

MADE IN THE SIXTIES

**Painting and Sculpture from the
Permanent Collection of the
Whitney Museum of American Art**

**Whitney Museum of American Art
Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza**

April 18–July 13, 1988

MADE IN THE SIXTIES

The 1960s was a period of transition and change not only in the social and political spectrum of America, but as well in the field of art and art criticism. Many of the traditional ideas about what constitutes a work of art, what a work of art should look like, or what effect a work of art can have on a viewer were rigorously reexamined. The plurality of stylistic and theoretical options that resulted stood in marked contrast to the state of art during the 1950s, when Abstract Expressionism and its critical advocates dominated the American scene. The writings of critic Clement Greenberg gained importance in the 1950s because they clearly explicated and justified the dominant practice of Abstract Expressionist painting. For Greenberg, modernism required each of the arts to concentrate on its unique and essential material aspects: "Purity in art consists in the acceptance, willing acceptance, of the limitations of the medium of the specific art....It is by virtue of its medium that each art is unique and strictly itself." Elaborating his theory almost exclusively in terms of painting, he maintained that flatness and the recognition of the boundaries of the picture frame should be the sole defining characteristics of modernist painting.

Greenberg articulated an extremely rigid ideal of art as abstract, anti-illusionistic, non-narrative, autonomous, and purely visual. A painting was to appear before the viewer as whole and complete — all the components of the picture to be comprehended in a single glance, all aspects of the image offered to the observer instantaneously. The aesthetic experience itself was collapsed into an ideal of visual fullness, a sensation of such total absorption in perception that it can only be described as existing in a conceptual realm outside real time and space.

Greenberg's model for modernism gained

common acceptance within American art criticism, largely determining the ways in which art was interpreted and seen. Much of the art of the 1960s, however, calls into question the validity and usefulness of Greenberg's ideas about art and the aesthetic experience, which could no longer account for the diverse practices that emerged during this decade.

Among these practices was a tendency to push Greenbergian ideals to such extremes as to reveal absurd contradictions. Helen Frankenthaler, for example, began her career within Abstract Expressionism and then moved beyond it. She rejected easel painting in favor of working on unprimed canvas stretched out on the studio floor. Abandoning the brush as a means of applying paint, she developed the technique of staining pigment into the canvas surface, thus making painting and canvas a single physical entity and pursuing the modernist concern for the flatness of the canvas support to the extreme. Frankenthaler's radical use of brilliant, deeply resonant, and wide-ranging color reaches its fullest expression in her works of the sixties. In *Flood* (1967), the fields of color have little or no relation to the framing edge, since they seem to spread beyond it. There is a sense of flowing movement and continuous transformation within the pictorial field. Frankenthaler's varying densities of paint application — from opaque passages fully saturated with pigment to more ethereal tinted washes — ironically create illusions of indeterminate, almost infinite depth. Although Greenberg's definition of the anti-illusionist nature of modernist painting was extremely influential in Frankenthaler's artistic formation, and her painting technique vigorously pursues an ideal of extreme flatness, the result is an image of deep illusionistic space.

If one were to look for an image of Greenbergian modernism bursting at its seams, one need go no further than Frank Stella's *Agbatana I* (1968). During the previous decade, in conscious rebellion against the improvisation and erratic strokes of gestural painting, Stella had instituted an art of studied composition and overt control. In *Agbatana I*, the flatness and shape of the painting surface are adamantly emphasized by the equation of the pictorial image to its framing device — in this case, the repeated semicircular shape of a protractor. Yet the tendency to see illusionistic space is encouraged as well as thwarted. In the interweaving patterns formed where the three protractor shapes overlap, lines cross over each other and colors project and recede according to their degrees of brilliance and saturation. However, no linear band or color area is allowed to consistently overlap or fall behind all the others. The particularly deep stretcher Stella used gives the work a certain visual punch. Combined with the regular geometric composition, the acidic and fluorescent brilliance of the colors and the almost overwhelming scale make the painting instantly graspable to the eye — an effect which modernist aesthetics specified as a central concern for painting. But the increased depth and eccentric shape of the canvas support pushes painting away from the realm of the purely optical toward the physical preserve of sculpture.

Other painters also rigorously investigated a highly reductive abstraction that pushed the modernist paradigm of pictorial flatness and a purely visual aesthetic to its limits. The simple, flat shapes and pure vibrant color of Ellsworth Kelly's *Green, Blue, Red* (1964) are not abstractions in the same sense as Stella's. Kelly culls his meticulously inflected forms from observations of the real world. As in *Green, Blue, Red*, contours frequently are enlarged to the edges of the pictorial field, obscuring distinctions between foreground and background. The lack of any modulation of color areas eliminates all perception of depth or reference to the original visual source. In Robert Irwin's painting, the monochrome white,

pointillist style creates a shimmering and shifting optical effect that stimulates and fascinates the eye. *Untitled* (1963–65), with its inordinately deep stretcher, can again be seen as playing upon that dichotomy between visuality and physicality which became an arena of contention in sixties abstract painting. In Paul Feeley's *Gomelza* (1965), the figure and ground become mutually interdependent. Through a vocabulary of simultaneously biomorphic and geometric forms, he defines the boundaries of shapes and interstices with equal vigor. By collapsing the distinctions between the illusionistic representation of depth and the material reality of the picture plane, the radically reductive abstractions of Feeley, Kelly, and Irwin test the boundaries of modernist painting, pushing the aesthetic of pure visuality to the limit.

Greenberg's theory of modernism, elaborated almost exclusively in terms of painting, could not account for many of the developments in sculpture during the 1960s. In contrast to Greenberg's idea of the self-sufficiency of each medium, sculptural practice during this period depended on painting and the pictorial to define its creative efforts. David Smith's *Lectern Sentinel* (1961), both in its means of composition and frontality, has been best interpreted as a sculptural investigation of space initially developed in the medium of Cubist painting and collage. *Lectern Sentinel* is one of the last and most ambitious of a series of sculptures Smith worked on sporadically between 1956 and 1961. Its emphatic verticality and orientation around a central spinal axis create an undeniable figural presence. This anthropomorphic sensibility is emphasized by the title's suggestion of a sentry and by the resemblance of the crowning circular element to an eye that seems to survey its environment. The work's lower half forms a lecturer's podium, playfully suggesting the sculpture's ability to preside over and forcefully address its audience. The overall frontality of *Lectern Sentinel* derives largely from Smith's working method, which has been described as drawing with form. He layered

and shifted his sculptural elements on a studio floor that he had painted white to simulate the ground of a canvas. *Lectern Sentinel's* overall gestural burnishing tends to dematerialize form as light, reflecting and refracting it off the surface in a way that reemphasizes Smith's exploration of the pictorial as a legitimate pursuit for sculptural invention.

The sculptures of Mark di Suvero and John Chamberlain have frequently been interpreted as translations of the heroic gesture evident in Abstract Expressionist painting. David Smith's pioneering use of industrial materials, such as stainless steel in *Lectern Sentinel*, is reinterpreted in the crushed and battered automobile parts of Chamberlain's *Velvet White* (1962) and in the massive wooden beams salvaged from a Lower Manhattan demolition site in di Suvero's *Hankchampion* (1960). In these works, the monumental is presented through the material detritus of contemporary society, ambiguously provoking allusions to violence, destruction, and disintegration. While Chamberlain's works incorporated color by exploiting the remnants of the original finished surface of the automobile parts, George Sugarman laminated the varied wooden forms of his sculpture with solid, eye-catching hues. Spread across the floor, Sugarman's *Inscape* (1964) echoes the jarring juxtapositions of color and form found in contemporary urban life. It posits a radical sculptural composition based on the concept of sequential vision, in sharp contrast to the immediately graspable visual impression sought in modernist painting.

Roy Lichtenstein's *Modern Sculpture with Velvet Rope* (1968) is an audaciously self-conscious exploration of the non-sculptural. Its adamantly two-dimensional forms, derived from the door handles, stair railings, grillwork, and interior details of 1930s *moderne* architecture, were first developed by Lichtenstein in a series of boldly designed paintings of similarly inspired, curvilinear motifs. His direct transfer of this pictorial imagery into sculptural form mocks the ostensible uniqueness claimed for each artistic medium. *Modern Sculpture with Velvet Rope* retains a

playful resemblance to the ordinary stanchions that keep people at a distance from precious objects. Since only a blank wall appears behind the rope, the work ironically criticizes the institutionally imposed relations between art and its public. Lichtenstein seems to want his art to have the accessibility of common objects, and this link to the real world rejects any notion of a transcendent aesthetic.

During the sixties, Greenberg's conception that each of the arts should be self-defining was also challenged by a prolific acceleration of cross-disciplinary investigations — of art forms that combined painting, sculpture, performance, photography, and architecture. The sculpture of Marisol, in its incorporation of carving, drawing, painting, and stenciling, in its use of plaster casts, photographs, and ordinary objects, challenges the conception of sculpture as an independent enterprise. The torsos of each of the life-size wooden figures in *Women and Dog* (1964) retain the boxlike format characteristic of Marisol's work. This insistent geometric form gives Marisol's figures the primitive quality of folk sculpture as well as a distinctive and penetrating sense of the anonymous, isolating aspects of modern life.

Architectural scale was increasingly emulated both by painting and sculpture during the 1960s, as is evident in the monumentality of many of the works in this exhibition. Louise Nevelson's constructions of obsolete and discarded wooden objects, such as *Royal Tide II* (1961–63), completely usurp the position of the wall, pushing the sculptural into the realm of the architectural and environmental. George Segal's tableaux combine plaster figures cast from life with real accoutrements such as furniture or architectural elements. Segal attempts to capture the stance and gesture of ordinary people as they move and act in relation to real space. *Girl in Doorway* (1965) suggests the instantaneity of a documentary photograph extended into sculptural dimensions. Joan Brown's heavily impastoed *Still Life with Vegetables* (1963) can be seen as a rebellion against the

advocacy of flatness as a unique painterly value. Her encrustations of luscious color expand painting into sculptural relief. She can literally be said to carve paint as she builds her enduring subjects.

Chuck Close's *Phil* (1969) represents another merging of media, as well as a rejection of the Abstract Expressionist cult of personality. The artist attempts to bury the trace of his hand by mimicking the mechanical operation of the camera on a monumental scale. His decision to reproduce the image of Philip Glass underscores the similarity of his painting process to the composer's musical compositions, which achieve their alluring and sensuous effects through a hypnotic repetition of tonal passages. *Phil* is not a painting that duplicates the appearance of reality in the way a photograph is believed to do; rather, it is a painting of a photograph. The blurring of the image toward its outer edges meticulously reiterates the narrow field of focus which appears only in photographic images, not in actual vision. This distinction directs attention to the fact that *Phil* must be seen as a painting of a completely flat object — a photograph — as much as a realistic portrait. In thus collapsing the dichotomy between illusion and flatness, it pushes the rules of the game to the limits. Similarly, many of the images usually associated with Pop art are also representations of flatness in that they are images of preexisting images. This can be seen in Robert Indiana's revitalization of the American tradition of sign painting in *The X-5* (1963), in James Rosenquist's transformation of his work as a billboard painter into high art, and in Roy Lichtenstein's signature renditions of printed comics complete with blown-up Benday dots.

Greenberg called for an abstract and autonomous art, the segregation of art from the flux and praxis of life to a rarefied sphere of human activity. The art of the 1960s can largely be interpreted as an attempt to reevaluate this purely formal model of modernism, a process of questioning the aesthetic experience as an elitist pursuit, as one requiring highly specialized taste. Jasper Johns

succeeds in offering an alternative by insisting that the act of looking at art should draw upon the common, everyday experience of the viewer. More than any other artist of his generation, Johns has displayed a compelling interest in the issues of perception and the position of the viewer in relation to painting. Although his paintings of the early 1960s lack the emblematic quality of his earlier work, which used preexistent flat images such as flags, targets, and maps to establish the boundaries of the canvas, they nevertheless continue his initial investigations. The central focus of *Studio* (1964) is the ghostlike image of a screen door printed at an oblique angle and ostensibly completing its shape on a surface appended to the bottom of the canvas. The larger, rectilinear canvas area has proportionally the same dimensions as the printed screen door. Such an observation is encouraged by the yardstick painted on the canvas surface, alluding to the importance of measurement and structured relationships within the painting. Through an exacting pictorial logic, Johns establishes the flat rectangular shape of a door as analogous to the conventional shape of the painting surface: doors, after all, have frames just like paintings. By conflating the concepts of door and canvas, Johns introduces a consideration of the painting as an object with physical as well as perceptual properties. The attachment of household objects and artist's devices, in this case a skewer of paint cans and brushes, furthers this idea of painting-as-object and also makes reference to the process of the work's production.

The insertion of the everyday into painting in the work of Johns and others was paralleled in the works of Larry Rivers by an ironic commentary on the heroic gesture and ambitious scale of Abstract Expressionist painting. In *Washington Crossing the Delaware* (1960), Rivers inserts the bombastic, narrative subject matter of nineteenth-century academic painting into an overall gestural surface. Rivers' painterly marks seem derived from a process of erasure and correction, of failed attempts at

composition and of hesitant drawing; the result is a wry commentary on the ambitious spontaneity and improvisation which had become the hallmark of Abstract Expressionism.

The inclusion of common objects and recognizable subject matter into abstract painting set a precedent for Pop art's appropriation of commercial and popular imagery — the "kitsch" that Greenberg had declared to be outside the realm of art. In the work of Andy Warhol, the use of repetitive images of consumer products draws attention to the advertising and packaging that inundates contemporary life. With his adoption of the Campbell's Soup can imagery in the early sixties, Warhol abandoned the practice of painting in favor of silkscreening and other printing processes which mimicked mass production through the mechanical duplication of his chosen imagery. Uniformity and monotonous regularity overwhelm any vestiges of variety, providing an icon of the unimpeded standardization and conformity within twentieth-century American society.

Warhol's consistent use of commercial products draws attention to the commodity status of the work of art, to its existence as an object bought and sold within an expanding and accelerating market system. The generation of artists that came to the fore during the 1960s were the first to experience the full postwar expansion of the American art market, which paralleled a general global extension of American economic interests. With the international critical acceptance of Abstract Expressionist painting, a new public for American art emerged and a new generation of cultural entrepreneurs was encouraged to collect it. This commercialization became a discernible and integral part of the American art scene and was reflected and examined within the art itself.

Blatant consumerism was addressed directly by Claes Oldenburg when he turned his East Village storefront studio into a mock emporium, selling his whimsically enlarged versions of ordinary American products. Whimsical too is his *French Fries and Ketchup* (1963), fabricated from stuffed vinyl — its

softness and pliability pokes fun at the rigidity of traditional sculpture. The pervasive extension of technology into the most mundane aspects of life is here parodied in the artificial material and standardized forms of processed food. In Wayne Thiebaud's *Pie Counter* (1963), the regimented display and endless profusion of desserts in a self-service cafeteria register as the uncompromisingly pedestrian embodiment of material excess and marching prosperity.

The works of James Rosenquist, initially inspired by the scale and advertising strategies of commercial billboards, display the deluge and abundance of images packed into contemporary urban existence. In *U-Haul-It* (1967), the disparate images — a stopwatch against butter melting over a hot stove, automotive doors incessantly repeated in depth, and a surface absolutely dissolved in reflective glare — resist literal or narrative interpretation. Rather, his juxtapositions of diverse subjects constitute a studied reconstruction of the constant and disjointed barrage of the mass media. The visual cacophony of flipping through a magazine of airbrushed advertisements, of watching a profusion of sumptuous television commercials amid the clipping pace of the nightly news or the jolting montage of the cinematic spectacle — all these experiences are captured in Rosenquist's sprawling compositions. The works of Alex Katz are less concerned with the speed of the contemporary image glut than with its overpowering, larger-than-life quality. In such works as *Eli* (1963), Katz's portraits of family and intimate friends are transformed from a private, small-scale genre to an art which appropriates the aggrandizing movie close-up of celebrity-dominated productions for the silver screen.

Greenberg's conception of the aesthetic experience as a realm divorced from ordinary life was challenged during the 1960s. Minimalist sculpture specifically investigated the duration of the aesthetic experience as an activity intimately related to and extending normal movement and perception in the

everyday world. The revolutionary nature of Minimalist sculpture lies in its shift from an exploration of the variety of form to a recognition of the act of viewing itself. The ideal aesthetic experience was redefined in Minimalism as an extended, potentially endless situation in real time and space. Minimalist sculptures achieve this effect through the use of simple, unitary forms which subtly alter or rearrange the overall space of the gallery in which they are situated. Uncompromisingly geometrical and often repetitive, they embody a sense of pure objectness. Scale is usually substantial in order to visually and physically impose the works on the viewer. Donald Judd's ramp-like *Untitled* (1965), in its simple geometry and industrial materials, bears a strong formal kinship to the modernist architecture of the gallery interior and corporate office. The "frame" of the work is expanded to the boundaries of the real physical space in which the viewer comes into contact with the Minimalist object. The precarious balancing act of admittedly weighty and flexible lead elements in Richard Serra's *Prop* (1968) draws attention to the architectural space by engaging both wall and floor, usually considered the separate preserves of painting and sculpture, respectively. Serra confounds normal expectations of gravitational forces and presents the viewer with both a fascinating and uneasy sense of potential danger and collapse.

In diverse ways, the art of the sixties openly rebelled against restricted conceptions of modernism, primarily those propagated by Clement Greenberg. Although Greenberg's was not the only theoretical explication of modernism, it held sway over other interpretations during the 1950s. In the following decade, through a broad range of artistic practices and in a far more heterogeneous art world, painters and sculptors initiated an art after modernism — a post-modernist era which continues today.

Karl Willers
Branch Director

WORKS IN THE EXHIBITION

All works are in the collection of the Museum of American Art.

Dimensions are in inches, height preceding width preceding depth.

1. Joan Brown (b. 1938)
Still Life with Vegetables, 1963
Oil on canvas, 48 x 48
Lawrence H. Bloedel Bequest 77.1.9
2. John Chamberlain (b. 1927)
Velvet White, 1962
Welded automobile metals, 811/2 x 61 x 541/2
Gift of the Albert A. List Family 70.1579
3. Chuck Close (b. 1940)
Phil, 1969
Synthetic polymer on canvas,
108 x 84
Purchase, with funds from
Mrs. Robert M. Benjamin 69.102
4. Mark di Suvero (b. 1933)
Hankchampion, 1960
Wood and chains, 771/2 x 149 x 105
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. Scull 73.85
5. Paul Feeley (1913–1966)
Gomelza, 1965
Synthetic polymer on canvas, 80 x 80
Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
Whitney Museum of American Art 67.28
6. Helen Frankenthaler (b. 1928)
Flood, 1967
Synthetic polymer on canvas, 124 x 140
Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
Whitney Museum of American Art 68.12
7. Robert Indiana (b. 1928)
The X–5, 1963
Oil on canvas; five panels, 36 x 36 each, 108 x 108
overall
Purchase 64.9
8. Robert Irwin (b. 1928)
Untitled, 1963–65
Oil on canvas, 821/2 x 841/2 x 41/4
Gift of Fred Mueller 77.108
9. Jasper Johns (b. 1930)
Studio, 1964
Oil on canvas, 881/2 x 1451/2
Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
Whitney Museum of American Art 66.1
10. Donald Judd (b. 1928)
Untitled, 1965
Perforated steel, 8 x 120 x 66
50th Anniversary Gift of Toiny and Leo Castelli 79.77
11. Alex Katz (b. 1927)
Eli, 1963
Oil on canvas, 72 x 86
Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Fischbach 64.37
12. Ellsworth Kelly (b. 1923)
Green, Blue, Red, 1964
Oil on canvas, 73 x 100
Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
Whitney Museum of American Art 66.80

13. Roy Lichtenstein (b. 1923)
Modern Sculpture with Velvet Rope, 1968
 Brass and velvet; two parts,
 83 1/4 x 26 x 15 and 59 x 25 x 15
 Purchase, with funds from the
 Howard and Jean Lipman Foundation, Inc. 69.1
14. Marisol (b. 1930)
Women and Dog, 1964
 Wood, plaster, synthetic polymer,
 and miscellaneous items, 77 x 91 x 16
 Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
 Whitney Museum of American Art 64.17
15. Louise Nevelson (b. 1900)
Royal Tide II, 1961–63
 Painted wood, 94 1/2 x 126 1/2 x 8
 Gift of the artist 69.161
16. Claes Oldenburg (b. 1929)
French Fries and Ketchup, 1963
 Vinyl and kapok, 101 1/2 x 42 x 44
 50th Anniversary Gift of
 Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Meltzer 79.37
17. Larry Rivers (b. 1923)
Washington Crossing the Delaware, 1960
 Oil on canvas, 84 x 108
 Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Laurance S. Rockefeller 80.27
18. James Rosenquist (b. 1933)
U-Haul-It, 1967
 Oil on canvas; three panels, 60 x 169 overall
 Purchase, with funds from
 Mr. and Mrs. Lester Avnet 68.38
19. George Segal (b. 1924)
Girl in Doorway, 1965
 Plaster, wood, glass, and aluminum paint,
 113 x 63 1/2 x 18
 Purchase 65.49
20. Richard Serra (b. 1939)
Prop, 1968
 Lead antimony, 97 1/2 x 60 x 43
 Purchase, with funds from the
 Howard and Jean Lipman Foundation, Inc. 69.20
21. David Smith (1906–1965)
Lectern Sentinel, 1961
 Stainless steel, 101 3/4 x 33 x 201 1/2
 Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
 Whitney Museum of American Art 62.15
22. Frank Stella (b. 1936)
Agbatana I, 1968
 Fluorescent acrylic on canvas, 120 x 180
 Purchase, with funds from Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Kohn
 and the Helena Rubinstein Foundation 68.35
23. George Sugarman (b. 1912)
Inscape, 1964
 Painted laminated wood; nine parts, dimensions
 variable, approximately 28 x 158 x 97 overall
 Purchase, with funds from the
 Painting and Sculpture Committee 86.10a–i
24. Wayne Thiebaud (b. 1920)
Pie Counter, 1963
 Oil on canvas, 30 x 36
 Purchase, with funds from the
 Larry Aldrich Foundation Fund 64.11
25. Andy Warhol (1925–1987)
Campbell's Soup I, 1968
 Portfolio of ten serigraphs, 35 x 23 each
 Purchase, with funds from the Friends of the
 Whitney Museum of American Art 69.13.a–j

WHITNEY MUSEUM OF AMERICAN ART, DOWNTOWN AT FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA

The Whitney Museum of American Art established the first successful branch of an American museum in 1973, with the primary purpose of increasing the audience for American art. With the opening of the Whitney Museum of American Art, Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza, funded by a partnership of Park Tower Realty and IBM, the branch system now comprises four separate exhibition facilities — three in New York City and one in Stamford, Connecticut — which together represent one of the most dynamic programs of the Whitney Museum. Each location has a separate character and the Branch Directors have the freedom to develop programs of interest to their particular constituencies.

The branches in the Champion International Corporation headquarters in Stamford, Connecticut (1981), in the headquarters of Philip Morris Companies Inc. at Park Avenue and 42nd Street (1983), and in The Equitable Center at Seventh Avenue and 52nd Street (1986) all operate with a program of total sponsorship by their corporate hosts. The alliance of corporate public service, respect for the integrity of the Whitney Museum, and the Museum's continued efforts to extend the knowledge and enjoyment of American art have made the branch museum system viable and successful.

In 1973, an exhibition center in Lower Manhattan originated as the first branch of the Whitney Museum. It was closely allied with the Independent Study Program and provided a laboratory for young scholars in the fields of art history and museum studies. The opening of this Downtown branch resulted from the combined efforts of Percy Uris, the developer of 55 Water Street, who wished a public amenity in his building, and the Trustees and staff of the Whitney Museum, who

realized the need for cultural activities in distinctive parts of the city where concentrated work forces were unable to take advantage of our programs uptown. Funded by modest contributions from businesses in Lower Manhattan, the original Downtown branch had no long-term occupancy in a single space; after moving to several different locations, it was closed in 1984.

During the later 1970s, however, the Museum had already begun the search for a permanent home and sponsor for the Downtown branch. In 1984, Park Tower Realty and IBM generously agreed to provide the facility and financial support for a Downtown branch at Two Federal Reserve Plaza, a building jointly developed by Park Tower and IBM. It is a pleasure to express our deep appreciation to Park Tower Realty and IBM for their extraordinary support in providing a new home and ongoing funding for the Downtown branch. It has been their respect for quality and commitment to excellence that have guided us throughout this endeavor. Park Tower's and IBM's sponsorship of the Whitney Museum of American Art, Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza is particularly gratifying because it has enabled us to return to the locale of our first branch museum with the assurance that we can successfully serve new audiences.

Philip Johnson and John Burgee, architects of Two Federal Reserve Plaza, have also encouraged this project since its inception. Tod Williams and Annie Chu conceived a design for the Museum gallery which successfully gives it the sense of importance and dignity we wanted to establish. They, and everyone who has worked on this project at Park Tower Realty, IBM, and the Whitney Museum, have realized that the construction of this branch was a special challenge, and we are fortunate to have

benefited from their extraordinary efforts.

The Whitney Museum of American Art always seeks to present outstanding twentieth-century American art to as wide an audience as possible, and the branch museums have allowed new and diverse constituencies to explore the achievements of American artists. Since 1973, over a million and a half people have visited the branches, enjoying the gallery talks, performances, and educational programs offered in conjunction with the changing exhibitions. With the reopening of the Downtown branch, we are looking forward to extending once again the professional resources of the Whitney Museum of American Art to the Lower Manhattan community with a cultural facility that celebrates the art of our country.

Tom Armstrong, Director
Whitney Museum of American Art

**The Whitney Museum of American Art,
Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza
is funded by a partnership of Park Tower Realty
and IBM, the developers of Federal Reserve Plaza.**

This exhibition was organized by Karl Willers, Branch Director, Whitney Museum of American Art, Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza. Special thanks are extended to the following Helena Rubinstein Fellows in the Whitney Museum Independent Study Program who helped with the research for this publication: Mark Helm Bessire, Aimee Holloway Conlin, Thomas Hardy, Amy Heard, Natacha Kucic, Michael Marco, Mary Jo Peer, Ingrid Perin, Michael Waldron, and Anne Wrinkle.

©1988 Whitney Museum of American Art
945 Madison Avenue
New York NY 10021

Whitney Museum of American Art
Downtown at Federal Reserve Plaza
33 Maiden Lane at Nassau Street
New York, New York 10038

Hours

Monday–Friday 11:00–6:00

Gallery Talks:

Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 12:30

Illustrations in the original publication
(not pictured):

James Rosenquist, *U–Haul–It*, 1967

Chuck Close, *Phil*, 1969

Jasper Johns, *Studio*, 1964

Claes Oldenburg, *French Fries and Ketchup*, 1963

Robert Indiana, *The X–5*, 1963

Helen Frankenthaler, *Flood*, 1967

Andy Warhol, Five serigraphs from the series

Campbell's Soup I, 1968

Original photographs by Geoffrey Clements
(Close, Frankenthaler, Johns, Rosenquist, Warhol),
Jerry L. Thompson (Oldenburg),
and Sandak, Inc. (Indiana).

Original Design by Tibor Kalman, M & Co.
Typesetting by Trufont Typographers, Inc.
Printing by Kenner Printing Co., Inc.