consisting of paintings by Nineteen Living Americans, was less successful than the first exhibition in terms of attendance. Perhaps, the inconsistent mixture of American artists was partly responsible. However, this second exhibition, for the first time, exposed the American public to the character and value of contemporary American artists, such as Charles E. Burchfield, Charles Demuth, Preston Dickinson, Lyonel Feininger, George Overbury, Edward Hopper, Rockwell Kent, Walt Kuhn, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Ernest Lawson, John Marin, Kenneth Hayes Miller, Georgia O'Keeffe, Jules Pascin, John Sloan, Eugene Speicher, Maurice Sterne, and Max Weber. Almost 28,000 people attended (The Museum of Modern Art, 1931).

The third exhibition, Painting in Paris, was even more popular than the first two. Great masters of the modern movement in Paris, among them Henri Matisse, Joan Miró, Pablo Picasso, Marc Chagall, Giorgio de Chirico, Robert Delaunay, André Derain, Raoul Dufy, Fernand Léger, and so on, were represented. During four weeks, the exhibition was attended by approximately 58,000 visitors. The large attendance at the Museum's temporary loan exhibitions was a testimony of the public's interest in and appreciation for the Paris Schools at that time. European modern arts seemed to stimulate the public interest and enthusiasm in enjoying artworks. The fact that European modern art appealed to the public reflected the public taste for the arts. Rather than enjoying American
contemporary art, the public had much more interest and a certain belief in the Paris Schools as the modern art tradition. In presenting these exhibitions on paintings and sculptures from Europe, the MoMA had clearly touched a public nerve and need to unravel the mysteries of modern art (The Museum of Modern Art, 1931).

It seems that the theoretical basis of the exhibitions of the MoMA presented in the above Table 1 was that the painting and sculpture should speak for itself. The Museum setting, immaculately white and stripped of all distracting ornament, promoted this intention. The paintings and sculptures displayed in those exhibitions of the MoMA were provided minimal supporting materials. Photographs of the exhibition show that there were no nameplates and text panels. Labels were extremely limited in these exhibitions. We can see only small labels at the corners of the frames of a few paintings or the center front of the base for sculptures to designate the number of the painting or sculpture. Some paintings or sculptures did not even have this kind of small label (Figure 16). These labels did not provide any content or other information about the paintings or sculptures.

Presumably, the Museum setting promoted the beholders’ concentration on the artwork itself. The beholders were expected to pay attention to the disruption of space, the denial of volume, the overthrow of traditional compositional schemes, the discovery of painting as an autonomous surface, the emancipation of color, line or texture, and so.
According to Bazin, the modernist display method, the isolation of objects from any preconditioning of labels or text panels induced the visitors to fix their attention on an artwork that existed seemingly in some other realm (Bazin, 1967, p. 265). The modernist view of installations thus took visitors on a kind of mental journey, a stepping out of the present into a universe of timeless value.

What we can learn from the attendance statistics of Table 1 is that during the first year of the Museum's existence, 'exhibitions' played a role in educating or sensitizing the public to modern art. It was felt that the exhibitions of the MoMA would help to raise the standards of taste and appreciation of the general public. Even those who visited the Museum through mere curiosity occasionally remained to study and enjoy. As for active educational activities or programs that could help the visitor to understand the works of art, there were none. There were no explanatory panels, lectures, or tape-recorded materials. The exhibition 'catalogs' comprised perhaps the most important educational activity of the Museum. The MoMA published exhibition catalogues which contained descriptive introductions to the works exhibited, lists of the specific works, often with notes for title, medium, size, the place where the work was created, and, perhaps more importantly, a large number of illustrations. Even though an elaborate schedule of lectures had not been developed at the Museum, 'informal talks' were given in the Museum by members of the Museum staff (The Museum of Modern Art,
During the founding period of the Museum, the ‘exhibitions’ themselves were thought to have ‘educational value,’ because it was believed that exposure to the artworks in the galleries could give the public a chance to appreciate the arts. Even though the Museum had been founded and possessed a permanent charter as an educational institution, the MoMA originally attempted to accomplish its mission of education for the public through emphasis on the exhibitions, rather than by developing diverse educational activities and programs. The MoMA’s active notion of distribution, with elaboration of the educational activities and programs for the public, was born at the time of the Great Depression era during the mid-1930s.

3.3. A SHIFT IN THE EDUCATIONAL MISSION

Holger Cahill, Director of the WPA Art Projects, reported that during the years after 1935, museums participated in and developed more educational programs than in the past:

Public schools, colleges, libraries, and other (tax supported) institutions have sponsored -- and this means not only subscribing to the idea but also sharing production costs -- 1400 murals, 50,000 oil paintings and watercolors, 90,000 prints, and 3,700 monumental sculptures for public buildings. In four years, in New York City alone, 616,357 children and adults had
Similar change occurred at the MoMA. Around 1935, the notion that merely displaying artworks to the public came to have educational value underwent a shift. The MoMA attempted to expand its educational programs and engage in projects—research, exhibitions, circulation exhibitions, and educational activities for the public—that might not have been financially feasible under previous circumstances. The MoMA emphasized a much more democratic approach to the arts and large scale community participation in cultural pursuits [Appendix 1, 2]. This shift towards expanded educational programs during 1935 was partly due to a shift in external factors, the economic conditions in the United States.

One critical external factor, the Great Economic Depression, surely had an effect on the educational mission of the MoMA. The Depression was precipitated by the stock market crash of October, 1929, even though its causes went far beyond this one event and were rooted in pervasive weaknesses in the American economy. The 1920s were a period of industrial expansion and increased profits that led to rising stock prices and a healthy increase in trading on the New York Stock Exchange. By the beginning of 1929, stocks were issued at prices sixteen times greater than their earnings although the traditional safe
ratio was ten to one. In October, 1929, the crash inevitably occurred when the bottom dropped out of the market as investors panicked and sold their inflated stocks en masse. Finally the decline in stock prices set off intricate forces that interacted to carry the United States to the depths of industrial and financial stagnation (Rawlins, 1981, p. 134).

In response to the crisis of the Depression, the federal government shifted its approach to the depression with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. In March of 1933 President Roosevelt articulated the keynote of his administration’s policy to deal with unemployment. As one aspect of the policy, for the first time in the history of the United States, the ‘Government’ officially became a patron of the arts, the President asserting that “the provision of work for those people at occupations which will conserve their skills is of prime importance” (Rawlins, 1981, p. 131).

It would appear that the New Deal programs for the arts can be divided into support for artists and art institutions. Under the new programs artists received aid in four general forms under successive and simultaneous sets of initiatives. Artists, who had always had ‘marginal employment’ had received a particularly devastating blow with the depression.

The first was the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP), a crash relief program administered by the Treasury Department from December, 1933 to June, 1934. This program had two aims, to provide work for
unemployed American artists and to secure sculpture and mural decorations of the highest aesthetic quality available for federal buildings. During the six months that this program was in operation, it employed 3,700 artists at a cost of about $1,312,000 (Rawlins, 1981, p. 140).

The second was the Section of Fine Arts, supporting painting and sculpture, which was also administered by the Treasury Department. It obtained paintings and sculpture to decorate new federal buildings, in particular post offices and courthouses, through anonymous competitions. This program was inaugurated in October 1934, and was discontinued in 1943. It awarded approximately 1,400 contracts and cost approximately $2,571,000 (O'Connor, 1972).

The third, the Treasury Relief Art Project (TRAP), was financed in July 1935 by an allocation of funds from the WPA to the Treasury for the decoration of federal buildings. It employed approximately 446 persons, 75 percent of whom were on relief. It cost $833,784 and faded away in 1939. Finally, the Work Progress Administration’s Federal Art Project (WPA/FAP), a large relief program devoted to the plastic arts was part of a wider program called Federal Project No. 1. This project included drama, music, and writing, and was administered according to the relief rules of the WPA. It started in August 1935, and lasted until June 1943, and cost approximately $35,000,000. Slightly more than 5,000 persons were employed at its peak (O’Connor, 1972, p. 12).
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The shift from emphasis on the custodial function of the American museum to emphasis on opportunity for educational services was motivated by economic reason because museums needed to get funding from the Government. In order to get such funding, a museum had to be an educational and recreational institution for the public, rather than an institution that served the luxury class.

In a time of financial famine, the public is forced to a reappraisal of all its possessions, institutions, and customs. Any institution asking the public to continue its support through a depression period must be ready to prove, not only that it merits support, but that its support is in line with a policy of economy . . . In so far as museums are classed as luxuries, a thoughtless public will cry out for their curtailment. It makes very little difference that the word luxury is a relative term, and that government expenditure, except that which goes for food, clothing and shelter, is for luxuries which we have grown to feel are essential for civilized life. *Museums must emphasize their educational and recreational services if they are to avoid the danger of being labeled in the luxury class.* (Youtz, 1933, p. 6)

Museums benefited from many of the New Deal projects as they did from the broader interest in the arts that they generated. However, museums received aid in the form of free labor rather than outright cash. Artists who participated in a wide variety of art projects provided free labor to the museums by building decoration and mural painting, doing art historical research, documenting the nation's folk crafts, teaching art, and doing other kinds of museum work (Beckh, 1960, pp. 4-5).

The MoMA, of course, was no exception. While the government was supporting the arts through the various New Deal Relief programs,
the MoMA was struggling with its identity as an educational institution. In order for the MoMA to survive during the Great Depression era, the Museum had to make an effort to transform itself into an active educational institution. The new educational programs that evolved in the Museum during the mid 1930s corresponded to contemporary trends in American schooling of the time.³

In addition to the economic need of recipients, a desire for social control seems to have been one of the motivating forces in all of the New Deal Relief programs discussed above. New Deal programs were initiated during periods of social unrest which accompanied massive unemployment and were then abolished or contracted when political stability was restored (Piven and Cloward, 1971, pp. 72-74, 80-115). Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward maintain that this pattern occurred both in the period of depression during the 1930s when unemployment resulted from the collapse of market incentives, and in the 1960s when workers lost their jobs as the result of shifts in technology and vocational practices (Piven and Cloward, 1971). According to these authors, during the 1930s, federal relief was not extended, despite serious economic suffering, until social unrest seemed to threaten the political stability of the nation. Perhaps the federal assistance received

³ Under the Progressive influence of John Dewey, museum developed art activities for children emphasizing 'creative self-expression,' an integrated approach to the arts, and exposure to a wide variety of material.
by museums at this time was justified partially by a desire for social
control through education. As we have already mentioned in the
Chapter 2, museums as early as the 1800's were viewed as a means of
fostering social control because people could obtain knowledge which
helped them to fulfill their duties as citizens, thus assuring the health of
the republic. This explanation would still apply during the Great
Depression era when education was again needed to achieve social
control.

Let us look at how the MoMA benefited from the wide range of
support from New Deal Relief programs during the Great Depression era.
The largest among New Deal art programs and one which had
considerable impact on the MoMA, was the Federal Art Project of the
Works Progress Administration (WPA) which was in operation from
August, 1935 until 1943. WPA was directed by Holger Cahill and
administered by well-known artists, museum directors, and art
educators, who were selected for their aesthetic discernment and
administrative abilities. The purpose of the Art Project was stated in a
WPA bulletin of 1938:

[The purpose of the Art Project in the WPA is] to conserve the
talents and skills of artists, who through no fault of their own,
found themselves on the relief rolls and without means to
continue their work, to encourage young artists of definite ability,
to integrate the fine with the practical arts, and, more especially
the arts in general with the daily life of the community. (Works
Progress Administration, 1938)
Economic relief for artists was the central objective of the program. Program participants were hired at weekly wages that were slightly lower than salaries in private industry.

The exhibition of the Federal Art Project (FAP) in 1938, entitled Murals for the Community, at the MoMA gave the public an opportunity to see the vigorous and imaginative character which mural painting was developing under intelligent government guidance. Through exhibitions of sketches, drawings, and paintings which showed the various steps in making a mural, with enlarged photographs and small shadow boxes lighted from within and see through ‘portholes,’ the audiences of the MoMA encountered appropriated information on the social characteristics of mural paintings (Lowe, 1938).

The MoMA supported and exhibited the painters of mural artists, who had been considered marginal artists before the mid-1930s. After the mid-1930s, when the New Deal Relief effects were heightened, the status of mural paintings in art world shifted. Generally speaking, the works of art by artists, such as Cézanne, Renoir, van Gogh, Gauguin, Rousseau, Winslow Homer, and Albert Ryder had won them fame as great painters. However, ‘mural paintings’ had conventionally been left for the most part as a ‘marginalized’ area in the field of art. However, during the mid 1930s, the value of non-academic mural painting was reborn. The mural artists supported by the Museum are two Mexicans, Diego Rivera and José Clemente Orozco. Shortly after the War they...
began to decorate the walls of public buildings in revolutionary Mexico. Furthermore, before 1930, they had done paintings on the walls of the San Francisco stock exchange, several schools and colleges, an office building, and a museum in the United States. The MoMA owned five of Orozco's paintings. Among them is 'Zapatistas,' a scene from the Mexican civil war, done on a canvas large enough to give a good idea of Orozco's dynamic mural style (The Museum of Modern Art, 1938). Moreover, 18 full color prints and 12 monotones of Diego Rivera were exhibited at the MoMA in 1938 and published by the Museum (Lowe, 1938). A New York art critic wrote of this exhibition at the MoMA:

Any lingering doubts among northerners as to the greatness of Diego Rivera's murals must be swept away by the portfolio of reproductions of these paintings just issued by the Museum of Modern Art. They are in color, astonishingly repeating the artist's efforts, and they do equal credit to the artist, to the skillful German printers, and to the benefactor who stood sponsor to the enterprise. (Rivera's Murals Shown at U.N.C., 1938)

Correspondingly, the Educational Department of the MoMA developed some activities related to mural painting. In 1938 under the supervision of Victor D'Amico, twenty-five murals by students of the Fieldston School, the upper unit of the Ethnical Culture Schools, were executed and presented in the next year at the MoMA (Student Murals, 1939).
During the Great Depression, 'Government' support to arts gave the private foundations the incentive to shift the focus of their philanthropic efforts from basic charity to educational and cultural programs and research (Bremmer, 1970, pp. 154-155). If the meaning of education in the inception period of the MoMA was not fully developed, during the mid 1930s, the Museum embrace a diverse range of meanings of education to develop and elaborate educational activities and programs. However, this is not the place to discuss the definition of museum education during the mid-1930s. This will be mentioned in the following sections.

Aside from the governmental support of the arts that accompanied New Deal Relief programs, museums were supported from another new sources of funding during the Depression years—corporate donations (Rawlins, 1981, p. 144). For instance, throughout the Depression period, the Carnegie Corporation contributed almost $2 million to emergency relief and social service agencies, assisted art museums, and promoted art and musical education (Bremner, 1960, p, 156). Under the Foundation's arts program, museums received grants for experimental educational projects and professional training programs. The Carnegie Foundation also funded a program which distributed art appreciation kits (slides, reproductions and books) to college students to prepare them for museum visits (Rawlins, 1981).
During the mid 1930s, the MoMA also received funding from the Carnegie Foundation. Figure 3 shows the sources of funding, which were much more diverse than in the founding period of the Museum. The endowment fund income increased tremendously around 1935. Even though this Figure does not give us specific information on funding sources, several primary sources regarding the Carnegie Foundation in the Museum of Modern Art Archives say that the MoMA was intimately involved with the project of the Carnegie Foundation during 1934. For instance, in a letter included in the Corporation Annual Reports (1934), the Carnegie Foundation was mentioned as one of the patrons of the MoMA. Furthermore, in the Annual Report of 1934, it is stated that the MoMA requested from the Carnegie Corporation a grant of $10,000 annually for a period until 1937. These funds were to be devoted to reconditioning the exhibitions and to preparing new educational material for circulating exhibition (The Museum of Modern Art, 1934).
Figure 3: Sources of budget income
3.3.1. The Development of Educational Programs: Packard Report

At the height of the New Deal Relief programs, the MoMA attempted to find a way to contribute to its role as an educational institution. During this time, Artemas Packard, the chairman of the art department at Dartmouth College, was employed to find out how the MoMA could most effectively aid in the development of "esthetic values in American life" (Lynes, 1973, p. 56). Professor Packard worked at the MoMA for a year. He agreed that MoMA had paid very little attention to the educational value of their activities.

Theoretically, inasmuch as the Museum of Modern Art is an educational institution, its various departments may be thought of as each devoted to some specific educational enterprise. In fact, however, very little attention is given, within the present organization, to a consideration of the educational value of any of the Museum's activities. The Trustees have hoped this report might assist them in the planning of an Education Department whose function would be to supervise various types of instructional services such as are now commonly expected of a public art museum. There can be no doubt as to the great need within the organization for some agency which can devote all its attention to the business of co-ordinating the expanding educational activities of the various departments, of seeking to secure consistency of effort with reference to the main purposes of the institution in planning new activities, and of keeping in touch with other educational institutions. (Packard, 1935-36, p. 17)

After he completed his one year stay, he produced a final 138-page document in which he proposed one way of achieving 'popular
Packard's effort to accomplish popular instruction contributed to the creation of the new notion of education at the MoMA. We have discussed the notion of 'distribution' as an educational mission for the public during the inception period of the Museum, and have referred to this as a period of passive understanding of the notion of education. With Packard's report on possible methods of achieving popular instruction, the MoMA entered a new period influenced by an active notion of education. Diverse educational programs and activities corresponding to the general educational reforms were elaborated and practiced at the MoMA after the mid-1930s.

Even though Packard knew that it would be very difficult to fulfill the dual purposes of 'popular instruction' and the 'study' of modernism, he strongly maintained that these seemingly antagonistic objectives were desirable and would lead to a broader understanding of arts which might harmonize their apparent contradictions (Packard, 1938, p. 63-64). In making his recommendations, Packard concluded that

the only safe way to preserve the integrity both of the ideals of "productive scholarship" on the one hand and of intelligent "popular instruction" on the other is to consider them as different kinds of enterprise, each equally important, but each requiring its own separate organization and specially trained personnel. (Packard, 1938, p. 15)

Packard maintained that the Museum should awaken public interest in all forms of modern art. He also indicated that it should be an agency for
stimulating fresh creative effort and for spreading not only factual knowledge about art but also a decent appreciation of its potential contribution to civilized living (Packard, 1938, pp. 79-80). His central idea of education was based on the educational theory that education was the means of developing the capacity of the individual to allow him adapt himself adequately to his living environment.

However, Packard maintained that the MoMA should be aware of the paradoxical implications of establishing a program of education that was to be independent of, but equal to its curatorial activities. If the Museum did not conceive of the importance of educational programs existing independent from and on an equal footing with curatorial activities, according to Packard, the Museum might fall into "the error of encouraging the one to the detriment of the other and impede the development of a broader understanding which might harmonize their apparent contradictions" (Packard, 1938, p. 64).

Packard was aware that the trustees were looking for assistance in planning for an Education Department in the near future, and thought that it would be worthwhile to examine the nature of the problem of building up relations with the schools and colleges. He made some suggestions to the trustees as to what the educational mission of the MoMA should be in relation to other museums and to schools and colleges. Packard’s proposal for the educational mission of the MoMA was focused on looking towards “a better integration of art with other
subjects in the curriculum" (Lynes, 1973, p. 169). For instance, Packard proposed that the Museum could create examples of ideal methods of instruction in devising traveling exhibitions and docent services for groups of children from the schools. Furthermore, the MoMA might assist the schools in acquiring suitable teaching materials, and publish manuals suggesting the best methods for using such materials. The advantage of using original material instead of textbooks, photographs, lantern slides, or white plaster casts, should make apparent the importance of acquiring collections of art objects as teaching material for classroom use (Packard, 1935-36, pp. 26-27).

Packard proposed three kinds of activity in the mission of popular instruction with which an Education Department might be concerned. First, he proposed 'direct instruction' such as docent service for current exhibitions, the preparation of illustrated lectures for general distribution, special exhibitions for school use, extension courses of study for professionals and art students, radio talks, educational movies, and so on. Second, he considered 'indirect instruction,' devising ways and means of influencing manufacturers, department stores, motion picture producers, and other non-educational agencies which exercise great influence on the public taste. Finally, Packard's report emphasized 'research,' for example, supervision of special studies in the field of modern art (Packard, 1935-36, pp. 17-18).
Additionally, Packard recommended the formation of an Advisory Committee to supervise the activities of the Education Department. He felt the membership of this Committee should include individuals who represented as wide a range of professional interests, and who living not only in or near New York, but also individuals from widely separated parts of the country. The members should include administrators of educational institutions, particularly those interested in art study and teacher training, directors of foundations, philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, manufacturers, advertisers, directors of radio and cinema enterprises, and so on (Packard, 1935-36, p. 18).

Packard’s notions on art education were influenced by the theories of Progressive Education, which had become the basis for the educational models in schools by the late 1930s. He stressed the importance of the study of art as ‘immediate experience’ with artworks in the curriculum of colleges and universities. Here, Packard used the term ‘immediate experience,’ to refer to knowledge deriving its validity from its direct impact on the consciousness rather than indirectly through an understanding of its relation to a sequence of stylistic developments (Packard, 1938, p. 25). For Packard, the study of art should focus on how best to help the student relate the subject matter of each of his formal studies to one another, to his own interests, and to his understanding of the world in which he lives (Packard, 1935-36, p. 21).
Even though Packard did not exactly define the term 'immediate experience,' his notion could be explained by reference to Francis Wayland Parker's. Parker asserts that individuals can only learn what is meaningful to them in their daily life, and meaning is rooted in their own experience. For these art educators, art was not an isolated realm of endeavor, but a quality that makes certain experiences worthwhile in the world (Efland, 1989, p. 168). I am sure that Packard's philosophy of art education was influenced by Parker's, because during the 1930s, the book The Child-Centered School, which was based on Parker's and John Dewey's notions, strongly affected the field of art education in the United States (Efland, 1989, p. 193).

Packard noted that all age levels, from elementary schools to the university, should adopt progressive educational practices. He stressed the importance of cooperation between the MoMA and the universities, asserting that the universities should work "out a program of art study...more consistent with the needs of the student and less unfavorable to a sympathetic interest in contemporary art" (Packard, 1938, p. 22). He argues that universities tend to provide the primary training for Museum curators who tend to be provided with intellectual information from the Museum. He proposed several possible educational services to promote cooperation between the Museum and the universities, such as circulating exhibitions for study purposes, the development of a library, cinema study programs, and the publication of books of value to the
Finally, in 1937, the Department of Education of the MoMA began its operation. It had a three-fold purpose. First, to help meet the needs of children and adults seeking to understand art for their personal satisfaction. Second, to promote among the general public an understanding of the value of creative art experience in every-day life. And third, to stimulate the teaching profession in promoting art for the purpose of general education (The Museum of Modern Art, 1960). The Program of the Education Department consisted of teaching four high school classes a week, preparing and circulating visual material to ten high schools, and operating the Young People’s Gallery. After its establishment in 1937, the educational program was financed primarily through grants from the Whitney Foundation, the General Education Board, and the Rockefeller Foundation, supplemented by contributions from the Museum’s annual budget (The Museum of Modern Art, 1946, p. 14).

After the Education Department of the Museum was founded, the educational activities and programs became more elaborate. During 1937 and 1938, twelve schools were invited to participate in the Educational Project. The program included 1) exhibitions held in The Young People’s Gallery, 2) rotating Exhibitions sent to participating schools, 3) demonstrations of techniques, and 4) lectures for teachers.
(The Museum of Modern Art, 1937, p. 21). Additionally, one of the important features of the Educational project was a series of 'lectures' at the Museum, with guest speakers who presented talks on recent trends and developments in art education to the teachers of the participating schools. The content of the lectures in 1938, was, in many ways, related to the theories of progressive art education of that time. Almost all guest speakers were from the Progressive Education Association, and discussed art appreciation, and the creative experience of children and adolescence. The following Table 2 presents a summary of the contents of lectures in 1938 at the MoMA.

---

4 The Progressive Education Association was founded in 1919, providing an institutional framework for spreading the ideas of progressive pedagogy. It adopted the principles that Dewey had promoted twenty years earlier. However, the emphasis of the Progressive Education Association in the 1920s was somewhat different from Dewey’s. This group recognized the importance of the arts and made the arts very core of the curriculum of the schools, by promoting creative self-expression (Zilversmit, 1993, p. 12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Lecture</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Content of Lectures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems in Teaching Art Appreciation</td>
<td>Victor D'Amico</td>
<td>Jan. 27, 1938</td>
<td>A discussion of various methods of teaching art appreciation and their relative effects on art education; an evaluation of the visual materials employed, and a review of the results of an experiment in art appreciation carried on at the Fieldston School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of the Art Work of Adolescents</td>
<td>Miss Eunice Vassar (Staff of the Adolescent Study Commission of the Progressive Education Association)</td>
<td>Feb. 24, 1938</td>
<td>An analysis of the characteristics of adolescents as seen in their art work. Case studies were presented and discussed. These studies were taken from the files of the Adolescent Study Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detection and Treatment of Handicaps of Normal Children Through Art Work</td>
<td>Mr. Bernard Sanders (formerly on the staff of the Psychiatric Ward of Bellevue Hospital)</td>
<td>Mar. 24, 1938</td>
<td>A discussion and presentation of a two-year experiment in working with a wide variety of handicapped children. Case studies and art work were presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value in the Creative Experience</td>
<td>Dr. Lawrence Conrad (Professor of Creative Writing, Montclair Teachers College)</td>
<td>Apr. 28, 1938</td>
<td>A discussion of the values underlying all creative expression and how they apply to every day teaching experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Adolescents</td>
<td>Dr. Fritz Redl (Staff of Adolescent Study Commission of Progressive Education Association)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Lectures at the Museum of Modern Art in 1938  
In short, from 1929 to the mid 1930s in the history of the MoMA, the meaning of education was limited to a focus on the educational value of displaying the artworks of the exhibitions at the Museum. Elaborate educational programs and activities were not developed in the Museum until the late 1930s. However, after 1935, the MoMA began to pay serious attention to ‘popular instruction’ as an element of its formal charter because of changes in social demands. The Museum attempted to analyze the public effect of the exhibitions of the previous years, and to get outside funding to develop educational programs and activities for the Museum. Moreover, the prevailing contemporary progressive educational theory of the 1930s influenced the Museum to undertake construction of the Education Department, which came to be the initial step in developing various educational programs at the MoMA.

3.4. PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION, MODERN ART, AND THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

The year 1939 marked a new beginning for the Museum of Modern Art, in entering its permanent building which processed much more space for exhibitions and educational programs. The Annual Report of the MoMA describes this particular year –1939 – as a period of “remarkable growth and achievement” in the history of the Museum
The fact, the statistics, the lists which fill this volume show beyond much question that the year 1939-1940 was the busiest and most enterprising in the Museum's history. It was the first year in the Museum's new building, which auditorium for the film programs, lectures and music. (The Museum of Modern Art, 1940, p. 9)

In late September of 1929, the seven founding trustees had set about raising a substantial sum of money for the first two years of operation, and founded a suitable exhibition space on the twelfth floor of the Heckscher Building at 730 Fifth Avenue, at Fifth-seventh Street. In 1932, the Museum moved from its temporary quarters at 730 Fifth Avenue to a house leased from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., at 11 West Fifth-third Street. Later, various locations in New York were discussed with reference to 'density of population,' and to easy accessibility for the largest number of people, in preparation for purchase of a new building for the Museum. Finally, the new building of the MoMA (11 and 13 West 53rd Street) was purchased and opened to the public in May, 1939 (Figure 17). As the MoMA had entered a permanent home, the Museum needed to make administrative changes.

When the Museum was about to open the doors to its permanent home, in 1939, Nelson A. Rockefeller was elected to succeed Goodyear as president of the MoMA. After serving as president for the first ten years of the Museum of Modern Art's career, Goodyear, a former Buffalonian,
announced his retirement at a meeting of the Board of Trustees (Mellquist, 1939). Goodyear retired from his position one day before the new building would be opened. The opening was celebrated with ceremonies and a radio message from President Roosevelt. Before the meeting, Mr. Rockefeller resigned from his former office as treasurer, to become a president of the Museum (Goodyear Retires, 1939; Goodyear Quits as Modern Art Museum’s Head, 1939). Under the new administration, the duties of the presidency were carried out by two officers, Stephen C. Clark and J. D. Rockefeller (Figure 18). Clark would preside at meetings, while Rockefeller would concentrate on the business affairs of the Museum. The two would consult each other on matters of general policy (Goodyear Quits as Modern Art Museum’s Head, 1939).

It was at this time that the Museum had growing concern for ‘popular instruction’ for the public. As we have already seen, the purposes of the Museum, under the guidance of the first director, Alfred Barr (Figure 19), were to invent a history of modern art and make modern art a part of the discipline of art history. As the economic depression heightened during the mid 1930s, the MoMA began to pay more attention to its educational mission for the general public. A literary work published in 1939 discussed and emphasized the educational role of the MoMA. For instance, Paul J. Sachs (1939) indicated that American museums continued to be not only exhibition centers and repositories of treasures, as in Europe, but also educational
centers. He maintained, however, that there was need for greater cooperation between museums and universities (Sachs, 1939).

At the time the demand for education was heightened at the MoMA, the influence of Progressive Education had reached a high point in school setting. By the late 1930s, the ideals of Progressive Education had become the basis for the educational reform prevalent in private schools, as well as in public schools in upper-middle-class suburbs (Morgan, 1995, p. 154). Although the ideals of Progressive Education flowered in the 1920s and became the dominant mode of teaching among educators, it is a difficult movement to define. Indeed, Lawrence Cremin (1961) saw that progressive education was “essentially pluralistic and occasionally even contradictory” (p. 228), and, thus, avoided a precise definition. Progressive educators shared a common core of beliefs, but it was not a monolithic movement. Its leaders emphasized different aspects of their aims and, over time, the movement stressed different aspects of its agenda.

Despite the diversity, Arthur Zilversmit attempted to define a cluster of ideas associated with progressive education. He asserts that the central core of ideas and practices of the progressive education movement in the 1930s stemmed from the educational and philosophical writings of John Dewey (Zilversmit, 1993, p. 3). First, progressive education emphasized a child-centered curriculum, one that mobilized children’s natural desire to learn. This notion developed from Dewey’s
belief that education had to begin with the interests and capacities of the child, not with the formal curriculum. Second, progressive education was concerned with meeting the needs of the 'whole child' by promoting children’s emotional and physical needs as well as their intellectual development. Third, progressive education held that children should play an active role in determining the content of their education. Some progressive educators believed that a progressive school should have a program that would lead children to develop critical thought and become reformers to improve the world beyond classroom (Zilversmit, 1993, p. 18). Progressive education promised to free the individual from social and psychological repression by allowing the child's imagination to flower: progressive education rejected rote learning and authoritarian discipline and would, instead, use the interests of children to promote learning in a democratic setting.

When the influence of progressive education was heighten during the 1930s, the emphasis of this movement moved further from Dewey's thoughts. The importance of the arts was recognized because of the relationship between art and creative self-expression (or aiding imaginations to flower) as emphasized in progressive education. For this reason, Cremin calls Progressive education a "pedagogical version of the expressionist credo" (Cremin, 1961, p 206). Malcolm Cowley (1956) lists a set of ideas shared to some degree by art education and progressive education theory:
(1) The idea of salvation of the child proposing that he/she be allowed to develop to his/her fullest potentialities;
(2) The idea of self-expression through creative work as the purpose of life;
(3) The idea of paganism leading worshiping the human body as a temple;
(4) The idea of living for the moment extolled the virtue of living intensely and to seize the moment;
(5) The idea of liberty demanded rejection of every rule, law, convention that interferes with human freedom;
(6) The idea that female equality required equal treatment of women;
(7) The idea of psychological health suggested that all maladjustments are results of social repression;
(8) The idea of changing place promoted the notion that they do things better in Europe. (Cowley, 1956; Sahasrabudhe, 1997)

Interestingly, the opposition of progressive education to formal educational practices was similar in spirit to that of the modernist artists who challenged the academic rules of the academy (Rugg, H & Shumaker, A. 1928).

Now the creative artist is a vision seer. He is essentially interested in wholes; he sees life as a unit, as an entity. He compels himself to go beyond the surface appearance of things, for it is the feeling, the spirit's intention, not outer details, in which he is interested. He strives to catch the flash of inner spirit, some unit glimpse of life. He expresses what he sees, and his criterion of a creative act is that it shall be his own original and completely integrative portrayal of what is in his imagination. (Rugg & Shumaker, 1928, p. 207)

The terms "life as a unity," "feeling," and "inner spirit" which are stressed in the above citation were the central points emphasized by the modernism of the time and by progressive education. The key to the
modern revolution seems to have been the triumph of self-expression, in education as well as in art. Basically, the ideal of progressive education shared the spirit of modernism.

As has been mentioned, the idea of using progressive education theories in the development of an educational program at the MoMA were introduced by Packard in his proposal. Since Packard's report was taken seriously at the Museum, Victor D'Amico was hired by Alfred Barr to design and implement educational programs that were, in Packard’s words, “in accordance with the public need” (Morgan, 1995, p. 155).  

3.4.1. Victor D’Amico

D’Amico began his career as an art teacher and later became head of the Fine Arts Department of the Ethical Culture School in New York. Also, he served as a part-time instructor at Teachers College, Columbia (Efland, 1989, p. 202-203). D’Amico’s central conviction was that art education for children should be based on ‘making art,’ and throughout his career he established and taught scores of art workshops, classes and programs based on this idea [Appendix D]. Here, I will cited some

---

5 The chairman of the committee, Eliza Parkinson, had been designated to do something about it. She turned to Barr, and Barr turned to the General Education Board. In 1937, the board recommended Victor D'Amico. The MoMA hired D'Amico, who began his duties as Director of the Educational Project on a ten-month, part-time basis on September 1, 1937 (Lynes, 1973, p. 169).
description of D'Amico’s childhood and taste, for a better understanding of his personality and character:

D'Amico’s father, born in Naples, was a designer of ladies’ cloaks and suits. His mother, also Neapolitan, came from a family of musicians. Victor, born in Manhattan, was the fifth of their 11 children in 1904. He spent eight years of his childhood in Cleveland. D’Amico said that “I’d always associated myself with being an artist. . . but my father said if you try to make a career of painting, you’ll starve. He wanted me to be a designer, like himself, and once I went to fashion school and made a valiant effort. In 1924, D’Amico won a two years scholarship in teacher training at Pratt Institute. He did his first professional teaching in the summer of 1925 when, armed with paints, brushes, swatches of silk donated by his father, paper, and variously shaped pegs for stick-printing, he traveled among 10 play schools of the Child Study Association to give the children weekly art lessons. . . He liked to read philosophy and psychology, and calls himself a “Gestaltist” – a believer that all things – ideas, people, and materials – are integrated. He enjoyed imaginative theatre, not realism. Moreover his apartment was hung with modern prints. (Art Down to His Fists, 1947)

D’Amico played a pivotal role in the history of museum education after the MoMA entered its permanent building. It is not an exaggeration to say that educational programs and activities after the late 1930s at the MoMA represented D’Amico’s philosophy of art education.

After World War I, a number of educators, including D’Amico, began to explore ways to implement the theories of progressive education in their art classrooms. The advocates of progressive education defined their aim as “the development to the highest possible point of all the powers of the individual---his capacity to adjust himself effectively to the world around him, his potential for improving that world through the
release of his powers of creative self-expression” (Rugg & Shumaker, 1928, p. 9).

Relying upon the theories of John Dewey regarding people and art, D'Amico developed and elaborated educational programs and activities at the MoMA for a diverse public, children between the ages of 3 and 18, veterans, and a large class of adults. After D'Amico joined the staff of the MoMA in 1937 as Director of the Department of Education he founded the Young People’s gallery, the War Veterans Art Center, and the People’s Art Center during the 1940s and 1950s. In the art education for children, which was connected with the Young Peoples Gallery, founded in 1949, D'Amico put emphasis on ‘making art,’ as did progressive education theories (McGill, 1987). In War Veterans Art Center (1944), D'Amico developed educational programs for adults, such as veterans. Eventually, the People’s Art Center was opened to provide services for various levels of the public from young children to adults, replacing the Veteran’s Art Center.

D'Amico’s programs for the MoMA fit into the education mission of the Museum, winning national as well as international acclaim, especially during the 1940s and 1950s. According to the records from the Annual Report of the MoMA, the programs were funded through various grants from the Whitney Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, and the General Education Board. These same granting organizations helped to expand educational projects in public
and private schools. With these grants, the museum developed more elaborate educational projects, such as the Educational Project for the public and private secondary schools in and near New York, radio programs, television broadcasts, gallery talks, and special lectures and films for members (The Museum of Modern Art, 1940, p. 23).

The followings is an analysis of an investigation regarding the educational programs at the MoMA developed by D'Amico from World War II to the 1950s. The examples that follow show how new educational meanings at the MoMA were created and constructed by the specific historical contexts of the time.

3.4.2. War Programs and Exhibitions

The New Deal art program, which had considerable impact on the Museum during the Great Depression, came to be of little use around 1943 when the nation became involved in World War II. Before the War, the Museum had been concentrating on educational programs for children to "communicate the ideas and activities of the Department [of Education], and to bring new experiments in art education to parents, teachers and the general public" (D'Amico, 1951, p. 12). However, this trend shifted during wartime. The MoMA stated publicly that the purpose of the Museum should focus on what the Museum could do to help win the War:
Can an art museum do more than give its treasures some protection from bombs and its public some refuge from the stain of war? These are appropriate and necessary functions for a museum. But aren't there more positive and explicit things to do, things more directly concerned with the War? (The Museum of Modern Art, 1943)

During World War II, the MoMA saw art as a service to the public, and the Museum became more a social institution or recreation center for the public since notions about the valuing of art changed during wartime. The paradigm of art for art's sake was not attractive at this time. Art was not viewed as a luxury isolating one class from another, but rather as understood, as medicine for the troubled mind and recreation for the people. Additionally, learning about art should meet the need of social efficiency. In the field of art education, the subject of art was taught in relation to other subject areas. During wartime, the education programs of the Museum embraced Dewey's hope for social reform through education. It was believed that education programs could bring about change and reform the mentally unhealthy people in

---

6 John Dewey regarded human beings as individuals functioning within an immensely complex environment, not passive spectators in the environment. He argues that one cannot experience the world with an empty state of mind, but perceives it through a screen of previous knowledge, which has been acquired through previous encounters with the world. Accordingly, a particular environment could have a determining effect on what would be found interesting in a new environment. The ability to perceive reality in a particular way is continuously being reconstructed as new experience is obtained (Eiland, 1989, pp. 159-160). In this context, Dewey formulated the aim of education in social terms based on the argument that education should read its successes in the changed behaviors, perceptions, and insights of individual human beings. He defined education as "that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (Dewey, 1926, pp. 89-90).
the society. Monroe Wheeler, Director of Exhibitions and Publications for the MoMA, commented on the value of art during this time -- art was regarded as the "great medicine of the civilized mind" (An Editorial, 1942, p. 24). He said:

In war all of us must keep our minds and our spirits healthy and well balanced. As every fighting man knows, there must be recreation and relaxation amid the confusion and strain of war. The enjoyment of our heritage of art and the participation in its new development, day by day, constitute one of the least costly and most wholesome of human stimulants. (An Editorial, 1942, p. 24)

On the basis of art as 'medicine' for the troubled mind, as 'recreation' for both civilians and fighting men, the MoMA developed new programs of contemporary arts--war programs, therapeutic programs, and circulating exhibition programs.

The War program of the MoMA began May 22, 1941, with the opening of a large exhibition entitled Britain at War. The primary purpose of the exhibition was to demonstrate how a nation's artists could be used in national defense. The MoMA hoped to survey how the British Government had conceived the usefulness of art in enlivening the idealism with which its people were united in self-defense, and what the artists could do in time of war (Wheeler, 1941, p. 9). This exhibition contained various works such as paintings, photographs, and cartoons.

The paintings consisted of portraits and scenes of action by leading painters appointed as official artists to the Navy, the Army and the Air
Force. These artists wore uniforms, and lived and worked with the various units to which they were attached. They went into action with those units and saw the worst—or the best—of the war with their own eyes. Other works shown were by artists commissioned to portray armament factories and air raid shelters. In addition, many artists had done work on their own and submitted war paintings which were purchased by the Government.⁷

Some of those artists were Edward Ardizzone, Anthony Gross, and Feliks Topolski who represented a keen and human observation in their paintings. Muirhead Bone, Paul Nash, and Eric Kennington, also participated in this exhibition. Photographs which depicted an impressive sequence of scenes of civil life, activities of the army and navy, and a group of significant forms of wartime objects were presented. The names of the individual photographers were not provided in order to emphasize the collective and national character of all these photographs.

Cartoons were included in this exhibition in order to offer the encouragement of humor in this dark time of the war (Wheeler, 1941; The Museum of Modern Art, 1940, p. 6).

---

⁷ During wartime, the Museum was affiliated with the Government with contacts, ranging from unofficial approval or collaboration to work done directly under government contract.
As another war activity of the MoMA, in 1942, the Museum displayed the winning posters from its National Defense ‘Poster Competition.’ The Museum of Modern Art Memorandum describes the procedure and purpose of this competition.

After long negotiations we have finally concluded arrangements with the office of War Information, the Treasury Department, office of Civilian Defense, Artists for Victory, Inc., and Council for Democracy to join them in sponsoring a National War Poster Competition for posters on ten different themes selected and approved by the Office of War Information. The Museum will act as a sponsor and agrees to exhibit all posters selected by the jury. Production of the ten first-prize winners is guaranteed in advance by various lithographers and printers. There is to be a first prize of a $300 War Bond for each of the ten sections. . . .

The Competition will open as soon as announcements can be printed and will close on October 15. The winning designs will be exhibited beginning November 10 in the ground floor galleries together with the Hemisphere Poster Exhibition, which will have opened two weeks earlier. . . . The Museum of Modern Art has been approached by Mr. John Taylor Arms and Mr. Erwin Hoffman of your organization regarding the exhibition, by the Museum, of the winning war posters in a competition to be held by your organization and the council for democracy, with the approval of the Office of War Information and the various Government agencies for which the posters are intended. (The Museum of Modern Art, 1942)

This competition, the first of several wartime competitions held by the MoMA, aroused great interest among artists and resulted in the creation of many fine posters, in particular, connected with the Treasury group. A complete catalog of the exhibition, illustrated with reproductions of the winning posters, was published with text in English, Spanish and Portuguese (An Editorial, 1942, p. 24).
Additionally, the MoMA concentrated on a program to utilize the talents of American artists for 'therapeutic' work to encourage and broaden the use of the various arts and crafts among disabled soldiers and sailors. In collaboration with Artists for Victory the MoMA opened a competition, the results of which were shown January 20, 1942 in an exhibition at the Museum entitled *The Arts in Therapy* (Figure 20). This exhibition consisted of two sections. The first section of the exhibition was devoted to the role of the crafts in occupational therapy, the second section of the exhibition focused on spontaneous self-expression through the arts as a means of psychological release and as a guide in the diagnosis of mental disturbance and conflict. It was believed that physiological and psychological illnesses were interrelated, and the 'free media' in art could offer a limited but nonetheless considerable aid in the cure and alleviation of both (*The Museum of Modern Art, 1943, p. 3*).

The first section of the exhibition included objects and projects related to those crafts acknowledged to have therapeutic and recreational value for patients. This section of the exhibition had been selected by a Museum-appointed jury from entries in a nationwide competition co-sponsored by the Museum and Artists for Victory and open to all artists and craftsmen in the United States. Its purpose was to provide a new supply of designs and objects in the crafts, to be utilized wherever needed by those in charge of therapeutic work for the armed forces. The Museum hoped to stimulate the curative potentialities of the crafts by
calling upon the manifestly suitable talents of American artists and craftsmen.

The second part of the exhibition used the so-called 'free media' such as painting, sculpture, drawing and so on, in therapy conducted from the psychiatric perspective. This second section had been assembled on behalf of the Museum-sponsored Committee on Art in American Education and Society by Victor D'Amico, the committee's chairman, Dr. Edward Liss, a member of the committee, and Mr. Bernard Sanders, who for three years worked as artist-instructor in the psychiatric wards of Bellevue Hospital.

This exhibition, The Arts in Therapy, was influenced by developments in the theory of modern education. It was held that mental, emotional, and even physical handicaps that prevent normal functioning could be discovered and corrected through artworks. Art was thought to be a mirror of the individual's inner life and personality to the trained eye. In this mirror, the psychologist could find latent disturbance if any existed. Art was considered an important instrument in the diagnosis of mental and emotional health. A reliable diagnosis through artwork should be made by a 'psychologist' who understood visual expressions and who could interpret these in relation to an entire case history. More important than diagnosis was the use of art for healing through the experience of creative expression a special need for war time veterans and others. Occasionally, repression and some forms of
handicap were discharged merely by working in creative media. The individual worked through the difficulty through painting, modeling, or expressing himself in any chosen medium. In this way, the art experience served as an emotional or mental purgative. Such expulsion was the first step in rehabilitation. It took patient study and scientific application to find a creative medium that would serve the individual and guide him from frustration and uncertainty to satisfaction and self-control (The Museum of Modern Art, 1943, p. 8).

The Museum had been recognized for the importance of the 'circulation exhibition (travelling exhibition)' before the war years. In the broadcast at the dedication of the new building of the Museum of Modern Art, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

The standards of American taste will inevitably be raised by bringing into far-flung communities results of the latest and finest achievements in all the arts. These travelling exhibits will extend the perspective of the general public. . . , will make all of our people increasingly aware of the enormous importance of contemporary industrial design, architecture, . . .

---

8 In 1931, two years after the Museum was founded, the MoMA organized its first exhibition of modern architecture. The trustees of the Museum assumed responsibility for half of the cost of the exhibition, on the condition that the balance could be raised among other participating institutions. An illustrated pamphlet outlining the plan and the importance of the exhibition was sent to museums throughout the country, and other institutions subscribed. During the same year, the MoMA assembled an exhibition of sixty color reproductions, entitled A Brief Survey of Modern Painting, for a group of New York secondary schools. These two exhibitions were the origins of the development of the Department of Circulating Exhibitions, officially established in 1933. Elodie Courter came to be Secretary of the Department of Circulating Exhibitions, which supplied exhibitions of modern art to other institutions (The Museum of Modern Art, 1939 B, pp. iii-iv).
photography, the printed book, the illustration, the advertisement, the poster, the theatre and the moving picture. Thus, a nation-wide public will receive a demonstration of the force and scope of all these branches of the visual arts. (The Museum of Modern Art, 1939 B, p. iii)

Importantly, the practice of circulating exhibitions continued to grow at the MoMA during the war years due to its vigorous Circulating Exhibition Department (Figure 21). With a grant that was obtained from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1939, the Museum was able to expand its program of exhibitions especially prepared for smaller educational institutions. Around 1943, the Department of Circulating Exhibitions and Museum’s Educational Programs, under the direction of D’Amico, combined facilities to provide materials for use in secondary and elementary schools. This program was later developed to include multiple exhibitions consisting of lightweight panels on which color reproductions, photographs, or diagrams were mounted. Teaching portfolios were designed for classroom use. These materials played an important role in the continuation of the Museum’s exhibitions program during World War II (The Museum of Modern Art, 1939 B, p. iii).

The programs and exhibitions during World War II were not isolated from the society, but closely related to social problems. The

---

9 A large number of inexpensive exhibitions, including original works as well as color reproductions, was assembled and offered at nominal fees to the exhibitions. Highly qualified color reproductions enabled the Museum to introduce to the public works that would be impossible to obtain on loan, because they were too costly to pack and ship. These circulating exhibitions
MoMA's ideal of educational effort seems to be based on a Reconstructionist concept derived from Dewey's thought. Dewey viewed art as a resource with which to solve problems of daily living in the community. Responsibility for social reform was strongly stressed in his view. It will be instructive to look at a particular educational center of the Museum, the Veterans Art Center, in order to fully understand the ideal and practice of art education during wartime.

3.4.3. Veterans Art Center

Before the end of the war, in 1944, the MoMA founded the War Veterans Art Center, with the primary objective to help veterans find themselves through the physical and emotional relaxation provided by creative thought and work. The War Veterans Art Center (Figure 22) provided free instruction and materials to veterans who wished to develop their creative talents in civilian life. The programs of the War Veterans' Art Center were based on the following principles:

1. Personal Satisfaction:
   By starting with simple projects concrete results are attained in a minimum of time, and thus the veteran is quickly reassured of his ability to go ahead.

2. Individual Instruction:
   For one who does not know where his talent, power, or interest lies, the first objective of the Center is to evaluate his ability. He first decides on which course will prove

proved ideal for MoMA as an educational institution (The Museum of Modern Art, 1938 B, p. iii).
most satisfying. Instruction is individualized. There is no set time schedule. He starts when he is ready, and progresses at his own pace.

3. Creativeness:
Perhaps the most important part of the program is that creativeness is stressed and imitative methods of working are discouraged. Once a veteran learns to express, through art, his own ideas, he has made the first important step in his struggle to assure himself of his importance as an independent and developing personality.

4. Fundamentals:
Dilettante methods and projects for mere entertainment are carefully avoided. The veteran is introduced at once to the fundamentals, because a knowledge of them in any art gives him the opportunity to progress as far as his interest and ability will allow. (The Museum of Modern Art, 1945, p. 3)

These 'experimental classes' in arts and crafts held for returning veterans under the direction of Victor D'Amico provided a model for other governmental and therapeutic work. Men who had served in the army, navy, marines and merchant marines of the United States were eligible. Veterans who had had no previous art experience entered an orientation class where they were shown various techniques and allowed to experiment in different mediums. In addition to helping veterans develop new skills for their leisure time, the MoMA gave pre-vocational training to those whose talents might support a professional career in one of the arts (War Veterans Art Center Is Opened Here: Free Instruction Provided for Discharged Men by Museum of Modern Art, 1944). The Veteran's Art Center was open for day and evening classes in sculpture and ceramics, drawing and painting, woodworking design, jewelry, metal work, book
3.4.4. People's Art Center

The Veterans' Art Center was very successful during and after World War II, but it was replaced by the People's Art Center in 1949. Why the Veterans' Art Center came to be changed into the People's Art Center can probably never be fully explained because there is not any indication regarding this in the materials in the Archives of the MoMA. However, it can be explained by analysis of the shift in the external contexts of that time in the United States.

Around the late 1940s, and throughout the continuing crisis of the Cold War, art education in the United States tended to abandon its 'Reconstructionist' stance in favor of 'Expressionism.' According to Efland, it was certainly the case that in the fine arts Abstract Expressionism had become the dominant art style in the United States, but rarely in the past had schooling practices in art teaching taken their clues from the contemporary art tendencies. On the other hand, it is possible that, after preoccupation with weighty social issues, it was time to decline this interest and reinstate issues regarding children and their personal development in art education. Certainly, Viktor Lowenfeld's
Creative and Mental Growth (1947) contributed to this cause in the United States (Efland, 1990, p. 234). Lowenfeld saw the child as a 'creative being,' who was worthy of respect and whose freedom was inviolable. This approach lessens the tendency toward mental disease not by using art merely as therapy but also making it the source of healthy expression. It was believed that art education could help to integrate the creative forces and contribute to the moral and spiritual support of mankind, strengthening the basis for permanent and honorable peace.

From its beginnings, the People's Art Center was a leader in developing progressive methods of art education. 'Creative Self-Expression' was one of significant articles of faith that characterized the People's Art Center, the central notions were freedom from control, the child initiative, the child's interests as the basis for the program, and focus on his personality and social adjustment (cf. the ideas of Cowley listed above). To promote the child's freedom of expression, the People's Art Center provided various kinds of studio instruction. It was believed that the child could enhance his expressive capacity by working with various media and materials.

The People's Art Center offered expanded programs for adults as well as a new range of activities designed especially for young children and teenagers (The Museum of Modern Art, 1948, p. 17). As a project developed by the Museum's Department of Education, its aim was
threefold: meet the needs of the ‘child and adult’ who looks to art for personal satisfaction, educate ‘the public’ to realize the importance of creative experience, and stimulate ‘teachers’ in promoting art for general education. Enrollment in the children’s classes at the People’s Art Center was strictly by chronological age. No emphasis was placed on talent for the belief was that ‘growth’ in creative art expression was a normal part of a child’s general emotional and social development. The Museum’s method of teaching children was based on experienced knowledge of ‘child development.’ Art was considered a ‘developmental activity’ and not a body of knowledge (Efland, 1989, p. 228). Indeed, in the most influential of art education textbooks of the late 1940s, Creative and Mental Growth, Lowenfeld asserts that aims of art education should emphasize the physical, mental, social and emotional ‘growth’ of the individuals. Lowenfeld explained these stages in understandable terms, illustrating them with examples of children’s drawings and paintings (Efland, 1989, p. 235).

Adults, however, were enrolled in classes according to their individual experiences and choice. These classes were planned for amateurs only, in order to help them derive satisfaction from participating in a creative activity, rather than as formal training toward a profession. In addition to the above mentioned programs, there was a program that emphasized the relationship between individual creativity and child development. These programs were for children and their
parents. In the programs for parents and young children aged three to twelve years, a class was set up so that parents might understand their children’s creative development by working with them in the same activities and observing how the teacher handled children.

The approach to art education for children’s classes in the People’s Art Center was an entirely new concept of education based on knowledge of the “child’s creative and psychological growth and on mastery of teaching techniques needed for their development” (Morgan, 1995, p. 156). Children between the ages of three and five began with the simple exploration of materials. Children aged six to twelve were guided by the teachers to experience more challenging art activities that had an emphasis on design and craftsmanship. According to Carol Morgan, reproductions of art works in the Museum’s collections were placed around the studio to stimulate recognition about the cultural and social contexts, although the children were not given specific information about them (Morgan, 1995) (Figure 23). These classes for developing art appreciation, supported D’Amico’s belief that the “visual arts, through properly directed experiences, can help to develop the visual, the emotional, and the kinesthetic senses, which must be developed along with the verbal and intellectual powers, if an integration of personality is ever to be realized through education” (Morgan, 1995, p. 156). The progression from ‘making’ one’s own art to ‘thinking’ about and understanding art was understood as progression and developmental.
D'Amico said that art is an expression of a "culture and society, and to understand or appreciate an art fully was to know and understand the culture and society which created it" (D'Amico, 1940, p. 51).

However, I fail to see how the classes described above lead to any kind of understanding and appreciation of art. In my opinion, even though those educational programs attempted to stimulate developing art appreciation, the purpose of real art appreciation could not have occurred in this class. Without being given any information regarding particular art works, the individual could not derive any understanding of artworks as an expression of a culture and society. Rather, through art products and images of modern art, the children were lead by the instructor to discuss special space, colors, and mediums.

The MoMA also offered experimental painting classes for children. These classes were based on the belief that the talents of young children should be encouraged and developed at a very early age. The MoMA admitted three-year old children to these classes. As a result of these experimental classes the MoMA published materials concerning the stages of development of the ability of young children to paint. According to the MoMA, the average three-year-old child grasped a brush, made for one color, and began to splash it on paper, and was not interested in expressing an idea or in drawing an object. The child painted to show how he/she felt. Children worked with one color for days before they turned to another and experimented with that one. Their response to
color was instinctive and acute. They had not yet learned to control their impulses and unbounded interest in expressing themselves. For them, color was a wonderful outlet. Based on the children’s experiment, the Educational Department of the MoMA analyzed color preferences according to children’s ages. It was found that two-and three-year-old children tend to emphasize red and orange. As they grow older, and learn that they are not quite the center of the universe and that they have to consider and get along with other people and modify their own desires and behavior, they show an increased preference for blue and green. The warm palette is one of uncurbed emotion; the cool palette, one of reason and control. By the time they are about three and a half, most children develop an interest in blue. From the research, it was concluded that two-to five-year-old children who emphasize blue or green tend to show controlled reactions rather than free emotional expression (Why Children Like Bright Colors, 1950).

10 According to Lowenfeld’s analysis of children’s drawing, the child comes to conceive of himself in relation to another at the age 7 years old. According to Lowenfeld, the child includes himself in his concept in the same way he includes the tree, the house, or the whole environment. His attitude now changes from a completely egocentric attitude, and this is reflected not only in his drawings but also in his total development (Lowenfeld, 1952, p. 146). Even though the MoMA’s analysis of the child’s preference of color seem to be based on the original thought of Lowenfeld, the MoMA study concludes that the child of three and half years of age comes to escape the self-centered point of view.
The program for which the MoMA received the greatest recognition was the Children’s Art Carnival. The Children’s Art Carnival was held every year during the month of December at the Young People’s Gallery from 1942 into the 1970s (The Museum of Modern Art, 1948, p. 18). Children come to the Carnival to paint, make collages and constructions and to play with toys and games especially designed to introduce them to the perception of color, texture and design on a level they can understand and in a way which involves their active participation. The entrance gate to the Children’s Carnival was the Contour Gate (Figure 24), a white metal rod curved in the shape of a four-year-old child and a twelve-year-old child standing side-by-side. The parent leaves his child at the entrance and returns to pick him up about an hour later. Once having passed through the wire silhouette, the child of 3 to 8 years enters into a world of magic built around modern works of art. D’Amico describes this experience:

Magic and fantasy, of a friendly forest, cool and quiet, with delightful surprises beckoning the child from every direction . . . The Inspirational Area provides a new approach to art teaching, for here the child is stimulated to think creatively and is oriented to the fundamentals of design without words or dogma of any kind. (D’Amico, 1960, p. 35)

Suspended from the ceiling were plastic mobiles that cast changing shadows on the walls. In a corner, is an ingenious ‘color organ,’ which was operated by the child like a Piano with a keyboard and foot pedals.
When he pressed the keys and the pedals, the child made an endless series of colored abstract patterns on a screen. This experience, D'Amico pointed out would "help the child in understanding and inventing abstract designs of his own."

In the second gallery of the Carnival a studio workshop similar to a classroom was set up. It was painted in warm colors and brightly lit, with mobiles hanging from above. Children worked independently at child-size easels and worktables full of materials for making constructions or collages (Figure 25). Children were assisted by a teacher only when they did not know "how to operate a toy, or how to get started on a collage or construction" (D'Amico, 1960, p. 36; Jablons, 1951). The idea of the Carnival was so popular that many museums and art centers in other parts of the country adopted this idea for their own communities.11

In addition to those educational activities at the People's Art Center, the Education Department also carried on an extensive program.

---

11 The Annual Children's Art Carnival, which began in 1942, was offered continuously. In 1957 the Carnival was presented at the Barcelona and Milan Trade Fairs, and it was a feature of the Brussels Word's Fair in 1958. In 1962, the Carnival was presented by Mrs. John F. Kennedy to the National Children's Museum in India on behalf of the International Council of the MoMA and the Asia Society. In the following year, D'Amico flew to India to open the Carnival and to train teachers in the methods of art education. The Carnival was open to children of the members at the MoMA, as were the art classes. This policy was expanded in the 1960s. The Carnival was taken to Harlem as an annual summer event sponsored by the Institute of Modern Art, which had assumed responsibility for the educational program at the MoMA. Also, when the People's Art Center was closed in 1970, the Children's Art Carnival in Harlem was incorporated as an independent organization (Morgan, 1995, pp. 159-172).
to aid art education in New York City public high schools. Begun as an experimental project in 1937, this program was largely financed by the Board of Education and furnished instructors in more than fifty city high schools with various visual teaching aids. Designed for the adolescent age group and tailored to meet the demands of a large school system, the Museum's stock of teaching aids included portable teaching models in the fields of painting, architecture, interior design, industrial design, poster and advertising art and teaching portfolios on "The Elements of Design," "Modern Design in Furniture," and "Modern Painters" (The Museum of Modern Art, Summer 1960, p. 4).

As a special service to public education, the Museum offered free classes to elementary school teachers in New York City public schools. These classes provided in-service credit for the teachers and in many instances constituted the only art training an elementary school teacher might receive. Approximately 100 teachers took advantage of these classes every year at this time (The Museum of Modern Art, Summer 1960, p. 4).

As discussed above, educational programs and activities at the MoMA from 1939 to mid-1950 were developed and organized according to D'Amico's notion of education, progressive educational theory. The ideal of progressive education was incorporated into the educational programs and activities to popularizing the appreciation of modern art. D'Amico's
methods of creative teaching were based on knowledge of the child's creative and psychological growth. In other words, the approach to art education taken at the People's Art Center corresponded to developmental theories of children such as those of Lowenfeld's developmental theory and put progressive educational theory into practice in programs for children, veterans, adults, parents, teachers and so on. After Packard recommended a more effective educational role for the Museum, the progressive educational theory was the basic notion utilized by the educational department of the Museum in offering varied educational activities for the diverse public. In looking at and teaching about modern art, progressive educational theory formed the theoretical basic in the educational department of the MoMA, and heightened the effectiveness of the educational activities for the diverse public in the history of the MoMA.

3.5. ART EDUCATION AT THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART DURING THE MID CENTURY

In the mid 1950s, the ideal of art education at the MoMA again shifted. The theory of progressive education, which was the prevailing ideal at the Department of Education at the Museum, was questioned and challenged by individuals who were involved in the educational
programs of the Museum. This paradigm shift occurred, because the external context, the social, cultural, and political environment of the mid-1950s, was quite different from that of the earlier period. For example there were changes in the artistic theories, the American sociopolitical environment, and the educational ideals.

During the mid-1950s, the artistic cultural landscape changed and New York became the center of the art world. Art became "the anxious object" (Rosenberg, 1973), with artists attempting to create three-dimensional art objects that were considered paintings. The two-dimensional element of the paintings in the modern art came to be geared toward three-dimensional objects. Abstract Expressionism, which had epitomized the power of action and experience, gave way to art movements, such as Pop Art, Minimalism, and Conceptualism.

Additionally, during this period, the United States and the Soviet Union became the dominant superpowers. The Soviet Union broke America's nuclear monopoly with the explosion of an atom bomb. Nationalist fervor reached epidemic proportions after the Russian space launch in 1957 (Morgan, 1990, p. 161). Nagging questions concerning American defensive ability were raised, which led inevitably to questions regarding the ability of the Nation to support its defensive capability. These events and questions served as the catalyst for curriculum reform in the United States. Thus, Congress passed the Cooperative Research Act in 1954 in order to improve education through basic research. The
idea of curriculum reform was discussed in the Woods Hole Conference of 1959. A number of groups, including the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Carnegie Corporation, and the National Science Foundation, participated in sponsoring this meeting on the various curriculum projects in science and mathematics (Efland, 1989, p. 237).

The MoMA experienced some changes in its definition of museum education, corresponding to these social and cultural shifts. The shift of direction in museum education could not be seen clearly because many educational programs at the MoMA over the course of the next 20 years continued to be held and maintained forms and styles similar to earlier programs. For instance, the annual Children's Art Carnival was offered continuously. Yet, in spite of these similar educational programs offered during this time, the progressive education prevailing in the Education Department of the Museum came into question among the members of the Committee on Art Education.

The Committee on Art Education (at first called the Committee on Art in American Education and Society) was founded in January 1943 by D'Amico to promote his educational goals of progressive education. Although D'Amico was one of the leading figures in the field of art education, he needed colleagues who not only shared his progressive views, but would also challenge him to think more seriously. He gathered the best thinkers around him and established an advisory
committee to foster better cooperation with the schools. His ideas for educational exchange evolved into the Committee on Art in American Education and Society in 1943 (Morgan, 1995, p. 160). This organization was formed with the desire to create a purer atmosphere for the discussion of the issues of art education. It defended creative art education in the face of economic and national interests that increasingly dominated the national educational agenda. Morgan cites a quotation from August L. Freundlich, a former member of the Committee:

> We cannot scrap art or the art teacher in the curriculum without scrapping America's creative power, the creative youth of our schools. But we shall be virtually doing that if we remain impassive to the onslaughts on art education, or if we neglect to make artwork during this time. (Morgan, 1995, p. 161)

From its inception, the Committee on Art Education defended the goals of progressive education, and, during the 1950s, practitioners of creative art education in the Committee on Art Education came to be associated with the MoMA. The MoMA strongly supported the new organization, the Committee on Art Education, because of the link between modern art and creative art education, and because of D'Amico's commitment to its programs and organization. According to D'Amico, the MoMA was the ideal institution to support the Committee on Art Education "as [their] aims and functions were similar. . . . [They] hope to follow its example by promoting creative art education in the United as effectively as the Museum has promoted modern art throughout the
Until 1950, the Committee on Art Education became the Museum's educational underground in defense of creative art education.

The purpose of the Committee on Art Education was stated in the Museum of Modern Art Bulletin of 1951:

"The purpose of the Committee is to bring together educators interested in formulating a basic philosophy of art education and promoting creative teaching on the highest possible level."

(The Museum of Modern Art, 1951, p. 17)

The Committee on Art Education supported various educational principles based on the belief that it could assure the survival of creative education by convincing an increasingly hostile world that educational practices were an investment toward peace (The Museum of Modern Art, 1951, p. 18). The Committee was opposed to teaching art either by imitation or by a laissez-faire method. They insisted upon the importance of well-guided creative education for children through conferences, publications, slide talks, and exhibitions. And they encouraged the exploration of new techniques while maintaining the basic values of aesthetic education.

Meanwhile, by 1955, the Progressive Education Association, the group espousing Dewey's ideas, had dissolved, and there was a new educational paradigm that focused on using models based on the structure of the disciplines and showing how they could be used in
curriculum reform. Efland describes this change of atmosphere in the following way:

The guardians of self-expression attempted to meet the crisis [of the paradigm shift in education] by arguing that it could foster creativity in children which would enable them to become creative adults in fields like science and mathematics . . . , an argument which never convinced anyone. (Efland, 1992, p. 2)

A similar shift occurred among the members of the Committee on Art Education at the MoMA. Throughout its two decades, the Committee on Art Education was structured according to D'Amico's progressive educational philosophy. However, by the mid-1950s, theoretical differences among the members of the Committee began to emerge. These differences eventually undermined the solidarity of the organization (Morgan, 1995, p. 167). D'Amico focused on aesthetic matters rather than on psychology, but other members did not. Other members proposed a new teaching method, the art historical approach to museum education. In 1955, discussions took place at a Committee on Art Education Seminar about, "Art History-Creative Teaching." Even though D'Amico was skeptical about this new tendency in teaching methods several discussions such as the "Relation between Art History and Culture" and "The Role of the Work of Art in Creative Teaching" were offered. To attempt rebirth in a new existence, the Committee on Art Education renamed itself as the National Committee on Art Education in 1957; however, it never regained the vitality of its formative years.
In the history of the MoMA, the mid 1950s signifies an abrupt end to the goals of progressive education, and the painful new beginnings of a new approach to museum education. Consequently, the MoMA veered away from the experiential methods of Victor D'Amico of the previous quarter century, having become convinced that making art was not the most significant learning process for the appreciation of art.

3.6. SUMMARY

Even though 'popular instruction' was mentioned in the Regent Charter of the MoMA, education was not fully considered during the founding period of the Museum. Why was the educational mission of the Museum not emphasized at that time? The purposes of the Museum from 1929 to 1933 were focused on inventing a history of modern art and making modern art into an accepted part of the discipline of art history. The educational mission seems to have been marginalized compared to the activities of collecting and exhibiting works of modern art because for the Museum exhibitions had educational value in that they would enhance a visitors’ appreciation of the arts.

However, with the Great Economic Depression, in order to survive, the Museum stepped up its educational efforts in order to obtain outsider funding. This effort helped redefine the Museum as an educational
institution. Diverse exhibitions related to the WPA art project and mural paintings were opened, and various educational activities created. In this era, when the New Deal Relief programs were at their height, Packard report considered how the Museum might more effectively contribute to its educational value. Packard’s recommendations on the educational role of the Museum gave some direction to the Advisory Committee and led them to hire an art educator, D’Amico. D’Amico, believing that education should be ‘central’ to the Museum’s mission, played an active role in developing educational projects at the Museum. By the late 1930s, progressive education had become the educational model in school systems and there was a demand that the Museum practice the philosophy of progressive education as an institution of higher learning. Consequently, diverse educational programs, such as circulating exhibitions, educational activities of children’s art in studio classes, and the partnership between schools and museum were developed.

Basically, the ideal of progressive education theory was similar in spirit to modernism and consequently became prevalent at the MoMA after the Museum had its permanent home in a new building. During World War II, educational activities and programs at the Museum during the 1940s and 1950s appeared in diverse forms. There was an art education program developed at the Veteran’s Art Center that used art as psychological therapy for veterans and disabled soldiers. After the War,
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CHAPTER 4

CULTURE AND DIVERSITY:

THE HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (HMSG), opened to the public in October 1974 as a part of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered America's national museum of modern and contemporary art. Situated on the Mall in Washington, D. C., the Museum and its collections have an especially high visibility in the United States as well as the world. The inception of the HMSG was subject to a long and strenuous congressional process that was complicated at various points by investigations and criticism from within and without the government. At the end of the 1960s, Congress began to investigate the feasibility of opening a Smithsonian's museum of contemporary art at the Washington, D. C. Mall. The bill to establish the Museum galloped through Congress in six months (Burnham, 1973, pp. 198-288). However, before the HMSG opened its doors in 1974, there were
numerous delays brought about by criticism regarding the quality of the collection, the donor of the collection, the site of the Museum, and so on. Hirshhorn's gift of contemporary art to the Smithsonian museum was criticized because the collection had been formed by one man. Sherman Lee expressed reservations about creating a Museum named after the donor, Hirshhorn. Lee maintained that use of the specific donor's name discouraged further gifts and contributions. Lee also advised that even though the collection seemed strong in the area of sculpture, the painting collection reflected so "personal a taste as to be unsuitable for a national museum" (Burnham, 1973, p. 285). Additionally, the HMSG's prospective location on the Mall was considered an abrupt disruption in the Mall's sprawling landscape. William Delano, a member of the Capital Planning Commission, was against any building plans for a contemporary art museum because he did not want a "trace of modernity to sully the Mall" (Hyams, 1979, p. 141). Later, the area of the garden was reduced to one-tenth its original size, and the garden was lowered to below street level so that it would not obstruct the open vista of the Mall.

Therefore, the Museum could not be opened until 1974, for almost ten years after negotiating, justifying, and constructing it. The transformation of Joseph Hirshhorn's private collection to a national museum of modern art within the Smithsonian Institution was directly influenced by the political and bureaucratic maneuvering of some
powerful individuals at the Institution and in the federal government.

On the opening of the Museum on October 1, 1974, Harold Rosenberg declared that the HMSG "marked a new phase in the public status of modern art in the United States" (Rosenberg, 1974, p. 156). The Hirshhorn Collection was a living assemblage of modern art, containing more than 1,500 pieces of sculpture and over 4,000 paintings and drawings, all valued in excess of $25,000,000.\footnote{According to Joseph H. Hirshhorn and documentation from Smithsonian Archives, Hirshhorn's donation of paintings and sculptures numbers sixty-five hundred. However, the annual reports of the Smithsonian Institution of 1975...} During this same period, the Museum of Modern Art in New York (MoMA) had a collection of only three thousand artworks. The Hirshhorn Collection was a unique recapitulation of the history of sculpture and of twentieth-century American painting. In addition, it contained an important representation of modern European paintings of the past two decades. The collection is thoroughly international in scope. Hilton Kramer, an art critic, has observed that HMSG's collection turned out to constitute "a substantial treasury of sculptural achievement" that runs from the nineteenth century to the present (Russell, 1981, pp. A1, A17).

However, unlike that of the MoMA, the history of the educational role of the HMSG in the twentieth century has yet to receive serious scholarly attention. Since the HMSG has a shorter history than the...
MoMA, it is very rare to find published literature on its history, especially literature concerning how the meaning of education at the Museum has been constructed according to historical, social, and cultural conditions. Almost no document has adequately and accurately documented the path of the ‘educational mission’ of the Museum from its inception to the present.

The only primary records on the educational missions and practices of the HMSG were in the Smithsonian Institution Archives. Beyond these primary sources, the annual report of the Smithsonian Institution contains some information on educational practices of the HMSG. In spite of these difficulties, this chapter attempts to discuss the educational mission and practices of the HMSG in relation to the history of the Smithsonian Institution. The HMSG came into being as a national art museum for modern and contemporary art within the context of the long history of the Smithsonian Institution. In other words, the notion of a ‘national museum’ was accepted by the Smithsonian Institution, as the Institution conceived the importance of the educational role to the general public.

First of all, Chapter 4 discusses the historical background of the founding of the HMSG: how the Museum was constructed and records 6,000 works of art from Hirshhorn (Smithsonian Institution, 1975, p. 184; Lerner, 1981).
established by examining administrational processes, the characteristics of the collection, and the Museum’s relationship to the Smithsonian Institution.

Second, the advent of new funding sources in the 1970s will be discussed in relation to political, social, and cultural conditions of the late 1960s and 1970s. Rapid social upheaval during the late 1960s—growth of the economy, the baby boom, expansion of the middle classes, and the civil rights movement—created a demand that the museum serve minority groups in the community, and finally, in 1965, the federal government became a permanent patron of the arts through the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Third, we will examine the HMSG’s educational programs and activities, especially the docent program, printed and audio-visual materials, the auditorium programs, outreach programs, teacher training workshops, and other programs. The educational practices of the HMSG targeted the diverse public of the community. These educational efforts and programs of the HMSG reflected the social and cultural shift of the 1970s and were closely related to the shifts in funding sources and the ideal of general education of the time.

Finally, this chapter will discuss the shift in atmosphere of the art field after the 1970s, when the HMSG began to be within the Smithsonian context, in order to understand how the Museum exhibition
reflects the postmodern movement. Moreover, this investigation of the
exhibition of the HMSG will show how the Museum approached the
strategy to facilitate communication between the artworks and the
audiences.

4.2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF
THE HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

The HMSG has continuously fulfilled its mission in the United
States government's cultural spotlight as 'the Smithsonian's Museum of
Modern and Contemporary Art.' Its Statement of Purpose, articulated in
the Museum's Collections Management Policy, directs the Hirshhorn to

encourage and develop a greater understanding and
appreciation of modern art, primarily North American and
European paintings and sculpture created between ca. 1830
and the present through exhibitions and study . . . . As a
constituent bureau of the Smithsonian Institution . . . . it
shares in the Institution's fundamental purpose of increasing
and diffusing knowledge among men. (Rabinovitz, 1996, pp. 2-3)

One thing that seems to be fairly special about the HMSG is that it
sought constructive ways to enter into a relationship with the parent
institutions, the Smithsonian Institution. Founded after Englishman
James Smithson left an unexpected trust to the government of the United
States in 1829, the Smithsonian Institution acts as a branch of the
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federal government. Thus, the Smithsonian Institution, composed of sixteen museums plus the National Zoo, is tied to the U. S. federal government for support. The Hirshhorn Museum is one of the sixteen museums, and one of the eight art museums, of the Smithsonian Institution. As one of the government museums in the Smithsonian Institution, the HMSG was supported by public funds. The HMSG must go to the Congress for its budget and it must be prepared to justify the way it has spent tax dollars in the past (Grove, 1972, Nov. 8, p. 6). Furthermore, the Museum's management was also subject to the management of the Smithsonian Institution. Congress allots three senators and three House members to the Smithsonian's Board of Regents, and the Executive and Judicial branches are represented by the Vice President and Chief Justice of the United States. Congress can also regulate most Smithsonian activities by monitoring its federal appropriations and by appointing the citizen members of the Smithsonian's Board. Additionally, the President appoints members to various Smithsonian commissions and the boards of trustee (Smithsonian Institution, 1974, 1975).

2 There are three types of museums in the United States: first, those supported entirely by private funds, for instance, MoMA; second, those supported partly with private and partly with public funds, for instance, the Metropolitan Museum; and third, those supported almost entirely by public funds, such as the museums in the Smithsonian Institution (Burnham, 1973, p. 197).
In the capital of the United States, Washington, D. C., there was a need for a national museum of modern and contemporary art which would be on equal footing with other major modern art collections in other cities, especially, in New York. Until the establishment of the HMSG, there were no museums in Washington, D. C., which housed modern and contemporary art collections. In the historical context, the first art museum in Washington, D. C. was the ‘National Collection of Fine Arts.’ It was established in 1848 as a National Gallery of Art. Having no patron to care for it, the museum declined to an unhealthy state until, Andrew Mellon gave his art collection to the Nation in 1937. The Mellon Collection was so fine that Congress crowned it with the name ‘National Gallery of Art.’ Then, Congress saddled the former National Gallery with the improbable title ‘National Collection of Fine Arts’ and directed it to “foster a growing appreciation of art” (Burnham, 1973, p. 201). Subsequently, in Washington, D. C., the ‘Corcoran Gallery of Art’ was established in 1859, which became known for its support of local artists. The ‘Washington Gallery of Modern Art’ was founded in 1962 and closed several years later, when its collection was sold. In 1968, the ‘National Gallery of Art’ recommended a design for a new

3 Before establishing the Hirshhorn Museum, during the late 1920s and 1930s, large modern art museums were founded in New York and other areas: New York’s Museum of Modern Art was founded in 1929, the Whitney Museum of
building, the East Wing, in order to house modern art (Rabinovitz, 1996). Even though the National Gallery of Art was in existence in Washington, D. C., Andrew Mellon's art collection in the National Gallery of Art housed Old Masters' paintings, excluding artworks of all living artists in the United States.

Since 1964, under the innovative leadership of Secretary S. Dillon Ripley, a national contemporary art museum within the Smithsonian Institution began to be considered (Figure 26). In 1965, Ripley wrote Joseph H. Hirshhorn a letter outlining the possibility of creating an independent Hirshhorn Museum on the highly visible national Mall to be maintained by the Smithsonian through federal funds. Ripley promised that the Smithsonian would assure the upkeep, care, and security of Hirshhorn's collection. Hirshhorn's collection would be assured a high attendance due to its location on the Mall, and Ripley guaranteed that

---

American Art in 1923, Boston's Museum of Modern Art in 1936, the Guggenheim Museum in 1939, and so on.

4 S. Dillon Ripley, biologist, ecologist, and authority on the birds of the Far East, emphasized on the Institution's responsibilities and participation which have extended across a broad spectrum—including education, research public service, community activities, conservation, and the performing as well as visual arts. Rigorous emphasis had been place on scholarship and research within Secretary Ripley's concept of the Smithsonian as a kind of open university in the manner of the earlier museums of classical times, an approach that also accords with the Institution's traditions from its earliest days. At the same time, his determination that museum should serve a side public in imaginative ways had provided exhibit techniques and exhibitions (The Smithsonian Today, p. 9).
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his collection would be protected against any change or interference. Ripley continued correspondence with Hirshhorn, sending him letters of encouragement for offering his collection. Later, Ripley contacted Sam Harris to invite Harris and Hirshhorn to Washington, D. C. to discuss this offer that would bring the Hirshhorn collection to the nation's capital permanently. Harris presented Hirshhorn's stipulations. The museum built to house the collection should be named after Hirshhorn. Additionally, the museum should be located on the Mall in company with the Smithsonian's Arts and Industries building, the National Museum of American History, National Museum of Natural History, and the National Gallery. All these were institutions that the federal government had given prominence to in the hope that they would be at the forefront of American national imagery. Hirshhorn hoped that the proposed Hirshhorn Museum would sit in the midst of these national monuments and treasures. In 1965, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian agreed to let Ripley submit legislation to designate a Mall location and authorized plans for construction (Hyams, 1979, pp. 142-143).

By an agreement signed on May, 17 1966, the Hirshhorn Museum was made the permanent home of the art collection of Joseph Hirshhorn and the Joseph Hirshhorn Foundation, donated to the Smithsonian Institution for the benefit of the people of the United States [Appendix F]. President Lyndon B. Johnson formally accepted the Hirshhorn's
Collection on behalf of the American people in a ceremony in the White House rose garden (Burnham, 1973, p. 287). An Act of November 7, 1966, entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden," authorized the construction of the Museum and designated the Mall site (Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, p. 2). A one-time cost of $1,499,000 was required for furnishing and equipping the building. An additional $13,000 was sought for necessary pay for current positions.

With funds appropriated in fiscal year 1968, an architect was retained to prepare plans and specifications, and with funds appropriated in fiscal year 1969, construction started (Figure 27). Construction was completed in the spring of 1971, at which time the Hirshhorn Collection was moved from New York to Washington. When completed, the Museum would conduct a full program of exhibitions, study, educational activities, research, and publications related to modern art, thereby using this valuable collection for maximum public benefit (Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, p. 1). Therefore, Public Law 89-788 [Appendix G], approved by the President on November 7, 1966, provides for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, to be located on the Washington Mall between Seventh and Ninth Streets, Madison Drive and Independence Avenue for one of the great focal points of tourist interest.
4.2.1. The Hirshhorn Museum and the Smithsonian Institution

As a 'national art museum for modern and contemporary art,' the Hirshhorn Museum has been a constituent bureau of the Smithsonian Institution. The HMSG shares the fundamental purpose of the Smithsonian Institution to "increase and diffuse knowledge among men," which was formulated by James Smithson around the nineteenth century. To achieve the purposes of increasing and diffusing knowledge, the HMSG preserves, studies, exhibits, and interprets works of art. Additionally, the HMSG lends works of art, borrows works of art, and maintains related programs of lectures, symposia, research, and publications. It is necessary to trace the history of the Smithsonian Institution in order to understand how and why the conception of the national museum came into being in the Smithsonian context. The idea that the Smithsonian Institution should have an educational mission was the stepping stone for the birth of national museums in the Smithsonian context.

As we have already mentioned, the Smithsonian owes its origins to James Smithson, a wealthy English scientist who never visited the United States. Before Smithson died in 1829, he had willed his personal fortune of more than half a million dollars to the United States of
America, “to found in Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men” (Alexander, 1983, p. 284). Receipt of the bequest in the United States in 1838 precipitated a lengthy debate in Congress on whether the nation should or indeed legally could accept the funds and the accompanying trust. Congress ultimately determined, in 1846, that the federal government did not have authority to administer such a trust directly. Consequently, it created by enactment a discrete corporate entity, “The Establishment,” to undertake the charge of the Smithson’s will. This body, in effect constituting the Smithsonian Institution, consists of the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Chief Justice, and heads of the executive departments.

The Board of Regents was created to govern the Institution thus established. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 2, the Smithsonian’s Board of Regents was composed of the Vice President and Chief Justice of the U. S., three members of the Senate, three members of the House of Representatives, and six citizen members. The Vice President and Chief Justice were named both to the Establishment and the Board of Regents. Of the citizen members, it was stipulated that two must be residents of the District of Columbia and no two of the remaining four may be from the same state. The position of Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution also was established at the outset, the incumbent also serving as
Based on his interpretation of the incorporation act of 1847, the first Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Joseph Henry (Figure 28), emphasized that the Smithsonian should give its main attention to the ‘increase’ of knowledge, to enlarging the bounds of human thought by original research, rather than diffusion of knowledge. His central plan was to support ‘professional science’ that made the Institution a center of scientific research. Unfortunately, establishing a ‘museum’ was not a part of Henry’s ‘research center’ concept of the Smithsonian.

With the passage of the act establishing the Smithsonian, Congress specially ordered that a museum, library, gallery of art, and lecture room be part of the institution, earmarked half the institution’s income for these purposes, and gave it custody of the government’s collection of curiosities. Yet, because Henry’s idea of the Smithsonian was different from the Congress’s, he quite simply ignored the museum, library, gallery of art, and lecture hall mandated by Congress. Instead, he envisaged a small office that would expend the majority of its income in promoting original research by professional scientists and publishing the results.

---

5 Between 1846 and 1878, Joseph Henry served as the Institution’s first Secretary and it was under his guidance that the Smithsonian’s course was set for the widespread dissemination of knowledge dictated by the Smithson mandate. A famed physical scientist, a Princeton University professor, and an inventor of remarkable genius, Henry fostered the extensive publication program of scientific findings that remains of paramount importance today, and
(Alexander, 1983). Henry believed that the Smithsonian Institution should support the quest for new facts and new discoveries in science. For him, the purpose of “the diffusion of knowledge” would be a secondary function of the Smithsonian (Orosz, 1990).

Henry's view of the Smithsonian was not only in conflict with that of Congress, but also with the views of the assistant secretaries, Charles Coffin Jewett (Figure 29) and Spencer Fullerton Baird (Figure 30). The story of Henry's long struggle against a national museum at the Smithsonian has been officially recorded in the Smithsonian history (Smithsonian Institution, 1965; Conaway, 1995). The Smithsonian endowment yielded only approximately forty thousand dollars per year, and Secretary Henry wanted to keep as much of that sum as possible for the advancement of science. In contrast, Charles Coffin Jewett and Spencer Baird held to a strict interpretation of the act, which in establishing the Smithsonian provided that one-half of its income be reserved for a library, gallery of art, lectures, and a museum.

---

established the basic organization that enabled the Smithsonian to develop its own direction during the mid-nineteenth century (The Smithsonian Today, p. 6). Spencer Fullerton Baird, a distinguished naturalist, joined the Smithsonian as Assistant Secretary in 1850. He succeeded Joseph Henry as Secretary in 1878, serving until his own death in 1887. For more than thirty years he exerted significant influence on the Institution's growth. Taking advantage of the many exploratory expeditions then taking place, Baird called upon participants to contribute to the Smithsonian's collections and was thus instrumental in the development of the museums of the Smithsonian (The Smithsonian Today, p. 6).
These different positions on the Smithsonian endowment eventually created friction between Henry and Jewett. In this situation, Baird looked upon Henry as a mentor; however, he was strongly drawn to Jewett’s position and admired him for building a comprehensive national museum at the Smithsonian. Jewett opposed Henry openly, while Baird opposed Henry indirectly. In 1853, in *Putman’s Magazine*, Edward Bissell Hunt, one of Baird’s friends, wrote an article critical of the secretary, and closed it with a broad hint that Henry was about to resign. Henry immediately made a counterattack, calling both Baird and Jewett. Baird apologized, but Jewett orchestrated the writing of a series of letters critical of Henry’s policies to various newspapers. Finally, in the midst of this serious feud, Jewett was dismissed. Theoretically, now, for Henry, it was the time to get rid of Baird. However, this was not possible officially, because Baird had quietly rejoined Henry’s camp earlier. Baird’s good friend, Thomas Mayo Brewer, authored an article that strongly supported Henry’s position over that of Jewett. This essay atoned for Hunt’s slurs in the earlier article, and marked Baird’s return to Henry’s camp. Henry could not eliminate Baird and his plan for the museum officially without a nasty fight. Now, Baird and Henry agreed to allow the sustained growth of the museum, and the Smithsonian changed from a research institution with a small cabinet to a research-oriented museum (Orosz, 1990, pp. 202-205) (Figure 31).
However, the first step toward establishing a National Museum was not taken until 1858, when the 'National Cabinet of Curiosities' at the Patent Office (Figure 32) was shifted to the Smithsonian's custody (Smithsonian Institution, 1965). The 'National Cabinet of Curiosities' consisted of a miscellaneous collection of art, historical, and scientific materials accumulated since 1840 by the National Institute for the Advancement of Science, and it included the natural science and ethnographic collections from the Wilkes Exploring Expeditions to the Pacific and Antarctic (Alexander, 1983, p. 285).

During the 1840s and 1850s, the collection at the Patent Office had been growing at an enormous rate, but the federal government had no means to preserve, utilize, or exhibit these objects. Henry was increasingly pressed to accept this collection, and, eventually, reluctantly accepted it. As early as 1853, therefore, Henry offered to take temporary charge of certain pieces of the army collection. By 1857, the commissioner of Patents demanded that the space in his building be cleared to allow Henry to exhibit patent models. Henry reluctantly accepted this idea, and this government collection came to be part of the collection of the National Museum. Henry allowed Baird, the assistant secretary, to build a study collection, not a general exhibition. However, the collections of the Patent Office had long been open to the public, and these collections could hardly be closed now because they were at the
Smithsonian. Because of this pressure, Henry allowed Baird to open this collection to the public (Orosz, 1990, pp. 206-208).

Great convulsion shook the Smithsonian between 1850 and 1865, which fundamentally led Henry to accept the principle of the importance of popular education as the basis for the future operation of the Smithsonian. This biggest upset arrived with the 'Civil War,' which turned Washington, D. C. into an armed camp from 1861 to 1865. Many civilians, soldiers, and sailors passed through the nation’s capital during those years. The National Museum needed to provide enjoyable, educational, and moral things for these men to do. Baird happily set to work to make the museum more enjoyable and more educational. By observing the crowds streaming through the museum, Henry began to grasp the full educational potential of museums. Thus, he came to accept the 'educational function' of the Institution and the purpose of 'diffusing knowledge,' rather than increasing knowledge (Smithsonian Institution, 1965).

As seen in the history of the Smithsonian Institution, by 1870, the feud with Jewett, the absorption of the government collections, and the Civil War had caused a complete change in the approach to the educational mission of the Smithsonian Institution. At first, Henry had grudgingly accepted a very small study cabinet at the Smithsonian. Then, after his deal with Baird, he approved the concept of a museum at
the Smithsonian, but only for the purpose of research. By 1858, after accepting the government collections, Henry realized that some provision for popular education must be made in the National Museum. Finally, during the Civil War, which brought enormous crowds to the museum, he was convinced that 'popular education' was nearly as important as original research at the National Museum.

In brief, since its establishment, the Smithsonian Institution had maintained original research as the keystone of its efforts to "increase knowledge." Scholarly research at the Smithsonian was confined to the sciences. The characteristics of this activity include works of the highest quality, primarily basic and fundamental research. To insure that the results of this research were widely 'disseminated' and put to practical applications as rapidly as possible, increasing attention was paid to strengthening Institutional ties with universities, as well as with State and Federal agencies (Smithsonian Institution, Fiscal Year 1976, Estimates of Appropriations, 1974, June 13, p. ii). The following written document was discovered in the Smithsonian Institution Archives, detailing the educational goals of the Smithsonian Institution:

Goals: Serve the public through a variety of programs that:

1. encourage the pursuit of knowledge-foster the appreciation of (if possible, involvement with) the tools of the scholar (scientist, art historian, etc.), the role of observation, of questioning, of research
- "Awaken interest" (arousal of curiosity) in man's past, present and future, his creativity and inventiveness, his role in and understanding of the universe (not to mention moon-rocks)

- inform about the collections, mission and operation (research and conservation, for example) of SI itself

- inculcate the skills or provide opportunities for the public to learn directly from the collections

And in establishing these programs (scope & methods)

- SI education strives for excellence

- SI education directly and indirectly serves a national audience

- SI serves as a model, an exemplar, and laboratory for learning (through installations, publications, programs, activities, research) designing paradigms emulated elsewhere

- SI is a learning and teaching institution (learning from its teaching, teaching directly from its learning experiences)

- SI education nurtures its staff as well as serving the public directly and the community of teachers and scholars

2. SI education functions on multiple levels and serves a variety of different, diverse, and directed audiences, offering in-depth and intensive experiences as well as cursory glosses designed for large general audiences. (Educational Goals for Smithsonian, pp. 1-2)

This history of the Smithsonian Institution shows how the notion of popular education was gradually considered and accepted at the Institution. The sixteen museums including the HMSG in the Smithsonian complex came into being as a result of a resolution of
disagreement and acceptance of the educational mission as the Institution evolved. The Smithsonian Institution, a great complex of museums and art galleries, was an independent establishment devoted to public education, basic research, and national service in the arts, sciences, and history, with major facilities in Washington, around the country, and overseas (The Smithsonian Today, p. 1). The 1975 Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution recorded that when the HMSG opened to the public, there was enthusiastic public response. When the Museum opened to the public in 1974, it was regarded as an educational institution that drew approximately one million visitors. The Annual Report also gave us information about the diverse educational programs for the public from 1974 to early 1975: for instance, a thrice weekly film program, a monthly Sunday lecture series, a general lecture series, a guide program by docents, a series of concerts of contemporary music, and two intern programs (Smithsonian Institution, 1975, pp. 181-184).

4.2.2. A Collector’s Museum: Joseph H. Hirshhorn

Joseph H. Hirshhorn was born in 1899 in the small town of Mitau, Latvia, and he and his family came to the United States in 1905 as immigrants. Hirshhorn and his family sensed the devastation and
violence of the imminent, anti-Semitic pogrom in Eastern Europe and sought a better life. Although they settled in Brooklyn, this Jewish family was quite poor, living in tenements.\(^7\) Since Hirshhorn's father had died a year after he was born, his mother worked in a sweat shop to earn a living six days a week, in Brooklyn, twelve hours a day, and as a cook on Saturday nights to support her children (Rabinovitz, 1996, p. 4). Of his youth, Hirshhorn remembered that “poverty has a bitter taste,” and “we ate garbage” (Burnham, 1973, p. 286). Hirshhorn overcame the disadvantages of his youth and by the 1960s had made many millions in uranium mining and the stock market.

His collecting activities started however, well before the 1960s. Already in the 1930s Hirshhorn had started collecting works of art. Hirshhorn, never formally educated in art history, began to collect modern European painting and sculptures as well as contemporary American (Hyams, 1979). With the help of his cousin Isac Friendlander,

\(^7\) More than 73 percent of Jewish immigrants to the United States between 1880 and 1920 were Eastern European Jews, particularly the fifteen western provinces of European Russia, and the ten provinces of Russian-held Poland. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, innumerable ordinary Jews were faced with impoverishment and persecution and many of these made the decision to leave Eastern Europe. They did not merely flee, but aspired to accomplish something with strength born of cultural renewal. The United States was the very land of opportunity—and fortunately in a period of industrial expansion and economic growth—provided the context for fulfilling their dream. Of the twenty-three million immigrants to the United States between 1880 and 1920, seventeen million came through the port of New York. Particularly, almost all of the eastern European Jewish immigrants arriving
he visited the Whitney Museum, the Downtown Gallery, and other nearby galleries, and purchased contemporary art. Ninety percent of what Hirshhorn collected was created during his lifetime (Lerner, 1981, p. 133).

The collection of artworks acquired by Hirshhorn contrasted with the traditional art that the federal government generally tended to support and collect. 'Contemporary art,' which was avant-garde art at that time, was less widely accepted than Old Masters’ paintings, but it appealed to Hirshhorn. As an uneducated, self-made man and Jewish immigrant, Hirshhorn was not associated with the art aristocracy and contemporary art was the only style of art collecting open to him. In addition, at this time during and immediately after the Great Depression, the art market was severely depressed, and many collectors were interested in contemporary living American artists’ works because they could be acquired more cheaply than that of the Old Masters’ (Rabinovitz, 1996). Hirshhorn was sympathetic toward the many poor, hungry artists whose works were displayed in galleries, and he enjoyed buying their works, which were often inexpensive (Lerner, 1981). Abram Lerner (1981) describes Hirshhorn’s unique style of collecting:

---

after 1870 initially found their way to the Lower East Side of Manhattan (Sorin, 1992).
He was a well-known collector, famous for his flash visits to galleries and studios from which he almost never returned empty-handed. He acquired on a large scale and often purchased several works in a single sweep. . . . Every article dealing with Hirshhorn refers to this “wholesale” buying. . . . He was just more enterprising than most, had a larger appetite and was by nature very fast in everything he did. (p. 133)

Hirshhorn’s dealers all agreed that he had terrific taste in collecting artworks. Hirshhorn bought paintings and sculptures almost every day. If he could not decide which of an artist’s paintings he liked, he bought them all, sweeping into a gallery, picking up six or eight paintings in the course of thirty minutes, and returning to his meetings of the board (Burnham, 1973, p. 285).

Hirshhorn’s somewhat adventurous choices have challenged traditional studies on art and expanded the study of marginally known artists. His collection was not driven by fashionable names in art. Nor was he guided by principle or consistent personal taste. Hirshhorn collected the works of contemporary art because he liked them, and thus he was free to discover his own tastes and expand his preferences. He bought the artworks from feeling, not academic knowledge or personal calculation. In this sense, Hirshhorn rebelled against the practices of many traditional collectors, who bought only what history, tradition, and high society dictated.
In the American Contemporary Artists Gallery\textsuperscript{8} in New York, Hirshhorn developed long-lasting friendships with artists and it was there that he met Lerner, the gallery's Associate Director. Lerner became a curator of Hirshhorn's collection in 1957 and advisor to Hirshhorn in the collection of artworks. Following Lerner's advice, Hirshhorn purchased numerous works by well-known artists such as Henry Moore, Philip Evergood, Willem de Kooning, Milton Avery, Larry Rivers, Arshile Gorky, and Thomas Eakins. Hirshhorn also collected 'sculptures' by Rodin, Picasso, Matisse, Calder, Giacometti, David Smith, and Moore, among others.

However, Hirshhorn did not provide a perfect collection of modern masterworks because some historically important artworks were omitted, even though the museum's collection contains a number of modern masterworks. For example, there are no great Cubist paintings, 'drip paintings' by Pollock, nor any great paintings by Matisse in the collection. In spite of this weakness, the museum's collection is valuable because of the unexpected works by lesser-known artists and contemporary American artists, including Thomas Eakins, Willem de Kooning, Raphael

\textsuperscript{8} The American Contemporary Artists' (ACA) Gallery, founded in 1932, was dedicated to the pioneering effort of sponsoring ideologically and socially conscious art in the context of American art. Most exhibitions of the American Artists' Congress, an organization of left-wing, politically engaged artists who fought artistic repression and called for permanent governmental support of American artists, were held at the ACA Gallery (Lerner, 1981, p. 8).
Soyer, and Larry Rivers. The collections of Clifford Still, Willem de Kooning, Kenneth Noland, and Morris Louis are especially remarkable (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, 1996).

Preceding and during Hirshhorn’s time of collecting artworks, many collectors began to acquire types of artworks representing the contemporary and living art in the United States, similar to those collected by Hirshhorn. During the first decades of the twentieth century, modern arts in the United States lacked the long-established tradition of Continental patronage. However, in the years from 1913 to the 1930s, an active market for modern art which was regarded as a marginalized area of collecting developed in New York City, where thirty progressive galleries and organizations catered to small clientele (John Quinn, Collector, p. 1). As we have discussed in Chapter 3, three founders of the Museum of Modern Art, Lillie P. Bliss, Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan, and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, and John Quinn collected works

9 Quinn (1870-1924) was a well-established Wall Street lawyer whose success had been largely self-made, active in New York and in the national Democratic Party politics. He was the primary beneficiary of the ‘International Exhibition of Modern Art,’ better known as ‘The Armory Show,’ in New York in 1913. In his capacity as attorney for the organization of ‘The Armory Show,’ he argued successfully for the repeal of tariff regulations on contemporary art. He was the exhibition’s largest single lender and patron, as well as a leader in the aesthetic revolution of avant-garde art in the early twentieth century. In 1921, he persuaded the Metropolitan Museum of Art to present its first modern art exhibition (The Rockefeller Foundation, 1977, November 4, p. 2). He was one of the brace minority to begin collecting modern art on a grand scale. In the Proud Possessors, Aline B. Saarinen wrote: “By the time he died in 1924, at the age of fifty-five, John Quinn had become the twentieth century’s most important
of contemporary art in art markets.

Unlike his predecessors and contemporaries, Hirshhorn holds a particular place in the world of art collecting. His collection was not donated to private, local, or regional institutions, but was incorporated into the Smithsonian Institution and became synonymous with the national art museum of contemporary art in the United States. Furthermore, Hirshhorn was quite different from the typical philanthropists of his time. Unlike most other collectors, he did not suggest any restriction regarding his collection. He modestly declared that anything in the collection could be sold or exchanged at the Board of Trustees' discretion, as long as the proceeds were used to purchase more modern and contemporary artworks (Russell, 1981, pp. A1, A17). Therefore, the Hirshhorn staff sought to compensate for the collection's weaknesses by acquiring contemporary artworks that build on its patron of living literature and art" (Edelstein, p. 1). At his death in 1924, Quinn left a collection of 2,500 objects of painting, sculpture, graphics, African and Oriental art which would have formed the nucleus of a major museum of modern art, had these remarkable works not been displayed by a private sale and public auction between 1924 and 1927 (John Quinn, Collector, p. 3). Quinn's collection for the avant-garde in Europe and America not only shows his individual taste, but also proves him to be one of the most important American collectors of the first quarter of the twentieth century. Quinn's significance did not only lie in his role as patron and collector of modern art, but also in the origins of patronage for the vanguard culture of the early twentieth century in the United States.
strengths. It was the absence of restrictions on Hirshhorn’s collection that made him truly unique.

However, many expressed concern and criticized the quality of the collection and the name of the Hirshhorn Museum. Among the negative reactions to the HMSG, Sherman E. Lees’ criticism was the most poignant. Lee, Director of the Cleveland Museum of Art from 1958 to 1983, criticized the quality of Hirshhorn’s collection and objected to the acceptance of the Hirshhorn gift. Lee stated that acceptance of the project “ill accords with the current standards of wisdom and professional knowledge in the arts” (Russell, 1981, pp. A1, A17). After Lee, some others also spoke out against the collection and the idea of the Museum. For example, Aline Saarinen complained that “[Hirshhorn’s] best things are splendid and unsurpassed; some of the rest is mediocre” (Saarinen, 1958, p. 280). Like Lee, she questioned the quality of Hirshhorn’s collection. In addition, some members of Congress questioned the propriety of allowing a national museum to be named after an individual who was not a public figure.

Among the negative criticisms surrounding the collection of the HMSG, the comments of Roger L. Stevens indicate that Hirshhorn did not receive equal treatment compared to other Smithsonian donors who came from a privileged Anglo-Saxon Christian background:
I would like to ask why Mr. Hirshhorn, a self-made man who has shown great genius in assembling a magnificent sculpture collection, should not have a museum named after him, just as well as a Mr. Freer or Mr. Smithson? I am surprised that Mr. Anderson would resort to this kind of snobbery. (Rabinovitz, 1996, p. 63)

This statement suggests that Hirshhorn was dealt with unjustly, even though his social class and religion were not mentioned. As a Jewish immigrant, Hirshhorn was a minority in American society, who made a great fortune very rapidly in the United States. Perhaps the name Hirshhorn was too Jewish-sounding to be the name of a national museum in the Smithsonian Institution. For Hirshhorn, this may have been a way of doing a long-lasting service on behalf of all minority immigrants, especially for the thousands of Jews who were excluded from many elegant and elite circles. Hirshhorn said of his collection:

It doesn't belong to one man. It's gotten very big. It belongs to the people. . . . Well, a lot of people wanted it. But I could not have done what I did in any other country. What I did I accomplished in the United States. It belongs here . . . . I am an American. I was born in Latvia. My mother brought her ten children to this country and set to work in a pocketbook factory . . . the things I did in my life can only be done here. (Burnham, 1973, pp. 287-288)

This criticism seemed to affect Hirshhorn. Perhaps he kept this criticism in mind, and withdrew from the HMSG after it opened. In fact, he did not serve on its Board until 1977, and, even then, retired before completing his term. Some remember that Hirshhorn rarely visited the
Museum except for a reception and other standard activities (Rabinovitz, 1996). This was really in contrast to the circumstances of the MoMA. The donors of the MoMA collection were actively involved in the politics or decision-making of the museum’s structure. Hirshhorn may have thought that people needed some time to mentally separate the idea of the national art museum of modern and contemporary art from their attitudes toward the Jewish immigrant, Joseph Hirshhorn.\textsuperscript{10}

4.3. CONTEXTS AND THE HMSG

When the HMSG was preparing for its opening for approximately ten years during the late 1960s and early 1970s, and finally opened it door to the public, the United States encountered unprecedented social upheaval. The first contributor to social upheaval in the United States was rapid economic growth. One important cause of the economic growth was the growth of population. Around the 1950s, the birth rate climbed until it reached a high of 25.2 births per 1000 population in

---

\textsuperscript{10} Hirshhorn belonged to various Jewish organizations such as the American Israel Cultural Foundation, American Jewish Congress, and American Jewish Committee. He was a member of an orthodox temple in Washington, D.C., and his favorite author was the Jewish novelist Isaac Bashevis Singer. He loved Jewish foods, and he visited and made financial contributions to the country of Israel (Rabinovitz, 1996, pp. 63-64).
1956-57. At the same time the death rate fell, owing to the development of medicine, and life expectancy at birth increased. Furthermore, among the middle-income classes, family size increased. The baby boom and the longer life expectancy of Americans were sources of prosperity; these developments meant a rising demand for housing, food, manufactured goods, and services. Part of the reason for increase in the size of families during the 1950s was the postponement of children because of the war, and part was the prosperity that encouraged parents to enlarge their families. In this sense, the new prosperity perpetuated itself. Additionally, the large corporations of this time were a cause of the nation's economic growth. One requirement for economic growth was a constant flow of new products and techniques, which came primarily from scientific and technological research. Corporations with the facilities and large amounts of capital and income necessary for research were one of the causes of economic growth of the United States during these years (Degler, 1975, pp. 166-167).

The rapid economic growth which occurred during the late 1960s and early 1970s affected the greatly expanding middle classes in the American social structure. As incomes increased, greater numbers of Americans attained middle-class status. The middle class is characterized by pursuit of college education and more time for leisure and hobbies. Among the middle class Americans, growing interest in the
arts occurred along with the increase in their leisure time. The new mass audience for the arts during this time differed from earlier patrons of the arts in the 1920s and 1930s. If the early patrons were extremely rich, the new mass audiences were more youthful and generally of middle class status.

Another characteristic of social upheaval during the late 1960s and early 1970s was social unrest that took the form of the civil rights movement. The struggle for civil rights—intensified by the mass migration of Blacks from the rural South to Northern cities—played a particular role in the turbulence of this time. Southern Blacks were especially vulnerable to the unemployment that resulted from agricultural modernization after World War II. They moved en masse to Northern cities in search of better economic opportunities. In 1940, only half of all blacks lived in urban areas; the figure reached 62 percent in 1950, 73 percent in 1960, and 80 percent in 1965 (Piven & Cloward, 1971, p. 214).

As the Blacks migrated to the urban areas, a resultant massive unemployment occurred and along with resistance to the patterns of legal segregation in the South and de facto segregation in the North eventually led to civic unrest during the late 1960s. A host of social disorders resulted from rising rates of gang delinquency and other forms of juvenile crime such as school vandalism. Drug addiction, armed
robbery and burglary also became more frequent. Additionally, the mass migration of Blacks to Northern cities threatened the political status quo of urban areas. Since by the 1960s, Blacks accounted for 10 percent of the population of the most populous Northern states, black voting power in national elections grew steadily (Piven & Cloward, 1971, pp. 251-252).

Traditionally, the Democratic party had received the support of the white South and reciprocated by containing liberalizing, reformist tendencies with regard to racial matters. Blacks who lived in Northern cities, had also traditionally supported the Democratic party but their influence on party affairs was limited. In the 1960s the Democratic party began to make concessions to the increasing members of black voters, which undercut the traditional support of the white South. As Southern support waned among white voters, the Black vote became important to the Democratic party in its effort to win support at the polls (Rawlins, 1981, pp. 222-223).

Therefore, in the late 1960s, Blacks and other low income groups received a number of concessions from the government. However, such change were not motivated by a purely humanitarian concern for the recipients, but by a desire to maintain social control. The government had not expanded the federal relief rolls or inaugurated anti-poverty programs, when Blacks experienced economic distress as the result of the occupational dislocation of the 1960s. Rather, when civil uprising
and political disaffection on the part of Blacks threatened, the
government began to precipitate a temporary expansion of welfare
benefits (Piven & Cloward, 1971).

The effort of welfare programs that may have been designed
primarily to control restless minorities affected museums. Since almost
all American museums depended to some extent upon municipal
funding, museums were quite sensitive to the political pressures exerted
by minority during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Museums were
challenged to serve the special needs of the minority groups in the
community. Under pressure, the museums occasionally offered special
ethnic exhibitions and outreach programs providing for the needs of
minorities. The funding that museums received seems to have been
motivated in part by the desire for social control and in part by the need
for popularization of educational efforts in response to the needs of
minorities.

4.3.1. Shift in Funding Sources

The funding sources of the HMSG had a relationship to the
political and social dimension that stemmed from the social upheavals of
the late 1960s. Museums, like universities and other institutions during
these times, were likely targets for Third-World groups struggling for
greater 'power' and participation in all aspects of American life and for radical groups seeking to overhaul what they considered to be a corrupt and oppressive political system. In general, before this period, museums were viewed as bastions of elitism, white privilege and materialism that excluded the artistic achievements of minorities, women, and non-establishment artists. Consequently, in the late 1960s and 1970s, museums in the United States encountered the situation of a host of pressures to democratize their governing bodies, expand their holdings to include works by 'minorities' and 'women' and make their programs and exhibitions more relevant to broader segments of the community. As a result of these pressures for the need for increased public support, museums in general entered a phase of educational expansion and social involvement (Rawlins, 1981).

Many of the educational programs (especially the outreach program) of the HMSG were encouraged by new sources of support that became available to the Museum during the 1970s. Since the federal government became a patron of the arts through the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and its two endowments, the Hirshhorn's educational programs were closely tied with these new sources of funding from the federal government. The HMSG continuously developed educational programs, especially outreach programs, as an educational institution in Washington, D. C. The 1974
Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution describes these new funding sources as follows:

In art we [the Smithsonian] continue to follow our mandate to preserve, collect, exhibit, and encourage the study of American art, its roots in the rest of the world, and its current evolution. With the present interest of our government in sponsoring and supporting the arts and humanities, a new partnership, in theme at least, begins to emerge. Although separate, the Smithsonian maintains common interests and close ties with the National Endowments for the Arts and for the Humanities. Both share common tasks, and both work together progressively through the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities. This is especially important in the forthcoming events of the Bicentennial years. In addition there is much to interest the Endowments in the new art museum opening on the Mall in October, 1974, and in the burgeoning studies in art and art history being undertaken by the various Smithsonian enterprises, as well as in the living Folk Festivals. What a celebration of the American spirit these endowments have become, and how vital their part in encouraging American creativity as well as cultural history and research. (Ripley, 1974, p. 4)

In 1965, the federal government recognized the financial plight of the nation's cultural institutions and became a permanent patron of the arts through the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (NEA and NEH). Public Law 89-209 created this autonomous federal agency to initiate "a broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities and the arts in the United States" (Rawlins, 1981, P. 231). Under the act, the 'arts' were to include not only traditional fields, such as drama and creative writing, but also photography, costume design, motion pictures, television, and radio. The 'Humanities' were to include "language, literature, history, and
philosophy; archaeology; the history, criticism and theory of the arts . . . and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods” (Eells, 1967, p. 65).

The creation of the Arts and Humanities Endowments marked the first ‘permanent’ commitment by the federal government to support cultural programs. Even though the government supported arts and culture with the WPA projects in the Great Depression Era, it was a kind of ‘emergency relief’ (Mulcahy, 1992, p. 8). Like the WPA funding for the arts during the Great Depression era, as we have seen in Chapter 3, endowment support during the 1960s seems to have been politically motivated. According to Piven and Cloward, the relief measures and social programs of both periods were motivated by a desire for social control as well as a compassion for art. In the 1960s, federal funding seems to have been extended to win the political allegiance of new black voters to the Democratic party and quell civic unrest which was reaching riot parts. The ‘outreach’ programs and ‘ethnic’ exhibitions which were funded through the NEA and NEH were concessions to urban Blacks that, like welfare relief, did not require any sacrifices on the part of the white community (Rawlins, 1981, pp. 231-232). Additionally, it served to popularize the educational efforts of these institutions and make them more responsive to the needs of minorities (Stecre, 1970, Feb., p. 22).
The Endowments for the Arts and Humanities proved to be important sources of support for museums. The financial aid to museums that the Arts and Humanities Endowments have been able to give has been very small when measured against total need. However, it has helped to focus attention on the widening role of museums in educational programs (Chagy, 1973, p. 55). Grants from the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities differed in scale and scope. During the years from 1971 to 1975, the National Endowment for the Arts’ Museum Program awarded 1,715 grants totaling $26,745,975 to approximately 500 institutions, 80 percent of which were art museums and 20 percent, science and history museums. Grants were awarded for the programs:

1) special exhibitions, installation of permanent collections, catalogs and cataloging, and projects that make museums more widely available to the public;
2) professional training in museums and universities, and short leave programs for museum professionals;
3) training of conservators and conservation work on individual objects, as well as surveys for and installation of systems to improve security, storage or climate control;
4) acquisition of works by living American artists. (NEA-NEH museum programs: An overview, p. 44)

Grants for museums in the National Endowment for the Humanities’s Museum and Historical Organizations Program rose from $39,000 in 1966 to $5,587,137 in 1975. When this program was begun in 1966, grants were offered solely to upgrade capabilities of individuals,
such as curators and other professional staff in museums and historical societies. However, by 1972, this grant was offered not only for individual development, but also for exhibitions and interpretive programs. By 1975, museum assistance from NEH had increased more than tenfold. Ninety-two awards totaling $5,587,137 were made through the Museums and Historical Organizations Program (Rawlins, 1981, p. 232).

The Endowments for the Arts and Humanities chose to fund highly visible, short-term projects, which would encourage experimentation and develop new audiences. Furthermore, ‘Outreach Programs’ were specifically designed to appeal to urban minorities. The ‘Expansion Arts Program’ of the National Endowment for the Arts was designed to increase ethnic activities at community art museums. Additionally, the National Endowment for the Arts’ ‘Wider Availability Funds’ Program’ encouraged art institutions to redefine their community by emphasis on the poor and undeserving in particular. In the Endowment’s 1971/72 survey, art museums had made efforts to attract blacks (49 percent of all art museums reported special programs in this area) (Barbara & Adele, 1978, p. 119).

With the aid of this new source of funding for the Museum, the HMSG developed various educational programs during the 1970s. The first record on the Museum’s effort to receiving funding from the National
Endowment seems to be the time before the opening of the Museum. In 1974, April 25, the HMSG submitted a proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for support for various parts of the educational program of the Museum. The National Endowment was particularly enthusiastic about developing an 'educational program' at the Museum. This funding was for a yearly lecture series, 'The Hirshhorn Lectures on Modern Art' and a 'Film on the Inaugural Exhibition for a Special Event.' The Endowment focused on modern art, and offered a program which would draw a large response from the Washington community. Additionally, such a program would include affiliation with an educational institution, lectures, and seminars for college credit and lectures for a general audience (Memorandum, 1974, April 25, pp. 1-2). On January 17, 1975, the HMSG proposed a grant for the National Endowment for the Humanities Cultural Institutions Program, for the purpose of making the Museum's collection the basis for an 'interdisciplinary program' of study and simultaneously broaden the base of the Museum's audience. In this proposal for the funding from NEH, the Museum proposed special lecture series, film on the museum's inaugural exhibition, and educational components (gallery handouts, film for elementary school children, books for junior high and high school students) (Proposal to National Endowment for the Humanities for Support for Various Parts of the Educational Program of the Hirshhorn 200
The Cultural Institutions Program, funded by the NEH, continued to develop throughout 1977. The basic resource for this program would be the Museum's collection which consisted of more than six thousand items from Joseph H. Hirshhorn's gift to the nation. The Museum proposed to make portions of the collection available to the Washington community on the bases that it would both benefit the area public and fulfill the Museum's mandate to give exposure to the painting, sculpture, prints, and drawings that it held. This program had three distinct aspects: First, a series of six exhibitions and associated publications organized and presented by selected interns and fellows under curatorial guidance. Second, a series of interdisciplinary seminars, courses and workshops related to the exhibitions' themes. And third, lectures, films and special activities relating these special exhibitions to the programs carried out in the Museum's own facility. An exciting and diverse use of artworks in such a program could lead to a greater understanding and appreciation of the objects themselves and to an awareness of the literature, theatre, music and times that helped to generate them. It made a contribution to knowledge in the visual and other arts by a study of the objects and by the exploration of cultural phenomenon.

In sum, we have investigated how the new funding sources supported various educational programs and activities, and corresponded
to political, economical, and social shifts of the time. In the shifts of funding sources for the arts during the late 1960s and the 1970s, two government endowments were closely tied to American museums. In particular, we have discussed how the HMSG developed its educational programs and special exhibitions with government endowments. Now it is appropriate to discuss the educational programs and activities of the HMSG from its inception to the 1970s.

4.4. EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES AT THE HMSG

The HMSG had large numbers of visitors who had many number of questions about modern art in general and modern sculpture in particular. It was the responsibility of the educational program of the national museum to concern itself with national educational problems and needs. Even though there is no published record that the HMSG concentrated on the particular educational reforms of the 1970s, presumably, the basic thought underlying the educational practices of the HMSG was involved with the ideal of the ‘Arts-in-Education Movement.’ We will later discuss an example of the HMSG education program, ‘Ongoing Workshops,’ which attempted to integrate the arts in teaching history, math, and social science.
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Furthermore, the ideal of 'Postmodern Education' also influenced a wide variety of educational programs at the HMSG. Various discourses of postmodernism have challenged the assumption that the museums should focus on the visible public, not the invisible public (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1993, pp. 72-73). For instance, 'outreach programs' of the Museum paid attention to the importance of marginalized audiences in the community.

The Department of Education of the HMSG was created in 1973, before the opening of the Museum. Edward Lawson was recruited from New York's Whitney Museum to be its chief. The most important function of the Education Department of the HMSG was to interpret the Museum's collections to the public in the broadest sense and to act as a center for the dissemination of information on the collections and the activities of the Museum (Program Planning and Review FY 75/FY 76, p. 1). It produced information on the Museum's collections designed to appeal to professional artists and art scholars, but also to the general public and to children. After its inception in the fall of 1973, the Education department of the HMSG focused on producing a comprehensive education program that can be divided into various segments:

1. The docent program
2. Other gallery materials including audio-visual devices as well as printed materials
3. The auditorium program of films, lectures and musical events
4. Other programs including educational outreach, school visit preparation and special educational materials.

4.4.1. The Docent Program

In the nineteenth century, when art museums were considered places for the general public, curatorial or research staff members gave lecture tours for educated visitors. It was not until the beginning of the twentieth century that a discourse began in the United States regarding the educational aspects of the museum (McCoy, 1989, p. 136). The word 'docent' comes from the Latin word 'docere' meaning to teach. This word was used to refer to a lecturer or tour guide. David McCord made humorous reference to the word:

The decent docent doesn't doze:
He teaches standing on his toes.
His student daren't doze—and does,
And that's what teaching is and was. (Alexander, 1979, p. 12)

The first docent (teaching) programs began in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in 1907. Benjamin Ives Gilman, secretary of the Museum of
Fine Arts in Boston, appointed a docent to its staff, in order to help their visitors see the beauty of the museum's collections. Gilman asserts that the aim of the docent service was to aid visitors to interpret and appreciate the works of art and to discover the "artist's intention." In order to search for intelligent enjoyment of individual objects, the docent was not attempting to "trace causes nor . . . expound laws."

Furthermore, since the intent was to "kindle admiration" and "awaken interest" in works of art, docent service was considered "not guidance, but companionship" (Zeller, 1989, p. 45). Gilman's teaching methods in the museum were first, focusing on the object itself rather than lecturing on historical information alone; and second, addressing the questions of visitors (McCoy, 1989, p. 136).

Following the example of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, art museums in the United States came to be leaders in museum docent training, and, by 1971, art museum volunteers represented 67 percent of art museum workers (Newsom and Silver, 1978). In the United States, during the 1970s, many smaller art museums imitated the educational structure of leading art museums, especially, the development of docent groups (McCoy, 1989, p. 137).

In the case of the HMSG, 'docent' participation was also significant part of activities in the Educational Department during the 1970s. The Museum provided trained volunteer docents who were capable of talking
with every age group on the Museum's diverse collections of painting and sculpture. After the opening of the HMSG, the docent program became the most important method of interpreting the collection to Museum visitors, and was the largest and most active docent program of any of the Smithsonian's art museums. Docents and staff of the HMSG traveled to outlying areas in order to provide classroom presentations for secondary-school children and lectures for adult groups. Ongoing workshops' at the HMSG were held to help elementary and secondary schoolteachers use art to teach other disciplines such as history, math, and social science (Smithsonian Institution, 1975, p. 186). This education program seems to be based on the ideal of 'Arts-in-Education Movement,' which was mentioned earlier. The central idea of this movement was that art was not a discipline, but was an 'experience' to be gained by participating in the artistic process. It was felt the arts could become "a fundamental part of the education of every child at every grade level in the entire school system." This was to be accomplished by a comprehensive curriculum that would integrate the arts into the teaching of other subjects. The term 'interdisciplinary' was occasionally used in description of the 'Arts-in-Education Movement.' It referred to the use of the arts to teach other subject (Efland, 1989, pp. 244-246).

The volunteer docents of the HMSG conducted guided tours of one hour in length of the Museum's collection. The program comprised
general tours of the collection, which indicated its scope, and specialized
tours, which focused on more specific aspects of the collection, that is,
modern sculpture, American painting in the twentieth century,
nineteenth century bronzes, the sculpture of Alexander Calder, and so
on. The docents were also trained to give tours of the Museum's
temporary exhibitions (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden,
Education Program, 1975, p. 1).

Since the beginning of the Museum, all docents who successfully
complete the HMSG training course had been members of the Education
staff. The training program included extensive instruction in the content
of the Museum collection, as well as training in methods of touring for all
age groups. All docents, after completing their training process, had to
pass certification by giving a tour to a member of the docent standards
committee, after which the committee's evaluation was reviewed by the
Museum staff. The Education Department constantly evaluated the work
of the docents, applying strict standards of performance and content
accuracy so that a high level of touring was maintained (Hirshhorn
Museum and Sculpture Garden, Education Program, 1975, p. 2).

Meanwhile, with the increasing demand for tours on Saturdays and
Sundays, it is highly probable that the docent had to give occasional
weekend tours. Duty in the HMSG consisted of assigned lectures and
talks to groups of children and adults, as well as gallery assignments and
research on objects in the collection. In addition, most docents needed to fulfill the requirement of stand duty 3 to 4 hours per week at the Museum during the school year. Docent committees were appointed to help the Education Department with particular aspects of the program. Several workshops on materials and media as well as fieldtrips of interest to the docents were organized (Report to the Director, 1975, p. 2).

In 1976, the docent program of the HMSG seems to have encountered a period of transition when it experienced a drop in the number of docents. Although the docent program of the Museum was the most important method of interpreting the collection for the Museum visitors, the docent programs was not active compared to previous years. This lack of activity was due to weather conditions, an energy crisis, unavailability of school buses for field trips, and the economic crunch. The following Table 3 shows the docent tour statistics for the beginning period of the Museum, between September 1976 and February 1977. It includes comparative statistics for the same months in the previous year, and the six months previous to this reporting period—March 1976 through August 1976.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tours--Visitors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tours</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (Walk-in)</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Tours</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3545</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening Tours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Docent Hours</strong></td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>4029</td>
<td>3341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading the tour statistics for the period of March 1976 through August 1976, we find a decrease of up to fifty percent in the number of visitors. These figures reflect the strict curtailment of school fieldtrips, as well as the severe weather experienced during this period. The problems of the energy crisis, cold weather, and the economic crunch among the Metropolitan schools affected the attendance of visitors at the Museum. The major problem for the District schools was the complete unavailability of school buses for fieldtrips. For the few tours arranged for District school groups, members had to pay their own fares on Metro buses. To work towards solving this problem in the District, the Education Coordinators of the Smithsonian Museums met with the D. C. School Board. Several meetings were held with the Superintendent of Schools and the higher echelon of school officials. To encourage more participation in school visits at the Hirshhorn Museum, the HMSG made the decision to inaugurate a new outreach program (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden Education Department: Bi-Annual Director's Report, 1977, pp. 2-3).

Around 1978, the docent program of the HMSG became much more fully developed and elaborated as an educational program. With one hundred and ten active docents, the HMSG's organization gave more than 3247 tours to 77,076 visitors. These figures represent approximately 11,500 hours of volunteer time. In order to keep this
program running at a high level of quality, and in order to maintain the interest and enthusiasm of the Museum’s volunteers, the Education Department was obliged to provide special lectures, training, and fieldtrips for the docents. Docent activities also extended to encompass the preparation of school groups for museum trips. Docents also went out to schools who could not be brought to the HMSG. Over 350 school groups visited the HMSG in 1978; slide packets with written instruction were used for these groups (Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 1978, Education Department, p. 2).

In 1979, the Education Department of the HMSG became interested in children’s education. The Museum offered docent tours for young children. After the docent group was trained, the Museum conducted tours on Sundays and expanded its outreach program (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Docent Training Program, 1979).

As seen in the above, during the 1970s, the idea of a docent program had considerable significance, in that it recognized the value of the relation between the visitors’ discourse and artworks of the exhibitions. The meaning of the art object as provable fact had changed to the notion that meanings of the objects are socially constructed and shaped by visitors’ particular interests and values. Language about facts and certainties was replaced by language about context, meaning, and
discourse between the artworks and visitors. The idea was that the meaning of artworks was not transmitted but produced. Thus, the role of docent was about not just interpreting artworks, but also deciphering interpretations, in other words, negotiating between the meanings constructed by visitors and meanings constructed by museums.

4.4.2. Other Gallery Materials Including Printed Materials and Audio-Visual Devices

A second facet of the education program concerns the 'printed materials' distributed in the galleries. The Education Department of the HMSG was responsible for the production of five special gallery leaflets, which gave a comprehensive self-tour of the paintings and sculptures on view in the sculpture garden and plaza, and galleries during the Inaugural Exhibition (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Education Program, 1975, Dec. 11). Leaflets provided information on artworks in the Museum, like text panels. However, the leaflets could be carried out by the visitors, and had the advantage of supplementing information given in the exhibition and serving as a permanent source of reference when the visitors got home (Belcher, 1991, p. 154). The Education Department produced all catalogue materials and the writings of original materials for education, didactic labels, and exhibition leaflets.
A third facet of the Museum's education program was the 'Telesonic Guide,' an audio system. From the inception of the HMSG, installing the Telesonic System in the Museum Galleries was the priority of the Department of Education (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, 1973, p. 1). Through this system, the visitors to the Museum could obtain a special hand-set, which could be used to pick up recorded information on approximately 100 individual objects situated in the Museum galleries. The content of these recorded mini-lectures was prepared by the staff of the Education Department (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Education Program, 1975, Dec., 11, p. 3). The Telesonic System had a wider impact on the general public. According to records from the Smithsonian Institution Archives, in 1978, over one hundred thousand people used the Telesonic System as an audio guide to the Collection. This program enabled the Education Department to reach visitors who would otherwise have had to face the perplexities of modern art alone (Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 1978, p. 5).

The 'Telesonic System' was regarded as very important in contemporary art exhibitions in the HMSG. The Audio-Visual presentations were an ideal medium for the exhibition developers to provide 'contextual' information on the artworks and extend the exposure of a subject through visual images and sound effects. The visitors
positively looked forward to experiencing some sort of audio-visual presentation. It created a 'theatre-like' environment with the audiences seated or standing when they looked at the presentations.

4.4.3. The Auditorium Program of Films and Lectures

The 'Auditorium Program' of the HMSG as an educational program encompasses films and lectures held in the Museum's auditorium. The multi-media nature of contemporary art had helped to make the auditorium program an essential component of the Museum's presentations on modern art. A program of films on art and artists, films by artist-filmmakers, illustrated lectures on facets of the collection, and art and artists of the twentieth century, as well as concerts of twentieth-century music offered insight into the world of twentieth-century art in the Hirshhorn Museum collection. Originally, the film program was to be a multi-faceted film program with films for children, films on art and artists, and films by young artist-filmmakers. These were to be presented on three successive days. 'Films for young people' featured both recently made and historical animation, as well as several collections of animated films made by children. The 'film for young people' series was used as a model for the introduction of similar programs to other museums (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden,
A 'special lecture' series was given at the HMSG, under the sponsorship of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The special lecture series would emphasize the interaction between modern art and the culture of the twentieth century. For example, Robert Rosenblum, Professor of Art History at New York University's Institute of Fine Arts and a recognized expert on twentieth-century painting, talked on "Art and Some Twentieth-Century Issues." Such special lecture series was given each year (Report to the Director, 1975, March 20, p. 8).

In 1975 and 1976, the 'Sunday Lecture Series' presented seven distinguished speakers who discussed a wide variety of topics reflecting the spirit as well as the content of the Museum's collection and special exhibitions. Three of the lecturers were artists; David Levine, discussed his own work and Douglas Davis and Peter Plagens, discussed topics relating to their own published works on theory and criticism. Two curators, John Hallmark Neff and Diane Waldman, presented their individual views of current ideas and the Director Emeritus of the Whitney Museum of American Art, John I. H. Baur, discussed the Nadelman exhibition which he organized. A noted young scholar, Michael Fried, presented a fascinating critique/history of the works of the artist Anthony Caro (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden/Auditorium, 1976, Feb. 11, p. 1).
A special feature of the Hirshhorn lecture series in 1977 was the Twentieth-Century Canadian Culture Symposium held in conjunction with 14 Canadians: A Critic's Choice, and sponsored by the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Almost the whole symposium program was held for the most part at the Hirshhorn Museum auditorium. In conjunction with the Canadian Symposium series at the Hishop, the Museum featured a complete series of Canadian films (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden Education Department: Bi-Annual Director's Report, 1977, Feb. 22, pp. 9-10).

4.4.4. Other Programs including Educational Outreach, School Visit Preparation, and Special Educational Materials

Outreach Program

During the mid 1970s, the ideal of postmodern education had an affect on the educational programs of the Museum. Postmodernism had provided the conditions necessary for exploring various forms of otherness as a fundamental dimension of both the cultural and the sociopolitical spheres. 'Marginalized' others were considered in the educational programs of the Museum. The HMSG's effort to reach the marginalized areas of the community took the form of 'outreach.
programs.’ The Outreach programs allowed diverse elements of the public who could not visit the Museum to experience artworks. These educational practices of the HMSG were made possible by various sources of funding which were created during late 1960s and early 1970s, such as the Smithsonian Institution Grant, Educational Outreach Funds, SI Special Funds for Innovative Outreach Projects, NEH and so on. With this funding, the Education Department of the Museum developed and elaborated various ‘outreach programs’ for the public in the community. This effort widened the outreach of audiences at various social levels of the Museum. Parts of the public who had not been considered part of the museum audiences in the previous era came to participated in education programs of the HMSG.

According to records from the Smithsonian Institution Archives, during 1976, the Education Department embarked on a program of ‘outreach’ designed to attract, in particular, more District and area schools to the Museum, and, in general, to interest everyone in the Metropolitan area. A special ten-page ‘teacher packet’ was prepared and duplicated. It was sent out to teachers to explain what the Museum had to offer, how they should prepare students for a visit, and evaluation of the students’ experience. It also gave the teachers some general background and references, which could be used, as well as a list of the Museum’s special exhibitions.
Also in connection with outreach, the Education Department created a project to produce a special eight-to-ten-minute ‘videotape.’ This tape would be used in the classroom to prepare students for a Museum visit. Another item in preparation was a ‘special book’ that the students could use when they were on the bus between the school and the Hirshhorn. This ‘bus buddy’ would enable the students to use their bus time to become acquainted with the Museum—thus increasing their awareness and curiosity. Another form of outreach was to get staff and/or docents into the classroom with slide packets. In this way, not only individual classes, but also entire schools could be made aware of the Hirshhorn Museum’s collection and the museum as an important place for an educational visit. The fiscal year 1977 and 1978 budget of the HMSG called for increased educational and support services, in particular, in the area of ‘outreach’ to the schools (Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 1978, Beginning October 1, 1977: Education Department, 1976, April 2, p. 1). Thus the HMSG emphasized more their outreach programs, which contributed even more to the educational mission for the diffusion of knowledge to the public.

To encourage more participation in school visits to the Hirshhorn, the HMSG inaugurated a new outreach program designed both to prepare school classes for coming into the Museum for tours, and to take the Museum out to school classes that could not come into the Museum.
because of bus trip curtailment or other reasons. The Museum gave a number of presentations to school groups in Fairfax, Montgomery, and Arlington Counties. In the presentations the staff talked to the schools about the Hirshhorn, and about the important place of art in the general curriculum. At the same time, the Museum reached junior high and high school groups, as well as other groups, which might not either know about the Hirshhorn or might not be able to get into Washington.

This 'outreach' constituted a 'multi-faceted' approach. First, experienced docents were trained to take ‘special slide talks’ to selected schools. These slide talks varied, but they all pertained to the nature of the Museum and its collection. At the same time, the Education Department created an eight-to-ten-minute videotape, which would play a similar role on a wider basis, for it would go out to even more schools who could not be reached by docents with their slide talks (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Education Department: Bi-Annual Director's Report, 1977, Feb. 22, p. 3). This outreach program was extended in 1978 as the programs for elementary school classes for Museum visits. This extension program was chiefly responsible for the increase of the number of elementary schools coming to the Museum (HMSG education department, director's report, 1978, March 17, pp. 2-3).
The significant epoch of the development of the education programs came in 1979 and 1980. The outreach programs of the Museum were elaborated and contributed to the diffusion of information to the general public. Table 4 shows the visitors' attendance of outreach programs at the HMSG during 1979 to 1980. During this period, despite a reported 6 percent drop in attendance for all Smithsonian Education programs, it is significantly noticeable that the Hirshhorn Museum's attendance of visitors was up almost 50 percent over the comparable time the previous year. This was due to the Hirshhorn's activated outreach programs (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden: Outreach Programs, 1979, Nov.--1980, April).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Tours</th>
<th>Number of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 th / 5 th</td>
<td>Light &amp; Shadow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 th / 6 th</td>
<td>What is Modern Art?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 th—Talented Funded Program</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 th—Special</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Citizens Program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Workshops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIP Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>6953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Special Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>9185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>774</td>
<td>16,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, outreach programs, November 1979-April 1980
In addition, a special outreach program was available. It was designed to prepare 5th- and 6th-grade students for Hirshhorn visitors. Teachers could select from two programs, ‘Light and Shadow’ or ‘What Is Modern Art?’ ‘Light and Shadow’ was an in-class presentation that would introduce 4th and 5th graders to the HMSG by means of a concentration on the artist’s use of light and shadow. “What Is Modern Art?” was an in-class presentation for 5th and 6th graders that explored realism, abstraction, and the principles of twentieth-century painting and sculpture. Given by a docent, these presentations were designed both to arouse interest and enthusiasm and to prepare students for museum visits. The presentation would precede the tour by one week and was limited to schools within an 11-mile radius of downtown Washington (Learning Opportunities for Schools, 1979-1980).

Additional outreach programs were prepared for gifted and talented students because of a special grant in the amount of $20,171 from the Educational Outreach funds of the Smithsonian Institution (Education Department, 1981, February 27, p. 2; Director’s Report, 1979, Nov. 1, p. 20). It was called the art enrichment program and was designed for talented and gifted 6th grade students of the Metropolitan area’s public schools.

Around the 1980s, the HMSG enlarged its audience considerably. For instance, in 1980, the Museum developed effective outreach
programs to reach junior high school students and senior citizens. The Museum designed a special six-session unit that included three visits to the junior high school students' classroom, interspersed with three to the Museum. This program emphasized historical presentation leading to important developments in abstract and twentieth-century styles. Additionally, after several successful pilot programs in 1979, the senior citizens outreach program commenced in Montgomery Country in October 1980. The Museum introduced hundreds of seniors to the pleasures of twentieth-century painting and sculpture (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Department of Education, Director's Report, 1980, March 14).

Teacher Training Workshops

The Hirshhorn Museum, in 1979, offered training programs for teachers so that they could be familiar with and utilize the Museum collection in their classes. Toward this end, the Museum developed special 'Teacher Training Workshops' that integrated art, music, and dance. These workshops were started in late January, 1979 and continued each semester during the school year. Additionally, because of the impossibility of sending docents or staff beyond a 10-15-mile radius of Washington for extension programs, the Museum developed a series of slide/cassette units to be sent to any school group requesting
information on the Museum (Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden—Director’s Report, Department of Education, 1978, October 5, pp. 2-3).

Furthermore, the HMSG offered ‘Teacher Training Workshops’ in conjunction with the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. In 1980, the Museum began an intensive series of workshops held in the Museum galleries as well as an outreach program for teachers to acquaint them with the resources of the Museum. In 1983, the Education Department conducted a teacher-training course, “The Challenge of the New Art/Teaching with Modern Art,” at Trinity College (June/July 1983). In December 1983, D. C. public school art teachers earned recertification credit through their participation in a workshop entitled “Utopian Concepts in Modern Art” (Lerner, 1984, Feb. 3, p. 19).

Education Programs for the Handicapped

Education programs of the HMSG continued to be developed for special audiences, as well as the general public. There were a number of significant educational opportunities for the ‘handicapped’ audiences. The word ‘blind’ refers to ‘visually impaired’ or ‘visually handicapped’ not to someone who merely has eye problems and wears glasses (Memorandum, 1979, May 9). In a continuing effort to make the Museum and its program more accessible to the handicapped, the
Museum partially relaxed its normal prohibition against touching artworks in order to adopt special rules for ‘unsighted’ visitors (Third draft, 1977, May 2). The Museum offered a program for the blind in which they were encouraged to touch thirty works of sculpture selected from the permanent collection for the purpose of the pleasure and knowledge that unsighted visitors derived from their visits to the Smithsonian.

First, in consultation with the Museum’s conservator, curator and chief of education, approximately thirty works of sculpture from the permanent collection were designated as touchable by the unsighted. The works, constituting a representative cross-section of the Museum’s collection and including important examples by Rodin, Renoir, Degas, Picasso, Matisse and Moore among others, were located on the second and third floor ambulatory galleries and in the sculpture garden (Third draft, 1977, May 2).

Unsighted persons wishing to touch these works of art could be accompanied by a sighted companion who could guide them to, and identify, the works that are touchable. On weekdays (except holidays) between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., the Museum would make an effort to supply a guide from its staff, who could serve as such a companion when no other person was available. Requests for this service had to be made, in advance, to the Museum’s Education Department. For the
protection of the Museum's collection, unsighted persons touching works of art were asked to remove all rings, bracelets or similar jewelry that might cause scratches, abrasions or other injuries to sculpture. Alternately, soft gloves could be worn. Only unsighted visitors could touch the works of art, otherwise the Museum could not preserve its collection for the enjoyment of future generations (Third draft, 1977, May 2).

As shown in the discussion of the educational practices of the HMSG, the Museum continuously made an effort to provide diverse visitors with a variety of didactic materials including wall labels, brochures, handouts, and so on. Additionally, with the growing national recognition of ethnic diversity and cultural pluralism, the Museum developed the outreach programs for those diverse publics. This cultural shift during the 1970s that were reflected in educational programs of the HMSG was also presented in the exhibition practice of the Museum.

4.5. POSTMODERNISM, ARTS, EXHIBITION, AND THE HMSG

After the early 1970s, there was a radical break with modernist traditions, a break widely decried as a critical juncture in twentieth-century art, identified with a climate of new ideas of postmodern art. The
works of art that laid most serious claim to attention in the seventies abandoned many of the aesthetic canons and concepts, the establishment that had constituted the project of modernism. Much of what resulted was situated between the media, beyond the scope of the traditionally individual arts.

Artistic interests shifted from a preoccupation with the objects, a thing in itself, to an acknowledgement of the object as a thing in this world that is subject to conditions outside itself and informed by other ‘non-art’ factors. The art that laid greatest claim to the imagination in the 1970s issued not so much from Modern formalist traditions, as from some of the anti-formalist art objects that had begun to appear in the late 1960s. The art of postmodernism suggests that artists found the most compelling model for their work not in the process of making self-contained objects per se, but in generating ‘situations’ and exploring ‘relational’ aspects of their work.

Therefore, postmodern art objects came in such diverse new forms as site-specific projects which existed in relation to their surroundings; constructed environments and interiors; participatory structures (such as mazes, chambers, or other architecture-like structures) that enlisted the activity of the viewer; earthworks; agglomerations and scattered forms which cannot be described as objects; and immaterial manifestations (such as sound, light, laser, and prism works). Art had
become more public in both its visibility and its support, and artists had
become increasingly conscious of the views they projected. There is in
much contemporary work an affirmative acknowledgement that a work of
art is never ideologically neutral, but has, by the fact of its existence,
both a situation and meanings.

Corresponding to this atmosphere during the decade of 1974 to
1984, the HMSG organized several exhibitions related to diverse works of
art, often referred to as postmodern: Content: A Contemporary Focus,
1974-1984. Interpreting the works of art in these exhibitions required a
new aesthetic and critical vocabulary from Postmodernism.

4.5.1. Exhibition: “Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984”

For its tenth anniversary, the HMSG organized the exhibition,
Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984, to celebrate the first ten
years of the existence of the Museum, a period that saw the Museum’s
transformation from a private collection to a national institution. This
exhibition was organized at the HMSG for the purpose of showing that it
was exhibiting for the first time

a unified historical overview of what is widely acknowledged to
be a “watershed” era in Modern art. Sometimes referred to as
“the post-Modern period,” it is a decade identified with diverse
stylistic developments, the emergence of many new international
talents, and a remarkable climate of new critical ideas about art
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The landmark movements of twentieth-century art reiterated the commitment to stress the primacy of form and fidelity to the inherent physical nature of the media. Many artists of the Modern era sought to express the physical realities of artworks as ‘objects’ rather than as illusions, since Edouard Manet’s self-conscious assertion in the 1860s of the picture plane as a flat surface. Modern art keeps itself ‘pure,’ free from the use of any element from a neighboring art by emphasizing the physical nature of the support of the painting during the progression towards flatness. Modern art is forced to give up many of its other aspects, which are integral components of illusionistic space containing content and story.

Three-dimensionality is the province of sculpture, and for the sake of its own autonomy painting has had above all to divest itself of everything it might share with sculpture. (Greenberg, 1960, p. 70)

Realistic, naturalistic art had dissembled the medium, using art to conceal art; Modernism used art to call attention to art. (Greenberg, 1960, p. 85)

‘Modern art’ is defined as specificity toward flatness in non-sculpture, and is achieved through the reduction of the meaning of a work into the formal properties of its physical medium. In modernist theory, the specificity of medium confirms the autonomy of each art genre, as in
painting, sculpture, music, poetry, drawing, photography, and so on. Each art is isolated from every other art, and maintains the identity of its genre.

Unlike modern art, postmodern art corresponds to ideas, conditions, and experiences that it does not contain, but to which it refers by means of analogy, metaphor, symbol, or allegory. In postmodern art, images and objects carry meanings and the ways in which we respond to given information in the world around us. Advertising, the news media, and popular culture have become important sources of imagery and techniques in postmodern art. Symbols, signs, and words become means of communication as we assign our own interpretations to the preexisting elements of language and nature. There is no absolute meaning and meanings are not fixed.

Artworks could appeal to visitors differently according to many different situations. According to context, the elements that make up these works can have a variety of meanings; out of context, they become visual symbols to which the viewer responds according to his and her individual perspective. In postmodern art, artistic concerns have centered on questions of what, and how, art means. Metaphor and allegory, sign and symbol, visual and verbal punning are all strategies used by artists for seeing and interpreting the world. All meanings and meaning itself are assigned or assimilated by the individual, whose
interpretation is necessarily colored by his or her own experience and outlook. In postmodern art, meaning is understood to be created, not assumed; inherited, not inherent.

The organizing premise of the exhibition, *Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984* was not concerned with issues of form—how an object is made and perceived, or what defines its style—but with content—what a work of art means in the context of society and the extent to which it deliberately engages common experience. Metaphysical ideas, social commentary, and use of allusion and metaphor—elements that many artists and critics had considered inappropriate to art only ten years ago—was then now essential to the creation and understanding of contemporary art (Hirshhorn Museum Celebrates 10th Anniversary with Major Exhibition of Contemporary Art, 1984, July 13, p. 2).

*Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984* explores the postmodern sensibility and the art—the painting, sculpture, photography, installation works, video, and other art forms. It was installed in the galleries on the third floor of the HMSG. A diverse exhibit, it includes 157 paintings, sculptures, drawings, constructions, mixed media, and photography. The works were those of 147 artists living in the United States and abroad (Feldman, p. 1). Some of the works to be included were constructions and installations by Vito Acconci, who used language, visual symbols, logos, and other signage.
appropriated from popular culture to confront viewers with their own ideological beliefs. Laurie Anderson's artwork, objects synthesized from music and multimedia performances, dealt with individual responses to the daily tragicomedy of contemporary American experience.

Additionally, works by Terry Allen, Joseph Bueys, Chris Burden and Robert Morris; paintings by Jean-Michel Basquiat, Enzo Cucchi, Leon Golub, Philip Guston, Anselm Kiefer, Malcolm Morley and Susan Rothenberg; sculptures by John Aheran, Richard Artschwager, Lynda Benglis, Richard Long, Slavatore Scarpitta and Michael Tracy; photographs by Eleanor Antin, Jo Ann Callis, Jen Le Gac, Duane Michals, Cindy Sherman and William Wegman, and so on were included in this exhibition (Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984).

Basically, this exhibition sought to weld conceptualism and other forms of postminimalism or postmodernism. Words like 'meaning,' 'reference,' 'subject matter,' and 'content' are used interchangeably throughout this exhibition. 'Content' is perhaps the most elusive, elastic term in the critical vocabulary: the meaning never stays quite the same from context to context. Meaning is never fully present in any one sign alone. It is scattered endlessly along the whole chain of signifiers. This process involves a constant flickering of presence and absence together. This movement creates the endless differencing and deferring of meaning. The meaning is always in relation to other textual locations in which the
signifier has appeared on other occasions. Every articulation of a meaning bears with it the trace of its previous meanings. There is no fixed transcendental meaning, since the meaning of concepts is constantly referred, via the network of traces to multiple meanings. Fixed and unified meaning is constantly deferred (Sarup, 1988, p. 36). Meaning is always ultimately indeterminable. Art has rediscovered the meaning beyond itself that it once had: "[art] is neither neutral nor objective, but incorporates value systems, fundamental assumptions, and points of reference characteristic of the world in which it is made" (Dorsey, 1984, October 7, p. 7L).

As mentioned earlier, the exhibition Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984 at the HMSG represented the shift in the artistic movement from the 1970s to the present. Modernist aesthetics was no longer appropriate for understanding the works of art of those exhibitions, but the new postmodern critical vocabulary and aesthetics were espoused by the proponents of these exhibitions. By its very nature, contemporary art was controversial, and the HMSG organized the exhibition not only to inform the public of developments in the visual arts, but also to proselytize, or create a degree of intelligent curiosity. Among the large number of temporary visitors to the nation's capital, many of whom have little or no previous experience with the contemporary arts, particularly with postmodern art. To create interest
where skepticism existed among the temporary visitors seems to be one of the purposes of this exhibition. Ripley stated at the inaugural ceremony:

The purpose of the Hirshhorn is to remind us all that life is more than the usual, subjectively, and being stirred by objects into new and positive ways of thought, thus escaping from the numbing penumbra of the ritual known as everyday. (The Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, 1984, p. 9)

What interests us in this exhibition is the display method for artworks within the museum context: in other words, the 'public presentation' for educational purposes. In this exhibition, we see installations and multimedia art works within the space of the Museum. Interestingly, the visitors could encounter artworks which represented a combination of visual art forms, as painting, drawing, photography, or video, or even with such non-visual art forms as music. These artworks do not presume form to be essentially optical, but rather consider it 'phenomenal': form is a happenstance of many variable factors extrinsic to the outward configuration an object may take. While the paintings presented in the MoMA during the 1930s, were to allow the public to experience the optical form of the modernist paintings, the artworks in the exhibition of HMSG were experienced by the visitors in a space of the Museum. In other words, the artworks, beholders, and the situation of the museum space created the meanings of the artworks. The meanings
of the artworks did not entirely come from the art object itself, but from the object, a subject, and a situation. Michael Fried describes this relationship between an artwork, the visitor, and the situation of the gallery space:

The better new work takes relationships out of the work and makes them a function of space, light, and the viewer’s field of vision. The object is but one of the terms in the newer aesthetic. It is in some way more reflexive because one’s awareness of oneself existing in the same space as the work is stronger than in previous work, with its many internal relationships. One is more aware than before that he himself is establishing relationships as he apprehends the object from various positions and under varying conditions of light and spatial context. (Fried, 1967, p. 125)

The meanings of the artworks was non existent, but transformed by its new situation. And, the meanings of the artworks involve the visitor’s awareness that outward form may not only be tenuous but optical as well, and obtained by the beholder’s experience. The artworks may be arranged, displayed, and viewed in a myriad of configurations, and of which must be affected by an act of the visitor’s experience. The meanings of artworks come with recognition of the situation or context into which they are placed.

Additionally, the exhibition, Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984 used literary texts on the walls. The following literary text was on the doorway of an exhibition in the HMSG (Figure 33, 34, 35).
CONTENT A CONTEMPORARY FOCUS 1974-1984

Is this blank? What we are accustomed to seeing here is part of the landscape. This text (sign, words) was made for this location, but it is a continuation of other things which may connect you to it. This sign (text, words) has a relationship with what you see around it. However, the ways in which it is different could constitute a criticism of the ways it is similar. Can this (text, sign) explain itself? And if it could would it mean what it says? This text, within a context of other, signs, also wants to function as part of the 'real world', but it (as a text, as a sign) seems empty. The content that it shares with other signs is what connects you to this (sign, text, words); it is also what is missing.

The use of literary text beyond artworks was quite different from that in the case of the exhibition of the MoMA that we discussed in Chapter 3. In the MoMA's exhibition, the art object itself was primarily important. 'Understanding' was essentially a process of individual communion between the visitor and the work of art. The visitor was supposed merely to 'experience' the artwork. No one or no materials were needed to prepare the audience to regard the artwork. All materials besides the artworks were extremely limited in the MoMA's exhibition. However, in the exhibition of Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984, in the HMSG, literary texts on the wall accompanied the artworks to help the viewer understand them. Some texts were placed between the artworks on the wall.

Labels were also clues to understanding the artworks in this exhibition. They offered the name of the artworks, artists, materials, sizes and so on. They did not discuss the visual character of the
artworks. The visitor does not attend the exhibition to read labels, though they could get help from them when the labels were well written and well presented. Perhaps, as visitors moved through the exhibition of the Content: A Contemporary Focus, 1974-1984, they looked at the artworks first, adding meaning from their own experience. Then, the visitors read the accompanying labels to verify their responses to unanswered questions. If this were the case, the labels not only identified and gave context to the piece, but engaged the viewers, causing them to look again with new insight. The visitor's interpretation of the artwork was made possible through the process of looking at a space between the artwork and the label. Michael Baxandall explains this idea of interaction between the visitor and the labels in the museum space. The visitor moved between visually pleasurable artworks and equally pleasurable cause finding; then, he moved back from the label about causes to the visually interesting artwork, scanning the artwork for
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11 The label has traditionally been the main medium used in the museum exhibition to communicate information about an object. It has its origins in the handwritten identification slips of curators. As the first practice of the labels, G. Brown Goode (1891), assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, charge of the United States national museum, stated, “an efficient educational museum may be described as a collection of instructive labels, each illustrated by a well-selected specimen.” He went on state that the merit of a label “depends much more on what you leave out than on what you put in.” He acknowledged the problems inherent in writing a label. However, Goode’s view was challenged by Dana (1927) when he advocated the use of labels because objects are silent: “Labels can be written to attractive and useful ends only by students of the art of presentation. . . Experts may give facts, but the expert is
applications of these causes. Here, the viewer was not a passive learning subject. He moved with great vitality between artwork and labels. The Museum hoped that the visitor's space was the intellectual space between artwork and label (Baxandall, 1991, pp. 33-41).

4.6. SUMMARY

So far, we have discussed how the HMSG was established within the context of the Smithsonian environment and how the Museum played its role as an educational institution during the 1970s. When Joseph Hirshhorn donated his collection to the Smithsonian Institution, the HMSG became the 'Smithsonian's museum of modern and contemporary art.' It opened to the public in 1974 as the national art museum in the Washington Mall. Since its opening, the HMSG has achieved and expanded its educational mission for the public, by offering various interpretive programming on its collections and exhibitions on modern and contemporary art.

At the time when the HMSG opened its doors to the public, the United States was going through rapid social upheaval. In the 1960s, the rarely found who can so present the facts that the reader is moved to an interest and appreciation by them.” (Belcher, 1991, pp. 156-161).
economy grew rapidly, and the population of the nation increased. The rapid economic growth affected the expanding middle classes in the American society. The middle classes generally sought higher education and spend more time in leisure and hobbies. They occasionally spent their leisure time viewing (or working with) the arts. Additionally, as minority groups migrated to the urban areas, massive unemployment occurred, which aggravated by shifting social priorities, eventually led to civic unrest. In this atmosphere, museums were asked to serve the middle class's interest in the arts and the need for control of the social unrest among minority groups. For this latter purpose, museums often offered special exhibitions or outreach programs providing for the needs of minorities. Moreover, the federal government became a permanent patron of the arts through the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Corresponding to this change, the HMSG became closely tied to these new funding sources and elaborated various educational programs, such as docent-led tours for schools and adult groups, walk-in visitations, one-to-one touch tours for the blind, signed tours for the deaf, and printed handouts on each special exhibition distributed free to every visitor.

Among the educational programs of the Museum, the HMSG's docent programs tours to both school groups and the general public were diverse. The total number of tours offered was usually controlled by the
Education Department of the Museum. Significantly, since 1978, the Museum placed special emphasis on teacher training and on a variety of 'outreach programs' arranged in cooperation with the schools of the metropolitan area. Through teacher-training, the classroom teacher as well as the specialist was made aware of the resources of the Museum and the ways in which nineteenth- and twentieth-century art could be integrated with the school curriculum. The HMSG made many contacts with area schools that resulted in a variety of outreach programs.

The exhibition of the HMSG discussed reflected the shifts in the artistic theory of the 1970s—from modernism to postmodernism. We have discussed how the postmodernist aesthetic differed from the modernist theory of the previous era. Moreover, we also examined how the HMSG attempted to display the artworks in the context of the postmodern aesthetics. Wall texts and labels as well as audio systems in the exhibition and outreach program in the educational programs of the HMSG were not found in the case of the Museum of Modern Art [Appendix H].
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has examined how the meanings of the art museums in the United States were constructed and how they changed as they evolved over the past century, particularly, from the 1930s to the 1970s. I attempted to reread the historical materials of the American museums in light of the needs of the present situation, with special consideration to how museums could serve their role as educational institutions for the public. This way of problematization, proposed by Foucault, led me to rewrite the history of American museums by paying attention to the shifts and changes of meanings of education in the American art museums within the specific historical contexts. From this reading, I argue that the meanings of education in the museum context did not emerge suddenly, but have had a long and complex history, which shapes what they are today.

In this dissertation, the origins of the museum were traced back to the ancient concept of the 'mouseion,' which was first and foremost a study collection with library attached, a repository of knowledge, a place
of scholars and philosophers and historians. In Renaissance Europe, individuals of power and wealth amassed collections of art and artifacts, antiquities, scientific instruments, minerals, fossils, and human and animal remains as well. The ‘galleries’ and ‘cabinets of curiosities’ of the Renaissance were museums which served not merely the function of the display of wealth or power or privilege, but also as places of study. This basic notion of the dual function of collections as places of research and places of display was inherited by the earliest public museums (Vergo, 1989). The Louvre and the South Kensington Museum had more sensitive obligations than the museums of the Renaissance that museums should not only display their treasures to the curious and make their collections accessible to those desirous knowledge, but should also be actively engaged in mass education. After the museum idea of the ‘cabinet of curiosities’ was transplanted in the United States, the American museums sought to make the public museums in Europe, such as the Louvre and the South Kensington Museum, their prototype. Around the nineteenth century, the Metropolitan Museum of Art achieved its own reality, which can be defined as a balance between the museum as a place of research (I call this professionalism) and as a place of popular education.

In creating such a historical line for the evolution of museum history, we occasionally make a mistake in our understanding of the dual
notion of professionalism and popular education. Throughout the history of museums, these dual notions used in justification of the museums were not treated or balanced equally. The attention was largely focused on the part of professionalism. As society became democratic in the twentieth century, the notion of popular education came to be considered importantly. The development of this notion of popular education in the museum context has been largely dependent on specific political, social, cultural, and economic contexts.

Therefore, in the process of attempting to support the hypothesis that the meanings of education in American museums have been constructed and changed within particular historical, social, and cultural contexts, this dissertation has concluded that the MoMA and the HMSG provide differing examples of the history of museum development. However, there are some dilemmas in creating these arguments. The MoMA and the HMSG were founded as museums to support modern and contemporary art in New York City and Washington, D. C. Even though both museums have been discussed as exemplary museums representing different times and contexts in the United States, there could exist continuities and similarities focused in both museums.

The MoMA was founded by three extraordinary women whose establishment backgrounds did not limit their interests to traditional art, but, on the contrary, enabled them to embark on an avant-garde

243
experiment which directly challenged the prevailing conservative beliefs that had shaped their lives during the early twentieth century. For this reason, the MoMA had a radical spirit in response to arts from its inception period. Sach's statement to the trustees at the formal opening of the new building in 1939 symbolizes the Museum's sense of mission and its experimental spirit.

The Museum must continue to take risks. . . . In the field of modern art, chances must be taken. The Museum should continue to be a pioneer: bold and uncompromising. (Hunter, 1984, p. 40)

The MoMA's radical spirit during the 1930s continued to the 1970s when the HMSG was founded and when numerous critics and social commentators observed that the movement of cultural modernism was in crisis. Questions were raised concerning the role of the MoMA at a time when the word 'modern' was used synonymously with a circumscribed historical episode, with the past rather than the future. Despite the volatile state of the pluralistic art scene and the attendant confusion in contemporary standards, and despite the loudly proclaimed 'crisis' of modernism, the MoMA has energetically and responsibly continued to interpret contemporary art, the art of postmodernism.

However, in Chapter 3, I stopped the story of the MoMA in the mid 1950s when modernism prevailed in the art and cultural context. Even though the MoMA energetically responded to the contemporary art, and
thus could be considered an exemplary museum during the 1970s, its educational programs and activities seem not to have actively developed like those of the HMSG. Additionally, I was interested in the historical experience of how the national museum of modern and contemporary art, which looked to the MoMA as its model, responded in its mission to the social and cultural upheavals of the 1970s.

In spite of the continuities and similarities of the MoMA and the HMSG, these museums represent the art museums for different times, the period before the 1960s and the period after the 1960s. The MoMA's emphasis on modernism and its relation to the Progressive educational ideal were a reflection of the economic conditions during the 1930s, whereas the HMSG's effort to expand educational and exhibition practices could be read as a reflection of the social context of the late 1960s and 1970s. From this interpretation, both museums were an amalgam of influences from historical structures, practices and strategies of display, sites for the presentation of pedagogical projects, and institutional demands from various funding sources. However, the practices of each museum throughout its history show that these museums were not separate from the larger terrain of the social, cultural, and political situations of the time, but evolved differently, according to their specific contexts.
First, this dissertation searched for some similar phenomena in government's funding structure for the arts during the two periods, the 1930s and 1970s, and, at the same time, identified some differences of government's funding support for the arts between those periods. In Chapters 3 and 4, we have described how the federal relief programs and government support to the museums were initiated or expanded as a form of social control and education when civic uprisings occurred as a result of mass unemployment and were then abolished when political stability was restored. Additionally, this study has observed that this occurred in the two periods discussed, the Great Depression era of the 1930s and a period of economic growth in the 1960s.

When market incentives collapsed during the era of the Great Depression, most American museums defined their mission as an educational, rather than a custodial function, since the museums needed to receive funding from the government to survive the worst years of the depression. In time of financial hardship, financial necessity settled the debate regarding the definition of the museum as an educational institution. During the depression era, the MoMA received financial support from New Deal Relief Programs, which helped it to expand educational efforts and implement a variety of special projects (PWAP, TRAP, and WPA/FAP). The MoMA's concentration on educational services was in part for economic purposes. The best way for the
museum to survive at this time was by defining itself as an active educational institution. Thus, the new educational programs that evolved in the MoMA of this time were developed and elaborated to correspond to the contemporary movement in American schooling during the 1930s. Government funding to support the arts was also motivated by the desire for social control when social unrest was heightened by massive unemployment. The government support received by the MoMA at this time was partially an expression of a desire for social control through education. It was believed that through a broader education as in the museum the people could obtain knowledge to fulfill their duties as citizens in the society. In fact, various educational programs supported by government funding from the mid 1930s to the 1940s at the MoMA were focused on nurturing the healthy people in the society.

Additionally, we have observed that government subsidization for museums also occurred during the period of rapid economic growth, expansion of the middle class, and the civil rights movement in the 1960s. The rapid economic growth which occurred during the late 1960s and early 1970s had an effect in expanding the middle classes. These middle classes, who pursued college education, had growing interest in the arts along with an increase in their leisure time. The shift in the funding structure of the late 1960s and 1970s was largely a social phenomenon related to the increased demands for service engendered by
the cultural boom after 1960s. Additionally, the 1960s was a period of social unrest that was focused in the form of the civil rights movement. The struggle for civil rights was intensified by the mass migration of minorities from the rural South to Northern cities, which led to civic unrest in the North. This was also a period of the difficult transition of the United States from a rural agrarian to an urban industrial society, a transformation that involved a massive migration of workers from farm to city. As workers gathered in the Northern cities, the social controls which had been effective in rural society were not sufficient, ushering in a period of widespread unemployment, crime, mob violence and class conflict (Rawlins, 1981, p. 236).

When civil uprising and social unrest threatened the social order, the government began an expansion of welfare programs for minority groups. Since most of the American museums were dependent on municipal funding, museums became involved in serving the special needs of the minority groups in the community. Thus, the museums frequently designed special ethnic exhibitions and outreach programs for the minorities.

New sources of support which became available to museums during the 1960s and 1970s, especially the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities grants, helped museums develop educational programs such as outreach programs and exhibitions for the minority
groups. Although the New Deal Relief Program in the depression era was the model for the government support for the arts, it had been discontinued after the depression was alleviated. However, the two endowments (NEA and NEH) were the first 'permanent' federal government funds to support cultural programs. The HMSG received these endowment funds and attempted to popularize its educational efforts in response to the needs of marginalized groups in the community, and through programs of lectures, films, and seminars as well.

Interestingly, in many cases, the main purpose for establishing educational programs of whatever scale was to qualify for state or national grants of various kinds. The same reasoning governed the art museum’s interest in the numbers of visitors to the museum. It was a means of certifying to the public authorities of the city or state in which the museum was located that the museum deserved public funds because of the service it provided to the community. We have discussed the existence of these funding sources in Chapters 3 and 4, such as the Carnegie Corporation Funds, the New Deal Relief Project during the 1930s, and NEH, NEA, and the Smithsonian Institution Grant during the 1970s. If the museums could prove that they were making an important contribution as educational institutions, they could gain public funds to cover part of their operating expenses and the development of new educational programs.
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Second, this dissertation has attempted to find the link between the museum practices of the American museums and the ideals of educational reforms movements. The general educational reforms, especially major trends in American public schooling, shaped the educational rationales of the MoMA and the HMSG. Museum professionals in the Educational Departments seem to have drawn upon new ideas through educational reform movements current in each period. The greatest influence of the ideals seems to have coincided with the Common School Movement of the nineteenth century, the Progressive Education Movement of the 1930s, and diverse art educational movements (such as the Arts-in-Education Movement and Postmodernism) during the 1970s.

In the nineteenth century, many of the philanthropic New Yorkers who promoted the establishment of art museums were supporters of schools and libraries as well. They were involved in the tenets of the Common School Movement: a belief in the educability of the common man; the importance of universal schooling in a democracy; the efficacy of education as a form of social control; and the pecuniary benefits of industrial training for American manufacturing. The rationale of Common School movement was the basis for the founding of the Metropolitan Museum in the 1870s.
The 1930s represents a second era when the notion of the construction of museum education was profoundly affected by the prevailing trends in Progressive Education, particularly, the thoughts of John Dewey. The emphasis on studio activities in museums was related to Dewey’s concern with the whole child and his/her interests and needs, an integrated approach to the arts, and diversity in the aesthetic experience. We have already mentioned that the MoMA’s educational rationale was pervaded by the spirit of Progressive Educational reform. Several exemplary activities of the Education Department of the MoMA reveal some intellectual debt to Dewey’s notions that emphasized social cooperation and community integration.

During the 1960s and 1970s, museum rhetoric took on social overtones. We have described the HMSG as an exemplary museum founded after the 1960s, which achieved the ideal of the educational reforms and practices of that time. Even though a serious intellectual acknowledgement of educational principles or practices of the period seems to be lacking in the writing of museum professionals of the HMSG, this dissertation attempted to establish a link between the museum practices and the ideal of the educational movement of the 1960s and 1970s. The HMSG appears to have been involved with such educational movements, as ‘the Arts-in-Education Movement’ and ‘Postmodernism.’ In the education programs of the HMSG, the arts were understood as
interdisciplinary subjects, and were used in teaching other subjects such as history, math, and so on. Additionally, outsider groups of the community who had been marginalized groups in the museum audience of the previous eras came to be considered as important museum visitors. The HMSG developed several outreach programs, for these marginalized audiences.

The third focal point in this dissertation concerned the methods and strategies of display of the exhibitions of the time. In the history of the origin of museums, museums invariably based their enterprise on a certain notion of system for the ordering of things. Although the museums sought to characterize their concept of the order of things as somehow inherent in the objects they presented, the display always took place within some externally constructed discursive field, such as social upheaval, cultural movements, artistic theories, and so on. This consideration was no a major part in this dissertation; however, it is important that the methods of display of the exhibitions in the museums (MoMA and HMSG) were closely tied with the museums’ mission for the education. The exhibitions were considered as a means to serve the educational mission for the public. Additionally, the methods of display in the exhibitions at the MoMA and HMSG were related to the artistic theories popular during that time, such as modernism and postmodernism.
The display and educational techniques in the exhibitions during the 1930s were explained with reference to the MoMA's exhibitions. The exhibitions of the MoMA of that time consisted of the modernist paintings of Europe and America. These exhibitions saw that the artworks—paintings and sculptures—were of paramount importance. The Museum merely provided some catalogues and limited labels for the public along with the artworks themselves. Additional materials to help in understanding the artworks were not used in the exhibitions of the MoMA. The Museum expected understanding to be essentially a process of individual communication between the visitor and the work of art. The visitor was supposed merely to experience the painting or sculpture, though quite what that experience was meant to consist of, no one seems prepared to say. Any kind of adjunct materials, for the audience, such as lengthy captions, information panels, audiovisual displays, photographic reconstruction, were considered needless instruction that interfered with the visitor's silent contemplation of the work of art itself. It was an attitude that was uncompromising, which took for granted a certain level of education and sensitivity on the part of the visitor, making no concession to the beholders with limited social and cultural backgrounds. The notion that works of art should be left to speak for themselves took no account of the fact that such works were, for most audiences, silent objects.
In contrast to the exhibitions in the MoMA, the displays of the exhibitions in the HMSG provided a narrative the viewers even to the smallest details: the choice of display lettering of the wall text, the design of the catalogue, the labels, related advertisements and publicity material. There were any number of possible stories to be told, depending not merely on the nature of the artworks, but also on the rapport between the additional materials and audiences. The same materials could be made to tell quite different narratives not just by means of labels, information panels, or explanatory texts, but by the sequence in which artworks were displayed, the very way the material itself was divided up, and, above all, the physical and associative contexts. The meanings of artwork in the exhibitions of the HMSG were not merely from the artwork, but from multiple contexts, such as the situation of artworks in the gallery space. Thus, in the case of the HMSG’s exhibition, the multiple contexts, artworks, visitor, and situation of the gallery space created the multiple meanings of the artworks.

In short, this dissertation has attempted to reread historical materials of American museums in order to support the premises that the meanings of the American museums were constructed with reference to social changes, economic needs, aesthetic theories, and general educational reform movements. It is possible to argue that the detailed events and shifts described in this dissertation represent the evolution of
museums from custodial function toward their role as social institutions, in service to their communities. Yet, the story of education in museums which was discussed in this dissertation tells us that ‘education’ often remained a marginalized arena compared to such other museum operations as collection, research, and display.

Yesterday’s museum possessed major impediments to achieving the museum’s educational potential. Museum workers who were involved in the educational programs and departments were handicapped by ill-defined role expectations and standards, an insufficient knowledge base, inadequate academic preparation, and limited professional communication. Within museums, they lacked status, power, and adequate financing in an institutional setting dominated by object-oriented trustees and professional art historians.

Confronted with these problems, today’s museums seem to be seriously and systematically working to resolve them for efficacy in the evolution of the museums’ public service. Growing professionalism, along with the diverse methods of visitor studies (accountability, customer service, and educational reform) has made ‘education’ a serious and central function in today’s museums. Today’s museum workers are involved in a much broader arena of education and audiences: for example, program and exhibit development, school field trips, teacher training, community outreach, visitor studies, and fundraising. This
shift represents the emergence of a new professionalism and revolution of values, knowledge, and power. The educational mission in the museums actually and potentially holds radical implications for what museums should be. The arena of education in the museums has brought visitors’ perspectives to bear on the treatment of collections: how they are displayed, what is said about them, and who does the saying. In this process, questions have been raised about such traditional tenets as the authority of objects and curators. As a consequence, traditional scholarly definitions of objects have been replaced with alternative interpretations based on different and diverse criteria and meanings. Perhaps, tomorrow’s museums will need to pay much more attention to their responsibility to the diverse arena of the public. The once prevalent view that the meanings of the museums are constructed by curators and trustees is no longer viable and the meanings of museum will increasingly be constructed by visitors’ particular interests and values.
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Annual Increase in Members
Annual Increase in Members

Year | Members
--- | ----
1929 | 400
1930 | 800
1931 | 1200
1932 | 1600
1933 | 2000
1934 | 2400
1935 | 2800
1936 | 3200

APPENDIX B

Annual Increase in Circulation of Travelling Exhibitions
Annual Increase in Circulation of Travelling Exhibitions

Number of Exhibitions: □□□□
Number of times exhibited: □□□□

In 1931-32: 3 exhibitions were shown, 15 items
In 1935-36: 24 exhibitions were shown, 141 times
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The Museum and Its Public
1938-39

MEMBERSHIP

EXHIBITION ATTENDANCE

MOTION PICTURE ATTENDANCE

1939-40

MEMBERSHIP

EXHIBITION ATTENDANCE

MOTION PICTURE ATTENDANCE

Each card represents 1,000 members
Each figure represents 30,000 people
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Victor D'Amico Biography
VICTOR D'AMICO BIOGRAPHY

Director, Department of Education, The Museum of Modern Art 1937-
Created Children's Art Carnival 1942-
Director, The Art Center 1949-
Producer, Through the Enchanted Gate (NBC-TV) 1952-1953
President, The Institute of Modern Art 1960-
Director, The Kearsarge Art Center, Amagansett, N. Y. 1962-
Consulting Director, The Children's Art Carnival in Harlem 1968-
Instructor, Department of Art and Art Education, New York University 1962-
Instructor, Department of Fine Arts, Southampton College, Long Island University 1967-
Head, Art Department, Fieldston School, New York 1926-1948
Instructor, Art Education, Teachers College, Columbia University 1932, 1934-1942
Chairman, National Committee on Art Education 1942
Executive Director, National Committee on Art Education 1960-1965
Alumni Trustee, Pratt Institute 1957-1962
Trustee, Philadelphia College of Arts 1960-
Advisor, Westchester Art Society 1960-

PUBLICATIONS

The Art of Assemblage (with Arlette Buchman), The Museum of Modern Art, publication, 1970.
Collage Kit (with Margaret Johnson), The Museum of Modern Art, 1967.
Found Objects (exhibition catalogue), The State University of New York (Buffalo), 1965.
Art for the Family (with Moreen Maser & Frances Wilson), The Museum of Modern Art, 1954
How to Make pottery and Ceramic Sculpture (with Julia Hamlin Duncan), The Museum of Modern Art, 1947.
Visual Arts in General Education, Appleton Century, New York, 1940.
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MAGAZINE ARTICLES (Selected list)

Other articles in Art Education Today (Teachers College, Columbia University), New York Ties Magazine, House Beautiful.

HONORS

Grants from the JDR 3rd Fund to develop the Children’s Art Caravan, 1968.
Honorary Degree of Doctor of Fine Arts, Philadelphia Museum College of Art, June 8, 1964.
Citation of Merit, The State University of New York (Buffalo), April 13, 1964.
Phi Delta Kappa –1942.

EDUCATION

Cooper Union, New York, N. Y., fine arts, illustration and costume design.
Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., art education.
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., B.S., M.A., fine arts and art education.
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Museum of Modern Art and Historical Context
Museum of Modern Art and Historical Context

1920s | 1930s | 1940s | 1950s | 1960s
---|---|---|---|---
**MoMA**
1929-34 Inception Period
1939- *Permanent building of the MoMA*  
"Change of administration*  
Practices of Progressive education*
**Political & Social**
New Deal Relief Program
Cold War (U.S. & Soviet Union)
**Economic**
Great Depression (PWPA, Section of Fine Arts, TRAP, WPA/FAP)  
Corporate donation  
(Carnegie corporation, Whitney foundation, Rockefeller foundation)
**Cultural**
Modernism
**General Educational Reform**
1933-45 Reconstructionist Art Education
Creative self-expression (1947, Lowenfeld)
1929-35 Active notion of education
1937 Packard Report
1943 Committee on Art Education
1944 Veterans' Art Center
1945 People's Art Center
1942-77 Children's Art Carnival

*1955: Progressive Education Association was dissolved.

*Advent of Disciplined-based on art education
APPENDIX F

Agreement between Joseph H. Hirshhorn
The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc.
And
The Smithsonian Institution

(May 17, 1966)
The museum and sculpture garden hereinbefore provided for shall be designated and known in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and shall be a free public museum and sculpture garden under the administration of the Board of Regents of the Institution.

The faith of the United States shall be pledged that the United States shall provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation and administration of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be the permanent home of the collections of art of Joseph H. Hirshhorn and The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, and shall be used exclusively for the storage, exhibition and study of works of art, and for the administration of the affairs of The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

There shall be established in the Institution a Board of Trustees to be known as the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which shall provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents of the Institution on all matters relating to the administration, operation, maintenance and preservation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; and which shall have the sole authority (a) to purchase or otherwise acquire (whether by gift, exchange or other means) works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; (b) to loan, exchange, sell or otherwise dispose of said works of art; and (c) to determine policy as to the method of display of the works of art contained in the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

The Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be composed of ten members as follows: (a) The Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Institution, who shall serve as ex-officio members and (b) eight general members to be initially appointed by the President, four of whom shall be appointed from among nominations submitted by Joseph H. Hirshhorn and four of whom shall be appointed from among nominations submitted by the Board of Regents of the Institution. The general members so appointed by the President shall have terms expiring one each on July 1, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975, as designated by the President. Successor general members (who may be elected from among members whose terms have expired) shall serve for a term of six years, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office of his predecessor, shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term. Vacancies occurring among general members of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be filled by a vote of not less than four-fifths of the then acting members of the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Regents of the Institution may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director and, subject to his supervision, an administrator and two curators of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, none of whose appointment, compensation or duties shall be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board of Regents may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation and maintenance of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

There shall be authorized to be appropriated, and there shall be appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of such legislation, including all sums necessary for planning and constructing the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

B. That "e said Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall have been constructed and completed in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.
Third. Upon receipt of appropriate authorization from the Congress and the appropriation of funds as provided in Paragraph Second hereof, the Institution shall, with all due dispatch, construct the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden on the site described in Subparagraph A(1) of Paragraph Second hereof, and landscape said site, in accordance with plans to be prepared by a firm of architects jointly chosen by the Donor and the Secretary of the Institution, which plans shall have been specifically approved by both the Donor and the Secretary of the Institution.

Fourth. Immediately following the construction and completion of the said museum and sculpture garden as herein provided, and the taking of such other steps as counsel for the Donor and counsel for the Institution shall deem necessary to give effect to the gifts contemplated hereunder, the Donor shall pay the sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) to the Institution and title to the collections of the works of art listed in Exhibits A and A-1 and Exhibits B and B-1 shall pass to and be vested in the Institution, and such collections shall be delivered to the Institution at the expense of the Donor and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, respectively, and thereafter shall remain under the exclusive control of the Institution, subject to the provisions of this Agreement.

During the period between the date of this Agreement and the time when title to said collections of art shall pass to and be vested in the Institution, or when this Agreement shall terminate, whichever shall be earlier, the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation shall respectively care for the said works of art and shall keep the same insured against loss or damage by fire, theft or burglary, in such amounts and with such parties as the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation in their discretion may determine, if and to the extent that such insurance may be obtainable; it being understood, however, that in no event nor under any circumstances, shall the Donor or the Hirshhorn Foundation be liable for any loss or damage to any of the works of art, however caused, which is not compensated for by such insurance. The Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation shall respectively pay all costs, premiums, and other charges incidental to such care and insurance.

Fifth. The gift of One Million Dollars by the Donor hereunder shall be used solely to acquire works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Pending the use of said funds for such purpose, the Institution may invest such funds in such manner as it may determine from time to time, provided that such funds and/or investments, and the income derived therefrom, shall be segregated and maintained as a trust fund for the benefit of the said Museum and Sculpture Garden, separate and apart from the other funds and investments of the Institution.

Sixth. The Institution may accept, hold and administer gifts, bequests or devises of money, securities, or other property for the benefit of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, provided that no works of art shall be accepted for such Museum and Sculpture Garden without the prior consent and approval of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Seventh. The Institution covenants and agrees that:

A. It will, at all times, properly maintain the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, protect and care for all works of art therein, and regularly exhibit works of art contained therein with dignity to the general public free of charge.

B. In no event shall any sculpture of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden be loaned for periods longer than three hundred sixty (360) days.

C. The funds received from the sale of works of art of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be used solely for the purpose of acquiring works of art for said Museum and Sculpture Garden. Pending the use of said funds for such purpose, the Institution may invest such funds in such manner as it may determine from time to time, provided that such funds and/or investments, and the income derived therefrom, shall be segregated and maintained as a trust fund for the benefit of the said Museum and Sculpture Garden, separate and apart from the other funds and investments of the Institution.

D. The first director of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be designated by the Donor with the consent of the Secretary of the Institution.

E. The said sculpture garden and museum in the area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, in the District of Columbia, shall be known and
designated in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden to which the entire public shall forever have access without charge, subject only to reasonable regulations from time to time established by the Institution.

Eighth. Anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, from and after the date of this Agreement and until title to the collections of works of art shall pass to and vest in the Institution, (a) the Donor may transfer any of the works of art listed in Exhibits A or A-1 to the Hirshhorn Foundation, and all works of art thus transferred shall remain subject to this agreement as if originally listed in Exhibits B or B-1 instead of Exhibits A or A-1 hereof; and (b) the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation may loan or sell (for such consideration as the Donor or the Hirshhorn Foundation, as the case may be, shall in his or its sole discretion deem appropriate) any of the works of art listed respectively in Exhibits A, A-1, B and B-1 hereof and may also exchange the same for other works of art. No loan of such works of art shall be made for a period in excess of 180 days. The Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation respectively may invest and reinvest the net proceeds arising from any such sale of his or its works of art by acquiring additional works of art and/or purchasing obligations of the United States Government. All works of art so acquired by purchase or exchange shall become subject to the terms of this Agreement as if originally listed in Exhibits A, A-1, B or B-1 in the place and stead of the works of art sold or exchanged as aforesaid. After title to the collections of works of art shall pass to and vest in the Institution, any obligations of the United States Government acquired as aforesaid and the balance, if any, of net proceeds not used for the acquisition of works of art or obligations of the United States Government shall be transferred and paid over to the Institution to be used solely for the purpose of acquiring works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and pending such use, such funds and obligations shall be administered as provided in Paragraph Fifth hereof. Any insurance proceeds realized under policies carried by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph Fourth hereof shall be treated in the same manner as net proceeds arising from the sale of the works of art of the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation as provided in this Paragraph Eighth.

Ninth. In the event that legislation containing provisions substantially as set forth in Paragraph Second hereof is not duly enacted by the Congress of the United States and duly approved by the President no later than ten (10) days after the close of the 90th Congress, or in the event that said Museum and Sculpture Garden shall not have been constructed and completed as provided in Paragraph Third hereof within five years after such legislation shall have been enacted and approved, this Agreement shall be null and void and the proposed gifts by the Donor and the Hirshhorn Foundation shall not be consummated.

Tenth. This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, executors and administrators of the Donor.

In Witness Whereof, Joseph H. Hirshhorn has caused this Agreement to be executed by his hand and seal; The Smithsonian Institution, pursuant to a resolution duly adopted by its Board of Regents, has caused this Agreement to be signed and its official seal to be hereunto affixed by its Secretary; and The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, Inc., pursuant to a resolution duly adopted by its Board of Directors, has caused this Agreement to be signed and its official seal to be hereunto affixed by its Secretary, all as of the day and year first above written.

Joseph H. Hirshhorn  
THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION  
By ..................................
Secretary

THE JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN FOUNDATION, INC.  
By ..................................
Secretary
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Public Law 89-788
Public Law 89-788
89th Congress, S. 3389
November 7, 1966

An Act

To provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

Section 1. (a) The area bounded by Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street, and Jefferson Drive, in the District of Columbia, is hereby appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution as the permanent site of a museum and the area bounded by Seventh Street, Jefferson Drive, Ninth Street, and Madison Drive, in the District of Columbia, is hereby made available to the Smithsonian Institution as the permanent site of a sculpture garden, both areas to be used for the exhibition of works of art.

(b) The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to remove any existing structure, to prepare architectural and engineering designs, plans, and specifications, and to construct a suitable museum within said area lying south of Jefferson Drive and to provide a sculpture garden for the use of the Smithsonian Institution within the area designated in section 1(a) of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The museum and sculpture garden provided for by this Act shall be designated and known in perpetuity as the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and shall be a free public museum and sculpture garden under the administration of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. In administering the sculpture garden the Board shall cooperate with the Secretary of Interior so that the development and use of the Garden is consistent with the open-space concept of the Mall, for which the Secretary of Interior is responsible, and with related development regarding underground garages and street development.

(b) The faith of the United States is pledged that the United States shall provide such funds as may be necessary for the upkeep, operation, and administration of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

(c) The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be the permanent home of the collections of art of Joseph H. Hirshhorn and the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, and shall be used for the storage, exhibition, and study of works of art, and for the administration of the affairs of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Sec. 3. (a) There is established in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees to be known as the Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which shall provide advice and assistance to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on all matters relating to the administration, operation, maintenance, and preservation of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden; and which shall have the sole authority (i) to purchase or otherwise acquire (whether by gift, exchange, or other means) works of art for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, (ii) to lease, exchange, sell, or otherwise dispose of said works of art, and (iii) to determine policy as to the method of display of the works of art contained in said museum and sculpture garden.

(b) The Board of Trustees shall be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who shall serve as ex officio members, and eight general members to be appointed as follows: Four of the general members first taking office shall be appointed by the President of the United States from among nominations submitted by Joseph H. Hirshhorn and four shall be

305
appointed by the President from among nominations submitted by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The general members so appointed by the President shall have terms expiring one each on July 1, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974, as designated by the President. Successor general members (who may be elected from among members whose terms have expired) shall serve for a term of six years, except that a successor chosen to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office of his predecessor shall be chosen only for the remainder of such term. Vacancies occurring among general members of the Board of Trustees of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden shall be filled by a vote of not less than four-fifths of the then acting members of the Board of Trustees.

Sec. 4. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director and, subject to his supervision, an administrator and two curators of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, none of whose appointment, compensation, or duties shall be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board of Regents may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation, and maintenance of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Sec. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $15,000,000 for the planning and construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and such additional sums as may be necessary for the maintenance and operation of such museum and sculpture garden.

Approved November 7, 1966.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 2222 (Comm. on Public Works).
SENATE REPORTS: No. 1538 (Comm. on Public Works) and No. 1583 (Comm. on Rules and Administration).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):
Sept. 1: Considered and passed Senate.
Oct. 17: Considered and passed House.
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Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden
&
Historical Context
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden and Historical Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMSG &amp; Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td>1974 Construction</td>
<td>1974 Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Cultural</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economical</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Economic &amp; Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Educational Practices</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Educational Movement</td>
<td>1973 ES Program</td>
<td>General Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Practices</td>
<td>1974 ES Program</td>
<td>Educational Practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figures
Figure 4: Michelosso: Palazzo Medici, Riccardi, Florence, C. 1440
Figure 5: Posthumous portrait of *Cosimo de Medici*, by Pontormo
Figure 6: Engraved frontpiece, *Musei Wormiani Historia*, Leiden, 1655
Figure 7: The Imperial Gallery in Prague, by Johann Bretschneider, 1714
Figure 8: The South Kensington Museum, Iron building, south front
Figure 9: The South Kensington Museum (later Victoria and Albert): interior of the south court, eastern portion, from the south, 1876
American Museum.

THE Subscriber having been induced from several motives, to open
the Collection for the Inspection of the Curious, and Lovers of Natural History, in the City, and
their Friends, who are disposed to see the Curiosities it contains, finds it important, upon
the present occasion, to publish a more complete and correct view of the Subject; which is now
published, collected from most parts of America, the West-Indies, Africa, the East-Indies, and Europe.

NATURAL CURIOSITIES.

Marine Productions: A very large and complete Collection of the rare and beautiful Shells, Sea-eggs, Corals, Sea-plants, Fishes, Turtles, Crabs, Sea-stars, and other curious animal productions
of the Sea.

Land Productions: Rare Birds, and parts of Birds and Trees; a variety of Snakes, Lizards, Reptiles, Insects, and Worms, the most of them from different parts of the West-Indies.

Fossils: Bones of various animals (Fishes, and other minerals) Volcanes, Meteorites, Minerals, and other curiosities; and rare-fa-
ged, polished and distinctly colored Fossils.

A Collection of various kinds of Wood, Plants, Fruits, Reptiles, Insects, Bones, Teeth, and
of other Curiosities that once belonged to the Sea; such as Malacoles, Sea-worms, Shark's Teeth, Coral, and Coral-prisms: As also various specimens of perfect lizards, and many lizards over
several kinds of different natural and artificial.

Artificial Curiosities: Made use of by the Projects of Volcanes.

Paintings: A very considerable Collection of the most curious Plants of the West-Indies, together
with the most remarkable productions of their Fruits; such as their Wood, Rust, Fruits, Fossils, Minerals, and
Seeds, all in the largest perfection.

ARTIFICIAL CURIOSITIES.

Antiquities of the Indians of the West-Indies, and of the North American Indians.

Ornamental Dress of the modern Indians of North and South America, with their Weapons and
Outrider.

Curious ancient Europæan and Indiæan Weapons; with a valuable Curiosity from the Island of
Outre-mer.

Various Weapons, Medical Instruments, and Utensils of the Negroes from the coast of Guinea, and
the West-Indies.

A Collection of various Paintings in Oil, Figures, Water-colours, Miniatures, Engravings, China, with
specimens of the ancient and modern transparent painting on glass, and a curious display of per-
fections.

Hence a number of miscellaneous Curiosities of various kinds.

The days of admission are Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, and the hours for each com-
pany are from 10 in the morning, and at 12, Noon, and 3 o'clock in the after-
noon, allowing an hour for each company; which is to avoid inconvenience to themselves, to begin
with not more than 300 in each room. By leaving the ticket a day or two before, the day
and hour that suit the company will be particularly noticed.

He takes this opportunity to return his grateful thanks to all those persons who for several
years past, have been various parts of this Continent to contribute to his Collection; and hopes
he will continue to be favoured with such, varied as may fall to his portion, more particularly as
he intends his Cabinet to be hereafter the foundation of the American Museum.

To be held in the frame of every day, Sundays excepted, at his house in Arch-
street, above Fourth-street, at HALF A DOLLAR each.

P. E. D. U. SIMITIÈRES.

Philadelphia, June 1, 1782.

PRINTED BY JOHN DUNLAP.

Figure 10: Broadside announcing the opening of Pierre Eugène Du
Simitièrés American museum, June 1, 1782
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Figure 11: The Metropolitan Museum’s main entrance
Figure 12: Lillie P. Bliss
Figure 13: Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan
Figure 14: Abby Aldrich Rockefeller
Figure 15: A. Conger Goodyear
Figure 16: MoMA's first exhibition, Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh (Nov. 7-Dec. 7, 1929)
Figure 17: The new building of the MoMA in 1939
Figure 18: Nelson A. Rockefeller and Stephen C. Clark
Figure 19: Alfred Barr
Figure 20: Installation view of exhibition "The Arts in Therapy"
Figure 21: Circulating exhibition department from 1936 to 1947
Figure 22: The War Veterans Art Center
Figure 23: Studio art classroom at the MoMA
Figure 24: Visitors entering the children’s Art Carnival through the contour gate
Figure 25: A studio workshop of the Children’s Art Carnival
Figure 26: Secretary S. Dillon Ripley. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 2
Continues

Figure 27: Construction of the HMSG. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 34
Figure 27 continued

Continues
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Figure 28: Joseph Henry. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 11
Figure 29: Charles Coffin Jewett, the first assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in charge of the library. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 14
Figure 30: Spencer Fullerton Baird, ca. 1865, the first assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in charge of the National Museum and the second secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 2
Figure 31: The United States National Museum, opened in 1881 (Smithsonian Archives, courtesy of the Smithsonian Institution), Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 28
Figure 32: Patent building, interior. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington: Photograph Collection, 1850s-, Record Unit 95, box 34, folder 7
Figure 33: Installation view from the exhibition of Content at the HMSG
Figure 34: Installation view from the exhibition of Content at the HMSG
Figure 35: Installation view from the exhibition of Content at the HMSG