

COLLECTING, SHARING, AND PROMOTING
CONTEMPORARY ART IN CALIFORNIA

Marcia S. Weisman

Interviewed by George M. Goodwin

Completed under the auspices
of the
Oral History Program
University of California
Los Angeles

Copyright © 1983
The Regents of the University of California

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publication, are reserved to the University Library of the University of California at Los Angeles. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the University Librarian of the University of California at Los Angeles.

CONTENTS

Introduction.	vii
Interview History.	x
TAPE NUMBER: I, Side One (July 26, 1978).	1
<p>Simon family background--Childhood in San Francisco and Los Angeles--Norton Simon--Mills College-- Marriage to Frederick Weisman.</p>	
TAPE NUMBER: I, Side Two (July 26, 1978).	31
<p>Painting lessons--Beginning interest in art collecting --Visit to Ben Heller, New York City--Simon's interest in art--Subsequent visits to New York City-- Becoming a collector--The "iffy" collection--Focus of collection--Personal love of art--Role of art in marriage.</p>	
TAPE NUMBER: II, Side One (August 2, 1978).	51
<p>Changing tastes in art--Values in buying art--Favorite artists--Interest in sculpture--Excellence in art-- Paul Klee--Helping young artists--"Using up" an artwork--"Tough" pictures--California artists.</p>	
TAPE NUMBER: II, Side Two (August 2, 1978).	85
<p>California artists--Historical importance of West Coast artists--San Francisco Museum of Modern Art acquisitions--A letter from Robert Motherwell--Need for cultural roots--New York provincialism--Elitism in art--Art and politics--Leadership in Southern California art museums--Frederick Weisman as trustee, Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA).</p>	
TAPE NUMBER: III, Side One (August 9, 1978).	120
<p>Relationships with artists--Barnett and Annalee Newman --Newman memorial at Pasadena Museum--Clyfford Still--Henry Moore--Memorial to Henry Seldis-- Andy Warhol--Guest books.</p>	
TAPE NUMBER: III, Side Two (August 9, 1978).	150
<p>Art dealers--Bad experiences--Frank Perls-- Paul Kantor--Other Southern California art dealers</p>	

--Era of Ferus Gallery--Walter Hopps.	
TAPE NUMBER: IV, Side One (August 16, 1978)	181
LACMA--Contemporary Art Council--Maurice Tuchman --Kenneth Donahue--Simon and Richard Brown's plans for a new museum--Jews as art collectors.	
TAPE NUMBER: IV, Side Two (August 16, 1978)	211
New York School exhibition at LACMA--Lending art --Problems of LACMA: staff, board of trustees, admission fees, expansion of galleries--Need for independent museum of modern art.	
TAPE NUMBER: V, Side One (August 16, 1978)	245
Volunteer work at Pasadena Museum--Possible purchase of Heller collection--Fellows for Contemporary Art--Plans for new building--Hopps --John Coplans--Pasadena board of trustees-- Failure of Pasadena Museum--Private art exhibition in Beverly Hills--Frederick Weisman's injury. Robert and Carolyn Rowan--Simon's takeover of Pasadena Museum.	
TAPE NUMBER: V, Side Two (August 23, 1978)	275
Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art--Interest in videotape--Validation of contemporary art by museums--Enticement of Weisman collection-- Newport Harbor Art Museum--Member, Advisory Council, University Art Museum, Berkeley-- Trustee, San Francisco Art Institute--Trustee, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art.	
TAPE NUMBER: VI, Side One (August 23, 1978)	307
Trustee, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art --Problems of trusteeship--Problems of museum directorship--Pride in San Francisco museums-- Support for National Gallery--Changing role of art museums--Need for art in society--Difficulties of teaching art--Art consultant to business-- Teaching the art of art collecting--Seminars for alumni.	
TAPE NUMBER: VI, Side Two (August 30, 1978)	342
Gift from Warhol--Warhol's visit--Plans for the class--Teaching at California State University,	

Long Beach--Needs of collectors--Art program, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center--Art consultant, Mayo Clinic
--Gifts to Cedars-Sinai--Exhibition committee at Cedars-Sinai--National interest in art programs for hospitals.

TAPE NUMBER: VII, Side One (August 30, 1978).374

Additional work for Cedars-Sinai--Specialized collections in Cedars-Sinai--Disapproval of Triforium--Plan to commission major sculptures for Los Angeles--Art for United States senators' offices--Weisman collection of California artists at California State University, Long Beach--Gov. Edmund Brown, Jr.

TAPE NUMBER: VII, Side Two (August 30, 1978).403

Governor Brown--Plans for an art center in Venice, California--Negative response to art center--Future of Weisman collection.

TAPE NUMBER: VIII, Side One (Video) (September 28, 1978). . .421

Robert Graham's bronze door, Dancing--Warhol's opening at Ace Gallery--Art exhibition at Hillcrest Country Club--Art on Weismans' lanai--Art in living room.

Index.463

INTRODUCTION

How does a preeminent collection of contemporary art get started? Could Marcia Weisman's be said to have begun with private lessons in painting, taken as a child to improve her handwriting? By the time she was a student at Mills College, she dreamed of owning paintings by Cézanne and Matisse. At nineteen, she married Frederick Weisman, a business executive, and together their nascent interests in art grew. Finally, it was the need to decorate a new home (a need mocked affectionately in the title of a course Marcia teaches intermittently: "I Have a Place over My Sofa and I Want to Buy a Painting") that converted an interest into an imperative. An evening with Ben Heller, a prominent collector of American art, was followed by frequent visits to the galleries and museums of New York City. Modestly the Weismans began to acquire contemporary art.

At no time did they decide to become collectors per se; they simply brought together works with which they cared to live. Though primarily interested in painting, they collected drawings, collages, watercolors, and, eventually, sculpture as well. Though artists of the New York School--de Kooning, Hofmann, Motherwell, Newman, Pollock, Rothko, and Still--were the nucleus of the collection, they acquired works by younger Americans--Johns, Lichtenstein, Oldenburg, Rauschenberg, Segal, and Warhol--and by European masters--Giacometti,

Kandinsky, Léger, and Lipchitz--too. Marcia's dream of works by Cézanne and Matisse also came true.

In time, Marcia Weisman became an enthusiastic booster of local artists. She points out that many leading New York artists, such as Motherwell, Pollock, Rothko, and Still, spent their formative years in California. Additionally she contends California is experiencing phenomenal artistic productivity, too often overlooked by New Yorkers and even, sadly, by officials of some California museums as well.

At the time of these interview sessions, Mrs. Weisman was particularly excited about her work as a trustee of and adviser to several Northern California museums: the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, the San Francisco Art Institute, and the University Art Museum at the University of California, Berkeley. Disgruntled (at best) with developments in museum exhibition of contemporary art in Southern California, she was actively promoting alternative spaces. She organized an art program at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in West Hollywood. The initial goal of decorating corridors and patients' rooms with graphics and reproductions quickly accomplished, she established a permanent exhibitions committee to mount the work of local artists several times annually. She proposed, furthermore, a program of contemporary monumental sculpture for the city of Los Angeles (partly in reaction to the Triforium, which she detests) and for Venice, California,

a complex of galleries and studios. (The latter project was rejected by Venice residents and by the Coastal Commission.)

Since the completion of these interviews, another Weisman dream, a museum of contemporary art in Los Angeles, has become a reality. As of this writing, that museum is staffed and preparing initial exhibitions in anticipation of a 1984 opening downtown.

Marcia Weisman is unquestionably a leader in the Southern California art community, whose activities have demonstrated that art collecting at its most refined is art sharing as well.

--George Goodwin and
Mitch Tuchman, June 1982

INTERVIEW HISTORY

INTERVIEWER: George M. Goodwin, freelance consultant, Oral History Program, UCLA. B.A., Art History, Lake Forest College; M.A., Art History, Columbia University; Ph.D., Art Education, Stanford University.

TIME AND SETTING OF INTERVIEW:

Place: Weisman home in Beverly Hills, California.

Dates: July 25, August 2, 9, 16, 23, 30, 1978 (audio); September 28, 1978 (video).

Time of day, length of sessions, and total number of recording hours: Goodwin conducted these interviews Monday afternoons. Each session lasted approximately three hours. Rebecca Andrade recorded the videotaped material.

Persons present during interviews: Goodwin and Weisman.

CONDUCT OF THE INTERVIEW:

Following an introductory meeting to get acquainted and outline the series of interviews, Goodwin guided Weisman through a sequence of significant themes: the history of the Weisman art collection, the Weismans' relationships with artists and art dealers, their interest in California museums and service on their boards and councils, their other volunteer efforts, particularly their work with Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.

EDITING:

Editing was done by Rebecca Andrade, assistant editor, Oral History Program. She checked the verbatim transcript prepared by staff typists, editing for punctuation, paragraphing, correct spelling, and verification of proper names. Words and phrases inserted by the editor have been bracketed.

The edited transcript was presented to Weisman for review; she and George Goodwin worked together on verifications.

Mitch Tuchman, senior editor, and Sylvia Tidwell, editor, reviewed the manuscript before it was typed in final form. Front matter and index were prepared by the Oral History Program staff. Goodwin and Tuchman wrote the introduction.

The original tape recordings and edited transcript of the interview are in the University Archives and are available under the regulations governing the use of permanent noncurrent records of the University. Records relating to the interview are located in the office of the UCLA Oral History Program.

TAPE NUMBER: I, SIDE ONE

JULY 26, 1978

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, first I'd like you to tell me about your family background.

WEISMAN: Well, there isn't anything, I guess, that's too unusual or outstanding. I was born in Portland, Oregon. I don't know whether I want to tell you how many years ago, but I guess that would be necessary in the circumstances. I was born on August 22, 1918, which puts me on the cusp of Leo and Virgo, for whatever that may mean. I'm frankly not into it too much, but I hear people talking about these things quite often. [When I was] two and a half my mother [Lillian Glickman Simon] passed away of diabetes just prior to the discovery of insulin, or the usage of insulin, being the moment in time when insulin was used prevalently. Within a year after that my father [Myer Simon] moved myself and my sister, Evelyn [Simon Brooks], and my brother, Norton, down to San Francisco, where we lived with a sister of his [Frances Reesberg] for about a year and a half until I was five years old, and my father remarried. He married a lady [Lucille Michaels Simon] that I loved dearly and I guess I might have been in the most enviable position of the three children on the one hand, and maybe in the most difficult position on the other. Enviably in that I

was an "adorable," quote-unquote, little girl of five when my mother and father married; I was amenable and moldable, and I became her little girl. She had no children of her own at any time. By the same token, at two and a half to lose one's mother left a tremendous void in my life that was an unknown quantity to me: there was no way possible for anyone to understand or be able to give me an understanding of it. It meant just a very empty, deep, black, abysmal cavern or abandonment that never was quite filled. And, taking nothing from my stepmother, I adored her, and she adored me, and we had a fantastic relationship. As I say, because of [my] being the youngest, our relationship was probably better than the relationship she had with my sister or my brother, although it was good all the way around. [tape recorder turned off]

GOODWIN: I want to back up a moment and ask something about your ancestors: where they came from.

WEISMAN: My father was born in San Francisco; and my real mother was born, I believe, in Russia--I'm not sure exactly where. But that is a story unto itself: my mother's mother and father were from Russia, and they were divorced, it says here in fine print. I don't believe they divorced in those days in Russia. She was the only child of their marriage, and my grandfather [Morris

Glickman] left Europe and came to this country, and I believe, came almost directly to Sacramento, which put him there at about the time of the Gold Rush. He wasn't here terribly long, but he met a lady [Rose Glickman], who, I believe, might have been Russian-born also, and he remarried. He brought my mother to live with him then; my mother came with her mother to this country--I don't know the details. There are two conflicting stories: that my grandmother and grandfather already came over and she was pregnant with my mother, and they came to this country, went to Chicago, and my grandfather split, and my grandmother stayed there and had my mother. I think that is probably the more probable of the two stories because, otherwise, my mother couldn't have gotten to Sacramento so readily. So I think this is truly what happened: she came over--pregnant--with my grandfather; they went to Chicago, or my grandmother went to Chicago, where my mother was born, and my grandfather moved on to Sacramento. Some years later he married, and then my mother went to live with him; she was always his favorite and she adored him. She lived in Sacramento, and I presume she went back and forth between the grandmother and the grandfather.

GOODWIN: What was your grandfather's business?

WEISMAN: My grandfather's business--I don't think I know. I remember him when he lived with a daughter of his

in Redwood City and in San Francisco when I was a little girl. Every Sunday we'd drive down to Redwood City to see my grandfather. And, of course, that was my father's father that I'm talking about.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: My mother's father and mother-- His name was Glickman. Her mother remarried a man named Foreman. My mother's father had five children subsequent to my mother; my mother's mother subsequently had five children. So she literally had ten stepbrothers and [step]sisters.

My father's father and mother had seven--there were seven boys and girls. So maybe my mother's family was four-and-four and she made the fifth on both sides. That was it. My father was one of seven and--I'm trying to think-- his father came from England, I believe. (I don't know what happened.) He came from the border between Germany and Poland, and then moved to England.

My grandmother, his wife, was born in Alsace-Lorraine; and they were in this country early on and must have come to the West Coast because my father was born in San Francisco. And my stepmother was born in Chicago also. So my roots are really in the Pacific Coast, and I think of myself as a second-generation Californian, and my children were born in California--San Francisco and Los Angeles.

GOODWIN: What was your father's occupation?

WEISMAN: My father was-- Well, the nice way they called it was importing and exporting. [laughter] He would buy up something--like he would buy an old factory and take all the machinery out of it and resell it, either to Japan or wherever the marketplace was at that time. He would buy and sell job lots of things, and it was quite successful. He had a clothing store in Portland, Oregon, at one time. He'd had successes and failures, a couple.

GOODWIN: Do you know why he was living in Portland?

WEISMAN: I don't know why he was living in Portland.

You're posing questions that I'd like to find the answers to; [laughter] I must ask my brother. But the big thing that happened--my father was successful in the ready-to-wear business; he had this ready-to-wear store. And then, I don't know when it was, whether it was the war or what, but then he went into this other business that was more successful. Then he and my brother-- My brother made a good deal of money in the stock market when he was very young, like sixteen, and bought the Geary Street Theater in San Francisco. He bought a thing at a warehouse sale: there had been a fire in a warehouse that had Cupie toilet tissue (we tease him about that very often). It was called Cupie Toilet Tissue and he bought the whole thing: that which was destroyed was destroyed, and the rest he sold, and he made himself a considerable amount of money. At

that time my father was not in the most "up" moment of his life, and the two of them found a cannery. My father found a cannery in Fullerton, California, called Whitefield, and they bought it, my father and my brother together, with the idea of selling the machinery. This cannery made orange juice, grapefruit juice, and tomato sauce. It was 1932, and things were very bad; and they were buying tomatoes, I think, for twelve dollars a ton. So they decided they'd operate for a year, and it was going fairly well. At that time they changed the name, and I was given an opportunity to try for a name, and did, and selected the name of Val Vita [Food Products, Inc.] for "valuable vitamins." They proceeded to operate this business and eventually took a position on the board of Hunt Foods [and Industries, Inc.]; and then Hunt Foods acquired Val Vita food products, and then it went on and on and on and became the Norton Simon, Incorporated, megalopolis, or whatever you call those kinds of businesses, and so forth. I always say I never got paid for the name, but my father always said, "But I kissed you for it. You were so sweet to do that." He was a very loving man. He was a tough businessman, and he was a good businessman. As my mother used to say, "The fruit doesn't fall far from the tree." I was going to say my father was a very warm-- I don't know, do you know the term gemütlich? But that's the

kind of a man he was. He was the kind of a man that he could be driving down the road, down any highway, and he'd see somebody walking along hitching a ride, an old man, and he'd say, "He's somebody's son," and he'd pick him up and give him a ride. I remember him always saying, "Just think of the mother that loved him. He was somebody's little baby once." He was that kind of a man; and yet he could drive a very hard bargain, and he was a very hard, tough businessman.

Well, the last line is that I think what speaks more than anything is when my father died, he and my mother were on a Mediterranean cruise. They came into the port of Portugal, of Lisbon; my mother went to awaken him, and he was dead. And it took three days of waiting in Lisbon until the boat took off again because they couldn't take him out of the quarantines, into one country and out of it; it was a horrible thing. I remember in the midst of all the grief saying to my husband, "Do you think if we called Forest Lawn, one call would take care of everything?" [laughter] Because it was so impossible. Anyway, it was three days in Lisbon, and six days crossing from Lisbon to New York. I went to New York with my brother-in-law and met my mother. And my father's body was transferred from the boat through quarantine in the health department to a funeral thing and into an airplane, which they didn't

have any big enough to take the casket--it was a terrible thing. But anyway, the funeral was like nine or ten days following his death, and so it was held at Home of Peace cemetery out in Whittier. They didn't think there would be too many people there, or we would have gone to the Wilshire Boulevard Temple, but we thought, "Well, such a delay in time, there won't be many people; people forget." It was brimming over, brimming over with people--from presidents of banks to the garbage collectors at the Fullerton cannery. And that was the gamut; so it gives you some kind of an idea of the kind of person he was. He was a very humanistic person, very disinterested in things and materialism. He wanted the materialism of success as a yardstick, more than what it bought. He could have worn the same suit every day of his life and never cared.

GOODWIN: Did he have any artistic interests?

WEISMAN: None to speak of. He read the newspaper every day of his life from cover to cover, and I don't know whether he ever read a book really from cover to cover. But he didn't really have any of the aesthetic interests that have subsequently come from-- My stepmother had more aesthetic interests.

GOODWIN: Do you want to talk about those?

WEISMAN: Well, her interests were really somewhat covert in that she wasn't "into" the arts or "into" music, visual

arts or music or theater; but she attended theater, and she attended musical performances, and she would go to a museum. She would do these things, not with any ritualistic compulsion, but from time to time. If King Tut was in town, she would have gotten to King Tut; if Nureyev was dancing she would have seen Nureyev dance; if Beverly Sills was singing, she would have seen and heard Beverly Sills; if there was a renowned opera company in town, she would have gone. She would have picked the peak performances because they would have been hyped the most, you know, and so she would have gone. But in actuality, it wasn't that she was a buff for any of it, and she was reasonably well-read. She was a very young person for her years: she was nine years younger than my father, but it always felt like she was considerably younger than my father. And they were both very giving human beings, I must say.

GOODWIN: Where did you live in San Francisco?

WEISMAN: Do you know San Francisco?

GOODWIN: Partially.

WEISMAN: Excuse me. [tape recorder turned off] When we first moved to San Francisco, we lived at my aunt's apartment, which was across the street from Lowell High School. And then my father took a house on Sixteenth Avenue, 343 Sixteenth Avenue. We lived there till I was

in about the first or second grade, I guess, and I went to Sutro School. Then we moved to 168 Funston Avenue, which was on Thirteenth [Avenue] really, and it's on the bridge path there that goes into the Presidio. That's a playground right there, so this was where I live in San Francisco.

And in Portland, we had lived in Westover Heights at the time my mother died. My father had beach houses down at Seaside, Oregon; we were down there when she passed away. And so anyway, we lived in San Francisco and I went to Sutro School.

GOODWIN: That's a public school?

WEISMAN: Yes. My sister went to Sutro, and my brother went to Lowell, and then she went to Girls' High [School]. And just before I was to leave Sutro--they went to the eighth grade in those days--we moved to Los Angeles in '29. So I was eleven and we moved down here. First I went to Third Street, then I went to Wilshire Crest, then I went to John Burroughs [Junior High School], and then L.A. High and Mills College--went back to San Francisco--so that was like kind of old home week. I guess that's why I feel so good about being on the boards of museums in San Francisco: because it is home.

GOODWIN: Were you a good student in school?

WEISMAN: Not particularly. I had the brains; I didn't have the discipline. I still don't have discipline. And

I think my lack of discipline was that I was spoiled, probably. I wanted to learn; I didn't want to take tests. I've always been a very good reader and read avidly; and I must say that my brother incited that in me: to read and read well.

GOODWIN: What did you like to read?

WEISMAN: Well, I don't like to read anything fiction; I feel that's a waste of time. I don't read as much today as I used to, but I don't find as much to read today that I think is as worthwhile. I love to read biographical non-fiction. I don't mind a biographical novel if it's based on fact to give me insight into a period; but I don't even like to waste time on that, you know, by the time I've perused the art books that come out that are of interest to me. But then I just finished reading [The] Rockefellers: [An American Dynasty (Collier & Horowitz)]; and I just received a book, The Mellons [The Mellon Family (Hersh)], which isn't an easy book to read cover to cover, but perusing through it and getting what I want out of it, and it's interesting when you know people that you're reading about besides. But that's the kind of thing I like to read, and I like to read about things that are meaningful in our life today or in the life of yesterday that made today what it is.

GOODWIN: What were your favorite subjects in school?

WEISMAN: Science, art, what else?

GOODWIN: What kind of art did you have?

WEISMAN: Art appreciation, really. And you know, it's an interesting thing, when I was a little girl in San Francisco, I took painting lessons from a lady named Florence Gore who was on Fourteenth or Fifteenth Avenue. She had a studio there. Mother had my sister and me take painting lessons from her. And it started because my handwriting was so terrible; mother felt it would help my handwriting but it never did. [laughter] Nobody can read my handwriting still, including me. But I did take painting lessons, and I think it must have done something to my eye and to my sensibilities. Subsequently when I was in college, I didn't take art history courses in college. I took an art history course, yes; and it was you know what kind of an art history course, how much you get in one year of that as a freshman at Mills. I look back and Lyonel Feininger was teaching there at the same time-- I could kill myself. I had friends that were in painting classes and so forth, and I should have known better. But one never knows at the moment, I guess, and particularly when you are seventeen.

GOODWIN: You had art appreciation in junior high school?

WEISMAN: At high school, junior high.

GOODWIN: Say, several years?

WEISMAN: Yes, I had some. You know I knew Matisse from

Cézanne. I didn't know anything about the twentieth century: the surrealist painters or obviously the abstract expressionists, because that was before them, you know. I moved down here in '29, and who was painting what in '29? It was the German expressionists really around that time, was it not? And the postimpressionists were still going pretty good guns. [Fernand] Léger was still painting. Matisse was still painting, Picasso; and even they hadn't reached the epitome of their successes.

GOODWIN: Were you aware of an art world [when you were] in Los Angeles?

WEISMAN: I was aware to the point that I had Pinkie and [The] Blue Boy hanging in my room at college, and soon took those down and didn't ever want to see them again. [laughter] And then I became aware to the point that I knew that if one day I was a rich lady, I would like to own a Cézanne and a Matisse: those were the only two I really wanted to own.

GOODWIN: When did you formulate that desire?

WEISMAN: I don't know when or why. I think I just liked them, and I had gone to museums. I had an aunt [Zadel Glickman] in San Francisco who lives here now, and an uncle [Louis Glickman] (and he has since died), and they were very, very influential in my aesthetic taste. When I was a little girl living in San Francisco, this aunt used to

take me and a friend of mine, whose mother was a very close friend of hers--to see The Chocolate Soldier downtown at the opera house in San Francisco or the children's ballet on a Saturday morning. And mother would go with us sometimes more often than not, and she'd take us to the museum occasionally, and she was a very cultured lady. And they used to go to Europe and come back with drawings--Spy drawings or Daumiers or whatever, and she always had this kind of thing going. She was really interested and cared, and so was he. I think a certain amount of that rubbed off. Their home was furnished exquisitely (they lived at the Huntington Apartments in those days) and with beautiful antiques and lovely etchings, and not major paintings but lovely, real etchings which she still has. She's well into her eighties now, and very deaf--you know, the usual problems of old age. But I think she played a considerable influence on all three of us on that score. Although my sister never really picked up on any of this, my brother did, and I did.

GOODWIN: What kind of a child was Norton?

WEISMAN: Precocious, as you would understand that. He was bright, he was a loving brother; he adored me. He graduated from high school at sixteen. He did not want to go to college--he wanted to go to work--and he implored my father and [my father] didn't concede. Dad brought

him law books thinking that he'd go into law, and then one day in his little Star car he disappeared. He said he was going to stay at the fraternity house that weekend in Berkeley (he had been there two months), and came Monday night when he was supposed to be back--or Tuesday night, because Monday night they had fraternity meetings--he wasn't home. They called the fraternity; they said, "Oh, he went east." And they found him: my father had the police out, and they picked him up in Salt Lake City. He said, "I'm not coming home until you let me do what I want to and go to work." And Dad said OK, and so he came back.

I guess he went to work for my father, and then he did his own thing, and then he moved to L.A. He was in business, but he was the kind of brother that used to bring me very expensive gifts. I remember sweaters or things that were very impressive to me and dresses. And then when he moved to Los Angeles, he won a car in a raffle for a dollar. [laughter] And my father was so excited. He thought, "My God, we're finally going to get a decent car; we're going to get a new car." We had a Cadillac Phantom at that time, but it was a 1923 car, and by then it must have been '28, '29, or something like that. And so Norton drove up to San Francisco in his new car. It was so little it drove under a truck, or so he said. It had one seat for the driver and a little jump seat on the outside. I was five, six, seven

years old--there's eleven years difference in our age-- Norton was eighteen, I was maybe seven? And he put me in the jump seat, put a cigarette in my hand, and drove me down Market Street to get attention. He used to play games with me all the time. Then when we moved to Los Angeles (I was eleven, twelve years old) we used to go to movies together. I'll never forget when his first son [Donald Ellis Simon] was born, after the baby was born, he took me to a movie one night; at seven o'clock we went to one movie, and at nine o'clock we went to another movie house. And we were very, very close, and it was a very loving relationship. And [it] prevailed pretty much so through the years. It comes and goes. It's got its hots and its colds, and I think that's true of people.

GOODWIN: Did your sister also go to Mills College?

WEISMAN: No, she didn't. She might have gone to UCLA, I forget. I think she was at UCLA for a year. I was at Mills only for a year, and then I came home, went to business college, and got married.

GOODWIN: Did you dislike Mills?

WEISMAN: No, I loved it. But my father said enough with the horseback riding and falling in love with someone he didn't like, that I had had enough education up there, come home. "All is forgiven; come home." So all was forgiven, and I came home. I went to Woodbury business school, and I

met my husband [Frederick] and got married. So I was married at nineteen; I didn't have much chance to do much playing around.

GOODWIN: Before we discuss your marriage, had you traveled to Europe as a child?

WEISMAN: Nothing. Before I was married, I had never been east of California or west of California or south of California. I had been to Portland when I was born, and we had gone up to Seaside to the resort there a couple of summers after we had moved to San Francisco. And that was the extent of my travels. We went up to Yosemite, when I was a little girl, or we'd come down to Los Angeles. My real mother's parents lived down here, and there was family down here, so we would come down. And my father then eventually had business down here, and we'd rent a house for the summer, and then eventually we moved down. So there was just none of that. There wasn't too much frivolity along those lines.

But as I say, spoiled I was, but in a different way. I don't think I was so spoiled; well, I must have been. I feel I was loved a lot, which is a good feeling. Having gone through therapy, I'm more convinced than ever that I was a very fortunate youngster in that, considering having lost my mother, and now understanding many of the apprehensions and fears and anxieties I had as a youngster and as

I grew up, and having a better understanding of it now, I think that I was extremely lucky because I always felt loved--and by both of my parents. And I loved them. I won't say I was always the best daughter by any way, shape, or form. I didn't express it maybe as such at the time; but as the years have gone on, I have come to realize that they were really perfect parents because they never did anything that they didn't think was absolutely right. And even if it was wrong, they didn't think it was wrong when they did it. And so I feel that they were very good parents and gave me opportunities that I should have had and did have, and I was terribly bereaved when they both died; but at the same time I was torn with the grief of losing them. But I don't think I suffered guilts, and I don't think I suffered the way-- I think my sister suffered terribly when my father died, and also when my mother died. But there were all of the kinds of mixed-up reasons in there. I understand where she comes from; it must have been very difficult being a middle child with a stepmother and a father who had a son that was the apple of his eye, and a little baby girl whom he could cuddle and whom his new wife took to so well. She must have been in a very unbearable position. She and I have talked of this; and I wouldn't necessarily want it to be discussed publicly,

obviously, but it has to be a difficult place to be.

GOODWIN: Was your family religious?

WEISMAN: Oh, no. We went to temple. Are you Jewish?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: We would go to temple on the High Holidays because my father thought we should, but it was a pain for him to go. And if a man would come around with a beard, he'd call him Rabbi Winkler. He hated everything that was ritualistic about Judaism. He was a good human being. He supported Jewish causes, and the [Cedars of Lebanon] hospital, and the welfare [United Jewish Welfare Fund] and all of the usual hooahas--Vista Del Mar, and so forth. But he always got into trouble with organizations when he served on them because he was much too businesslike and practical. I remember they were building an auditorium at Vista Del Mar (and my stepmother had been raised in an orphanage) and they were soliciting funds for the blank-blank auditorium, named for a person [Myer Gensburg Recreation Center]. And my father said, "Why are you soliciting funds from me to buy an auditorium bearing someone else's name? If he wants his name, let him build the auditorium." "Well," they said, "he gave the first thing." Well," he said, "I'm giving the second. So you can call it the hooaha Myer Simon auditorium." But they said, "You don't understand"; he said, "I understand very

well. Let him pay for it and change the name to the Vista Del Mar auditorium." So he was on the board, I think, at Vista Del Mar for fourteen minutes when this took place, [laughter], and that was the end of that.

I might add, subsequently my mother built a school on the Vista Del Mar facility in my father's name called the Myer Simon School, and she paid for the whole school. She said my father would never have had it any other way. Subsequently, that school has been taken down because time went on and the needs were different, and so forth. I think they renamed another facility for him [Lucille E. and Myer Simon Classroom]. It's still there, and my mother was active there, and they did a dinner in her [honor].

GOODWIN: Did you ever have any musical training?

WEISMAN: I took the piano lessons like every other little girl, took the piano lessons and was made to practice and hated it, and wished I could play later and then tried again to learn to play by ear, which doesn't really work too well, but--

GOODWIN: Dance?

WEISMAN: I took all of the lessons. I took ballet and enjoyed that. I hated the music lessons because I didn't like the practicing. I took elocution lessons; I'm not sorry. I took everything but tree-climbing

lessons, I think.

GOODWIN: Were you a girl scout?

WEISMAN: No, I wasn't a girl scout. [tape recorder turned off]

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, did you have any childhood friends with whom you've maintained friendships over the years?

WEISMAN: Yes, I've had friends that I don't see all that often, really, but I remember them, and on occasions we've seen each other. A girl I went to school with at Sutro School in San Francisco--her name was Kathryn Wolf (she's married to August Rothschild in San Francisco)--I haven't seen her or talked to her in years. But you reminded me I should drop her a note.

Then there was another girl named Virginia Simon that was no relation at all, but I remember she was my ideal of what a girl should be. She had blond curls and blue eyes, and I thought she was beautiful. She was mean to me all the time. She used to wear dresses to school, and most of the girls in San Francisco wore midis and skirts. They weren't uniforms; it was just what they all did. There were uniform schools, private schools, but that wasn't the case. They just wore midis and skirts, but her mother let her wear dresses. And I was so envious. I always wore high-laced shoes because mother said it would keep your ankles trim when you were older, and

Virginia got to wear Mary Janes to school. As I look back, it wasn't such great taste.

I remember one day her coming to me and saying--she was angry at something I must have done that was terrible-- "Oh, I hate you! You have a face only a mother could love. And your mother died of fright." And I said, "What are you talking about?" She said, "It's true, it's true; my mother told me."

Well, I must have known it, but I went screaming home, crying, from the school grounds. I went to my mother and said, "Is it true?" And she said, "Of course, it's true! But I selected my children. I didn't just have to take what I got." And I went back to school and told her, "Your poor mother got stuck with you, and my mother chose me out of all the children in the world," you know, all that nonsense. And that stuck with me forever and ever. I never see her, and if I knew her--I don't know her married name--if I ever saw her again, I would be ready for her.
[laughter]

But you know, I see people in San Francisco that I knew as a child, and people my brother had known. Like Pat [Edmund G.] Brown [Sr.], I remember when I was a little kid, Norton and Pat used to play cards together. They were in a high school fraternity together at Lowell. And Sonny Marx, who subsequently has become my husband's

best friend, I remember seeing him around. And other people: sisters and wives of people that I knew in San Francisco as a youngster. Some of them are my best friends now. So we have a kind of a dual life in San Francisco and Los Angeles because we did live there then after we were married.

GOODWIN: Tell me how you met your husband.

WEISMAN: Well, I had met him originally-- My sister was going out with this man that she subsequently married [Harold Brooks]. They were very good friends and one night this girl from San Francisco came down to visit Kathryn [Wolf]. She was staying with us. My sister fixed her up on a blind date with Fred, and I was very angry at my sister. "How come you could fix her up, and you wouldn't fix me up with him?" Because he was cute and so forth. So anyway, I met him because when they came from their date and I was asleep with my hair rolled up, she brings them in the bedroom. And I was just chagrined. Then subsequently my sister got married. Oh, he became engaged to a girl that was one of my dearest friends. And at my sister's wedding, which was at the Ambassador Hotel-- yes, he was at the wedding with his fiancée. After the wedding we went back to his fiancée's home. We'd all gotten just potted. He and I, after the wedding dinner, had gone around the table--there were, how many, fifty

or a hundred people--and drunk all the empty champagne glasses. We cleaned them; we emptied them, and then we went back to her house. And it wasn't too long after that she was going with another fellow. And she said she didn't know what to do because she liked this other guy, too. And I said, "Why, you can't compare them. Why, Freddie's little finger is worth more than all of this other fellow." And she said, "Go get him if you think he's so great." And I said, "Well, that's not what I'm talking about."

So subsequently, there was a group in Los Angeles called the Los Angeles Service League, and they were ladies that raised funds for something, for a social service situation. They raised this money, and they had a family service group. That's what it was, family service, Jewish family service, I think. And they would have a revue at the [Wilshire] Ebell Theater followed by a dance, a whole big number at Hillcrest [Country Club]. So I was in the revue, and we used to rehearse at the Arden Farm offices on Alden Drive, which now has Cedars-Sinai [Medical Center] sitting on top of this space. During the rehearsals he came over. He would watch the rehearsals sometimes, which the guys used to do. I was eighteen years old and he was twenty-four, and he was in the liquor business at that point selling for Schenley's. He went to

the revue at the Ebell, and I was--big deal--I was in the chorus. It was all the nice little Jewish ladies and the little girls and all the ladies. My sister-in-law (subsequently she became my sister-in-law) was in this revue. They were all very chic, beautiful people of Los Angeles: there were the Isaacs family and the Nordlinger family and the Hellman family, all those kinds of people were involved.

Well, at the dance later at Hillcrest I was with a doctor. I had been working at Cedars as a volunteer, and I went with a doctor that I had been dating, an intern. So [Fred] told the intern that the girl that he was with was from Atlanta, and he told his date that the intern I was with was from Idaho, wherever the hell she was from. He gets the two of them together, and we spent the rest of the evening together. And then he asked me out for the next night; and the next night we went out, and he asked me to marry him, and I said yes. [laughter] We were ashamed to tell anybody--it was so fast. So we waited about a week. And I'll never forget the next morning: he called and he asked for me. I came on the phone, and he said, "This is Fred Weisman speaking." And I said, "There aren't a lot of Freds I'm engaged to." He said, "Well, there aren't a lot of Marcias I'm engaged to, either." It was really weird.

So anyway, he had a plan that night he didn't want to break, and I didn't want to break a plan I had because we weren't going to tell anybody. So we made a date for the next night--we had lunch that day, or whatever, and then he came for dinner the next night and-- I don't know--it was a couple of weeks later. In the meantime, I told my mother and I told my father. (I didn't tell my father right away.) I told my mother, and she said, "My God, he can't keep you in stockings." And I said, "Oh, you'd be surprised!" and "I won't wear any," you know. The last line is we had our first date, we were engaged, married, and back from our honeymoon in two months. Pretty fast. Forty years later, still pretty fast, set a fast pace. But he was really nice.

GOODWIN: Why don't you tell me about your husband's background?

WEISMAN: His parents were both born in Russia: one in Russia, one in Bessarabia; I think it's all the same today. They moved to Minneapolis. I think his father came over to this country when he was twelve, and his mother when she was fourteen or something like that. His father [William Weisman] was a very aggressive, assertive little man. He was maybe five-feet-four or five-feet-six--terrific little guy. And he always knew where it was at. He was in business with L. B. Mayer; he was in the real

estate business; he was in the fur business; he was just a mover. I might say his son is very much like him. And he was into everything.

His mother [Mary Zekman Weisman] was a very old-fashioned lady, and very beautiful and very sweet. But she was in another world. And you know, as I think back, she was maybe ten years older than my mother, but she always felt like forty years older than my mother. However old [my mother-in-law] was, I never knew my mother when she was that age. You know, it was one of those things. I never thought of my mother--knowing my mother at sixty and my mother-in-law at sixty was like seventy-five, and it was just the way it was. It was that kind of a situation. But anyway, she was a typically martyred, old-fashioned Jewish lady that gave up everything for her children. You know, you've met those kind. But she was a very sweet, lovely lady. We got along; we got on very well. We just didn't have too much in common. She could have been in and out of this house twenty times, which she would be, and she would never know there was a picture hanging. And I could have refurnished the whole house, and she wouldn't know it was refurnished. Whereas my mother would say, "How could you put this next to that when it should have been this way instead of that way?" And my mother made an effort to learn something

of modern art, even though she knew nothing about it when we started to collect.

GOODWIN: Did the Weismans move to Los Angeles?

WEISMAN: Oh, yes, they moved to Los Angeles from Minneapolis.

My father-in-law was always a marvelously good provider.

And my mother-in-law-- They separated after they had been married about twenty years, but she would not get a

divorce until her children were married because she didn't want to harm their reputation in any way, which in itself

is an old-fashioned concept. But after my brother-in-law

[Steven Weisman] got married, my youngest brother-in-law--

[Fred] has two brothers. His older brother [Theodore

Weisman] is a lawyer. He subsequently retired and is

into specific, special situations. And he had a younger

brother, who just retired as a superior court judge in

Los Angeles, and is now an arbitrating judge, I believe

they call them, special situations. It's been very good

for him and very good for the courts because it's alle-

viated a lot of the pressures off the courts. He'll go

into a law office on request: if two people are having

a dispute, he will arbitrate it right there in the lawyer's

office and settle it for them.

GOODWIN: Where did Mr. Weisman go to school?

WEISMAN: He went to Virgil Junior High, and then he went

to L. A. High. Then he went to the University of Minnesota

because his father was in business there at the time--
I think this was the order; I could be wrong--and then to
Northwestern in Chicago, and then he went to Oregon, and
then he went to UCLA. Or he went to UCLA and then to
Oregon--I don't know which succession. He went to four
universities. And the crash came in November of '29.
He had a chance to get a job. He was in the first building
on the new UCLA campus after they left what is now
L. A. City College. He had a job offered to him at MGM
in the sound department or something in 1932, and he
quit school to take the job because jobs were really--
They were lucky to graduate college and get a job as a
gasoline attendant. So he then went to work, and he worked
with MGM as a sound mixer and worked on all Joan Crawford's
pictures. Then he went into the produce business with
someone who was very well experienced. He had the money,
and the other man had the experience. And [Fred] left
the business with the experience, and the other man
with his money. And then he went to work for Schenleys.
I think he was a regional sales manager or something at
Schenley. And then when we became engaged, my father wanted
him to come to work. He wasn't keen for that, and neither
was I. But nevertheless, he did; we then felt it was fine.
So that's where he was for twenty-some years.

And then one day he decided, "OK, I've had that."
I think he was forty-five when he retired from Hunt Foods.

He had been president of the company and resigned to retire. That lasted exactly two weeks. [laughter] I don't think it lasted two weeks. He had made an investment that was very profitable while he was at Hunt's, and it was a flyer, a high-flying thing into a uranium situation. And they hit, and hit big, and sold out. And from nothing he made a fortune, and it gave him the wherewithal to be able to do what he wanted to do. And he did. Since then he's been an entrepreneur; he's been in investments in one thing and another. He took on the distributorship of Toyota automobiles for the mid-Atlantic states; the timing could not have been better eight years ago. It really was like a license to steal, as he says. Where he started getting 15,000 cars a year, he's now getting 15,000 a month, or approximately. He has his own depot where they bring the cars in off the boats and service them.

TAPE NUMBER: I, SIDE TWO

JULY 26, 1978

GOODWIN: We were talking about Mr. Weisman. Did he have any interests in art as a young man?

WEISMAN: Not at all. He really was not interested.

Actually I had always been interested. I painted, again, from the time that I was a child. I didn't paint for a long time, then I did paint again. I painted from time to time. I'd pick up brushes and stuff and start to paint or take lessons. It was enough to keep me aware and interested and concerned in, not the art scene per se, but to go to a museum and see what was going on: to go see the Monet show when it was here or the van Gogh show or whatever was going on at UCLA early on. I don't know. When was the Monet show? It was a long, long time ago.

GOODWIN: Where did you take lessons?

WEISMAN: Oh, when we lived in Fullerton, there was an art professor from Washington University in St. Louis who had come to Fullerton to retire. I heard about him and asked him if he'd teach me, and he said sure. So he'd come to the house, and he'd teach me, and I'd paint. And I spent one year with that man learning hue, intensity, and value--the difference. And you know, most people don't know what you are talking about when you discuss this

unless they really sit down and think. It got to the point that one year later I finally got the message: that is not easy. With that, we would go looking at art. It was during that time my brother started to collect. He had bought a Pissarro, a Renoir, a Gauguin-- I think--at that time.

Prior to that, I had gone to the Broadway department store--we had moved into another house in '48 or '49, and my interests were sufficient that I bought etchings and lithographs or things that I saw along the way to enhance our home, some of which I gave away, which was kind of sad. I remember going to the Chicago Art Institute and seeing a van Gogh sepia drawing that was reproduced on a postcard at the institute. I bought it and took it to a photographer, and had it blown up bigger than life, and spent a lot of money having it framed and hung it over our sofa in the living room. I did that with things, and I really cared. Then I went to the Broadway department store, and I bought reproductions that were done like on an oil canvas. Then I'd go and get varnish and paint over to get a real thick varnish and things like that. Now, I did this. He liked having them around the house.

We went to Europe in '53, and we bought a couple of lousy paintings. Not only that, he was someplace, and

he came home with a painting that was pretty bad. But that was all right: they were paintings; we knew we needed something. And then we bought this house in '57. Now, we had had etchings; we bought a couple of paintings (and nothing to rave about, I might add) in '56, '57.

GOODWIN: Do you want to mention what a few of those things were?

WEISMAN: Well, one was an [André] Marchand. Do you know who that is? Another was-- Oh criminey, what was his name--not the guy with the big eyes; this was a more surreal person. I'll have to think of his name. We'll fill it in when the time comes. But that was the kind. They were people we saw in France, but they weren't just up at Montmartre. We went to galleries. There was a gallery called Harvé Gallery, and we met Harvé on the Liberté. He had us come to the gallery, and we went there with Harold Lloyd's wife and daughter. And we all bought art there.

Then we were going to buy this house. We saw this house, and I said to Fred, "I love that house because you know why?" And he said, "Why?" And I said, "We could have a Museum of Modern Art sculpture court in that lanai." He said, "Is that a reason to buy a house?" And I said, "Yes, I think that's a good reason." And we had recently been to New York and-- When was that

[Joan] Miró show in the early fifties? It was a huge Miró retrospective.

GOODWIN: I don't know the dates. [1959]

WEISMAN: Anyway, we saw that show and liked it. We liked it a lot--didn't know why, but we liked it. So we decided to buy this house--and we were going to New York--and it was in escrow. I had talked to Norton about the fact that I was going to get some art for this house. I had rented some things from the [Los Angeles County] Museum [of Art] Rental Gallery and returned them (because [Fred] wasn't excited about them). We were going to New York and he said, "I'll give you \$2,000 to spend, and you can do the four walls." The four walls are the one in the bar; the one in the dining room over the buffet (I didn't want anything for over the fireplace); I wanted something for this wall inside the entry where the Cézanne is now; and I wanted something in here where the [Jasper] Johns Map is. So I said, "What if I found one painting I liked for \$2,000?" He said, "Nope, we need to cover four walls." So I told Norton what we were doing, and he wrote a letter to his friend Ben Heller that he had met once, and I said, "Splendid." He wrote him and said maybe he could help us pick out a [Philip] Guston or something. Well, we went to Ben's apartment. We were astounded that he was so young.

GOODWIN: How old was he?

WEISMAN: Oh, he wasn't forty. The outcome is we got in, and a pregnant lady opened the door, and it was his wife. He was under forty--he was thirty-five years old, I guess. (This was long after Fred had left home.) So we decided then, as we looked around waiting for Ben, that Fred wasn't excited about [Willem] de Kooning. He thought he was an angry man. He said, "I worked for an angry man too long, and I'm not going to live with one now in a painting." He had really wanted something that was realistic, and he thought he liked surrealism. He didn't like his [Mark] Rothko (a brown and beige Rothko was one of them); he liked the Clyfford Still; he didn't understand or like the [Franz] Klines (which I didn't either); and we did like the [Jackson] Pollocks.

The outcome is we said we'd go to galleries the next day and make a list of what we saw that we liked. And all he really wanted to know was, "Is it worth what we're paying for?" Because we don't want to buy something, paying \$1,000 for it if it's really only worth \$500. Because then if we wanted to turn it in, we won't be able to. But we didn't want his taste, necessarily. When we told him what we saw-- [tape recorder turned off]

So anyway, we called him back and told him the pieces we were interested in. He said, "Hey, these aren't the

same things you were talking about." We said, "We didn't ask you that." So what did we buy? A Ralph Humphries [entitled Victoria]. We bought an Adja Yunkers [untitled]. And we bought a Paul Brach [untitled]. Those were our first three purchases of twentieth-century art, all three of which would really hold up today, none of which we have. We gave them all to the Pasadena Museum. [laughter] And so there they are.

GOODWIN: Let me ask you, how did your brother's interest in art pick up?

WEISMAN: I think from what I gather, my sister-in-law [Lucille Simon] was really very interested. He was not. My sister-in-law was a Wellesley graduate and was really involved somewhat in art history and the knowledge of it. Whether she had the exposure, I'm not so sure, but she probably did have; she certainly had more exposure than he had had. And then he became piqued. His curiosity was piqued. And then he began to hear about businessmen that he respected spending \$1 million on a painting, or \$100,000 on a painting. You know, that's very hard for a businessman to understand. It's very difficult to understand; how you can rationalize that.

And he is a very avid reader. In one month he will learn more about a subject, such as art, from reading and exposure probably than anybody you know would learn in five years. Because if he once sets his head to something--

and he is a genius; his head works like a genius--he's going to do it. And he's always said, "Ah, you keep the books. Give me the paintings to look at. Let me go to the museums. Let me go to the galleries. That's where I'll learn. You look at the books." And of course, I've always said that as well. There's no point in looking in a book. I tell my classes, too; there's no point in looking at reproductions ever, or slides. I'm opposed to them. Totally. I know as an art history professor you can't live that way because it's impossible.

GOODWIN: Right, it is.

WEISMAN: But certainly, you must admit it is the proper way, the best way to learn; but it's not practical--

GOODWIN: Right. It's the ideal way.

WEISMAN: --for a university situation, unless the university has galleries around. And this is the importance of universities: having galleries and having them maintained, and keeping collections going. So in any event, this was really what spurred him on to begin with. Then, as I say, he's a very quick learner, and he steps right in.

And I must say, my husband functioned pretty much the same way. It was really kind of a simultaneous thing. He may have started to buy a little before us. It might have been at the early-on point that we didn't think we

could spend the kind of money that would be necessary to buy impressionists or postimpressionists. That was long since over and out because for what we spend on modern art today certainly we can have great impressionist paintings. And we could have twenty years ago or twenty-five years ago, as the case may have been. But it was really in about '56, '57 that we really did get into it; and then in '58 we started to buy, and in '58, '59, '60 we bought very heavily, up to '62.

GOODWIN: OK, explain how you got into it in '56.

I mean, what were some of the steps?

WEISMAN: I think the stepping stones were my taking painting, and Fred watching and seeing what I was doing--liking it or not liking it, but just an involvement. I was going in and spending time at the museums, with my art teacher and alone, and looking.

We'd go to New York on business, and I'd take him to galleries and museums. We went to the Miró show as an example that I remember, or going to the Monet show or the van Gogh show. But, you know, just being involved. Going into Paris as we did in '55 (well, the first time was in '53) and going to galleries and museums and seeing things with different eyes. By the time we went back in '56, '57, we wondered what we used to do when we went to Europe. [laughter] We wondered what we used

to do when we'd go to New York. I remember going to New York and saying, "Guess what, I saw theater." I went to five different shows in a week. Now, if we go to one show in a year it's a lot. I don't know what we did with ourselves. It must have been awful, in a sense. But we were interested in theater, then we'd go to the music, then symphony and ballet, and whatever.

But how do you know when you get into it? I guess you know when you get into it when you write that first check. And that's truly the commitment. And that commitment is one that is inexplicable. It's a feeling; it's gut. I don't think it has anything to do with head. I think you get into a direction. Something happens that makes you look to begin with. And after that first look, you get the first olive out of the bottle, and bye-bye, you've had it. [laughter]

GOODWIN: What was a big turning point for you at that time?

WEISMAN: Oh, I think I bought a [Pierre] Soulages [January 3] for Fred for his birthday or for Christmas for \$2,000. I bought it on time and then forgot to pay the payments, and he had to pay it. [laughter] He almost died. Someone rang the doorbell; I was delinquent. Then we bought a [Philip] Guston [Winter Flower] that we still have--it's in New York. And we bought a [Robert]

Richenburg [untitled], not [Robert] Rauschenberg. Do you know who he is?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: Which was a good painting. We gave that to Pasadena also. We bought a Billy [William] Brice [Rocks in a Garden] here; that went to Pasadena, too. Then we went to a sale at the L.A. County Museum in '58, I think it was, that they had for the benefit of the Museum of Modern Art. They were going to build a new wing. [laughter] You know how long ago that was [1958]. We bought the [Jean] Arp [Figure recueillie], we bought a [Alexei von] Jawlensky still life [Still Life with Citron]. It was gorgeous. That we gave to Pasadena Museum to beef up the Galka Scheyer collection. [laughter] Those were the two we bought in that sale. That was probably the most we had spent at that time because the Arp, I think, was \$4,500, and the Jawlensky was, I think, \$6,500, and that was really a big number. We paid \$3,500 for the Guston, something like that.

GOODWIN: Did you have a notion that you wanted to become a collector?

WEISMAN: Oh God, no. We were never going to be collectors. We were buying things we liked; we were enhancing our home. We were not "decorating," but we were. We had walls that needed to be filled. We didn't want to fill them with furniture and candelabras and antiquities. We wanted to

put art on the walls because we believed that. So we found something for this wall, something for that wall, and something for that wall, and then we felt that other wall needed it so very badly, and so we saw something, and we bought it. Then we'd start going to galleries, and once you start going to galleries you've had it. We bought stuff in Esther Robles's. We'd buy stuff at Felix Landau's and buy stuff at Paul Kantor's when he was up on Camden [Drive], and Frank Perls's--up and down those crazy streets--Ferus Gallery.

And the next thing we were just hooked. We were always buying because there were things we wanted. They were never for any other reason. [It got] to the point that there were times when people would come to us--to our faces--as collectors. And we'd say, "We are not collectors." We would be offended. It had a sense of greed and acquisitiveness that we really didn't think we were into. We didn't think that's where we were at, or where we're at today. I don't think we collect out of greed and acquisitiveness. Even though we'd like to have it all, we know we can't have it all. We don't really want it all because there are so many things we don't like. And there are things we do; and when we see things we like, we want them. And you know, this is my lack of discipline again. This is why I couldn't teach at UCLA [Extension] either: because they wanted to know where I was going to be

four weeks from Tuesday. There was no way I was ever going to know that. And on and on we went that route. It was just a continual acquiring, falling in love, acquiring, and making it happen. You'll hear all of this later [in class] because it goes into their understanding of what it is to collect, what is a collector, why is a collector. And I'm sure as many people as there are in the world that are collecting, there are that many reasons to collect. But I'd still resent "collecting." We aren't standing there collecting urine like a doctor would or collecting seashells with our hands out grabbing. [laughter] Although our hands, I guess, are out grabbing. [laughter]

You know, it's a very--what would you call that?--an ambiguous kind of a situation. You buy an artist's work that you like, and one of his things doesn't tell you everything about him. It's like looking at a photograph of someone that you've never met, and you say, "Here is a picture of George Goodwin." And you say, "But this really isn't George Goodwin, here's another one. Maybe you'd better see this one, too." So you really need five or six pictures. Pretty soon you get a sense, a sensibility about the person.

So it is with art. You can't have one Max Ernst. He was a very profound man, and he did so many things. His paintings were marvelous--but none as great as his sculpture. His sculpture was so meaningful. When you see that, and how he carried it to that, you know it's just impossible

to say it with one piece. It's impossible to say, "That's Henry Moore, that Animal Head." How can that be Henry Moore when you see that stately Queen sitting out there, or that loving Family of Four or the little Family of Three. I mean, they all are very positively a composite picture of the man, and the person and his soul and his feelings and his philosophies and everything that go to make him up.

Now, there are some artists, in our opinion, that are uneven. They had a moment in time when they did exemplary work, and then it wasn't ever quite as good as before, or quite as good afterwards, and so one can handle it very well.

There are also people that you can't really do justice to, so you're just as well to stay away from them--like Picasso. We have a marvelous Dora Maar of 1939. We have a wonderful drawing of 1967, [Trois nus assis]. I think his work after the forties was really downhill all the way. But downhill all the way compared to what? Compared to Picasso's, not compared to the other people who were painting at the time. Certainly he was one of the most prolific and profound and experimental of all the artists; and [he] explored so many fields of aesthetics that you couldn't put down what he did the day he died. But if you're comparing Picasso to Picasso. I was the one, I admit it, when Fred said, "I found it" (an analytical

cubist panel: it was two feet high and nine feet wide or eight feet wide, and there were three--one was owned by [Daniel] Kahnweiler, one was owned by Klaus Perls, and this one Jane Wade had--it was \$80,000), I said, "Fred, you've got to be out of your mind! \$80,000 for a painting!" And we let it go. Well, it was acquired, and we never got it. There was a vertical the same size of a seated bather that the National Gallery [of Art] bought for [\$] 1.3 million; and that was a couple of years ago, so it would be more today.

Then, of course, there was the [Alberto] Giacometti chariot that was painted, and it was \$60,000. I said, "Look, it's an edition; I think that's stupid." But by the same token, we had a Matisse pastel and watercolor of a woman sitting at a table, in front of an open window, with the philodendron leaves drooping down, and the printed drapery, and the printed wallpaper. And Fred didn't like the hand; he thought it was a very unfinished-looking hand. It bothered him. We had another Matisse painting that was in oil. There was no figure in it. It was an open balcony looking out in Nice with a violin case opened and empty on a chair in front of the window--I'm sure you've seen it, with the vanity table with the oval mirror? There's a version of it at the Museum of Modern Art. And may I tell you, he

sold that one so as to sell the pastel to sweeten the pot, and I ended up with no Matisse after all. All my life I'd said, "When I'm a rich lady someday, I'm going to have a Matisse and a Cézanne." Well, I have the Cézanne; I don't have the Matisse anymore.

GOODWIN: Not yet.

WEISMAN: I had them, and he sold them. So both of us have done things that we rued the day we did, or didn't do, and that's inevitable, too. We've often said that the best collection is the "iffy" collection: "if" we hadn't sold it, "if" we had bought it, "if" we hadn't given it away. And it wouldn't be bad except for when you look around: I wouldn't want to trade the "iffys" for what we have. So they're there and they're to be seen elsewhere, as long as they're alive somewhere being shown and not destroyed.

GOODWIN: At some point did you develop a plan as to a direction you wanted to follow?

WEISMAN: I don't think so. Do you know as recently as six months ago we discovered we have a remarkable collection of drawings, of the twentieth-century masters. And we really didn't know that. Did I tell you this?

GOODWIN: You mentioned it.

WEISMAN: We discover ourselves with [Arshile] Gorky, Pollock, Still, [Barnett] Newman. Who has drawings like that? So we went and saw a Kline [untitled], and I said,

"Fred, we've got to have it," and we did. And that was kind of a plan, when we bought the Kline. I think this [Robert] Motherwell [In Red with Two Ovals], I don't know whether you'd call it a collage and drawing, or whether it's a painting--really everything, isn't it, because it is partially painted. But I'd like to have a more complete situation, where you have a marvelous Johns-- We should have a good Rauschenberg going. To that extent I see a plan. And we've had Rauschenberg lithos, and he gave us a very nice one for Christmas. But a litho isn't really the same thing. I would like very much to kind of complete some sort of a plan of drawings. But there is no plan. How can you have a plan? Like saying I'm going to have a family and then have two boys and two girls: who can plan that? (Today you can!)

GOODWIN: You did settle on modern art.

WEISMAN: There was no question ever it was going to be modern art. At the beginning we thought, well, maybe at one time we'd go into something earlier, into impressionists, but that lasted six months maybe because after we first experienced the abstractionists and came into that marvelous feeling of every time you looked at it you saw something else, and you never could go by without picking up some nuance of it, and then you'd take it from one wall and move it to another wall, and then

it became a whole new world again, and who its sisters and brothers are, who it's sitting next to, hanging next to, who's accompanying it to wherever and whatever its doing, that's so very special. It takes it into another world, and we really love it. That's the marvelous thing about it. We adore everything about it. We adore the things we learned to dislike. This little turtle of Max Ernst [Tortue] we owned and we sold. Fred made some cockamamie deal somewhere along the way and we sold it. And we bought it back at a sale for considerably more money. But I'm sure at the time if you were to balance it out, it didn't matter that much in money. We know it's the same one because it is inscribed to Bernard Reis, which is the only sad thing about it. [laughter]

But the point is that even the things we don't like, we love being involved in it. We like the whole tenor of it. If I didn't love it the way I love it, I wouldn't be teaching; I wouldn't get into it so much. I think when I started doing art in offices as a consultant and doing the hospital [Cedars-Sinai Medical Center] and all of these other various situations, my feeling was really one of sitting down and knowing that I was not going to be a woman at a bridge table ever. I had tried that. I had played golf and stopped because of arthritis and one thing or another. I was never going to be a lady

that was-- I knew this long, long, long ago, I guess, when I started taking painting lessons. But I knew many, many years ago I was never going to be a bridgey lady or a clotheshorse lady (though I like clothes and the things that happen with them). I love my home, and I'm continually with projects going on in or about my home. I had to have something to put my teeth into, to keep me busy all day.

I have an active husband--and a going, moving husband. He's a workaholic, and he loves what he's doing. He's a driven man about his work. And you can't have a man like that come home at night and say, "Guess what! I [shot] 101 today, but tomorrow I'll break 100," and "I had lunch with the girls," and "Guess what she was wearing and what she said and who's sleeping with who and why." It just wasn't my world. I hear about good friends or old friends that died, and I hear of it two weeks later because I'm not into that kind of thing.

So one day I sat down and said, "If I'm going to do something, what am I going to do? What do I love the most?" It was obvious. A is for art so I love it the best. So I went to A, and so I had to be involved. It certainly makes for forty years of marriage to have that. I think we are blessed because there are very, very few people that have any one thing that they both care that much about, because I really don't care that much about

his business. While he loves his home, he really doesn't care that much about what the meal's going to be that night or what his breakfast is the next morning or whether the furniture was cleaned, just so it's clean. And how the house is run doesn't interest him; it just better be run--that he cares about. But I care about that, too.

But with art, if I said, "I was at an art gallery today": "Where? What? Who? What'd you see? How much was it? Had you ever seen it before? Would it look good in our garden, or wouldn't it? Do you think we ought to have it?" And I say, "You can't own it all." Or the story could be in reverse: "Today I went out to lunch with so-and-so, and guess what we did? We ended up at Margo's [Margo Leavin Gallery], and we were looking at so-and-so." And I'll say, "How could you have gone there without me!" and that'll be the argument of the night. "OK, I'll take you tomorrow, and I'll go back."

It is such a part of our lives. It is such an adherent. It's really glue is what it is. And our son [Richard] has said it to us. He is in the process of getting divorced--and has been for five or six years now. When he first separated from his wife, he said, "You've got to understand, you two have something special. You have art." I looked at him, and I said, "You don't think

we have something special in that we love each other?"

He says, "A lot of people start out loving each other.

It's easy to quit loving each other if you have nothing

to hang in there with. You've got something that's an

adherent for your marriage, that you can latch on to."

He was absolutely right. I think it's essential to have things like that. May we resign for now?

GOODWIN: Sure.

TAPE NUMBER: II, SIDE ONE

AUGUST 2, 1978

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, would you explain how your tastes in collecting have changed over the years, if that is possible?

WEISMAN: Yes, I think I can explain our tastes. I don't know to what extent you can say it changed; it's ever-changing. We've always been very eclectic or catholic in our tastes, whatever that means, but I'm repeating what other people say. I find that it's really a question of seeing things we fall in love with, and by and large it all falls into the same area. Now, the same area is what? I mean, I don't know. It's twentieth-century, that's all. The earliest thing we have is one Cézanne that refers back to the moment in time when, as I told you, I always said, "If ever I were a rich lady I'd have a Cézanne and a Matisse." Well, I was tattooed a little on the Matisses, but I still have my Cézanne. And maybe one day I'll have a Matisse that will be--something that will be meaningful. But in the meantime, how can I complain about Matisse when we have Motherwells that are straight out of Matisse, and others as well, and bringing their own message to it besides, which in a way is even better, if that's possible.

So really we started in the twentieth century and we are still in the twentieth century. We have no qualms

about seeing a Miró that we would buy tomorrow maybe, and the next day buy a [Claes] Oldenburg or buy a Duane Hanson or John DeAndrea or Anthony Caro (whom we don't own) or whoever it may be, or a Henry Moore. Well, there are a lot. We do seem to go to that area. We find them more refreshing, more spirited, more exciting to us, and so we have no really specific-- Believe me, we never went in to buy the [Jean] Dubuffet tree [L'Arbre de lait] that I'm looking at, but we did because we saw it, and we liked it, and it worked well; the whole arrangement was able to be resolved.

GOODWIN: How would you characterize your strengths as a collector? What do you see, perhaps, more perceptively than other collectors?

WEISMAN: I think probably one of the great strengths of the collection is the fact that it does cover such a broad scope and such a broad period of time and still within the confines of a period of time. We're now into-- Practically eighty years have gone by in the twentieth century. I haven't ever said that before, and it sounds like a long time, doesn't it? So that's a pretty broad-brush kind of a collection.

GOODWIN: Somebody mentioned that last week at your class.

WEISMAN: What?

GOODWIN: Well, somebody I knew, and I don't know who it was. He or she said, "Where have all these people been? The history of modern art has almost run its course, and these people who are enrolled in the class are just beginning to comprehend."

WEISMAN: Exactly, but why was that person there?

GOODWIN: I don't know. [laughter]

WEISMAN: I think, like anything worthwhile, that artists produce far ahead of their times, and so there is always the lag. It's amazing how many people really don't know what Matisse is about other than they like it, and how many people don't know what Picasso is about and still don't like him. So I don't think it has anything to do with where they are in the numbers or the years. The fact that approximately eighty years has gone by, yes, it's a long time for you who know and understand, and I who know and understand less than you but still have had the experience of-- We've had different experiences, let's say.

GOODWIN: Right. They're not comparable.

WEISMAN: They are comparable and they aren't comparable: one is a documentation and the learning process through one channel, and the other is through another channel.

I feel we've been very fortunate. We always stop and count our blessings along the way. We know we were

fortunate enough to be at the right time in the right place with the funds to do it. And while the funds don't seem great as we look back now-- When you think of inflation, and the drop in the cost of the dollar and the advance in the cost of the yen and all these things that have transpired in our country, it's really not so different today. You know someone that goes and pays \$10,000 for his first painting today isn't paying any more than we paid when we paid \$1,000 for our first painting, or \$800, whatever. Or \$400 then is \$5,000 today. Yet it seems like a lot, and the people in my classes go, "Oh, yes. But--" And I say, "Oh, yes, but what have you got for \$400 lately, a dress?" You know, it's true. And certainly the ladies in this class, that's what they spend: [\$]2-, [\$]3-, \$400 on a dress (and maybe less, we find little bargains here and there). [laughter] But seriously, anyone who is involving their life in this, by and large, when they are couples coming to a class to acquire a work of art because they're trying to find a painting to hang over their sofa (which is technically the name of the class: "I Have a Place over My Sofa and I Want to Buy a Painting"), anyone that's looking at paintings from that point of view, from that frame of reference--they're buying [\$]3-, \$400 dresses.

I think so differently. Don't misunderstand, I'm not saying that I am-- I'm not being all that humble. I have my sprees and I do my thing, but certainly it isn't the focal point of my life. That's evident. I may go out and blow it on a blouse or a dress from time to time, but I do think twice. I'm basically a frugal person. Now, frugal in terms of-- Before I'll go spend \$1,000 on a dress, which I know many ladies that do, or before I'll go into a store and buy myself a piece of jewelry or a diamond, that I might well afford to do, I'll think in terms of where will that be in five years from now in relationship to if I bought a picture or if I bought a sculpture. I think I really get more joy from the sculptures and the paintings and the graphics or the antiquities or whatever it may be. But granted, we've got a full house now, too, so I can go spend a little more on clothes and spend a little more time on it. [laughter] But it's just not been my private personal enterprise and interest. I certainly am not judgmental about it, and for those who collect clothing for themselves, I hope they collect their clothing with the same kind of spirit and concern. Because if you're going to spend it on clothes, buy the best, and look right in them. There are too many people you'll see that will spend \$1,000 on a dress, and they still look like it came from Penney's for \$82.95 or \$16.95. That

to me is the pity, as it is in the collecting business. The person that goes out and buys a painting for \$1,000 or \$5,000 and comes home with a [Bernard] Lorjou (the Lorjou probably costs \$15,000 today), when for \$15,000 they can go buy an Oldenburg, and they don't know that. Or they could go buy a beautiful drawing of Matisse, a small one, but a beautiful one. Or they could buy lots of things. There are so many things to be had in the lesser area. I tell my classes as time goes on, I try to emphasize the fact: it doesn't have to be an oil painting, and it doesn't have to be a major sculpture. It can be graphics, it can be serigraphs, it can be lithographs, it can be silk screens. [tape recorder turned off] It can be drawings, which I think are the most beautiful of all.

When you ask me how our tastes have changed through the years, we've come to terms, I think, with more of the fine line of collecting and art and paintings and some of the historical nuances and importance in collecting. Not so much for collecting, but when you put together a body of work like this, pretty soon you begin to realize its strengths come from-- You understand the museum position, and the strengths of any collection, if you are collecting (and we can't help ourselves now; I guess we are collectors, no matter what we may or may not want to say), the strengths come from, not having one major Jasper Johns painting, but

from having a Johns watercolor beside it, or in another room, that gives you some idea of his direction--where he came from and why. And so we have come to go back and forth, and that might be our change.

GOODWIN: Are there certain artists you enjoy today that you weren't able to enjoy twenty years ago?

WEISMAN: Of course, of course. If that didn't happen it would be no good at all.

GOODWIN: Can you give some examples?

WEISMAN: Well, we enjoyed Motherwell, but not all that much. And the Elegy series [Elegies to the Spanish Republic] had gotten beyond us. We had the one small one [Blackness of Black], but when we came to really believe and feel and understand a little bit better, then it was kind of out of line. Then we had a hard time finding Motherwell again in our heads until recently. Now we're into Motherwell very heavily again. A year and a half [ago] we bought two major collages [Summer Seaside Doorway and In Red with Two Ovals] and a painting, for starters, and an etching, a beautiful etching (which is another field people can collect in). When I say graphics, nobody thinks in terms of etchings in their oldest, most established manner--and done with color today in a way that they weren't as one thinks of early English etchings and French etchings and Italian etchings. Motherwell did this beautiful

red etching of--the red background with the black window, as it were, coming down from the top. We have that at the beach house. I just love it, and we've become more involved with him. We've become more involved with the new Rauschenberg. We had Rauschenberg in '54, '55 [Spreads and Veils]--no, we bought it in '77, '78, but it's a '54, '55 painting. Subsequently we bought other Rauschenbergs.

And we've moved back and forth a lot. But I think the back and forth, it's mainly forth and then going back. When you learn to love something, then we want to know more about it, where it came from, and more or less document what we have. And this is how we've come to realize, here we are all of a sudden long in drawings that we never realized we had. So we just picked up a Kline drawing [untitled]. Picked up? It wasn't cheap. It was \$9,000, I think, or \$7,000, for a drawing of Franz Kline. Well, that's a lot of money on the one hand, but to buy a Franz Kline painting today of any quality would probably be in the neighborhood of \$70,000 to \$100,000. But we're fortunate that we have a Kline painting [Black and White]. It's not a major Kline painting on the one hand; it's a '51, which was major in terms of his direction. And to have the drawing that's later on makes a nice complement to one another. So I think

our direction has changed in terms of history. We have become involved in the history of the art that we have.

GOODWIN: Who are some other artists you particularly enjoy today who really didn't interest you earlier on?

WEISMAN: Well, early on we bought an Oldenburg [Pastry Case]. Now, we have more Oldenburg than I can count (well, I can count them; I shouldn't be that pretentious). But actually we have a great deal of Oldenburg. We bought the showcase of the ice cream sundae with the banana and the baked potato in the process of being eaten [Baked Potato]-- we bought that in '61. Then we didn't buy any for a long time. We only bought a watercolor drawing of the inverted Q [Monument for Akron, Ohio]. We bought a washbasin that was done for the peace group of New York, a watercolor on parchment [Washbasin and Mirror]. I had wanted the soft-hard sculpture, and it got away before we could get it. There was a lithograph that Claes-- We had met him and he told us about it, and we got that [Toilet]. Then we have the pickles [Pickle Slices in a Jar], which we had seen early on for like [\$]6-, \$700 that we later pay \$15,000 for--or the sliced cucumbers, whatever. We have the inverted Q in a sculpture. We have an eraser--you know, typewriter eraser in a sculpture [Typewriter Eraser]. That's at the beach. We have a sailboat ready to become a Q. We have an etching of a spoon becoming a pier--

an ocean pier, a lake pier. I know we have others, and I can't think of what. Isn't that dreadful? Oh, we have one of the great ones, the [Constantin] Brancusi: the Sleeping Muse becoming a baseball mitt [Brancusi's Muse as a Baseball Mitt]. We have lithographs of his as well, like the cuff links of the Picasso sculpture in Chicago as a lithograph. But, you know, all of that-- that's maybe twelve Oldenburgs right now that I have mentioned--and all of them take on a different place in moment and time. It's very important to us, and we care a great deal about those.

Now, by the same token, the Ernst-- All of a sudden we started with an Ernst painting many years ago. We bought the Ernst turtle [Tortue]; we subsequently traded it on something else. Now we've bought the turtle back again. And then we have the wood sculpture of the man with the beating heart [Jeune homme au coeur battant]. And then we bought the bronze one that incorporates the man with the beating heart in a way. But it's really very different, and it's bronze. So from that one painting came three sculptures. And then we have another sculpture of Ernst that we've had for many, many years that our son [Richard] confiscated, called Gai, or the Man with the Bottle; you may know that piece. It's flat plateaus--the face, the body--and he's got a bottle under his arms--rather phallic

and yet it isn't. It's absolutely straight out of a Mayan piece called the Laughing Man of--where?

GOODWIN: I know what you mean. I don't know the name.

WEISMAN: Well, that bottle is structured exactly like that pre-Columbian piece from any little country.

GOODWIN: When did you begin collecting sculpture?

WEISMAN: Oh, right away, right away. The first sculpture we bought was the Arp that's in the living room [Self Absorbed].

That was really our fourth or fifth major acquisition. When I talk of major acquisitions: we bought the Arp, the Jawlensky, a Soulages, a Guston. Those I consider really our first major acquisitions. We had bought a Richenbourg; we bought the Paul Brach; we had bought, what else-- ? Those were really the beginning of the good pieces. So that was in the first year or two.

GOODWIN: Is there a certain quality in either painting or sculpture to which you are attracted instantly?

WEISMAN: Excellence. [laughter]

GOODWIN: Well, that's a good answer, but I'm thinking of color, shape, line.

WEISMAN: No, I don't think so. I think we really strike out to have the best. Because if it's less than the best it falls short, and we end up trading it, selling it, giving it, until we get the best. We have pieces here I'd rather not mention. We know they're not quality. We bought them thinking they were. Now we know we've got

to upgrade them; we're having a terrible time upgrading. One of them is a beautiful [Isamu] Noguchi sculpture [Little She]. It really is lovely. We bought it at the UCLA show that was "Southern California Collects." How that piece was in it I don't know. We had loaned our Newman to that show, and I don't know why Noguchi loaned that piece, and how that came to happen. Anyway, we bought the piece out of the show. It was beautiful. We loved it. We adored it. We wanted a Noguchi. We think he is terribly representative, and he really is California orientation--and if I shall excuse the pun, no less. [laughter] We loved the piece. Then as time went on, we came to know this is not Noguchi. This is Noguchi, yes, but it's not the quality of Noguchi that should be standing beside that Arp, nor should it be in front of that de Kooning Dark Pond, or next to The Glade of Giacometti. It just doesn't hang in there. Now, he hangs in with any one of those artists, but this work does not represent his maximum in excellence. And so we would like his maximum in excellence.

I talk to him about it often, and he says, "I'll cast you a marble. I won't give you the marble, they're too fragile, the ones you want." I want a tripod. Do you know the kind? They're so beautiful. And he keeps saying, "I can't let you have that one; what if it broke?" I said,

"Look, they break in museums, too. I guarantee I take better care of them. I don't have as many people tramping through them." We go through this dialogue all the time, and he's just a dear, lovely man. And he knows what we're saying. He wants to cast one for us. Did you ever see the piece that was at the National Gallery when they had the art of mid-century some four or five years ago, three, four years ago?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: Well, anyway, they did this show and they had a Noguchi in there that-- It was the rose pink marble and with the tripod and the little piece that fit over the top. It was exquisite! And it was owned by the artist, and we called him and said, "OK, here we go." He said, "OK, I'll cast it in stainless; I'll cast it in bronze." I said, "You won't cast it in anything. We want it in marble." And we have the same dialogue over and over again. He's invited us to come to see him in Japan, and we shall one day, hopefully. But, you know, we feel very keenly that excellence is it. What else can you look for?

GOODWIN: Let me ask you an irritating question. Do you make safe choices when you're--?

WEISMAN: I hope not. I really hope not.

GOODWIN: Is that irritating, that question?

WEISMAN: No, it doesn't irritate me because I know better; I know we do better than that. There are times we are

safe. But excellence is safe, isn't it?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: So, we're not safe, like if we were safe we would have been buying Cézannes, wouldn't we?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Because when we paid \$33,000 for the Cézanne we had, we could have bought a bigger one by that time for \$60,000, maybe a little bit bigger than that for a \$100,000. We paid \$75,000 for the Kandinsky [Yellow Nude]. We paid \$75,000 for the Kandinsky, \$85,000 or \$90,000 for the Pollock Scent. We could easily have had a Cézanne at that time or a Matisse for those prices. It wasn't a question of dollars and cents. Or we could have gone to Picasso. We did buy Picasso at \$45,000 for a Dora Maar. Funny how the numbers-- A lot of the numbers I do recall. A lot of them I don't. They must be blocked for some reason. But when you pay those prices you're no longer looking for bargains, and that's why you're not into the impressionists. We own Paul Klee. We sold Paul Klee. We paid \$30,000 [for a] Paul Klee. We bought it from Paul Kantor [Little Red Train].

GOODWIN: What did you have?

WEISMAN: Oh, it was gorgeous. The little red train up the mountain in Switzerland. Oh, I had the most marvelous story about that. Can we waste the time on it?

GOODWIN: Sure.

WEISMAN: We had bought this painting from Paul [Kantor]. And when I first saw it, it was just the burlap--it was painted on burlap--and he said he had it without a frame. There it was in my hand, and I'm looking at it, and it was just so lovely. It was like [\$]30-, \$35,000. So I talked to Fred about it, and he said yes, he liked it, too. And he saw it. So we buy the painting. And we had it framed beautifully in a Picasso frame. It's very pastel. At the top of the mountain is the little Swiss flag and, you know, the little red engine with the little train going up. And it reminded me of "the little engine that could." So anyway, but it was more than that, it was just really a beautiful painting, beautiful Klee. It said it all. It was one of the few Klees that I know of that you could almost say it was all there. But that's not true really of any Klee.

So in any event, some years back, I'm in New York, and I had a driver taking me someplace, and we were talking. Oh, he picked me up at the airport, and I had just come in from Europe. And he said, "Where have you been?" And I told him I had been in Switzerland. He says, "I'll never forget--I was in Switzerland once." Seems as though his father was a stockbroker, and he had traveled a lot. And he really was going into the investment banking business,

but he had to know he could go out and work and make a living first. So he was driving. He had been in Switzerland, and he said there was this one little village, and it was so lovely; it was at the bottom of this mountain. There was a little red train, and it traveled to the mountain and all the way up to the top of the mountain. And that train would stop at every little village along the way, and it made three trips a day. It went up in the morning, back at noon, up at noon, and back at night. And the wives would give sandwiches to the trainmaster to put on the train to take to their husbands at work that worked up the side of the hill. I said, "What color was the train?" He said, "Oh, it was a little red train, and it's been there for a hundred years." [laughter]

GOODWIN: Where is it?

WEISMAN: And so he told me where it was. And this whole thing was not far from Salzburg, but in Switzerland and Munich and that area; it was in the southern part of Switzerland. I said, "I've got to tell you"-- I was so beside myself. Here was a man telling me the story of this little red train that we had in the painting. Anyway, I thought it was quite charming that such a thing would happen.

Well, some years later someone offered us \$125,000 for that painting. Now, our tastes changed to the extent

that we'd lived with it, I see every line, I can see every color, I could draw it for you. I own the painting. I'll never not own the painting, but we could have left that. It wasn't from lack of excellence because it was excellent. But sometimes \$125,000 looks pretty good, and we must have bought something worthwhile for it. I don't know what because we didn't keep track. That would have been an interesting thing to do: that as we sold things, what we put the monies to. Because rarely was it put to paying bills. It was usually put to buying more art. So in that way, our tastes changed. In that way we go to special situations.

We get carried away now and then with young artists who are just beginning to make their mark. And to encourage them, we'll buy; and sometimes it's not the best art available. Every now and then it's amazing. We buy something because you're helping someone. I never will buy an artist to help them. An artist of fifty years of age, or forty years of age, that's been pounding the pavements and working hard and doing his thing for ten, fifteen, twenty years, and he's a painter, and if I don't like his work, that's tough. He's a serious artist, he's put his lifetime to it, and either I like it, and we like it, then that's that. We're not patronizing that artist. I won't do it. I'll take people to his

studio in hopes that somebody else will like it. I won't patronize.

But a twenty-year-old kid that's still in college calls me from Minneapolis yesterday. His grandfather called because he had known my husband in the grocery business when he was president of Hunt Foods, and he had big grocery chains in Minneapolis. He calls my husband. What should he do about his grandson? And he knows that we are into art, and maybe we could help. I talked to this boy on the phone and to his grandfather. He's been taking commissions since he was sixteen. His grandfather offered him a trip to Europe to go look at the museums this summer, but he had so many commissions lined up he won't be through with his commissions till September or October. He's had one year of college at Illinois college of something outside of Chicago, outside of Minneapolis--either Chicago or Minneapolis, I don't know. It didn't sound like a very impressive school to me, but that doesn't really matter. He can use it on his résumé. He's had shows there, and so forth. He has works at Mayo's [Clinic]; he had works in the area owned by local people, and so forth. He sent me a whole bunch of photographs.

GOODWIN: So what was your advice?

WEISMAN: My advice was, "If you finish school in seven years instead of four years, so what? But you go to school."

Take your trip. And if you can't be through with your commissions this summer, take your trip and get it out of your system till January. But the first part of your trip should be one month minimum traveling the United States finding the location where you want to go to school and where you think you can work best. You go to school. If it is UCLA or [UC] Irvine or [UC] Santa Barbara or in New York State--City College, whatever it is--find a school that you think has the best art department, the best potential for you. Instead of carrying fourteen units, carry eight, and you'll finish your college at the end of seven years instead of four years. And if I'm not mistaken, when you get to that fifth year you're going to say, 'What the hell am I futzing around for?' And you'll plow into it by then, and you'll knock it off in a year and a half or two years. In the meantime you'll have your accreditation. Without that you'll never really be anything. Do you want to go to a museum that's having a one-man show and get up and say, 'It don't matter whether I'm here or not,' or 'Whether you like it or not, I'm proud.' You want to be able to stand up there and speak English. And you want to go into France and be able to speak their language, if only minutely to communicate, and in Italy and wherever you go. And you want to go to Switzerland and be able to speak the language of the area in Switzerland where you are.

But you don't want your work to die, and you don't want your mind to die. So you must complete it."

I feel that it's important. If he just went to school--his grandfather wanted him to just go to school--I think his head would rust, and he would have to backtrack. And by then others will have done what he was doing. He's done some very interesting things. This young man--I would buy a sculpture to encourage him. He doesn't really need me, though. [laughter] At sixteen he was selling pieces for \$500! And he's now up to [\$]4-, \$5,000, with commissions that he can't complete until September. That's exciting.

GOODWIN: Do you have any works in your home here by unknown artists?

WEISMAN: Yes, we have one [SB986] on our terrace by a man named Richard Mayer from San Francisco. I think I told you about him.

Not so much here, but I have [works by unknowns] down at the beach. I'll tell you, we keep more of the cream of the crop here. I mean, it's safe. But I don't think so here. But we have-- It's hard to say. We have so many little personal things that were given to us when they were unknowns that are here. You know, like Bob Graham's given us gifts and George Rickey's given us gifts and Vasa has given us gifts and--God!--Clyfford

Still has given us gifts. One day I said to Fred,
"We really ought to do a show of gifts." He said, "You've
got to be sick. How can you say such a thing?" Reuben
Nakian has given us gifts, Claire Falkenstein, Billy Al
Bengston, Ned Evans--you know all these people from around
here?

GOODWIN: Sure.

WEISMAN: Claude Kent. I don't know, they all have.

A lot of them have come as a result of my taking classes
to them. Really when I started my classes, there wasn't
anything quite like I was doing. There were classes at
UCLA in Extension. It was all from slides, and it wasn't
giving the artists exposure. In fact, we took one of
those classes from Walter Hopps after we bought our
Soulages. I remember going to those classes, and we'd
go time after time getting mad at Walter because he kept
talking about Franz Kline. We kept saying, "Why do you
talk about Kline? He's no better than Soulages, and
it's the same thing." You know, if it only took us a
year to discover the difference; it took us longer.
It took us a year to know there was a difference, and it
took us five years before we bought a Kline. He was
very difficult for us in the beginning. So I probably
would never have gotten to it. Do you like him?

GOODWIN: Yes. I haven't seen many examples of his work.

Why don't you like him?

WEISMAN: I think he is derivative of Jasper Johns and doesn't say as much. And he's a charming man. It's very difficult when you know someone, and he's charming, and you like him, and he likes you, and you keep saying, "Beautiful piece, very interesting work"--it's horrible. For years we never bought a Billy Al. I had bought a Dento some seven, eight years ago. I think I paid [\$]5-, \$700, something like that. I keep dragging my classes to Billy's studio, seeing his art, seeing him at parties, having him here at our parties, very good friends, never bought a thing. But as I saw it, we did him a favor. Because if I had bought it and not liked it, it would have gone in a closet. And that's no service to anybody. I would not do that. I don't believe in doing that. I don't think it serves the artist's best interests or mine. I'd much rather give him \$1,000 and say, "Here, if you are in trouble I'll be glad to loan you the \$1,000." And if I may use the vernacular, I'd rather keep him a mensch. Let him owe me the money and pay it back without interest. We've done that and written off a few loans--not to Billy Al, but several people that we've done that with. Like you've seen the money, we've seen the money, but who cares. It was done with an honest intent, and we didn't buy a work because of it. We didn't buy the work because he needed

the money. We gave him the money because he needed the money. When we bought the work, we bought the work because we liked the work, and one thing had nothing to do with the other. I think it gives the artist the opportunity, as I say, to be the mensch and develop character on his own.

GOODWIN: Sounds fair.

WEISMAN: And subsequently, I might say, we bought a Billy Al out of his last show. But in the meantime Fred has gotten very strong into acquiring California artists, which I have pled with him for a long time. I'd like to acquire some of the works of the people I go to because some of them are very good. And I think we would do well owning them. Well, I can't do that on my own. As I always say, I'll spend on anything up to \$232.65 like a damn, but when it gets into anything more I can't do that. And I think art should be for both of us anyway. And if one of us prefers it and the other one doesn't, at least we go in knowing "Well, that's yours, and this is mine, and maybe one day I'll respect your tastes," and so forth.

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, is it possible to describe any of your weaknesses as a collector?

WEISMAN: Sure. We get carried away emotionally from time to time. What else? I mean--

GOODWIN: Are there certain kinds of pictures or sculptures

that elude you that you should be able to enjoy?

WEISMAN: Well, I always have said the best collection we ever would have would be the "iffy" collection: if we bought it, if we hadn't sold it, or if we hadn't given it away. Well, that's a weakness. We should have known better. We should have probably known better than to sell a Klee. Because in the long run what's the \$125,000 compared to-- Probably by today it's worth another \$50,000. But you know, you can't figure it that way, that's all.

GOODWIN: Well, are there certain artists you would like to enjoy?

WEISMAN: Of course. We had a Picasso [Dora Maar] hanging in our living room. I can't even discuss it in front of my husband. He just looks at me, and he doesn't say anything. If he weren't so damn nice about it, I'd feel better. But this was probably two and a half feet high. What's the size of that Motherwell there [In Red with Two Ovals] with the--

GOODWIN: Is this the panel that--the three versions?

WEISMAN: Yes, did I tell you about it?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: And one belongs to Kahnweiler.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: So I thought [\$]85-, \$90,000 was too much money. Did I also mention on this tape about the Giacometti--

GOODWIN: The chariot?

WEISMAN: --that I put the kibosh on. I had sold-- He sold my Matisses. You know, those things have happened. Of course, those are weaknesses. Certainly it was a weakness that we didn't--that we saw the Kandinskys, or Nolde that we didn't buy that I liked, or whatever it might have been. But my husband's phrase, which I think is very accurate and correct and feeling, is you can't have them all. You just can't have everything. And you make mistakes. When you have that much exposure--

GOODWIN: OK, that's a question I want to ask. What are some of your mistakes, not necessarily pictures you've let go by, but things you've acquired that you really didn't care for.

WEISMAN: I don't think of those as mistakes at all. That's a learning experience. We've bought things that we have subsequently given away; we have sold them, or whatever. When we do that, it means that we've grown. That was part of our education. Anything we bought that proved to be less than it was when we bought it, that we got rid of, that kind of a getting-rid-of is the most educational process you can go through: living with it, and as I even refer to it in my classes, "using it up; and disposing of it, taking your money, and putting it into the next step forward."

GOODWIN: Outgrowing it.

WEISMAN: That's right. I never like to say "outgrown it" because it becomes a put-down to the people who might buy it. And inevitably we always feel when we put a picture in a sale or it's publicly known that it's ours, most people's response is, "What's the matter with it? Why are they selling it?" And I try to respond to that by saying, "It isn't that there is anything the matter with it. We have used it up." But look at what we're comparing it to. And when we use it up it's wrong to keep it and not have it out. It's something for somebody else to grow on. Everybody's rate of growth is different, and everybody's extent of growth is different. It doesn't demean the painting or the sculpture or the work, and one mustn't be judgmental like that. One must look at it as for what it does for them.

GOODWIN: What are some works that you've used up?

WEISMAN: That's not fair for me to tell that to you.

[laughter]

GOODWIN: Which artists?

WEISMAN: Well, one artist who knows it really and is angry, has been angry at us ever since, was [Yaacov] Agam. We had bought four or five of his things. We gave some to family and so forth. We had a major painting of his [Cycle] that when we bought it we thought it was great. We

bought it from him in his studio in Paris. And he's come here, and we've visited, and you know, we became good friends, and then we sold it at auction. I don't know, maybe we paid [\$]3-, \$4,000 for it at the time. And maybe we sold it for [\$]15-, [\$]20-, or \$30,000, and he thought it should've gone for \$60,000 and that we wholesaled it. Do you know him at all?

GOODWIN: No, but I like his work.

WEISMAN: Well, he's a very aggressive man. And anyway, it was as good as any you'll see around. It was great. It was the cover of a book that we have somewhere around here of his. And it was a fine Agam as Agams went. But I think Agam is Agam; and Chagall is Chagall. And you know, and there were goods of those moments. There were works of each of them that were very good, but they were used up easily for me. I would love to have one Chagall that was owned by some people [the Steinberg family] in St. Louis. It was a white painting with a bouquet of flowers with lovers flying up in the corner and the little Hebrew letters down below, and it was done in 1919. That kind of Chagall I'll buy every day of the week if I had the money for it.

GOODWIN: Right. I understand that.

WEISMAN: But all of these paintings that he has done-- painting himself over and over again. And Miró did the

same thing. But his new work, I think, is marvelous. His tapestries or macrames or whatever you want to call them-- I think those are great.

GOODWIN: So you like tough pictures.

WEISMAN: Sure, we like tough. It's amazing, when they're pretty and sweet, one has doubts about them. Do you know who was a beautiful painter--never wore out really, but he was so sweet, we were continually threatened by the fact that he would wear out--was Jon Schueler. Did you ever know his work?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: Very much like [Joseph] Turner or [John] Constable--gorgeous skies from Ireland. He paints from New York, lovely man. We owned a big painting of his [Scottish Skyscape]. It was so sweet; it was just sweet, sweet, sweet. Now, maybe he'll never wear out. But we just couldn't handle that much sweetness in our bedroom (it couldn't work anyplace else). So, there are a lot of them that have come about that way. I know I don't like sweet, pretty things. We like tough things.

GOODWIN: Are there any works presently in your home that you're still trying to digest?

WEISMAN: Oh, some of them we'll never digest.

GOODWIN: I mean, are there some where you feel you don't even yet have a handle on them?

WEISMAN: No, I don't think that, because we have to have a handle, or we wouldn't have bought it.

GOODWIN: You wouldn't take the chance of--

WEISMAN: Oh, we had to have some reason for it. It had to have a challenge. It had to have something that got to our gut. We may not have known what, and we may not have known why, but there was something inside us. There was some gut feeling that made us buy it when we bought it. So there was always the handle. And then it became-- We absorbed it more and more and more. That's generally the way it works.

GOODWIN: What's a picture you're still working on, you're still trying to understand?

WEISMAN: I don't know. [laughter] I think the Rauschenberg, that '54 red Rauschenberg [untitled]; I always have trouble with that. Always.

GOODWIN: Why?

WEISMAN: Well, it's a very challenging painting. It goes from bloody to moonlight to sunlight and mountains, a red sea--you know, it goes to so many things. You just can't sit there and accept that painting and say, "Lovely painting," and walk by it, can you?

GOODWIN: No. I know you continually rotate the location of the objects in your collection.

WEISMAN: Constantly.

GOODWIN: But at the moment that tends to be--

WEISMAN: Oh, not so. You get a vision of that from--
You walk in the front door it's the first thing you see.
It's a straight line to the front door, that spot. That's
a very key spot. That's where the Pollock [Scout] goes
sometimes.

GOODWIN: I'll reevaluate it.

WEISMAN: Now, I'll tell you another key spot is where--
I don't know what's hanging there right now--in the bar.
Can you believe that? I don't know what's-- The red Still
[1947-R-No. 2], the red Still is hanging there. You
know, Stills are always challenging, the black one
particularly because it changes so. It's an ever-changing
painting. They all do that, and as you change them
around, they change more, and it makes them all very
special in their own way. I don't think we'd have anything
up that we didn't feel that kind of a feeling about, that
didn't offer some kind of challenge to me. And when
it stops, I'm ready to leave it; I've had it. I don't
want it anymore. And that's when they start shifting
locations. Not in the house--they shift from here to the
office, or the office to someplace else. They go to my
son's-- Not that they have lesser collections because they
don't, but you know, it is an ever-changing process.

I think having become involved with the California
artists has been a really nice thing. It's been special

because we find they're not as pretty as we thought they were in the first place: We were afraid of them because at least we felt we always wanted to maintain a challenge to ourselves. It's very hard to discern between that which you really believe in and the person that you really believe in. And separating the painting or the work from the person is sometimes very, very difficult to do. So we stayed clear of it for a long time, and that gets back to the patronizing thing. But I don't feel that way anymore because I think that I can have confidence in my judgment and Fred's judgment. And I've discovered-- I'd like to read you something that Robert Motherwell wrote me. May I, or is it--?

GOODWIN: Let's wait a minute or so.

WEISMAN: Right, then you're turning [the tape] over.

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Because I'd like to get back to this, because it does have to do with the California situation. And it's very meaningful and very pertinent.

GOODWIN: It seems to me paradoxical that after having gone as far as you have in one direction that you would move backward to California artists.

WEISMAN: That isn't backward. Those works are only just emerging, that's all.

GOODWIN: Well, they're certainly younger, less mature artists.

WEISMAN: Ron Davis isn't any younger than Jasper Johns, is he? Maybe a couple of years.

GOODWIN: Slightly.

WEISMAN: Slightly. Or Billy Al isn't.

GOODWIN: But you don't have anybody in the generation of the abstract expressionists.

WEISMAN: We certainly do. We have a Lorser Feitelson [untitled] that we've had for many years. And we have-- Who else of the older ones? I'm trying to think-- Claire Falkenstein, and we've had-- Some of them we bought a long time ago: Sam Francis certainly, and the new ones. There's [Tom] Wudl and there's-- You don't like him, I don't think.

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: There's-- No, not Wudl I take that back-- [Chuck] Arnoldi.

GOODWIN: Right. I think--

WEISMAN: You like that better? We have Bob Graham, and we've just commissioned him to do another piece [Dancing]. We're going to have an unveiling here which we'd love to have you attend--

GOODWIN: Oh, thank you.

WEISMAN: --on the twentieth. It's a monumental piece. He feels he turned the corner on that piece.

GOODWIN: Let's stop here for a minute. [tape recorder turned off]

WEISMAN: I think Bob is really an emerging artist. Now, he's what? Forty-five? You know he hangs in there with what's good in New York today, or what they think is good in New York today. He's really of the time of the sixties; he started in the sixties.

GOODWIN: How do you know he's a good artist?

WEISMAN: Oh, come on. Look at it.

GOODWIN: Is that the only measure of his excellence?

WEISMAN: Well, compare it then--everything as compared to what?

GOODWIN: Right. I know, that's one of your themes.

WEISMAN: Always. But isn't that true?

GOODWIN: Yes, OK. To whom would you compare him?

WEISMAN: Well, let's put him up against-- [Jacques] Lipchitz, I think, is a good person to compare him with, or next to the Ernst in the front hall?

GOODWIN: All right.

WEISMAN: All right.

GOODWIN: I don't think he's made a dent in either of those.

WEISMAN: You really don't?

GOODWIN: No, not at all. Given the chronological difference in when the works were produced. I consider him more of a grandchild of those artists.

WEISMAN: He is. I don't expect him to be-- You know, you

can't say Clyfford Still is related to Rembrandt either, but in a sense he is for his generation--or a Barnett Newman or a de Kooning or a Pollock or a Gorky. They're the Rembrandts of their generation.

GOODWIN: Right. I think all of those artists are profound artists.

WEISMAN: I think that Bob Graham is a profound artist for his generation--and a great draftsman.

GOODWIN: But isn't it possible he has hardly any competition in his generation as compared to--like the abstract expressionists have?

WEISMAN: Well, there's Caro; there's Anthony Caro. George Rickey's older than he. Certainly, I think George Rickey is marvelous, but I don't think he's as profound as Bob Graham, do you?

GOODWIN: I don't think Rickey is a profound artist.

WEISMAN: Neither do I. But he's delightful.

TAPE NUMBER: II, SIDE TWO

AUGUST 2, 1978

GOODWIN: What do you think is profound about Graham's sculpture?

WEISMAN: Oh, God, I don't know how you answer questions like that. I really don't because-- Is there any way?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: Oh, thank you. That makes me feel so much better. I always feel like such an idiot.

GOODWIN: Well, what were you going to say?

WEISMAN: I was going to say that I don't know what's profound. I only know the things I've seen and some things seem better than others. What makes me think of Barnett Newman's work as being profound? It's a zip down the middle of a painting, a field of color. And I don't know why it's profound. It is. It's just there. Again--I hate to keep repeating myself--it's compared to what? And you expose yourself and expose yourself. And I think that John Graham, Bob Graham-- John Graham also is a fine artist, but Bob Graham I think is an impeccable technician, a great draftsman--a really good draftsman (if you've seen his drawing). And I think he has put realism into a form of abstraction in that he has broken it down into its most minute forms and put it all back together. Now, I don't know, that's gobbledygook.

You know what I remind myself of? I should say, "May his soul rest in peace," I guess--but to read an article by Tom Hess or Harold Rosenberg--

GOODWIN: His soul too.

WEISMAN: His soul should rest in peace, too. All the best ones have gone lately. There was another one that just died. And Tom and I were never great friends. We were longtime acquaintances that knew each other well. But we didn't get on all that well. But to read an article by those people on art-- This is why I tell my classes, "Don't read, look." Because it really doesn't say a goddamn thing. What's profound depends upon the individual that's looking at it, and what they are looking for, and as to what they find. How can you determine that? I just think he's [Graham] a good sculptor. Now, I've seen a lot of his work. I didn't like his early-on things--the little wax thing he used in the swimming pool, zero--until he started working in bronze. And his early bronzes didn't get to me that much. But later on, maybe there's-- I don't know. Was there a sense of Giacometti when I saw those tables? No. This says nothing about Giacometti except method of showing the work, exposing it. I think his figures are incredible. You don't like those mirror people? OK, that puts one on your side and one on my side that we don't agree on.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: And that is great, because otherwise neither of us could ever afford to buy Bob Graham--if everybody liked the same things.

GOODWIN: Right. But I don't see how he fits in your taste, having learned something about your taste.

WEISMAN: Well, tell me, do you think Oliver Andrews is profound?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: Neither do I--don't quote me--and I think he's the dearest, nicest man. It breaks my heart.

GOODWIN: I don't feel that way about him either. [laughter]

WEISMAN: The drawings he has made for us--water sculptures for our pool and around our pool that he wanted us to have-- I'm not foolish. I know that these artists would like to have [their] things in this collection. And I feel very badly, but I won't demean the collection, nor would I demean them, because in effect I would demean them. If I put an Oliver Andrews sculpture up there, Rickey would make him look sick.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: And that would make him look like a pile of you-know-what, and that's not fair to a decent person when there are a lot of people-- He could be the number one in their garden. So I think he should be placed where he's

number one, not number ten.

GOODWIN: Well, who are some of the other California artists that you admire?

WEISMAN: Well, I think Ron Davis has done some good work. I think he prostituted himself for a long time with his lithographs. That was too bad because he was really doing himself again, and that was too bad. I think his paintings, his last batch of paintings, were very good. I think the "sandboxes," as I call them, were marvelous. I think these last ones are particularly good.

Who else is there? I think Arnoldi really matured a great deal. He hasn't made it, but he's moving in on it. And I think he's taking on direction.

GOODWIN: What about someone like [Richard] Diebenkorn?

WEISMAN: Oh, I think Diebenkorn is marvelous, but, you know, I must say he never set us on fire. He never made us feel we had to have one. When we went to the Diebenkorn show, I zeroed right in on the picture I wanted, and subsequently I found it was owned by the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh. You may know the painting--the pale blue one--it was beautiful. But compared to everything else of Diebenkorn's-- We wanted to buy a Diebenkorn many, many years ago when he was at Poindexter [Gallery]. It was a corner window with a man sitting at a table [Ocean Park No. 64]. It was very good, and they backed away on the deal.

Whatever they were asking for, we offered them a little bit [less]. And they said OK; and then they rose and said they decided they didn't want to. They never gave us a chance to say, "OK, then we'll pay the original price." They just said the deal was over--out, forget it, it's gone. So maybe that had an effect on it, too, and on our acquisition of a Diebenkorn, which is too bad because he really is such a good artist; he really is a good artist. And I think he's done marvelous work, and I think his whole range has been excellent, and his growth processes, and all of that. I think I could find a Diebenkorn challenging to live with. I don't think I want to spend that kind of money. How much are they--[\$]50-, [\$]60-, \$70,000? I don't want to spend that much money to be challenged by Diebenkorn.

GOODWIN: You've had [Edward] Kienholz.

WEISMAN: We've had Kienholz [The Birthday]. I think he definitely was excellent. He made a mark. He will not go down in the annals of history as being a great artist. But he'll be an artist--what will he be?--he'll be an innovator, and maybe the first to bring about new realism as we see it today: the neorealism and the social commentaries and statements in art. Whether those are altogether valid I'm not sure.

But certainly the Duane Hansons have been very meaningful to us. I think they can be a little kitsch.

They can maybe slip out of the socket from time to time, but I think, by and large, they're very good. But certainly they're derivative of Kienholz, don't you think so?

GOODWIN: Yes. You mentioned that last week after class, and I hadn't really thought about those two artists together.

WEISMAN: Who?

GOODWIN: Kienholz and Hanson.

WEISMAN: Oh, do you think--

GOODWIN: No. I hadn't thought of them as being that close together as--

WEISMAN: Well, they aren't that close.

GOODWIN: --as Hanson being, in a sense, a follower.

WEISMAN: Well I think that he had to have learned from Kienholz. Who else did anything like that? Whoever else did something-- It certainly isn't [George] Segal.

GOODWIN: What about Segal?

WEISMAN: No, it isn't Segal.

GOODWIN: Why not?

WEISMAN: Segal is right out of Bonnard. Segal took a Bonnard painting and made it real, made it come to life.

GOODWIN: Is that what Segal says?

WEISMAN: No, never.

GOODWIN: That's what you feel.

WEISMAN: That's what I feel. [tape recorder turned off]

You know, I think that when you look at his drawings--
Have you seen Segal's drawings, any of them? Well, those
are just absolutely--they're fabulous. And we regretted
not buying drawings of him. But there again we had two
of his sculptures, and he was telling us we must come
together and get to see some of those colored sculptures.
He said they're really neat. I can't really believe him
necessarily, but I don't think I'd like the colored
sculptures. Of course, I haven't seen them. I think
it's the white ones that give the message I want to see
and feel. I see that sculpture in there [Girl Looking into
Mirror] as that lady standing in front of the bathtub of
[Pierre] Bonnard. By the same token, we didn't keep it
that way. Fred thought it was too cutesy. We had the
Cézanne painting in the front hall with the Segal and the
mirror, making that painting a part of the composition.
They are identical, you know. So that's what happens.
It's inevitable maybe, because we've lived with them both,
that we think that way. Maybe had we not lived with them
both, we would have thought differently.

People who've lived with Hanson who have never seen
a Kienholz probably wouldn't think about that at all. But
then I don't know whether that's silly, too. Let me get
back to the California artists again because I'm really
anxious.

GOODWIN: You have a letter from Motherwell that has some

bearing on this.

WEISMAN: This is a letter I've just received. It seems as though-- You know I serve on the board of trustees of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, and Henry Hopkins is their director. He has a program going on which I think is outstanding. I must say not unique to me, because it was something that my husband had wanted to do at the Pasadena Museum many, many years back, prior to their building of the new museum. In fact, we really moved toward helping them do that with our Stills, in a way. But that's a whole other story. The idea being that they should really covet a specific group of artists and go about making a collection in the field, in an area with artists.

Henry Hopkins, whom I've known for many, many years, when he was a preparator at the L.A. County [Museum of Art]-- But that's another story when we talk about museums. Henry started this by doing an evaluation of the collection in San Francisco. They have a good portion of the original--who were they--[Michael] Stein Collection of Matisses, Picassos, et cetera. They also have, I believe, four Gustons in their collection. The first step they made in this direction was he went to Phil Guston and said, "I'd like to buy for the museum one painting. How many will you give us?" [laughter] And

Guston said four, which meant [the collection would increase to] nine. And I immediately said, "And we have one [Winter Flower] we will give you at some time. When, I don't know. Maybe it will be by will or whatever. Making ten. And another collector in San Francisco said, "Make it eleven." And now, they have a body of work of Philip Guston that ranges from '56, '57 on up to now. I think that's excellent.

They have in the collection a few Motherwells. They have a few of this, a few of that.

Now, what Henry has put together is the idea of artists that have been associated with, or lived in, the Bay Area--or in the state of California actually--and have been here at a time in their lives that was meaningful to their production of art, to put together bodies of work by those particular artists. So that the San Francisco Museum will have historical mini-retrospects of that particular artist.

GOODWIN: I think that's a good policy.

WEISMAN: Brilliant idea, I think. And we've wanted to do it for years. And we have tried.

Well, anyway, so I see Bob Motherwell at the opening of the National Gallery, the east building. I happen to have been in the room with the Elegies when he walked in. I said, "My gosh, what a room, it's gorgeous." I said,

"Bob, I don't know whether I'm speaking out of turn or not, but I must tell you about a situation."

[tape recorder turned off] So I told him something of Henry's program and what he had in mind. He said, "I just think that's marvelous." And I said, "You really do? Well, I hope you'll give it some consideration, and I'm sure as hell will be in touch with you soon." So I wrote him a letter.

I called Henry when I came home, and I told him what I had done. I said, "Henry, have I let the cat out of the bag? Have I done wrong?" He said, "Oh, God, no. That's marvelous. You've opened the door for me. Fabulous. Write him a letter, follow it up, and then we'll take over from there. And we'll keep you in the negotiations."

Of course, during the course of my conversation with Bob, I had mentioned the fact obviously that--restated the fact (he's known this, because we've known each other on and off for many, many, many, many, many, many years, when we used to sit around the bar at the Algonquin [Hotel] with Barney Newman, he and Helen Frankenthaler [Motherwell's former wife], and Fred and myself, and so forth)-- So anyway, I had said to him, "I don't know whether you recall, but you know, we have a small Elegy. But we also have (now I've got three) more pictures of yours, and

God knows how many more before school's out," which he was delighted to know. So I wrote him a letter and confirmed what I had said and told him how exciting it seemed to me, and so forth.

And this is the letter I get back: "Dear Marcia: I do find your proposal interesting and challenging. I'm in the process of forming a foundation and can't go any further until it exists. Moreover, Lee Eastman is my principal in this sort of thing, and I think copies of our correspondence in regard to it should go to him."

(He happens to be a friend also of ours.) "Maurice Tuchman and I have been talking along these lines, and several other museums have shown comparable interest. But, of course, the damn tax laws as they relate to artists create a hangup. Also Proposition 13 makes me worry a bit about municipal- or state-funded institutions.

(It is also true that I grew up mainly in San Francisco.) I have the deepest respect. . . ." Oh, I forget to mention: you know that Clyfford Still gave twenty-three paintings.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: So that was really the nucleus of this whole program. So that [Henry's] already got the Stills. Now he's got the Gustons, and it's ever onward. He thinks he's going to have Sam Francis do a ceiling mural

for the entry of the museum. They're opening that up now doing new things. Of course what [Proposition] 13 does to them, I don't know; but I'm sure they'll resolve that someday.

"I have the deepest respect for Clyfford Still, Sam Francis, and especially Richard Diebenkorn and, as I say, find your idea appealing. I presume you know Jackson Pollock and Philip Guston also spent their formative, artistic years in California. In fact, apart from Diebenkorn, I've always been startled that no one has ever made a point that a very important segment of the so-called New York School, a term I invented for a catalog for Frank Perls, in fact has a very strong "California School" origin. Including awareness of Mexico, of Mediterranean intense color, of the overriding importance in the twentieth century of Matisse, this contribution seems to me much more consequential than what is commonly thought of as California art. "With warmest regards to you both, Robert Motherwell."

"[P.S.] Obviously there is much more to discuss, and moreover, when Henry Hopkins is in the East, I'd like to make his acquaintance. I hear only good things about him. Will be away till September."

And his signature is so fabulous, I can't believe it. I just love it. Don't you? And everybody that sees that

signature flips out over it the same way. He rarely signs. He usually just does the RM and rarely does the Motherwell.

Anyway, I thought that was really a very profound statement, and meaningful. And I think it's something-- He sent a copy of this to Lee Eastman. I sent a copy of it to Henry Hopkins, because I don't care whether he likes it or not. I wrote him back telling him I was sending a copy of the letter to Henry Hopkins; and with his permission, I would like to be able to use excerpts of the letter and quote him. And until I hear an affirmation from him, I was doing so anyway with my classes.

[laughter]

So I do think it's important, because it does put an entirely different meaning on the California School. And that's something that I think is of the most importance of all. So that we of California develop that history. It incenses me--the fact that the people of the East and Europe and around (not so much Europe really, but in the East) think of us as westerners, as cowboy-Indian country still. That when there was even a discussion as to whether we should maintain [Simon Rodia's] Watts Towers--good, bad, medium, or indifferent. It's our background. It's our history. We need roots. We're looking for roots. How many roots can you find in two hundred years? Not many. And how long has Los Angeles

been here--a hundred, a hundred and fifty years?

GOODWIN: Close to two hundred.

WEISMAN: Close to two hundred, all right. So close to two hundred in Los Angeles, and what have we for roots? We need--and must grab--anything and everything that has any credibility whatsoever, and any resemblance to the aesthetic, to the culture, to the background of why, where, how we came to be here.

When there was dispute in the Los Angeles Times, an article on whether we should do anything about the Watts Towers, and there were people opposed to spending the money on it, it was the first letter to the editor I'd ever written to the L.A. Times. And I wrote them a letter, of which they quoted in part: Bill Wilson wrote the article, I believe. I said, "How can there be a question? Who are we, what do we represent, what do we stand for? How dare we build museums and not preserve what's already here." It doesn't make any sense.

So in any event, I do feel-- And do you know, come to think of it, Bill never wrote me back on that. That wasn't at all very nice, was it? Because it was a statement for him, not against him.

So my feeling is I've always been chauvinistic about California. Maybe that's because my father was born here, and I lived here all my life, and my children were born

here, and I guess there aren't all that many of us around. I'm a new kid compared to some of my friends who are fourth- and fifth-generation--not too many of them, but a few. I do feel chauvinistic, I guess, for those reasons. But by the same token, I feel there's good reason to. And I resent the fact that the New Yorkers, and particularly the galleries, the collectors--their heads are high. They look down their noses as the galleries in New York are picking up the artists of California, little by little, without calling them California artists, which is just fine, and they keep on praising, "Well, there is no place like New York." Well, there is no place like New York, but it doesn't mean that the most of the best is happening there at all times. They have had their moment in history. Much of it came from California. I also feel that they have dispelled and dispersed the information and the aesthetics of New York throughout the world. There is no doubt. But it has been picked up less here, more there, less someplace else, and somewhere in the middle someplace else. But Los Angeles, San Francisco, the whole California scene has been there from the beginning and has been tenacious. They have never let go, all the time that they were cowboys and Indians. And I think they should be respected for that.

GOODWIN: But has California already had its moment in time?

WEISMAN: I don't think so. I don't think so at all.

GOODWIN: Maybe it was the moment that Motherwell describes.

WEISMAN: I don't think so. Because I think that moment-- At that time, those people were so ahead of themselves, and they went to New York to find company, because there were so many artists coming to this country at that time from Europe because of the war. And so when the artists came from Europe to New York, which was the closest point of embarkation, it was imminent that these artists that were working here go to meet these people halfway, because it was from them that they learned so much. And so that's where it happened. And I think that they left their history here--a great deal of it--and gave the rest of the artists of California something to grow from. And they have, and they have developed the largest and, I think, the best art scene going right now. Now, I go and look at art in New York, and I don't go to every little pitchie-koo gallery around; I go to the big galleries, and I know that.

But if it's so good in New York, where is it? What are they showing? They're showing it from every place else. Or they're showing old art, what I call old art. Thirty-year-old art, art of the forties and the fifties. They're not showing anything contemporary from New York.

If they're showing contemporary they're showing Ron Davis at Leo Castelli's, they're showing Ed Ruscha, that I bought at Leo Castelli's. You go to-- I'm trying to think who else there is--André Emmerich; he brings in artists from Los Angeles. He has Ed Moses. And who is more profound than Ed Moses, by the way, and has grown any better? You don't think he's good?

GOODWIN: He's not my favorite, but I know that you love him.

WEISMAN: Oh, I think he's tremendous. I do love him, as a matter of fact. [laughter] But besides loving him, I've known him for a hundred years, and we bought our first painting from him two or three years ago. And we subsequently bought drawings of his, and now we're just about to buy another drawing of his.

GOODWIN: I'm not quite sure what your point is.

WEISMAN: My point is I hate California sold down the river, and I will remain chauvinistic about it. I will continue to do everything I can to help and perpetuate the California scene. I get angry at New York. But I get angry at lots of things.

GOODWIN: Right. Haven't most of these great artists made their contributions in spite of the existence of California? There's nothing here that sustained them other than the opportunity--

WEISMAN: What about the environment?

GOODWIN: You mean the natural environment?

WEISMAN: The natural environment--it's got to be better than those stone canyons.

GOODWIN: Right, but would you call Hans Hofmann a California artist?

WEISMAN: Somewhat.

GOODWIN: Is Rothko a Californian?

WEISMAN: Somewhat.

GOODWIN: Is Noguchi a California artist?

WEISMAN: Somewhat.

GOODWIN: I agree that California gets--

WEISMAN: They get the shaft all the time.

GOODWIN: Yes, there's no doubt about it.

WEISMAN: Our educational institutions for the arts are certainly--

GOODWIN: Yes, but I would say that perhaps the principal reason that this has happened is that the California institutions themselves have given the artists the shaft.

WEISMAN: I don't think it's the universities that are giving the artists the shaft.

GOODWIN: I think the universities and the museums--

WEISMAN: The museums have been devastating. They have done a first-class job on them, no question about that. But the museum doesn't alter the fact of production.

That the artists are here producing not because of, but in spite of, the lousy museum situation. All right. But there has still been [UC] Irvine, [UC] Santa Barbara, [California State University] Fullerton, [UC] Davis-- where else--CalArts [California Institute of the Arts], UCLA, Otis [Art Institute], the Art Design Center [Art Center College of Design]; San Francisco: there's [UC] Berkeley, of course; there's San Francisco State with a good program. It goes on and on and on, all over the state of California. It's there, it exists-- much more so than in New York, much more so. What is there in New York? Have you ever been to Storm King Art Center in [Mountainville,] New York?

GOODWIN: No, but I know about it, and I would like to go.

WEISMAN: All right. I've made a point of interrogating-- The Museum of Modern Art took the International Council one afternoon to a picnic at Storm King Art Center, and I would say there were fifteen to twenty people out of a group of maybe sixty to eighty members that went. I went, and one of the members-- These are some of the people that went: the director of the Western Museum of Tokyo (he and I sat next to each other on the bus going up there), the director of the Modern Museum in Paris (this was before Beaubourg), a lady from London (I can't think of her name,

Lady somebody, who was here from London, who was a member of the council), and a smattering: Mrs. Straus (you know her? Beth Straus?), and Bill Lieberman was along, and Barbara Jakobson and Liza Parkinson and probably Blanchette Rockefeller, Louise Smith. They were the nucleus of the International Council, so they went to give the strengths. There could have been, on a bus that holds forty, there could have been twenty-six people, maybe twenty-eight. Elegant luncheon when we got there. Not a one of those people, outside of Blanchette, who at that time was president of the International Council, had been there before. I think Beth Straus and Blanchette went up and discovered it together, and then put it on the program.

Subsequently, I've interviewed people continually in New York. "Have you ever been to Storm King Art Center? Oh, no? You haven't been there? You really ought to try it sometime." They don't even know where it is. They don't know anything about it. There are thirteen David Smith sculptures, cubist sculptures standing out in a field. There are sculptures starting from yesterday and tomorrow going back. It is fantastic. They don't even know what they've got, and they don't do anything about what they do have. They don't support Storm King. It's privately endowed. They've never done anything about it. I'd say that we have UCLA [Franklin D. Murphy] Sculpture

Garden--people know about it and they go there, do they not?

GOODWIN: Oh, I don't think so.

WEISMAN: You don't think so?

GOODWIN: I think it's another unknown quantity in Southern California, for the same reason that people don't know what the Galka Scheyer Collection is.

WEISMAN: Don't you think they do?

GOODWIN: No way. I think it's a tiny, tiny elite that knows anything or cares anything about the art institutions in this part of the world or anywhere.

WEISMAN: I neglected to mention the San Francisco Art Institute in San Francisco, which is very good. See, I don't think it is. That's what Jerry [Edmund G.] Brown, [Jr.,] says to me, "It's an elite society, the artists."

GOODWIN: That's not a bad implication.

WEISMAN: Right. So then you are saying that elitism is equated with educated. It's time more people were educated, and they could all be elite. They're informed. And so he says, "Oh, you don't understand me." I said, "Jerry, I understand you; you don't understand me. You better become more a part of this elite. You're a part of your own special elite. You are the elite of the political world; I am the elite of the art world. And if you want to call me bad, you're bad, and I don't think you're bad."

GOODWIN: I don't object to the word elite. I think it has positive connotations.

WEISMAN: Oh, my God. I got into such an argument with Gray Davis and Tony Klein over this one time. It's just unreal, but they have come around.

Do you know we're doing a dedication at Cedars-Sinai [Medical Center] of the Loren Madsen [untitled] sculpture, and Jerry has agreed to come, and so has Gray Davis. We're having an art lithograph done, or silk-screened, by Ed Ruscha. It's going to be signed by Ed and Jerry. We're having a dinner for him here. We're going to have this dedication at the medical center. We're doing it a week before election, because I think that's a good time, and so do they. I just think it's time they get it all together--that there is such a thing as mental health, and art, and politics, and it isn't elite! It's needed for the soul and to hold everything together.

You must have politicians, and politics isn't a bad word either. To be politic is to listen to your side and to listen to my side and know how to deal with the two of us and get it together, where both of us are satisfied a little bit, and making it happen and have something happen. You have to be a politician to do that. If you were me, you just get angry and slap one of us in the face and do your own thing. Right? So I say there's a place for the

elitism of politics and for the arts. Well, I'm into a whole other subject we never anticipated, but-- These are what I call my angers. But they're really not my angers; they're my enthusiasms and my desire to really make it happen here. Because if it happens good in California, it will happen good someplace else. It spreads.

GOODWIN: What's going to happen?

WEISMAN: What's going to happen? Our museums will get better; the artists create a place in the sun. Our people become involved in the cultural aspects of our community. And if your head turns to beauty, some of the nasties have to be replaced by it. Now maybe that sounds like the gospel, but I can't help but believe that if there are more people looking as they drive down the street and seeing trees, and seeing that the stoplights are red, yellow, and green--primary colors-- I mean this, that the automobiles are a multitude of colors. When you come into an airport and you see that wave of color that's automobiles-- It's really only been in America, it's only in very recent years that you fly into an airport in another country and see anything but black cars, but you fly into an airport in our country, and they're all multicolored cars. That lifts your spirits.

GOODWIN: So you sincerely believe that the world can be improved through art and--

WEISMAN: and music and theater and culture.

GOODWIN: Politics?

WEISMAN: Right. I think it should be. And I think it takes good politics.

GOODWIN: I wish that were all possible.

WEISMAN: Don't we all?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: I can dream, everybody has a dream.

GOODWIN: It is a dream. But I think the basic reason that this will never happen, especially in Los Angeles, [is] because there's no leadership.

WEISMAN: But that doesn't mean there never will be leadership. That's negative. You know, we have a director at the [L.A.] County Museum, Ken Donahue. His term of office is over momentarily. Within a few months, he'll be replaced. Eventually, we're going to replace our curator of modern art. And when those people are replaced--you won't know by whom right now, nor do I--and hopefully, it'll be strength. Look at what was going on in San Francisco five years ago, three years ago--nothing.

GOODWIN: I agree.

WEISMAN: Henry Hopkins came into that seat, he beefed up every organization in the city around the arts, all because he beefed up the museum, the Museum of Modern Art. He put together--

GOODWIN: I agree, he has turned that place around.

WEISMAN: Absolutely. One man, that's leadership.

GOODWIN: Right. He made a difference. But look at

Southern California--

WEISMAN: All the millions of people in Southern California, in Los Angeles-- You mean to say they're not going to find a museum director that's going to beef up this city's museum?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: It only takes one man.

GOODWIN: I think this is a totally demoralized community, if there's anything like a community that exists here. I don't think there is. But I think the County Museum is in trouble. All the museums are--Norton Simon [Museum], [J. Paul] Getty Museum, Huntington [Library and Art Gallery], UCLA.

WEISMAN: Why do you say Norton Simon's in trouble, and Getty's in trouble?

GOODWIN: Well, I don't want to--

WEISMAN: I think it's nice to have a flow in the conversation. [laughter]

GOODWIN: We will talk about museums in some detail, but my basic feeling, well, my basic concern is with the public institutions or the ones that are largely publicly supported. My basic feeling is that the people in power, whether they're professionals or trustees, don't care enough about the little people.

WEISMAN: May I tell you how wrong you are?

GOODWIN: Sure.

WEISMAN: All right. I don't think it's been a radical change

by any means, but it's been something. And it takes lots of little somethings. Our museum, by and large, is ten, twelve years old, in Los Angeles. Do you want to count the ten years preceding, when they were with the animals [Museum of Natural History]?

GOODWIN: Yes. Because--

WEISMAN: There were some good shows there.

GOODWIN: Right. There was progress.

WEISMAN: There was a good van Gogh show; there was a good Monet show.

GOODWIN: Actually, the County Museum had its most distinguished director in the forties.

WEISMAN: Yes, Jim Byrnes.

GOODWIN: No, no. [William Reinhold] Valentiner.

WEISMAN: Valentiner, right, very true. All right, they had two very distinguished directors there, and the art scene was nowhere anywhere in the forties. There were ten people in the United States that had more than six pictures in their homes, maybe twenty. There weren't really a lot. There were the Rockefellers. Who else?

GOODWIN: There was somebody here named [Walter] Arensberg.

WEISMAN: Oh, yes, there was Arensberg. He left town. When did he leave town, in the forties, the fifties?

GOODWIN: No, he died here.

WEISMAN: He died. But what did his collection lead to? There were some very good collections, but they were few and

far between. And nobody knew what they were talking about. Valentiner was a fine director, but he never thought to get the Arensbergs involved with the L.A. County Museum. There wasn't money, I grant you, but it seems to me great leadership would have made that [collection] stay here.

GOODWIN: Precisely, precisely.

WEISMAN: Joseph Hirshhorn would have been very happy having his collection up at Graystone [the former Doheny mansion in Beverly Hills]. With leadership it would have been.

GOODWIN: We could cite numerous examples.

WEISMAN: Right, so that can go on and on. But this is the kind of thing that I think happens. Maybe, again, I'm looking at my own private--looking through my eyes at my world. My husband went on the board of trustees approximately two and a half years ago, I guess, at L.A. County [Museum]. Prior to that, Dick Sherwood became president of the board following whoever was president--Frank [D. Murphy]--

GOODWIN: Franklin, yes.

WEISMAN: Franklin always said he would never join the Contemporary Art Council until an old art council was formed, and I would join that. Because he was interested in old art. Franklin has come around a lot--

he's changed a lot--come a long way since then.

He really has. In any event, when Dick Sherwood took over the presidency, we gave them an Ellsworth Kelly sculptural painting--a wall sculpture, I guess it's called--called Blue on Blue, a very important Kelly, which we gave him as a gift.

GOODWIN: In [Sherwood's] honor.

WEISMAN: In his honor, right. With the hope that we now had a twentieth-century man in the museum. I would venture to say that possibly that gift, and that respect shown by Fred to Dick, had something to do with his selection to the board. Also, I think the fact that Norton was no longer on the board of trustees meant it was OK to ask Fred to be on the board of trustees, because I do think there was a certain amount of friction about that, somehow, somewhere.

GOODWIN: Why didn't they ask you? Why did they ask Fred?

WEISMAN: Because Fred's the collector in our household. And not only that, they're not woman-oriented, you know that.

GOODWIN: That's why they didn't ask you.

WEISMAN: Right. They got Katie [Mrs. Freeman] Gates and Anna Bing Arnold. That's enough. And Mrs. [Howard] Ahmanson. That's enough. They never took Dolly [Mrs.

David E.] Bright on after her husband really busted his ass (there's no other way to say it) and killed himself over building that museum. Yet they never took her upon his demise--and after getting half the collection, besides.

When Fred became a trustee, the first major thing that happened [was] George Kuwayama came to him and said, "We have an opportunity to buy the Brother-ton collection of Japanese paintings and scrolls. Would you be willing to help us," knowing that Fred was interested in Japanese art (because of his business originally, and then we came into it, and we had bought some other things from the Frank Lloyd Wright collection previously when we were in Pasadena). And so Fred said, "Well, yes. I'd be happy to consider it. I'd like to see the works; let's talk about it"--which he did. He had George Kuwayama designate to him who are the four best authorities on Japanese screens and scrolls of the Edo period. George named the four people: one in Tokyo, one in New York, one in San Francisco--two in New York, maybe. And Fred said, "Well, then what I'd like to do is if the people knew the work, then you don't have to send the work or send the person. Where the person doesn't know the work"--which I can't believe if they're authorities in the

field--"I would like you to send them the list of what's available to us in the Brotherton collection, and I want it graded, each thing from A to F," which George said [was] fine. He said, "When you get the report back, call me." He got the report back. All four agreed on five works of art as being A plus. Fred said, "How much are the five pieces?" George told him, and he wrote him a check then and there and bought the five pieces and said, "That is how I believe artwork should be selected for a museum, not by an individual's taste. I don't think you should buy twentieth-century art based on my taste or Maurice Tuchman's taste. We should have experts making determinations over where we're going, what we're doing, and why we're doing it."

We pled before the [King] Tut show to beef up those twentieth-century galleries. We wanted to get them out from behind the elevators in the [Howard] Ahmanson [Gallery]. We wanted to do something about making the third floor of the [Frances and Armand] Hammer [Wing] accessible during the Tut show. So they made it accessible. And you know how--through the back door. I mean, you couldn't find it. In my instance, I couldn't have walked those steps no matter what, because I haven't the ability to. None of this took place really until Fred finally went to Maurice

and said, "Look, I have heard that you don't have the people to do it, because they're all priority to King Tut." He said, "I will supply you with people."

GOODWIN: People to do what?

WEISMAN: The preparators, to move the art around.

He said, "I will supply you the people. What else do you need?" "Oh, we need the time, we have to lay it out." Fred said, "What does it take? I'll do it for you." He did change. He finally took Stephanie [Barron] and Maurice, and we must have had six meetings at the museum with Fred pushing. He finally beefed up behind the elevators and got rid of some of that junk. Fred suggested prior to that--it was his suggestion--and it was he that pushed forward to get the sale of the de-accessioned works. They took the tip off the iceberg.

And when it was finished and they're all patting themselves on the back, Fred says, "OK, now you've done that. New business: what about the rest of the stuff? Let's get rid of that, and get the cash in and buy some meaningful works." Well, you know the first work that was purchased was Maurice bought that pipe of Magritte, the Magritte Pipe. I forget how you say it in French, La Pipe de--? I don't know. We have the etching of it in my john, in my bathroom. But the point is Fred wanted to get continuity. He said, "I know we can't

change the nineteenth-century Americans, because the Ganzes [Julian Ganz, Jr.] have done a fine job in putting that collection together. They got Michael Quick in as the curator, and they've really worked at it, and fine. All right, let's start there: nineteenth-century American, nineteenth-century French, then behind the elevators. Then there's that collection of nineteenth- through twentieth-century French that's on the other side by the elevators. Bring that around the corner, and then let's get to twentieth-century American. The bay where [B. Gerald] Cantor [Rodin Collection] is should be California, masters of California."

And he said, "With it all, there is only one thing I want. I'll pay to redo the whole thing. I want the bay opposite the elevators. That's mine." So they agreed. And when they agreed, we loaned them our Jackson Pollock Scent. I don't know if you saw that. The Scent, the Hofmann [Equipoise], we gave them the Rauschenberg [Dervish Profile]. And it wasn't out of our collection; we bought it and gave it. And we gave them the Morris Louis Unfurled, and we loaned them a Clyfford Still that we bought that was five inches too tall for our house, with every intention of knowing that we had to give that Still to somebody,

don't we, we cannot hang it. We haven't got a wall that's ten feet tall. And so, there it hung. And our intention was to show them what it's like to put powerful paintings across that bay. Now, they weren't perfect. The Pollock washed out; we know that. But our next shot at that was going to be a mini Newman show. We were going to loan them our Newman painting [Onement Number Six], the Newman sculpture [Here I (to Marcia)], the Eighteen Cantos which we own, the two lithographs [Number One and Number Two], two etchings (untitled), and a drawing, [all of] which makes a pretty profound Newman statement. And Fred is still pressing on this. When the Johns shows in San Francisco-- There are many Johns in Los Angeles that can be taken that are not in that Johns show and put into that bay-- Let them know.

I think when you have that kind of person coming onto the board that is screaming like a Comanche, putting his money where his mouth is, I think that kind of thing multiplied and put in a leader in the twentieth century or a director of the museum or--not a twentieth century director, but a director that understands that there is a twentieth-century: a [John] Carter Brown, an Otto Wittmann, a Sam Sachs [II] in Minneapolis, and on down the way.

GOODWIN: So you're saying with the proper leadership the museum can be great.

WEISMAN: Right. And it only takes one person in one place.

GOODWIN: So, you're saying that there hasn't been a leader yet on the board of the museum or the staff.

WEISMAN: There have been leaders, but there haven't been leaders in the direction of the twentieth. Well, there haven't been leaders! You're right. Because there isn't one facet that has been good, except for the Costume Council. They have probably done the best job with the least expenditure of anybody. The Graphics Council has done quite well. The graphics department has done quite well. But both of them are relatively inconsequential.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: Because where it counts, where are they? The best thing that was done was Julian and Joanne Ganz with Michael Quick. And unfortunately, from where I sit, it's not the most potent or profound area of art in the history of art.

GOODWIN: What is Michael Quick going to do that Donelson Hoopes couldn't have done?

WEISMAN: Donelson Hoopes, I think, had another offer, did he not?

GOODWIN: He quit because he was disgusted. And most of

the people leave the museum because they're disgusted.
There's a helluva turnover rate there because the
staff is abused.

WEISMAN: Well, I think this: I think that Michael
Quick will--

TAPE NUMBER: III, SIDE ONE

AUGUST 9, 1978

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, it seems that you enjoy socializing with artists. Is that so?

WEISMAN: Well, I enjoy socializing with artists to the extent that somehow one tends to get insights into them and consequently into their work, or some of the profound meanings of their works. On the other hand, we have found in too many instances with the great majority of artists that we feel sociably, friendly, and adoring toward are not the people whose work we necessarily like the best. By the same token, work that we like the best doesn't necessarily exude a glorious personality in its maker. But, by and large, we have found a great many of the artists we've felt are the profound artists of the twentieth century, masters as we call them, that we have been in contact with--and I should say the forties and the fifties particularly, since our last tape when something came up where I said there have now been almost eighty years of twentieth-century art (that was a mind-blowing remark to me; I couldn't get over it, that there are eighty years under our belts of twentieth-century art, or seventy-eight years)-- But of those that we've known, like Mark Rothko and Clyfford Still and Barnett Newman and Bill de Kooning and Bob Motherwell and Jasper Johns

and Robert Rauschenberg and Jacques Lipchitz, and I look around the room--and Henry Moore--and think in terms of the people that we've known, and known really relatively well-- Not only have we known them, but they've known us: Bill Turnbull, George Rickey; my husband knew [Alexander] Calder--I never really knew him--and on down the line. I find that most of those people are extremely bright, and a lot of them are quite erudite. Most of them are not, because, obviously, their best method of expression is in the work they do.

But I think George Rickey is extremely bright to speak to, even though I may not think of his art as being the most profound art that was ever produced. I think part of what is disturbing with the art of George Rickey to me is that everybody loves it. It's a strange kind of statement, and something that might be difficult for someone to understand. Anything that's so easily loved and long loved--I wonder about how profound it is, because it doesn't offer the same kind of challenges then that other kinds of art offer. But it nevertheless doesn't take from it in another way. George is a brilliant man. He is a teacher, a professor of art history, or professor of history, I think, in English--and I can't tell you offhand what university. But he's a knowledgeable, bright man--an intellectual certainly, an intellectual of,

if not the first order, the second.

Bill de Kooning--also not so intellectual and not so very erudite either. He's a very warm, sweet man. We've never had the same kind of a rapport either with Bill de Kooning, and yet he's a sweet, lovely man.

GOODWIN: How did you meet somebody like de Kooning?

WEISMAN: Well, the first time, I had met de Kooning alone. I was going out to the Hamptons [Long Island] because I had heard about the Hamptons, and I felt I wanted to go and see. What is this little community like, is it Malibu? I don't know the East, and this was in the mid-sixties, early sixties. So, I was going out there with a friend, and just coincidentally I had spoken to Martha Jackson and told her I was going out. And she said, "Please, let me go with you; I'd love to take you around, and we'll have a very pleasant day," and I said, "Splendid." She was going to be up there anyway because she had a home up there. (She has since passed away.) And so Martha met us and took my friend and myself to Bill de Kooning's. He had his new studio in The Springs [Long Island] at that time. So that was the first I had met him. He was very warm and very gracious and hospitable. And I was thinking as I looked around-- I remember so many of the newspaper blottings that were on the floor on which he had blotted the paintings. Subsequently, so

many of those blottings were picked up and framed and utilized as paintings by unscrupulous dealers or dealers who felt, who sold themselves a bill of goods that it was really great. Those things do happen, and they have happened in the art world, and it's too bad. But nevertheless, we subsequently had met him on other occasions and we've become more friendly, through Lee Eastman, the lawyer in New York who's represented many of the artists. But still in all, there's never been that kind of a rapport with Bill de Kooning. Oh, he was out here; I think he came to our home. He was here visiting his daughter, and he came over, and I don't know. He's just a very nice man, what can I say?

GOODWIN: You were closer to Barnett Newman?

WEISMAN: Oh, Barney and Annalee and Fred and I were really good friends. We didn't like his art in the beginning. We couldn't get into it at all. And then subsequently-- Did I tell you the story of how we got Here I (to Marcia) and the blue painting here, Onement Number Six?

GOODWIN: No, tell the story.

WEISMAN: I'll tell a story. We were having lunch at Sweet's down on Front Street, which is the fish market in New York, where Barney used to go eat all the time, and Jim Elliott was with us. Jim and Fred disappeared after lunch, and Barney said, "Come up to the

studio. I want you to see the sculpture I have done." And I said, "Barney, what could you sculpt? How can you sculpt based on what your paintings are?" And in the meantime, I had yet to find a painting that I really liked, and he must've been aware, even though we never discussed it. We went up to his studio, and there was Onement Number Six. I fell in love with that painting immediately. I called my husband and said, "I found a Barney Newman I like." He said, "Where are you?" And I said at Barney's studio. He said, "How could you do anything so embarrassing as to call from there?" And I said, "Well, OK, fine. Then you'll see it the next time you come in," or something like that to cover his anger at the fact that I would put him in such a spot. Well, subsequently, he showed me the sculpture [Here I (to Marcia)] and I fell in love with the sculpture. I think what really happened is that when I saw the sculpture everything else fell into place. Because as I looked at that sculpture, I realized what he was about. I said, "Barney, tell me about it." And he said, "Well, it doesn't make space; it defines space. And as you move around it, it defines all the space relating to those two poles." And I saw it as that. Then I began to look at the paintings with that in mind, and they took on a different light. But I also think that what

happens in situations like that is you look and you look and you look at all kinds of things in all kind of places. Then there is that magic moment that everything you have in you, you bring to something, and it all takes shape.

GOODWIN: It crystallizes.

WEISMAN: It crystallizes. Exactly. You only change your feelings and your thinkings about a work of art based on what you bring to it, not by what it brings to you. Obviously, it has to have something there for you to bring something to it and get it together. I guess what happens is whether it's your head or your heart that becomes the catalyst, I don't know. But it's as though your head's out here, and your heart's out there, and all of a sudden they come together on the work, and the whole thing fits and crystallizes, as you say. So I think that must be what happened.

Well, six months later-- Oh, in the interim, I kept calling Barney daily: "When are you going to cast this piece?" And he had told me, "I'm thinking about it." (He had done it in '54; it was 1960 now.) I said, "You've thought of it long enough. Come on, let's get off the stick and cast it." I called him every day, every other day, and finally, one day it was done. We bought-- He did two casts: one for us and one for Annalee. Prior to that, Fred was in New York and went

to his studio to see the sculpture, and he saw Onement Number Six, and he said to Barney, "There's a painting!" He calls me and says, "I found the right painting of Barney Newman." Barney just sat there chuckling. We had both found the same painting independently. Well, we had been good friends prior to that. I guess that made it an even more lasting, more cohesive relationship. But on the other hand, I don't know that it did, because they're just good, solid, sound, decent, loving human beings.

I don't think Barney ever judged a friendship or a relationship with a person based on what they thought about his art. Because what he thought about his art was really the most important thing to him. He couldn't have painted as long and as much as he did, with his wife supporting him by teaching at secretarial school and really not living it up very well. He couldn't have done that. He's a man of a great deal of wisdom. He was a great scholar of Judaic history without being a religious, or far from a fanatically religious, Jew. He was not even a particularly religious Jew, but he was very in touch with the history of Judaism. And there was something in his Jewish makeup which was homelike and lovinglike family orientation. So that he would not have sacrificed his wife or his family orientation and the

idea of having children, which they never did, and all of that, if that art hadn't had a profound meaning to him. I believe sincerely that it really didn't matter what I thought about his art, or what you thought about his art. It was something he had to do, and he believed in it. And he was a man of many, many facets. He was bright, he was well-read, he was well versed in music, he was well versed in architecture.

You know, one of the first sculptures he ever did, that nobody really knew much about until after he died, was the Synagogue Designed as a Baseball Diamond. He did it in the form of a baseball diamond with the rabbi as the pitcher and the cantor as the catcher, or whatever way it went. And then the bleachers were the ladies, and the gentlemen were behind home plate, and he took it all into a very religious orientation again. He was just a neat guy, and extremely bright, as I say, and he did things. I think all of his paintings had to do with religious concepts, and names indicate that: Abraham; there were six Onement paintings; ours was the final Onement painting, which he felt was the culmination of them all. Then Here I [(to Marcia)] was the beginning of that into sculpture, and I think that had to do with one God, and all the rest of it. Anyway, we were very close and very dear, and it made me very sad when he died--my husband as

well, because the four of us had a really nice relationship. I still see Annalee. In fact, a few weeks after he died, I arranged for an exhibition in Pasadena. I don't know if whether I talked of this with you.

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: We had a memorial exhibit in Pasadena [September 1970], and, unfortunately, no one had the foresight or the insight to photograph it and document it properly. But what happened is I asked Annalee if I might do that, and she said yes, and she'd send a picture. I said, "But more important, would you come and be with us," and she did. And so did S. I. Newhouse, Jr., and he sent a picture-- he was very close to Annalee and Barney--as did Xavier Fourcade, who handled things for him at that time through Knoedler [Gallery]. Ben and Judy Heller came (and Judy passed away shortly after that), and a few others from New York. I don't recall now offhand who. But what we did is we gathered up the work of Barnett Newman that was local. Bob Rowan had a piece, and Dolly Bright had a painting, and there was S. I.'s, and there was Annalee's. And we had the painting [Onement, Number Six] and the sculpture [Here I (to Marcia)]; we had a drawing [The Cry]; we had the Eighteen Cantos. And Annalee brought us as a gift: two lithographs [both untitled] that she gave us as a gift--after he passed away--from him, and two

etchings [both untitled]. So we really had something of everything he had done.

I don't know whether you recall the galleries out at the Pasadena Museum, but in the far east gallery--it would be the northeast gallery--right next to the auditorium, down at the far end of that gallery, was Onement Number Six, our painting. Then we had the Cantos going down the two walls going into it. Then there were five, or three, paintings divided between the two wings on either side. And the lithographs came in, and it was all loaned anonymously. In the front of the gallery was a plaque that was put up stating about Barney Newman and his background and his history, like a résumé on him. And then we had chairs set up in the central gallery. Ben Heller spoke and asked if anybody had comments, and people that were there this particular day for the memorial opening of this exhibition all spoke to their relationship with Barney. It was really a very touching day. Paul Brach was there, who had known him so well; Dan Flavin came in, and Bob Rauschenberg. There were a lot of people that knew Barney and made the effort to come. There was probably, all in all, an hour's, maybe two hour's-- Everybody gathered around and just spoke their-- I told the story of Onement, Number Six and the Here I (to Marcia). We went through this exercise, which was really quite lovely.

The show remained up for three weeks, and, as I say, we've never documented it. It was a sadness. This [oral history] probably would be the closest thing to an honest documentation of it--

GOODWIN: Could be.

WEISMAN: --that has happened. If you'd like further information about it, I'll be glad to contact S. I. Newhouse and find out exactly which picture he loaned [White Fire II], and Bob Rowan [Tundra], and Dolly Bright [The Third]. Dolly has subsequently sold that painting.

GOODWIN: OK, let's do that.

WEISMAN: I think that it would be very nice to do it so that it is documented for all time. Wherever possible, we'll get photographs, reproductions, of the work, and put it together so that it remains with the archives somewhere, because it was very meaningful to us.

Clyfford Still and my husband and I have had a long-standing relationship. But if you know anything about Clyfford, he's a very hot and cold man. He has mellowed probably some in the last few years. But basically, I would say that he's the closest thing I know of what would be really termed as a misanthrope. And yet, we had a very nice relationship, as relationships went. I think we probably had the longest-lasting relationship, and [it was] maybe one of the most profound relationships of

anybody he ever was involved with-- Maybe Seymour Knox at the Albright-Knox [Art] Gallery--and subsequently the gift there. The relationship with Henry Hopkins has been certainly a lovely one when he gave the twenty-three pictures in San Francisco. But those two gifts were based on something else. They were based on a documentation of Clyfford Still. And he knew (he's a very bright man) that he had to have documentation on the East Coast and the West Coast, and he could not leave it to his heirs or to society to do this for him. He had to provide this. And I agree with him, he did. I think it was a responsibility he had to do--take on--himself because he was so reluctant to release his pictures. He never sold a painting. He released it in exchange for money, which was a very definite and positive feeling. It wasn't funny. He released it in exchange for money, based on your ability to understand, believe, feel, and think his work. You had to understand and know that he was painting masterpieces. And you had better believe it, or you were not going to acquire a painting. And we have more Clyfford Stills than anybody, I believe, in private hands.

GOODWIN: How many do you have?

WEISMAN: Well, we have seven, six. This is shameful: one, two, three, four, five, six now. At one time we had seven, and that was the end of our relationship when

we sold one. And why we sold it I don't remember. It was probably a question of space, maybe money--I don't know--money to acquire other things.

And I might add he wasn't alone in his anger against Barney Newman and Mark Rothko for having stolen his thing. Barney felt the same way, and so did Mark. But we always say that Barney was as soft as steel, [laughter] Clyfford was always as tough as a donut, and Mark lays somewhere in the middle. Now Barney, he was loose and easy and soft and sweet. All the time he would talk about Still and what he may have or may not have done. They all challenged each other, you know, as to who started, who did what first. I always thought Barney had a very cute anecdote. He always used to say, "I closed the door, Mark pulled down the shade, and Ad turned off the lights." [laughter] (I'm referring to Ad Reinhardt.) [That] really was kind of the way they look, isn't it? That was Barney Newman, but that was the kind of sense of humor he had.

But in any event, Clyfford was very adamant about who he would release his painting to. And what we went through to get them! We must have wooed and cajoled him for at least two years. We had cocktails with him, lunch with him--

GOODWIN: For your first painting?

WEISMAN: --and we went to see him all the time. We first saw a work of his at a slide show, at a lecture that Walter Hopps was doing with Extension at UCLA. We were taking this class, and we fell in love with the Clyfford Still that was in the slide. It was owned by Hassell [W.] Smith, [Jr.], and is still owned by Hassell Smith, I believe, but on loan to San Francisco Museum, I think on extended loan. So in any event, we went through this whole thing with him, and then going back and forth, east and west, and all that. We'd go there and call him and make a date with him, and he'd meet us in a bar, never let you up to the studio; and then once in a while, he'd let you go to the studio and look at something and then fade out. A long time would lapse, and then we'd see him again someplace. This went on for a long time, and then one day we were here, and the phone rang. It was Pat Still, his wife. And it was always "Mr. and Mrs. Weisman," and "Mr. and Mrs. Still" for two years, three years, which isn't really our style. We're much freer about first-name calling and stuff like that. She said, "Mrs. Weisman, Mr. Still has agreed to release two paintings to you. What would you like to do about it?" I said, "Just a moment. I'll get my husband on the phone. I'm delighted." And so he gets on the phone, he comes back (and at the time, Irving Blum was here at the house, and so was Walter Hopps).

And Fred came back and said, "He agreed to give us two paintings, and we got them. We're buying them." I said, "Fabulous. How much are they?" He said, "I don't know." I said, "What paintings are there?" He said, "I don't know." I said, "How could you do that?" He said, "Look, he agreed to release two paintings to us. If we don't like them, if we really hate them, we can always sell them, but have we seen anything we really hated?" So the two paintings that came were the black one [1947-M] and the red one [1947-R-No. 2]. And they were \$35,000 each, which was a great deal of money then. I can't tell you exactly the dates, but I could get them for you--probably around '62, '63. It could have been before that, '61. In any event, certainly Jim Elliott was very responsible for our getting those Stills. He was very influential--not responsible but influential--toward our getting them, as was Walter in showing them to us first.

So subsequently then, we went to visit him, and he came to visit us. Then we bought a brown one [Indian Red] that Fred bought for his office; and it got here, and it didn't fit. So we had it at home, and it was very difficult hanging three paintings. But we did. We were at his studio another time, right after we bought the two Stills, the two he bought a farm with--we always say we bought him a farm in Westminster in Maryland. We went there, and we

selected a blue painting and a yellow painting that we wanted. And came the yellow painting [1951 Yellow] and a painting we didn't know what the hell it was. So we sent the green painting, whatever it was, back, and Fred sent a check for the yellow painting, which at that time was [\$]38,000, I think, or [\$]40,000, sent the \$40,000 check and said, "You have sent us not what we asked for, I know you well enough to know that you knew what we asked for." And with this, Clyfford called back and said, "You're a man of principle and honor; and I want to consider that painting my declaration of independence in art and to you, and your declaration of independence. I'm giving you the yellow painting as a gift and returning your check"--which he did. He tells me this on the phone. Fred wasn't here, and I said, "Mr. Still, I can't"--oh, at that time it was Clyff--"I can't speak for my husband, but for myself I'm overwhelmed. And I can only think of what my mother would say: she would have said, 'Say thank you graciously.' So as graciously as I know how, I want to say thank you." So sure enough came the check back with the signature torn off and he gave us the painting. We subsequently bought another one for our children, and it's in their home. It wasn't a gift to them, but it was for them to hang. So that made three, four, and the brown one was five. Then we were in Washington, we were

at his home visiting and I said, "You know, Clyfford, we all know how much you love Fred, but what have you done for me lately?" Which was pretty gutsy--to say anything--because he could have thrown me out as well as look at me. He said, "Well, come with me," and he takes me into what was a bedroom in this big old house, upstairs. And there was one carton after another, these cardboard cartons. In them are pastels and he said, "Find something you like." He stretched out three boxes and I started going through them, and pretty soon I began to get so confused I didn't know what I liked. And I'm not so sure the one I selected was the one I liked best. I really didn't select, I finally pulled out three and--[telephone rings; tape recorder turned off] Anyway, I selected three or four or five--I don't even remember--pastels. I kept pulling them out of the box, and little by little I let the-- After going through these boxes (I had selected at least three or four, kept moving them around, little by little), I got them down to maybe three or four, and he said, "Never mind, I'll make the selection and send it to you." So he framed it and sent it and gave it to me as a gift, which was really very nice that he did that. It was after that, I guess, that we sold the brown one; it went to a man in Washington, and it hangs at the Corcoran Gallery [of Art]. Now subsequently, he isn't on such great terms

with the Corcoran, this man bought it; it was at an auction, and it's now I guess at the National Collection of Fine Arts, and it's back in Walter's hands, which makes me feel nice.

Subsequently there was one up at sale at [Sotheby] Parke Bernet recently, and Fred fell in love with that painting, and we bought it. And he knew it was five inches taller than the house, but he bought it anyway. So it's on loan now to the County Museum. So that's what happened with Still, and after we sold that painting, that was really more or less the end of our relationship.

Interestingly, in the middle of the relationship, he at one time stopped talking to us. We couldn't figure out why. Fred went through all the correspondence to see what it was, and he discovered a letter where his name was spelled with one f instead of two, and he never mentioned it. So Fred called and said, "Clyfford, it would appear to me that someone inadvertently spelled your name wrong in one of the letters." He said, "I wondered if you ever would realize it." And he was angry. He was really angry. I guess he's a man who fights hard for his identity. So anyway, then we did an exhibit at Pasadena for him to start the Fellows at Pasadena Museum, and that was part of our Clyfford Still situation. He would come over; he would come to town and stay with us, sometimes with [his wife]

Pat, sometimes without. He has a daughter that lives in San Francisco and one that lives in New York. We used to fly the daughter back and forth with us from New York to Baltimore, and he used to come and get into these great discussions.

The one man that he felt amenable to was Bill de Kooning, because there was no competition. They were in a different world as far as he was concerned. He was very amenable to him. He was amenable to Rauschenberg and Johns but continually discussed the fact of the virility of the men of the forties and fifties and the homosexuality of the men of the late fifties and sixties and seventies. This was a theme of his. And it wasn't that he put down the homosexuality necessarily. It was the grand manner of the virility of these men of the forties and fifties--tough guy and all that. And he is a tough man. Well anyway, when the San Francisco Museum got all these Stills as a gift, and we were invited to the opening, and they had several dinners, and the gallery space had all been redesigned by David Robinson--have you seen them out there--

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: --so that they could all be hanging. At that time they had many dinners throughout the city prior to the opening, and-- [telephone rings; tape recorder turned off] Suddenly [we] get an invitation to a dinner, and we

accepted the dinner. Subsequently Henry [Hopkins] called and said, "Marcia, I'm so glad you're coming, because when Clyfford was coming out for this, and we asked if there was anybody specific that he would like to have at the dinner where he is, he asked for you and Fred." Well, I almost fainted. So we went up. And we get to the airport to go up, and it was a very foggy evening, and they would not guarantee the planes coming back that night. And Fred had an eight o'clock appointment the next morning that was very important to him; so he didn't go, and I went. He was going. We were at the airport. But I have the feeling that Fred wanted to play it down--I don't know, I could be wrong--because he had been angry, Clyfford had shown anger at Fred when he really shouldn't have. After all, there weren't many people that came up with the kinds of money that we came up with to support his art, and to support him. And we did support him, in the sense that we were the only people around buying his art. But, of course, we were the only ones allowed to. But I don't know if anybody else had pursued it, if they might have, but not many did. And Patrick Landon, I think, has one or two and then there [was] Ossorio who had a couple. But Ossorio's Clyfford slashed out of the frames. He was so angry at [Alfonso] Ossorio at one time. So there was nobody really with substantial holdings in Still--one or two here and

there. Ben Heller had one, Bob Scull had one, you know. So there were a few around but not a lot.

It was really an opportunity for him to have museum shows and to be seen in a unit, not in a group, not alone-- I mean, alone, not as one of many. So in any event, whatever Fred's reasons (and maybe they should not be documented), Fred was unable to attend. I did go. And I must say, Pat was snotty as usual, Clyfford was very warm and gracious; and one of the pleasant things of the evening was Henry Hopkins, Clyfford Still, Jim Elliott, and myself in conversation. And we did get into a marvelous conversation that evening. And it was like, you know, one says you can't go home again, but there it was. It was just too bad Fred wasn't there, because both Henry and Jim and Walter [Hopps], I think, was there, too. We were all there, all those that were there at that moment in time, and there was that moment in time almost repeated. It was very nice. So it was a very strong relationship.

We've had a good relationship with Henry Moore.

GOODWIN: Would you like to own another Still?

WEISMAN: Now? Where could we put it? [laughter]

GOODWIN: I don't know. I mean, if you find the right one, would you acquire it?

WEISMAN: Well, the blue one that we really wanted is now in San Francisco. I think if he ever had anything around

that we had felt that about, I would: I would want to trade it. I don't know what for. You know, I'd like to trade Stills, maybe, like the one that's too big for our home. I'd really much rather have one that we could hang. At one time we used to hang six in our house, strange as it may seem, and we were able. Because one of them, the brown one, was considerably smaller, and that one we kept in Fred's dressing room. The red and black ones were opposite each other in the living room. The yellow one was in the lanai, and the brown one was in the lanai. I take that back. There were one, two, three, four, and the pastel in our bedroom near the front hall, so we had five in here. We also have the other one. We did have the brown one in Fred's dressing room. We have the one that we eventually gave to our kids. That's in Beth's apartment now, and we'd like to get it out of there, but-- He was upset that we had said we were going to get that for them, and then we kept it ourselves for a while. But we wanted to live with it before we gave it away. We never really gave it away. It's still part of the family collection. What other artists would you be--

GOODWIN: Let's talk about [Mark] Rothko for a moment.

WEISMAN: Our relationship with Rothko is a very minor relationship in terms that we've had lunch together a couple of times--once with Lee Eastman, once alone. We've

been to his studio, looked at paintings a couple of times, over and over. It wasn't anything that was all that profound. And certainly not like Joann and Gifford Phillips [who] had a much more meaningful relationship with him. But we see each other at openings. It was "Hi, Mark," "Hi, Fred," "Hi, Marcia," you know, and all this "Hi, Mell," and whatever with his wife. We knew his kids when they were little. I don't know that they would know us anymore. But it was, as I say, not the same kind of an intense relationship.

GOODWIN: I think you were going to mention Moore.

WEISMAN: Moore is not an intense relationship, but a nice relationship. When he opened his show of the gifts in Toronto, we were up there for it. We'd been invited, we went up, and we had a marvelous dinner. There was Henry and Rini [Irina Radetzky] Moore and Henry Seldis and Taft Schreiber and Fred and myself, somebody in the critical world--trying to think who it was, an Englishman, but I didn't know him. But we were eight, I think. And we had dinner before the show, and then we had supper-- No, we had dinner after the opening. We all went to dinner together, and everybody got smashed, and we had a lovely time.

We've been to his home, and we've had dinner with him in New York at the Stanhope [Hotel], and sat around after a show drinking together.

I think the last visit we had was probably the most meaningful in many ways. We were just there in May. Oh, it was really very nice. We made plans to go out and visit them, which we did, and he took us through his new studio that he's in the process of building, because his studio isn't big enough any more to handle his work. This was like a month before his eightieth birthday. Just the fact that this man needs more room to work at eighty and doesn't have enough room to move around; and [Irina] needed a place for her orchids and cactus, and she has maybe twenty orchid plants, which isn't very many, but in England you don't grow orchids easily. And he built this atrium in the middle of this studio and offices for his secretary. [He] took us all through and showed us sketchbooks that he had done of his grandson, and how great Gus was, and what a genius at fourteen months. We've known Mary, his daughter, before she got married. She went out with [our son] Richard in New York, and so we kind of had a nice thing going. It's very warm and sweet. We had a lovely time visiting.

Then when Henry Seldis died, I called him. Henry Moore was very involved at that moment in works for his eightieth birthday exhibition at the Tate [Gallery]. I guess they were doing a big number, and then there's another traveling show going on, and so [it was] at that time I

called him. He was really quite shaken by it. I said, "Henry, I don't want to beg. I don't want to do anything that is out of line, but we are giving a Morris Louis painting [Beta Rho] to the museum in memory of Henry Seldis, and we felt that possibly our doing that, and maybe if there was something you would want to do on that score, that it would start the ball rolling for something meaningful to take place at the museum, and a collection of works donated in memory of Henry Seldis that would really create the right attitude and environment in Mark's head"--that's Henry Seldis's son--because it was a very difficult thing for Mark, particularly because he was really his only child. The other two daughters [Maralee and Carol Ann Brahm] were stepdaughters; they belonged to Anna [Bruni]. And while Henry raised them, Mark was his son and the apple of his eye, and he was destroyed by the fact that his father committed suicide. He felt that he had failed, and he was really an upset little kid. I felt--and others felt, Josine [Ianco-] Starrels and Betty Gold--we all felt that we had to do something to make it right for Mark. And we thought that that was the best thing to do. So Henry [Moore] said of course he would. He sent a lithograph [Stone Reclining Figure], which I never did follow up on (I must check that out), and he was sending the drawing, and we gave the painting. I bought a leather-bound

autograph book so that at the memorial service, that was held at the museum, everybody who came in signed it. And the book on the outside said, In Memoriam. And inside it was addressed to Mark for him to keep, because we did want him to feel good. Everybody spoke, to say their feelings. Well anyway, Henry Moore was very receptive to that, so when we were in London this last time, and we did go out to visit with them, we talked a lot of Henry Seldis and his situation. It was a very meaningful time, and it was close and warm and nice.

Again, not the same kind of relationship that we-- I guess our relationship with Annalee and Barney [Newman] was the closest of all. But we have a very good relationship with Bob Rauschenberg. He gets angry, we get angry, you know; but we have an ongoing relationship with him. We have an ongoing relationship with Jasper Johns. Bob and I have worked a lot on the residuals for the artists; that sort of thing we'd done together. We have a relationship with Oldenburg and with Roy Lichtenstein, who's done lovely things for us for the hospital: given us many things, autographed them, and so forth, so we could sell them and make money for the hospital.

GOODWIN: What do you think these artists perceive out of the relationship?

WEISMAN: What do they get?

GOODWIN: Yes. Why do they like to be with you?

WEISMAN: I don't know. And I would like to add at this time another one of that particular group would be Andy Warhol, who we've been friendly with through the years. That's a more intensified relationship; he and Richard have become very good friends, too.

And what do you think they perceive out of this? Well, there is the obvious. In that if our collection has any meaning, any stature in the art community of the state, the country, the world, whatever, and if their works are in it, that is good. I guess. And I guess it's good when you're an artist in a collection to have a relationship with the people that own that collection, and that we will show their works upon their request more readily and comply with their requests. So there is something in it for them. Just as I guess there's something in it for us in just having the relationship. It gets kind of movie-starrish, I guess, in a way.

And yet it does something else. I think I've used a lot of these people in my teaching. When they've been in town, they come to my classes and [have] spoken or done something or other, or use them at my hospital endeavor, or Andy has been terribly generous at the hospital. I mean, he gave us a suite of Flowers as a gift, and he's given books and signed them, and autographed them so we could

sell them, and posters, and posters again, and come to the hospital and signed them, and done things like that, which is really very generous of him to do. But you know, Andy's on, and they [the artists] are on, all of them. And I guess they got something out of that. And when they do come, we do entertain them. There's no question about it.

Another person we've had a really nice relationship with is Ellsworth Kelly. He's a different kind of person. He's more like Roy Lichtenstein; they're real people. You know, they're not all out in space or something like "Jap" and Bob and Andy and some of those others. They do kind of flake out from time to time, but they have their adorable qualities, and their lovingness. So when they come, we entertain them, and that's nice. I'm sure that's pleasant for them.

GOODWIN: Oh, sure.

WEISMAN: And they meet the people in the community that collect and the people in the community that show. They meet the museum people, the dealers, the other artists, the collectors through us. So I think there's something in that. And I hope they find some qualities in Fred and me. We find qualities in them. But what else can one presume? That's kind of hard to know, isn't it?

GOODWIN: Right, right.

WEISMAN: We knew Alberto Giacometti--not well; we know Diego a lot better. We've known-- I'm thinking of European artists that we've known. Several I can't think, but not well.

GOODWIN: Dubuffet?

WEISMAN: No, never have known Dubuffet. We knew Jacques Lipchitz. He was my kind of a tough guy--sweet guy, but a tough guy. And she's [Yulla] a really nice lady. It's hard to remember. There have been so many.

I think one of the things we have done through the years, which I think is very nice--we first saw this done really was at Peggy Guggenheim's home in her villa in Venice--her guest books. After we went to her house for the first time, we knew we had to do that. And we're on our second guest book now. Our first one is really a treasure. And the second one is good too, but I want to tell you we have drawings in there that are really very special.

GOODWIN: You had so many guests I'm surprised that this is only your second.

WEISMAN: They're very thick. [laughter] In fact, we did a terrible thing. We combined the one we got. We kept additional pages for the one. We never should have done it, because the one is really the equivalent of two, and the first person to sign was Harold Rosenberg. I

bought the book for Fred for Christmas as a Christmas gift, and I opened--and Harold was here--and I opened the gift and had him sign. And now as I look back through the book, there's a lot of sadness in the book, too, you know. But we have marvelous drawings of Kelly's and Roy's and Andy and all.

GOODWIN: I see people write messages to others, not necessarily to you.

WEISMAN: Oh, really, I hadn't noticed. What do you mean?

GOODWIN: Well, I saw the book one evening, and there were little notes to other people on it, like "Hi, So-and-so."

WEISMAN: Well, part of it might have been to us, but with other names. Like our grandchildren have strange names for us.

GOODWIN: Well, that could be it. [laughter]

WEISMAN: And so forth. So that might be part of it. I don't know. But anyway, those guest books have been very nice, and we try to keep them up. And that one there I think should be part of the archives, too.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: Because there are lovely drawings.

TAPE NUMBER: III, SIDE TWO

August 9, 1978

GOODWIN: Let's talk about art dealers for a while.

WEISMAN: I hate to talk about art dealers.

GOODWIN: Why?

WEISMAN: Well, I don't know. They're kind of a strange mix, to say the least. Unfortunately, they haven't earned themselves a very enviable reputation, as a whole.

And yet one should never generalize or group people and judge people as a whole. But my husband has used the expression "one might compare them with"--if you're going to be judgmental--"one might compare them with used car salesmen." That's the kind of reputation they have.

Now, I don't mean that inasmuch as that they sell used cars, or that they deal in them, and that their method of operation is that of used car salesmen, but their reputation in dealing tends to go along those lines. There are those that lack scruples, they lack integrity; and yet I'm not sure that they really lack integrity and that they are unscrupulous as much as they don't know the difference. I think that they-- We have had dreadful experiences with dealers. I wouldn't begin to name names, because I don't think that's nice.

GOODWIN: Can you describe a dreadful experience without a name?

WEISMAN: Well, I could describe many. One: we acquired a painting in New York from a dealer, gave him a check as a deposit. It was a Friday. We were in New York and Fred said, "Hold the check till Monday, until I can contact my office. They're already closed, and I want to make sure there is sufficient money transferred from one account to another." The dealer said fine, and that evening someone called us. We had a museum person with us that evening having cocktails (we were going out to dinner). This person called and said, "I found a painting I'm going to buy, and I want you to come and see it first to make sure it's OK." The museum person said, "What is the painting?" And they told him the name of the artist. He said, "I saw that today, and the Weismans bought it." He said, "It couldn't be. We're looking at it." The dealer was selling it to them for [\$]15-, \$20,000 more. So immediately, to make sure it was the right thing--and this museum person had gone to look at the painting with us--so to make sure it was correct, he went to see it again. And for sure it was the same painting. So we called back and said we would cancel the painting. We didn't wish it and told our friend about it, and he bought the painting for \$10,000 less than we were going to pay for it. Fortunately, the painting lived very close to us for a long time. So we

saw it a lot, and now again it's very close to us. The painting is in the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art on loan. It's a Gorky painting called The Orators. And now, let the shoe fit; it doesn't matter. You know if they would know, and I'm not disclosing anything, right?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: Another situation where we gave a dealer some artworks to sell on consignment: we knew what we wanted for them, and he knew what we wanted for them. And one in particular was a Roy Lichtenstein painting [Scared Witless], that we agreed to sell for \$5,000. And a year later (it hadn't sold), or eight months or whatever the time lapse was, there was a Lichtenstein show in Pasadena. And there was our painting owned by somebody else. It had been sold, and we were never paid. This dealer kept saying, "But I haven't sold it; I haven't sold it." We ended up in litigation over that.

Another dealer we had bought a painting from--a Dubuffet. This dealer, I don't mind saying: everybody knows Frank Lloyd.

GOODWIN: We can't tarnish his reputation. [laughter]

WEISMAN: We bought a Dubuffet painting from him. We had it about eight months. We paid \$35,000 for it. This was in early sixties, I think, maybe mid-sixties. It

was understood that should we not like the painting-- which any dealer understands this--we are free to bring it back, not for cash, but to exchange. And we called and said we were sending it back. We just weren't happy with the painting. So he said, "Well, I can't take it back, and I had it on consignment." So we said, "Well, you could try to sell it for us, certainly." "Oh, yes, I could try and do that." So he kept the painting. And after a few months went by, several months, and continuing communication, the painting hadn't sold, and the painting hadn't sold. We go into New York, and we said, "If the painting hasn't sold, send it back." "Well, it's out now. We have someone contemplating it." So we bought the purple Rothko [untitled], which is another whole story, as you well know. And that painting could well have been part of that whole other story. We bought the purple Rothko. We bought a-- mind you, for \$35,000--we bought the [Naum] Gabo [Linear Construction Variation], and we bought another sculpture. I'm trying to think what, offhand. And then he billed us for those, and we said, "We'll take the Dubuffet, or we'll take these." Now until that matter straightened out, that's the way it is.

At that time, we were selling about \$100,000 worth of art at Parke Bernet in New York--[of] things I say we had

"used up," is the way we put it--and it went very well. Actually, it was part of a sale with the Sculls--not the big sale, another sale with the Sculls, and which we took no credit for. Our name wasn't even mentioned, because we really didn't want to be in relationship with the Sculls at this sale. So at any event, after the sale, Fred talked to-- It wasn't David Nash; it was somebody else at that time at Parke Bernet. He talked to him and said it seemed to go well. He said, "Yes, except I want to tell you there's been an attachment by Frank Lloyd and Marlborough Galleries against your share, which was a hundred and some thousand dollars. At that very moment the David Smith show was going on at the Los Angeles County Museum. There were all works of art loaned by Marlborough, and Fred put an attachment on all of the David Smiths. How I wish we'd kept them, all of them. In the meantime, of course, we're in litigation again. And the last line is he never could produce the Dubuffet. He had obviously sold it. So he was instructed to pay us the \$5,000 balance that he owed us. The difference--can you imagine what we bought for [\$]35,000? A Gabo, a Rothko, and there was something else we bought, and I don't remember what it was. All at the same time, all this plus \$5,000 to make [\$]35-. So you know what those prices were. So that's how long ago it was. Well, the last line is we got our \$5,000, we kept

these works, and he kept the Dubuffet. That was a nice experience, too.

We've had other little sticky things, but nothing quite as dramatic as that. And who needs it! You know, we've learned through the years; we're very careful when we go to dealers. We know how much it's going to be. We arrange the price. We take the work. We pay for the work after we have the work in our presence, and not before, and not a day before. In fact, we much prefer having the work in our possession for at least two weeks to a month before we pay for it. Because too often things happen. Something happens. And when it happens, why should we be the ones stuck? And the dealer, invariably, will stick you if he can. At least we find that to be the case.

GOODWIN: Did dealers take advantage of you because of what they know about your collection?

WEISMAN: Well, what do you think? Of course.

GOODWIN: Wouldn't it make sense for them to cooperate?

WEISMAN: Of course it would, and they're very shortsighted. We are very well aware that when we go into a gallery to buy a painting from a dealer--now mind you, I'm not talking about-- When we go into Jim Corcoran's gallery, and he's having a Billy Al Bengston show, the prices are pretty obviously printed, what they are. And we have a

policy: we just don't chisel around on something unless there's an amount involved that makes it a valid reason to chisel. I'm not being cavalier about [\$]8- or \$10,000. But if it would be, say, under \$10,000 and it's a Billy Al at \$6,500 or [\$]45- or [\$]85-, whatever it is, I don't know; and there it is on a sheet of paper, typewritten in a gallery, and there's a whole show, we're not going to mess around. Now certainly, we get our 10 percent discount, but so who doesn't; and that's all written in, and we may ask for delivery, and that's it. But we're well aware that when you go into a dealer, and they have something in the back room, and they're showing it to you, immediately they up the price. Because they assume you're going to ask for a discount. And certainly they at least up it to the 10 percent, but I always figure the 10 percent is built into whatever the price is at the outset.

But we're aware of that, and this is why very often we'll make a package deal. We'll buy two or three things and then put it all together. This is [\$]10- and that's [\$]12- and this is [\$]6-; so it ends up [\$]26-, and we'll give you \$23,500 for the whole thing--and we know they're not getting hurt--or we give them \$20,000 for the whole thing. We know they're not getting hurt. We know they're well aware of what they're doing. And I don't think we have to have a lot of pain and horror in our hearts for having

chiseled them a little because, as the word goes, I think they build that price in when they gave it to us anyway. They build a certain amount of discount in. I've heard it from dealers--out of their own mouths--what they build into a piece if Norton Simon walks in: how much they build into the price before he asks, because they know he's going to chisel them right down. So they build it in, and anything over and above they get from that price that they build in, they're that much to the good. We're all aware of it. But I'm sure Norton is well aware of it, too; and what can you do? What's the answer for it?

So, the point is I think they have as much to gain as we do in selling us a painting. They have something to gain to put that painting into our collection and to have us on their list of satisfied clients. I don't think Doug Christmas hurts from our having bought two Rauschenbergs from him and a Lichtenstein within a month or two months of each other. I don't think he is pained by that a bit. And we traded in a Rauschenberg. I don't think he made a bad deal. I don't know what the deal was. I don't know how much for. But we bought one painting we gave to the museum, one for ourselves, and then we bought a Lichtenstein for ourselves--a major painting--and then we traded in our Hoarfrost of Rauschenberg, and I don't think he hurt. I don't think he would have given me

fifty Lichtenstein posters for the hospital, or the Rauschenberg posters for the hospital, if he hadn't had a nice deal. I don't think he would have been by our side during the Venice thing [Weismans' attempt to create a Venice Art Center] trying to help the situation if he didn't come out very nicely.

I think Frank Perls was a reasonably good dealer. I think he-- Well, it's not nice to say these things maybe, but I think there was a certain amount of Frank that rode on the tails of his brother, Klaus, a certain amount over the fact that his family was very intime with Matisse and Picasso and Léger and Miró and the people of that era in France from whence he came, or Germany is where they came from. But I'm not sure that Frank was as knowledgeable, maybe, as Klaus is. I think that Frank was more amicable in many ways than Klaus, but in other ways Klaus can be nice. They're both-- You don't pretend he's an easy man to deal with. I remember going into Frank's gallery with someone who really wanted to buy a painting. She had a place over her sofa, and she wanted to buy a painting. Now sure, it may be offensive to me to think in those terms, that I want a red painting to go in my red living room. But on the other hand, I also have the feeling I don't give a damn why they want to buy it. If they buy something that in my heart I feel is a good painting, it's going to elevate their taste for

the next thing they buy. But anyway, someone went into Frank looking one time, said they wanted a horizontal red painting. And he said, "Why don't you go down to La Cienega," and threw them out of the gallery. I don't think that was appropriate. I don't think that's the way to do business. But on the other hand, Frank admittedly was-- He used to say, "So sometimes I'm darling and sometimes I'm not." And he'd come over and he'd say, "You know, I'm not going to be darling tonight. It's not my darling time." And we had a very amicable relationship, but a darling guy he wasn't, always. And yet when he was ill, I went to visit him in the hospital, and I'd bring him something and so forth.

I think Paul Kantor is one of the toughest dealers in the city. We have not heard from him in a long time. But as my husband has said, "I'm sure he hasn't had anything around that he knew we would like, or we would have heard," because he's a very shrewd, smart dealer. We never bought a work of art from Paul Kantor no matter what we paid-- and in instances that we thought we might have overpaid at that time--but what water didn't reach its level and far surpass whatever it was we paid for it. He dealt in quality works from day one. He was the first to show Diebenkorn in this city, and he showed him well. And he really had exceptional art to sell. The last time I saw

things of his that were of any value whatsoever were he had some Lichtensteins. But other than that, I haven't been at his house in a long time. That was when the Lichtenstein show was at Cal State Long Beach [February 22 to March 20, 1977].

GOODWIN: How does he make a sale? Does he get on the phone?

WEISMAN: Oh, he'll call, and he'll say, "I have a couple of de Koonings you might want to see. I think they're your kind of painting. Why don't you drop over?" "Why don't you bring them up?" And he'll go, "Ah! If I have time, I'll try. I'll let you know. And maybe I can get up there tonight, but maybe I'd better make it tomorrow." And Fred might say, "Well, make it tonight so we can look at it for a couple of days, gives me an extra view." "Well, OK, I'll try." And he'd get up, and bring it over. And then he'd come up, and we'd say, "Well, Paul, we're surprised to see you!" His famous expressions: "Well, what can I do? What can you do?" That's his favorite words: "What can I do?" And this famous expression, uses it all the time: "What can I do?" as he raises his shoulders. So he brings over a couple of de Koonings. We couldn't make up our minds; we bought them both [Dark Pond and Pink Angels], which we never have regretted for one moment. With the Kandinsky [Yellow Nude], we bought it from him;

we've never regretted it for a moment. We bought a Paul Klee [Little Red Train] from him, and we subsequently sold it at a handsome profit and never regretted it. We bought a Mondrian [Composition in Yellow and Blue] from him. We had it for several years, and all of a sudden it began to crackle, and the yellow began to change color. And we said, "Paul"; he said, "Have it restored." We said, "We don't want to restore Mondrian. Let somebody else restore it and live with it." We had been someplace with a restored Mondrian. You walked in the house, and all you smell is wet paint. I didn't want to smell paint on that painting. It was too beautiful. So he said, "Well then, I'll sell it for you," and he did. And he got us a handsome price for it. And I have no complaints. I don't think my husband would have any complaints over any paintings, works of art, that we ever bought from Paul.

Frank Perls had a great Calder show; we didn't like any. Paul had the Calder in the lanai next door at the same time. We went in and bought it [Nine Elements] from Paul. There really was no hanky-panky. Those two--you weren't here when they were galleries next to each other. That was a scene unto itself. It was marvelous watching the two of them run back and forth into each other's gallery as they were selling to see what their clients were buying, to see what they might've had better to offer

them of the same artist. I couldn't swear to that but you can imagine what would've happened.

GOODWIN: Why is Kantor such a bitter person?

WEISMAN: I don't know. The thing is that you might-- We knew him when he was a union organizer down in San Pedro. My father had a fish cannery in Long Beach called California Sea Food that was really a part of the Val Vita Company, subsequently Hunt Foods, Norton Simon, Incorporated, conglomerate. Well, at that time it wasn't Norton Simon. It was Hunt Food Products. My father had a dog- and cat-food cannery down in San Pedro. And Paul was one of the union organizers against my father. But he was a bright man, and what his angers are I don't know. But he is a very angry, bitter man, to me.

GOODWIN: Has he always been that way?

WEISMAN: I guess so, but he laughed once in a while. And he was married to Ulrike while he was in the gallery business. She was a very meek, mild little lady before they married, and after they got married she became very verbal. She became very assertive. They had one lovely home after another. And then they split, as you know. I guess she had a friend, or he had a friend; but I don't think they cared about things like that. Their values were different than mine, certainly. But I certainly wouldn't stand in judgment of what they liked--that's their business.

But I don't know. I think he's just a bitter man. I don't know why. We all have our bitters, I guess, along the way. But he was really one of the top dealers in this town, always.

GOODWIN: Well, he still thinks he's the best.

WEISMAN: Oh, he has the best merchandise. He gets the best there is to be gotten. He comes up with-- Oh, the things that we missed from him. Oh, gosh, I think now of my "iffy" list; you know I've always said our "iffy" collection is the best: if we hadn't sold it, if we had bought it, if we hadn't given it away. He had a painting that was the size of a postcard--literally, this big--on wood, of Matisse, of the street, a street scene in Nice. Now, you've been to Paul Kantor's, and you may well have seen it. It is absolutely exquisite. I don't know how much it was. It probably was \$42--and we didn't buy it! It was too small to be very valid. That painting carried across our whole living room, that little postcard. It was so beautiful. Excuse me.

[telephone rings; tape recorder turned off] Anyway, it was a gorgeous painting.

There are other things we've bought. I'm trying to think what else we bought from him. We've bought some beautiful things from Paul. And he's a really good dealer. He doesn't deal in crappy art. He deals in good art. What

his own dealings are, I don't know. I would not want to say, because it's really none of my business, but I don't think he deals as straight as he might. In that respect I think he falls into the category of most dealers. I doubt if I should say any more than that.

GOODWIN: What makes a man like him become a dealer? Is it the intrigue or the--?

WEISMAN: Oh, it's a tremendous business situation. It's a big wheely-dealy thing. And this is part of the intrigue for men like my husband or Norton or Nelson Rockefeller and Armand Hammer, people like that. They love to wheel and deal and to be able to wheel and deal in things that they love--

GOODWIN: To what extent does Kantor love the art?

WEISMAN: Oh, I think Kantor likes the art pretty good. I think he really does, because he has things he's had for many, many years. He has some small [Josef] Albers that he has kept for years and he could sell easily and have replaced along the way.

GOODWIN: That reminds me, didn't you give him a portrait of him painted against some Albers? He showed me something in his office, which I thought he said was a gift from you.

WEISMAN: Oh, we have an Albers reproduction [Homage to the Square].

GOODWIN: Yes, it's not authentic Albers.

WEISMAN: Oh, it's a reproduction of our painting?

GOODWIN: Right, with him in it? Or is that a separate painting?

WEISMAN: That's a separate painting.

GOODWIN: It's painted on a rock, or--

WEISMAN: That's something else he has.

GOODWIN: Was that from you?

WEISMAN: The rock wasn't from us, the reproduction.

We went through a time when Norman Ives, who subsequently has passed away, did these for us. It was a result of the Mondrian we had bought. Norman did a silk-screen suite of ten Mondrians. He selected ten Mondrians from all over the country, and came to us and asked if we would be willing to allow him to use ours. We said yes, and as a result, he sent us some of the announcements that he sent out of this suite, using our Mondrian as the announcement. And it was yea-big, which is--what?--four inches square maybe. And, of course, it was the more conventional size of Mondrian which is--what?--eighteen inches, two feet square, something, whatever, three feet square. So it looked so great, and we had it framed. And then we ordered a hundred of them, which he gave us. We had a card made for the back of the print that said, "Mondrian Composition, blue and yellow, 19-" whatever it was, "-37," I think, "-32 [1934], reproduced from the collection of

Marcia and Frederick Weisman." We gave them for Christmas gifts that year, framed, to family and friends. And it was really quite nice. Oh, and then we gave the actual dimensions, and so it was evident that this was not an original. And we would never, obviously, want to get into that kind of a thing. So the following year, we did another painting, and the following year, another, and we did it every year for about nine, ten years, and then we stopped, because we found it more difficult and more difficult to find works that transposed properly. So that's how he happened to have that Albers, and we had given him several of those as gifts through the years.

But Nick Wilder's a good dealer, if you don't deal with money with him. Never get into money, never. Doug Christmas is a good dealer. I would never get in money matters with him, into money situations with him. Jim Corcoran, I'd be more prone to. Margo Leavin is an excellent dealer and an excellent business lady, and I don't think you'd have any trouble with her. But I wouldn't bet on any of them. I wouldn't bet on any of them. I hate to go to any of them and say, "Look, I bought this from you for \$10,000. Will you give me [\$]8- cash?" and know it's a worthwhile artist and they could go and sell it for [\$]10- again, or 12- or 15-. I know I wouldn't get it unless I gave them the world for nothing. But if I

bought the de Kooning from Paul Kantor, as an example, for \$45,000, Dark Pond--and today it's probably worth a half a million dollars; would you say that's a reasonable estimate?

GOODWIN: I don't know.

WEISMAN: All right, say a quarter of a million dollars. And if I went to Paul Kantor and said, "I'll sell it to you for [\$]200- [\$200,000]," he'd offer me [\$]75,000 [laughter], and he'd sell it for [\$]400- if the going market was [\$]3-. And he'd get [\$]4-, because that's Paul Kantor.

We had this little Paul Klee that we bought from him for [\$]30,000. He bought it from us for [\$]125-, and it's-- Coincidentally, we happened to have heard that it went for two and a quarter, or [\$]200-. Well, that's a good dealer; that's his business. That's what he should do. But I'd hate to go to him crying because I needed the money. It would be impossible.

Now, I think Leo Castelli is an excellent dealer in New York. I would have little problem dealing with him moneywise, I think. I don't think he has any money to back up, that's all. And that's the difference. See, Paul has the money. Where? I don't know. I think in Switzerland he keeps most of his money. But that's not for me to judge either. I don't think Leo has change for fifty cents. He has a lot of good art. But I think he's up to his ears in, you know--

I think André Emmerich is a hell of a dealer. He's tough. He's straight. What it is, it is. And very often he won't budge one nickel off that 10 percent. He says that's the price and that's it and that's that. But I respect him for that. I'd rather know that there is a dealer that doesn't budge. And when I go in, what he's asking is what he's asking, and that's it. You don't have to worry about "Did I get screwed or didn't I? Could I have gotten it for less?" He doesn't sell it for less. He just doesn't play those games. And I think that's OK. I like that.

GOODWIN: Have you outgrown the local dealers?

WEISMAN: Oh, not at all. You can't outgrow a dealer if they have an artwork you like. This is the only reason you continue to play with the dealer, that you go into a gallery where they screwed you on a Gorky.

GOODWIN: [laughter] Get even?

WEISMAN: No, not to get even. If he has an artwork I like, I go in, and I'll look at it. And if I want it, I'll buy it, because that's for me. But he won't get a nickel more than what I think he should get, or otherwise he can screw it. I've never bought anything from him since; neither has Fred. But we don't go to him. Unless we hear of something, we wouldn't go.

GOODWIN: But don't you tend to do your shopping in New York?

WEISMAN: Not at all. We buy a lot of art here. I bought Ed Ruscha in New York, and we buy Ron Davis here, and we'll buy Oldenburg here, or you know, you buy in different cities. There's no reason not to buy Oldenburg in New York--we're in New York. But we'll buy Oldenburg from Margo, we'll buy Ed Ruscha from Leo, we'll buy Hockney that he did of us here. We bought it from Emmerich in New York (we subsequently sold it through Kasmin in London).

GOODWIN: Where is that painting [American Collectors]?

WEISMAN: I think it's in a museum in West Berlin. But it makes no matter where; and the question is going into the galleries and seeing it all, and I don't think we do properly by all the galleries in Los Angeles, I must admit. Because we don't get in to see them all, and it's hard to. That's one of the reasons I love doing my class: we go to galleries. And like right now, Rosamund Felsen has a new gallery, and I haven't gone in. I feel so ashamed, but I'm doing so many things I just don't do much gallerying. And where am I going to put something if I bought it? So it has to depend on something else; I don't know.

I went into Doug Christmas's [Ace Gallery] a couple of weeks ago. I was down that way for something and saw those Anthony Caros and they're just gorgeous. Well, we can use sculpture out in the garden, and we've really kind of made a pact with

ourselves now. We're not looking at anything that isn't sculpture to go in the garden. Because that's really all we have room for, unless a monumental painting came along that would mean, "Yes, we could upgrade this Motherwell to buy this monumental Motherwell," or make a decision, "OK, we've had other Yves Tanguys; we'll sell the Yves Tanguy, because it's worth so much money, and we can put it into something else that we would like more," which we don't like to do. There aren't many things we like to do that with, because we love the things we have. And we try not to be nostalgic about work. We never have been too much so. But on the other hand, we don't want to compromise with what we think is qualitative.

GOODWIN: What impact did Ferus have on your collecting?

WEISMAN: Oh, I think they've had a very strong influence. I think there were many elements in Ferus. There was the art, there was Chico [Walter Hopps], there was Irving [Blum], there were the people we met that were collectors that incited us, and there was an excitement. I also think it was a moment in time.

GOODWIN: I was going to ask that precisely. Was that the golden era?

WEISMAN: Oh, it was for Los Angeles. You know, we did go to Barney's Beanery after an opening. Or Monday nights we were at Barney's Beanery. On Monday nights we tramped

La Cienega, and it was great. It was truly great. I guess you can't go home again; it won't happen again. It's really too bad. Actually the whole thing of La Cienega was going from Esther's--oh, where the hell did we go?-- Esther Robles, we'd go to Ferus, which was two doors down. We'd go to Felix Landau across the street, and Sidney Janis's brother Martin had a gallery later on. Later on--it was probably two years later-- [laughter] in 1960, '61, next to Felix, up the path from Felix. And then there was Ankrum Gallery, that was there early on. I guess Ankrum was up there then, that was it. And who else was there on that street? David Stuart and Ed Primus [Primus-Stuart Gallery], and we used to go in there. Then there was the American Art Association, whatever art association [L.A. Art Association Galleries] where Lorser [Feitelson] used to teach and show other people's works that related to his television show on the arts. There was another gallery there, too. There was up the street a ways-- I guess that was David Stuart. And who is where Irving is now, or where Ace [Los Angeles] is now on La Cienega? There was somebody in there. And then across the street Pace was there for a while. And Irving Blum was running Pace. Well, that lasted about twenty minutes, [laughter] and it was over and out. Oh, and then Betty Gold was upstairs from Ferus, but that was later, I guess. Dwan was there. Weren't

they in Westwood at the beginning?

GOODWIN: I think so.

WEISMAN: And then they moved to what's Flax now. And that's where I first saw those [Oldenburg] Pickles. And we didn't buy them, and then we bought them \$15,000 later. We used to be there. We saw the Rauschenberg show there. We saw Kelly there. But it was a moment, and I wonder why?

GOODWIN: That's your question. Why did it go sour? Why did things change?

WEISMAN: I don't know. I think it was before the new museum. And there was great hope for what would happen in twentieth-century art. The collectors have gotten together with the Contemporary Art Council, which was prior to that time. And there wasn't Gemini [G.E.L.]. There was what's-her-name? June Wayne--Tamarind [Lithography Workshop]--but I think we anticipated the Contemporary Art Council making a tremendous dent in the Los Angeles County Museum, in the new museum. We all were working for it, and we were all into it and excited by it, and--

GOODWIN: Why don't we get into that when we talk about the County Museum?

WEISMAN: But I think it all was going great guns through Maurice [Tuchman]'s exhibit of the New York School ["New York School: The First Generation" (1965)]. Then after that it

suddenly went downhill. And then there was a pickup again with the art technology show ["Art and Technology," 1970] and the sculptures in the sixties. Those were individual pickup things. The "Art and Technology" wasn't as great a show as it was a catalog. But I think that things happened as a result of that that were healthy. But it was during that time that La Cienega went steadily downhill. People moved away, collections started to dissipate, times changed, divorces: the fact Don and Lynn Factor split, the Hoppers split-- Dennis and Brooke Hopper split. You know, things started going in different directions.

GOODWIN: Were people speculating?

WEISMAN: I don't think they knew from spec. Who knew about speculating in '58? Speculating on Ed Kienholz?

GOODWIN: Well, '65.

WEISMAN: Did you speculate on Kienholz or on Ed Ruscha or Craig Kauffman? When you ask about Ferus--

GOODWIN: When I use that word it sounds contrived, but were people-- [telephone rings; tape recorder turned off]

WEISMAN: The enthusiasm and the spirit of what was going to happen at the museum had to have a great result. [tape recorder turned off] I think it went sour--

As I say, I think it might have been the museum. On the other hand, Pasadena was emerging and doing well, so it shouldn't have been. What could it have been? I really don't know. I just don't know whether times changed, people changed, the museum here changed. Pasadena was flourishing, but not doing all the things it should have. We had-- Who was the director at Pasadena early on that did the [Mark] Tobey show? And he's now in Virginia University, art professor [Thomas Leavitt]. Do you remember the gallery? I don't remember. So Pasadena was making changes. L.A. was making changes. I don't know; I really don't know. The collectors were becoming more, not less. UCLA was doing its thing. They had the Frederick [S.] Wight [Art] Gallery. I really am not sure exactly what it was, because the enthusiasm ran high. Was it too incestuous, the group? GOODWIN: Well, I think that's a problem. I doubt that that was the contributing factor of the changes that you've been--

WEISMAN: But there was still people that I knew like Sarah Briskin. Even my sister-in-law, Norton's first wife, Lucille, would come and look at the [Morris] Brodersons and the Billy Brices. And she was buying Rico Lebrun at that point and collecting him, and still has a lot of Rico Lebrun. So I just don't know. It

was a mixed bag of people on that street. I think the Ferus group-- I can just see us all standing in that gallery looking at the Ruschas, of the painting of the Los Angeles County Museum on fire. Were you around for that?

GOODWIN: No, but I know the painting.

WEISMAN: Yes, I remember when that was shown. And I remember the group of us in there and the people around. And I remember when Dick Sherwood defended what's-his-name, the guy that had the-- I don't know. It was probably a naked woman or something, and it had to be defended. It had to do with abortion, do you recall?

GOODWIN: Was that Connor Everts?

WEISMAN: Connor Everts. What was that that he did that was so naughty? Probably so nothing today, but Dick Sherwood defended him from O'Melveny and Myers, which must have been a shocker for them to deal with. But those things were taking place, and I just don't know. I think I'm so pleased that we were there then and were a part of it. I don't know what good it does to have been, except that it is nice to have been a part of that time. [telephone rings; tape recorder turned off]

GOODWIN: Some people have explained that Hopps was

the catalyst for all this.

WEISMAN: I think he had a great deal to do with it. You know, Walter is a very learned man. He knows a tremendous amount about art. He doesn't know it like you know it, in the scholarly fashion. He hasn't read the documentation.

GOODWIN: He knows it like you know it, intuitively.

WEISMAN: Intuitively, from his gut, from looking at the art. He's not all that old, either. How old is Chico? Forty-five, forty-eight, something like that? And besides which, he has an eye second to none. I would say the two eyes in the business--the four eyes--would be Walter Hopps, certainly early on, and Dick Bellamy of New York. Do you know him at all?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: I'd trust his eye, putting him up against anybody. He found [Jim] Dine, he found [Tom] Wesselmann, he found [James] Rosenquist, he found Oldenburg, he found [Lucas] Samaras. He found all the pop artists, all the good ones. And he had the Green Gallery in New York City, and Bob Scull put up the money for him when things got bad. And then Bob backed away. Now he's with Bud Holland, I think. He works with him. Brilliant eye. I think that Walter Hopps has the same. They don't know how to deal. They deal, [but] they don't

know how to sell; they don't know how to buy. Walter puts together exquisite exhibitions. He can hang them magnificently. Somebody better go get the pictures. Somebody better get the labels, and somebody better do the catalog. And they're still waiting for the catalog for the Johns show in Pasadena, and the catalog from the [Joseph] Cornell show in Pasadena. That one might have come out; I don't think so, but-- When he did get a catalog together it came out two months after the show was down. He is totally irresponsible.

I think this is true of dealers, too. I think I started to say this: more than lacking integrity or trying to steal or do the wrong things (and this is not true of, and exclusive of, Frank Lloyd, because he's just bad news all the way around), but I think the little dealers around--Nick Wilder, Doug Christmas-- they don't lack integrity. They don't want to steal. They're just irresponsible. They just don't know or understand. They don't know what a contract is. They don't know that when you sign a contract, that means you mean it. That that's the way it's going to be. You don't sign papers unless you know what you're signing. And when you sign them, you've got to live up to it. And if you don't, you're a deadbeat. They don't know that. And if they know it, it's words only.

They don't understand what it really implies. I think this is true of Walter: brilliant museum person, brilliant art person, nowhere in terms of discipline. That's true of probably so many of them.

GOODWIN: Have you ever had the desire to be a dealer?

WEISMAN: Oh, God, no. My husband has from time to time, and taxwise there are reasons why we could and should.

(I don't know whether that's for the documents or not.)

But to me it would be a bloody bore. I can't imagine anything worse than sitting in a gallery all day long and for two months looking at the same show.

GOODWIN: But assuming you could get somebody to watch the gallery, wouldn't you enjoy that?

WEISMAN: Well, what else is there? It wouldn't intrigue me at all. The only thing that would intrigue me about being a dealer is that it would make me do things I don't do that I want to do. It would make me go to artists' studios and look at their work. And it would give me the *raison d'être* to run back and forth to New York, looking at paintings, buying paintings that I can look at and see, and be a part of that. But otherwise, what is it? It's a business. They're dealing in a commodity.

GOODWIN: Yeah, but maybe you could promote a concept that needs--

WEISMAN: There's a young lady in the city that's going to go into the gallery business. Her name is Jill Alexander. She's taking a class from me now. She's a B.A. She has her B.A. in, I think, art history or something like that. And she and Mitzi Landau are going to open a gallery together. They've got the space now on Little Santa Monica in Westwood, just east of Sepulveda. The concept that she wants to do is having a show, go along with the show, have lectures, have the artist in, have groups come in, and do something like my classes within the gallery. I think that's a marvelous concept. I don't think it's necessarily going to sell art. It might, because if she's teaching new people what to look for in the art that's there and maybe they get a little bit of understanding of it, there's a chance they will buy it. So it might have some merit to it. So that's a concept. The last line gets down to who's going to put their money where their eyes are? And that's where it's at. You've got to take it home with cash, or the equivalent. I think it's going to be a rough business, and I wouldn't want to deal with all those kind of people. Because you're not just dealing with the public. You must deal with other dealers, and they all mix it all up together and do their thing. It would be a very heavy scene.

I'm glad I don't need to do it. I really am. My husband would like it, but then he's business oriented. He loves to hustle and wheel and deal, and that's the businessman in him that wants to do it. And I think that's why we'll--

TAPE NUMBER: IV, SIDE ONE

AUGUST 16, 1978

GOODWIN: OK. Today we're going to talk about art museums, and we wanted to begin with those in Southern California. How did you first get involved with a museum, Mrs. Weisman?

WEISMAN: Well, I would guess that our first involvement with a museum was after we had had some classes at UCLA with Walter Hopps. And then we came-- I really don't know how and when we started at the County [Museum]. I remember going to an auction that the Museum of Modern Art did for their building fund. It was in '58 or '59, and it was a closed-circuit television auction between New York, Houston, Chicago, Los Angeles, I believe. And we bought some works there. I'm not positive how it happened that we became-- Maybe we had friends that had already been involved in the arts and in collecting a bit. And subsequently Jim Elliott came to us, and we had a meeting here for him. He wanted to get a group of people together, and he had a meeting here and invited Gifford and Joann Phillips, and Betty and Stanley Freeman, and Harry and Phyllis Sherwood, Taft and Rita Schreiber, Ted and Sue Cummings--no, Ted and Sue were not here--I think, Don and Lynn Factor. There were maybe seven couples, six, seven couples. And the purpose

of the meeting was to get a group of people together that were interested in twentieth-century art to create a council of some sort for the museum for the express purpose of collecting for the museum. It did get wider and more diverse in that it wasn't just collecting. It was to raise funds for exhibitions, collect acquisitions and necessary periodicals or publications involved with those situations. We didn't want to pay for any curatorial staff, because we felt that was a museum responsibility, but we wanted to do whatever we could to support exhibitions and acquisitions. And that's what it really started out to be. And at that time, Taft [Schreiber] and Fred (and there was somebody else, I'm not sure who) and, I know, Betty Freeman went along with this. We committed [ourselves] to \$2,500 right off the bat. Now, this was a long time ago. \$2,500 then--

GOODWIN: This was before the new museum opened?

WEISMAN: Oh, long-- This was in '58, '59. Now, the new museum's been opened eleven years. And this is '78, so it was open in '67. So, this was probably--

GOODWIN: '65.

WEISMAN: Well, it didn't open-- '65? All right. So, this was what, seven, eight years before. They were in the old museum. And we made our commitment along the line for \$2,500 and so did Taft. There were three of us--

I think, three or four couples. [If] I'm not mistaken, Gene Klein might have been in that group. I'm not positive. I don't remember. I'm sure someplace somewhere we may have some kind of documentation. We wouldn't, but the museum would certainly. Betty Asher would. So that was a decision to do--

Subsequently, they decided that wasn't so good. It should be \$500 a couple, a year. By the time they came to this conclusion, already Taft was disinterested, and I think it was Ted Cummings who was no longer interested, and Fred became comme ça, because we've all had an idea of we were going to put together an acquisition fund of [\$]25-, \$50,000--boom!--and go out and buy art for the museum, because we were all interested in doing just that thing. Well, that soon became obvious that it wasn't going to happen. But the beginning of it started, and Gifford Phillips was elected chairman of what became the Contemporary Art Council. Giff was a very good chairman, and the meetings took place at various and sundry people's homes, once in a while at the museum, or whatever. Betty and Monte Factor became members quite quickly early on. I'm trying to think of some of the really meaningful collectors that were into that. I think Phil and Bea Gersh, Dolly Bright-- No, Dave [Bright] was already on the board of trustees,

so they didn't go to the Contemporary Art Council until a great deal later. I think she did after he passed away. It was then. I'll think of more as we talk.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: In any event, it became a situation that had its merits that we were all pleased with, but it began to disintegrate a little very early on.

GOODWIN: Why?

WEISMAN: Well, there were differences in terms of what's modern art, where does it start, where does it end? Are we going to go to the flaky, young people like Bob Irwin, or were we going to go to people like the more respected ones, you know, de Kooning and the likes? There were all kinds of differences of opinion. And how thin were we going to spread the money? Were we going to have to support curatorial staff? Jim Elliott wanted a preparator very badly, and the museum wouldn't pay for it. And we were going to have to, so the Contemporary Art Council voted not to. So, I gave them the equivalent of \$350 a month to pay Henry Hopkins. And I paid him for six months or a year--I don't know. It was about \$3,000 I gave them, and Fred almost fainted when I offered this. I said, "Well, either they'll need it [a preparator] or they don't. If they don't, they'll soon find out; and if they do, they'll pick it up. So he said, "Dreamer,"

[laughter] and I guess I was kind of a dreamer. I think Terry and Becky Lynch might have been in on that at the beginning, too. (They're no longer married). So, what we did is I paid Henry. At the end of six months they came to me and asked me if I was ready to pay the second six months of the year. And I said, "Do you need him very badly?" "Oh, yes, we do." And I said, "Then you pay him. That's all I did: I wanted to stimulate you into doing what you really had to do, and you were never going to know it if somebody didn't show you the light."

So, in any event we started on that basis. It went on fairly well for about the first few years. Then there began to be political situations that took place, like, oh, I guess-- Then they had to get into all the ruckus about the new museum. And [there was] Ahmanson: who he wanted for the architect, and somebody else wanted-- all of that. Then it was into curatorial staff and director's staff. Then Jim was going to leave. I don't know in what succession these things began to take place. Jim was going to leave. No, before that, I guess, Gifford's term expired, and they came to Fred and asked him if he would be good enough to take over the directorship of it, the chairmanship. He didn't want to, but he said he would based on one fact: that anything that would happen

in terms of choosing a curator would have to go through the Contemporary Art Council for at least an approval, if not the selection.

GOODWIN: Why did the council want that responsibility?

WEISMAN: Because they felt that if they were going to choose a curator of twentieth-century art, who better than the twentieth-century art group to take care of it, to validate it? So anyway, the outcome was we all in the group had decided this was important. We should know who our curator is. We should have an opportunity to meet him: see if we know him, see if we care about him, see what his record is. The museum at that point had not shown any interest in twentieth-century art other than late Monet, or what else?

GOODWIN: Van Gogh.

WEISMAN: Van Gogh. And then who else had they shown down there? They had some [Clyfford] Stills on loan.

GOODWIN: Rico Lebrun.

WEISMAN: Uh-huh. They had Rico Lebrun, and they had Billy Brice, and they had a few people; and they had some permanent collection, not a great deal. But it was all older. The few contemporary, well, relatively contemporary things-- I think "Buster" [Morton] May in St. Louis had already contributed a Beckmann, maybe a Kirchner. (Donald Winston--did you ever know him? We

saw him the other night, as a matter of fact. He's given all of his art to the Minneapolis Art Institute. He had probably one of the finest collections of German expressionists this city ever saw. He gave them all to them.)

We wanted to have some kind of input, so they agreed to this. And about three weeks later, they called Fred just prior to a meeting that was to take place at Bob Halff's. He was a member of the Contemporary Art Council--do you know him?--exquisite collection, beautiful collection of twentieth-century art. So they called here, and it was Taft, and Norton called, and I think Rick [Brown] called. In any event, they called to tell Fred they had selected a director, and they had selected a curator. And it was Ken Donahue and Maurice Tuchman. And nothing had been said to the Contemporary Art Council. (And I'm pretty sure this is the chronology. I could be off on some of the details.) So we went to the meeting, and they were being presented at the meeting just like that. We come in to the meeting, and, "We want you to know who your curator is that we're bringing in." And they brought him, and after he was introduced and everything, Fred said, "So, now that you're a member of the family, then there's no feeling any longer of airing dirty linens [laughter] publicly," and Fred told it as it was. We listened to Maurice tell his story et cetera, et cetera. The last line is, when that

part of the meeting was over, after the meeting, it was decided a letter would be written. The next meeting was here at our house. There was a letter written that if they [the trustees] don't comply in certain areas, if they can't come to us and talk to us about this or whatever it was-- The last line was, there was no response to the letter from the museum. And Fred resigned as chairman of the Contemporary Art Council, which made him chairman for probably a full six weeks, maybe two months. And he resigned. People to this day that were there refer to that wild and woolly night, because we were all geared to really putting this thing together. We were finally going to get-- The museum was behind us in every way. They came to Fred. They said it was OK that we'd have a say-so in the curator and all that. And then they went back on it all. So, the last line was Fred resigned as chairman.

We remained members. At that time we owed, I guess, another \$1,500, [\$]1,800--[\$]500 a year we owed. It couldn't have been over two years, because I remember we owed \$1,500 on our pledge. So Fred went, and we selected two works of art for them to choose between to pay off our pledge. One was the Marisol Kennedy Family; the other was a George Segal of the Lady Washing Her Foot in the Basin in the corner. And they were not interested in accepting such vanguard trivia. And so they didn't take the art we

offered them, and foolishly, we didn't keep it for ourselves. (We bought another Segal at that time.) But in any event, they didn't take them. And the last line was we went on paying our \$500, but we just more or less stayed out. We paid off our pledge, and that was it.

So, that was over and out, and we were really annoyed. Then it wasn't too long after that they moved into the [new] museum, and we were still-- Harry Sherwood was the vice-chairman. He became chairman of the Contemporary Art Council. Michael Blankfort was one of the original ones--Michael and Dorothy Blankfort. So, what we did is we were still involved somewhat but really not in the same profound way. Then they came to Fred [and said] that Dave Bright had found a Norbert Kricke sculpture. Would we pay for part of the Kricke for the museum? And Fred said no, he wasn't interested in paying for part of the Kricke. And I'll never forget; it was at the Hollywood Bowl, and Ed Carter came up to him and asked him. And Franklin Murphy was standing there, I think. No, it couldn't have been Franklin--or could it?--but somebody else with the museum. Who was president or chairman at the time that Ed Carter was--?

GOODWIN: Sidney Brody.

WEISMAN: No, Ed was president, Sidney wasn't anything yet.

GOODWIN: Right. No, no. Carter was chairman while Brody was president.

WEISMAN: But it wasn't Brody [who was] president then. Carter was president, and who was president before?

GOODWIN: Before Carter?

WEISMAN: Yes. Well, anyway, Ed Carter--maybe he was just with Franklin at the time, I don't know--comes up to Fred and says, "Wouldn't you like to give half of the Kricke to the museum?" And this is the man--Ed Carter--who sat there at a lunch at Perino's and told Fred what support he was going to give him for the Contemporary Art Council. And, you know, Ed Carter was born Jewish. (You may or may not know, and I don't know whether this is necessary or not to put into this tape, but nevertheless--) Maybe he had a father, a mother that wasn't or whatever. But he's always gone as a Gentile--for whatever reason, that's his business--and always has irked a lot of people in the Jewish community, that fact that he was passing.

In any event, we were standing in the Hollywood Bowl, and Ed asked Fred. Fred looked at him and said, "Ed, I have a feeling you know the meaning of the word chutzpah. [laughter] And I want to tell you that what you have just done is the most perfect example of chutzpah I have ever heard. No, I will not contribute to the Kricke sculpture." So, this is the kind of feeling that was going on. And anyway,

the museum opened, and that was fine. We went to all the to-dos, and it opened with a Bonnard show that what's-his-name--Maurice--put together.

GOODWIN: No, Elliott.

WEISMAN: Did Elliott do the Bonnard show? And then Elliott left after that? All right, so we were already in the new museum then when Fred was chairman and resigned. Because Jim Elliott left simultaneously with Rick, correct? And it was a whole hoo-ha which we won't go into, because Rick really was not the one that was involved in our area. Although he was involved, he wasn't the one that was directly responsible for what was going on.

GOODWIN: Well, do you think he was responsible for hiring Maurice?

WEISMAN: I don't know whether that was the way it was, or whether Rick or the board brought Ken Donahue and Maurice at the same time.

GOODWIN: Oh. Well, do you know why Maurice was hired?

WEISMAN: Oh, I don't, no. I have no idea. He was from the Guggenheim. He was an underling. He was going to take orders. He was working for a Soutine-- He was going to do his dissertation on [Chaim] Soutine, do a Soutine show--which he did--and the New York School show he instigated after he came. Why was he hired?

GOODWIN: I was just curious as to who was responsible.

WEISMAN: I had the feeling that Ken Donahue was in there in that decision, that Ken was already there. I could be wrong on that. I think that Ken was either there, or they did them both at the same time, almost simultaneously.

GOODWIN: I think that's more likely.

WEISMAN: I think that's what happened. They came together. And Ken was hired for one very obvious reason. He was from Sarasota, Florida, from the museum there, the Ringlings' museum [John and Mabel Ringling Museum of Art]. He was-- I don't know how to say this gently. To me he was mindless, which does not mean that he didn't have education and knowledge. But he was mindless in terms of dealing with a board of trustees that existed at that given moment in time. He could no more have dealt with-- There was Bart Lytton, Norton Simon, Howard Ahmanson, Ed Carter. Well, that's enough for starters, right? [laughter] Norton brought Franklin Murphy onto the board. Hammer came on subsequently. Anyway, it was a good group, let's say. Armand Hammer was there, I think, at that time, or right about then, right after that time. But certainly it took someone that was-- Maybe mindless is the wrong word, but someone that was not going to be judgmental, that was not someone who was going to take a position on anything. And here was someone that was going to follow orders from the big boys.

GOODWIN: So he was intentionally selected because he was weak? He'd be a fall guy.

WEISMAN: I think so. Not so much to be a fall guy as to just not interfere, that he would stick to his business of "museuming," and leave the policymaking and directing and all the rest of it to the big boys on the board of trustees. I feel that that's why he was hired. And that was a good reason. It was a logical reason, because nobody could have withstood this. They had an excellent director in Rick. He had his problems. There was always the question and the doubt about the Goya [The Marquesa of Santa Cruz as a Muse]. We would hear that three times a week (need it or not), fifty-two weeks a year. But whether that was true or not, who knows? But he got the museum built under difficult circumstances, because he really wanted to bring in eminent architects, and they wouldn't have any part of it.

GOODWIN: There is a marble plaque at the County Museum that says that Rick Brown and Norton Simon were responsible for the conception of the museum.

WEISMAN: That's true, because Norton was the one, I think-- Norton and Rick were very close. Rick was very instrumental in the early formation of Norton's collection. And I don't know whether they're friendly anymore or not. I have no idea. But I know there was a very close relationship-- and with his wife, Polly (she had polio). Lucille, Norton's

first wife, and Polly were very close. And the whole thing went very well. (Excuse me.) [tape recorder turned off]

GOODWIN: What kind of plan do you think Norton Simon and Rick Brown had for building a museum?

WEISMAN: I think their plan was that it was time that the-- It really emanated from the fact that Norton was putting his collection together at that time, and it was getting stronger daily, and Rick was being responsible in some ways--never responsible, because Norton is the kind of person that will ask twenty people the same question, get all the answers from all twenty, and do as he will his own thing. But he will have used that input, whether anybody else is aware of it or not. And certainly the people who gave the input will never be aware of it. It will end up being his idea, which it will be probably, because he'll take a little from here and a little from there. And he does have a genius for being able to collect people's ideas, digest them, and then bring them out--or up--in a very fine, constructive manner. And his idea was to separate the museum; it was time. At that time it was a museum of Art, Science, and History, I believe--or Science, History, and the Arts, whatever [Los Angeles County Museum of History, Science, and Art]. But it was certainly a very miniscule part of-- Was it upstairs, or was it downstairs in the back?

GOODWIN: Yes, it was downstairs.

WEISMAN: Downstairs in the back. So they had a very minimal space. They were gathering large groups of collectors through the Contemporary Art Council. And I believe the Costume Council was in effect even at that time. And there may have been the Art Museum Council. They were getting some response from the community, of people who cared. And they felt they could do it. And Ed Carter was a tremendous money raiser. And they felt they could raise the money. And Norton, I think, originally pledged a million dollars to it. You know, when you go back in time to where that was, I guess it might be four times that today, four or five times that. So he pledged a great deal of money, and he was behind Rick and the concept of separating the art museum from the other.

And I believe it could have been his idea (but I won't bet on that) that got the Gilmores to give the land to the city, or to the county.* That was all part of the Gilmore family that were in the oil business. And they had a Gilmore Stadium, which might have been before your time. I don't know where the Dodgers, which were then the Los Angeles Angels, I guess-- The Angels were playing baseball there, and softball--or baseball--and that was on where Park La Brea is. And here was this park with the tar pits, and it wasn't too long before that

* This explanation is incorrect. The land was donated by Cpt. Allan Hancock.--G.G.

that a little girl fell in--and they lost her. So he got the Gilmore people to give this land that was wasted land, because people were falling in. You know, it was very dangerous. And I don't think they knew about the pits. Yes, they did know about the pits. They knew about the pits then, but they hadn't done anything about it really. So it was a question of giving the land to the city, or to the county, and then getting the county to come up for monies. And they raised monies. And I think Norton conceived the idea and got people like Ed Carter and the likes to come up with the money.

GOODWIN: How grand a museum were people dreaming of building?

WEISMAN: I think a very grand museum. I think-- The people I knew-- We were all looking to something that was going to be spectacular. And I think we all looked to a [Ludwig] Mies van der Rohe or a Philip Johnson or some of their likes. And when Ahmanson came up with Millard Sheets, that was the first of Norton's falling outs with the museum. And then when it went to [William L.] Periera, that could have been the second: that his million two [\$1,200,000] contribution diminish itself to the plaza, the Mr. and Mrs. Norton Simon Sculpture Plaza. And Ahmanson wanted an Ahmanson building, and Norton said, nobody gets buildings in their names. There can be

galleries in the Los Angeles County Museum, but there should not be buildings in the County Museum.

GOODWIN: It reminds me of the story you told about your father in building the school at Vista Del Mar.

WEISMAN: Right. It's the same principle, and Norton felt that way: it belonged to the county. If all the people were contributing toward it, no one person should have their name on a building. But nobody listened to what he was saying. I think there's merit to what he said, although the merit dissipates itself immediately if the Ahmansons would have withdrawn their money, because maybe it wouldn't have been built then. And if Anna Arnold hadn't come up with the money for the--what is it?

GOODWIN: Bing--

WEISMAN: [Leo S.] Bing Center. And Lytton wouldn't ever have done it without his name on a plaque. Why, it never would have happened. So maybe Norton's concept was right, but it doesn't work in the pragmatic sense.

GOODWIN: Do you think he was planning eventually to give his collection to the County Museum?

WEISMAN: Oh, I think he thought about it. I wouldn't go so far as to say he was planning it, because I think at that point it was too early. You know, he was fifty years old. This was twenty years ago, you know, when it was conceived. At twenty years ago--or fifteen, eighteen years

ago--you know, when you are fifty-two against seventy, or fifty-five against seventy, that's a spread in your thinking. And at fifty-five you aren't thinking of willing your art. We're thinking of that now. And I won't tell how old I am, but I'm over fifty-five. I'm fifty-five and a minute.

[laughter] (Fred's fifty-six. That's it; give or take ten, that's what he says.) But we're starting to think about these things now. So certainly you have an ultimate goal or thought, as we did. But, you know, when you're beginning a collection, and as it starts to grow, you think of it in terms of giving it to a museum. And then later you begin to think of not wanting to give it to anybody; you'd really like to take it with you. [laughter] And you know you can't do that. And it becomes a grave problem as to what to do, because as it grows no museum can really handle it. So I think all those things were in Norton's head. And I think he used the fact that he had a great, huge collection as a tool to getting certain things done in the museum. I guess that isn't altogether all right, but on the other hand I don't think it's all that bad. Who better should design these things than people who have the potentials of putting the art in?

GOODWIN: Do you think he wanted to be, say, president of the board?

WEISMAN: Never.

GOODWIN: Why not?

WEISMAN: I don't think that's his style. He doesn't like particularly being president of anything, or head of anything. He did, maybe, in his youth with his company, early on with the various family companies: that he enjoyed.

But no, he's not a goer on boards. He's not that kind of a person. He has his ego trips, but it doesn't have member of the board of trustees as one.

GOODWIN: He's now director of the Simon Museum.

WEISMAN: Well, but that's a whole other thing.

GOODWIN: OK.

WEISMAN: That's another whole ball game. But I don't think he ever, you know-- I'm sure he could have served on-- He served on boards of companies, and in terms of acquisitions, and so forth and so on. But those were business matters when he was dealing in stocks and so forth and so on. That was a whole other thing. But he's never been on the board of a museum. He's never been a member of the International Council, or Friend of the Whitney, or those things. He's never done that sort of thing. That's not where he's at. And I'm sure he's been sought by not one, but many.

GOODWIN: So you don't think he was slighted by not having been made president.

WEISMAN: Ah, no way, no. He has his ego trips, but I don't think that would be one of them. I really don't. I think there are other things. Look, I think he felt other things that were very important. He was the first Jew on that board. There was never another Jewish person on the board of trustees before Norton, except for Ed Carter.

GOODWIN: What about Brody?

WEISMAN: [Sidney] Brody wasn't on the board, I don't think.

GOODWIN: Well, that raises an interesting point. How do you explain such a deep interest among Jews in, say, the contemporary art field, or the museum in general?

WEISMAN: Well, I've been asked that question before. I remember Elise Haas [Mrs. Walter Haas, Sr.] in San Francisco saying to me, "Why do you think it always seems to be the Jews that are the heads and involved people in the museums, the opera, the music centers, or the symphonies in San Francisco, Los Angeles, wherever you go? Why are they so involved?" We talked about it, and I think we came up with the idea, and I think it's very true, that the Jews were so downtrodden for so many years and always looked upon as second-class citizens, as it were. And they had to have something to feed on; and they fed on the culture to possibly give them some kind of inner faith in society around them. I don't know whether I'm expressing it well, but-- They didn't have any prestige in the Christian society around them.

They could gain no prestige. In business they became money hagglers or changers or dealers. And so their only way was the house. The Jewish household always rendered a very high acclaim to education in the Jewish family life. I believe from early on, just by nature of the Talmud, that the Jewish family was indoctrinated into education. Along with that feeling of education came culture; and it was their claim to fame. They had nothing else. Acquiring great wealth gave them no fame. It only gave them, instead, exactly the opposite. So this was their means of finding a place in the world, and I think their education stimulated it. And it is true that for many years they were not accepted on any of those boards of museums, music, symphonies, cultural affairs in any of the major cities in the country.

But there were always one or two that were exceptions. There were the Hellman family in San Francisco, and there were a few people-- I don't know who they would be in Los Angeles that came in early. But there were those one or two, and one or two in New York, and Bobby what's his name-- Lehman--in New York, and maybe the Hellman family in San Francisco. And in Los Angeles the counterpart may be the Newmark family, whoever. But there were always one or two that kind of made it. And they were probably the token Jews, because they were more easily assimilated.

GOODWIN: Well, how do you explain the Jews' interest in modern art, which is not traditional?

WEISMAN: I don't think that's so traditional. I think that's where it's at because of the fact that the other ran out. I think their original interest in modern art from the standpoint of acquiring--whether it be Jew or Gentile, I don't think it mattered--was who could afford what: couldn't afford the impressionists anymore, couldn't afford the masters. You know, when you're buying de Kooning for [\$]35,000, you were buying Degas for--what?--[\$]50-.

GOODWIN: I think there's a deeper explanation.

WEISMAN: You think they're more creative?

GOODWIN: Yes, they're more responsive.

WEISMAN: Well, I think that's part of the culture, yes. But what I'm alluding to is that it wasn't just the Jews in twentieth-century art. I think it was all people. It was a better buy. People saw what was happening with the impressionists and the other. They thought van Gogh-- All of a sudden the story went out, you know this. At the outset of the major collecting in twentieth-century art, which was in the fifties, right? Wasn't that the major start of collecting modern art?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: There were a few scattered instances in the forties.

GOODWIN: Right, right, right.

WEISMAN: But by and large it started in the fifties. When de Kooning was bought heavy, Newman, Still, those people weren't selling before that. All right. And I'm talking about contemporary. I think up to that point, they were kind of priced out of the market, and people were hearing-- These stories were starting. They thought van Gogh was crazy, too. All those crazy artists up in the attic, and here we have them right before us. And they're doing their thing. Now's the time to buy right. And they were thinking of investment. I think a lot of people thought of investment, not with a dream of what it would be, [laughter] no concept of what it would be. But I think that did enter into it. I remember people coming to me early on saying, "You think this will be worth more later? You think this is going to be this year's van Gogh?" This was used all the time as an example.

GOODWIN: Well, that takes into account the collecting aspect of modern art, but then you also have to consider the large number of Jews who are artists, dealers, curators, art historians.

WEISMAN: You think there are more Jewish artists than non-Jewish artists?

GOODWIN: No, no. But there's a lot in proportion of significant Jewish artists.

WEISMAN: I think there were a lot of Jewish artists in the impressionists. I just don't think we were as aware of how many of them were.

GOODWIN: Well, not compared to the New York School.

WEISMAN: Well, there weren't that many artists then either that you know about. [laughter] I mean, there weren't eighteen hundred artists gathered, or twenty-five hundred artists gathered in one city either, were there?

GOODWIN: Well, Paris would be an exception.

WEISMAN: Yes, but I don't even know-- There might have been the exception, yes, but do you think in 1850 there were as many artists gathered in Paris as there were in New York in 1950?

GOODWIN: Yes. Fortunately, we've been able to forget most of those early artists, and only the giants stand out.

WEISMAN: Well, I just didn't think they had that large an artist community. They had a large artist community, but I didn't think it numbered that many. You think there were equal amounts in 1850 in Paris as there were in 1950 in New York?

GOODWIN: Oh, sure. I think there were as many artists in Amsterdam in the seventeenth century or in New York in the twentieth.

WEISMAN: Well, you would know that better than I. I really don't know.

GOODWIN: Well, it really is a kind of an academic question.

WEISMAN: But, I don't know why-- I remember discussing with Clyfford Still at one time another aspect of why the artists of the forties and the fifties, the abstract expressionists, were all (now, we may even have touched on this somewhere else) very virile, tough guys--

GOODWIN: Yes, you talked about that.

WEISMAN: --where the artists of the sixties and the seventies all of a sudden they were homosexuals, a great many of them. And for what reason, who knows? You know, but those things happen. Maybe it's just that they came out of the closet. You know, in the past-- So you can't tell why it happened. I don't know. I think that the non-Jewish collectors in Los Angeles today are hard to find; they're hard to come by. There's the [Julian] Ganzes, there's the Phillips, and there's Becky and Pete Smith (who was Becky Inch), and there's certainly the-- [Hoyt] Leisures are not. She is, but he isn't; she's half. They're not Jewish. Who else is there? Who is there?

GOODWIN: Ducommuns?

WEISMAN: The [Charles] Ducommuns. Yes, they collect, certainly. Mia Frost doesn't collect. I don't know of anybody offhand.

GOODWIN: Well, to me that's an amazing--

WEISMAN: --phenomenon?

GOODWIN: --situation. Well, I'm not saying it's necessarily all positive, but it's certainly noteworthy.

WEISMAN: Yes, I don't know why.

GOODWIN: Well, one explanation--

WEISMAN: Do you think maybe all the things we're collecting are lousy?

GOODWIN: [laughter] No, I don't think that's in the realm of consideration. It's interesting--

WEISMAN: Is Bob Motherwell Jewish? [He is not.]

GOODWIN: Not as far as I know. I've never studied it.

WEISMAN: I've never thought about it. I know [Helen] Frankenthaler is. What made me think is I was looking around this room-- Because Max Ernst is Jewish. But other than that nobody else [is] that's in this room. I'm looking at Max Ernst in the hall, and I don't think Brancusi was and Still isn't. Johns and Rauschenberg certainly aren't, and I don't know whether Lichtenstein is or not. I'm really not sure. I doubt it. So, I just don't know.

GOODWIN: Well, I think it's interesting that the Jews are collecting modern art, contemporary art, as opposed to, say, African art, which has become--

WEISMAN: That isn't true.

GOODWIN: Well, not in the same proportion, not as actively.

WEISMAN: Oh, the Gershes collect African art very heavily. (Katherine White isn't Jewish. I'm just trying to think.)

I find African art collecting as a mix. Who do you know that's into African art so intensely?

GOODWIN: Well, certain friends but not people with reputations.

WEISMAN: Well, who has major collections of African art outside of Katherine White, who also collects contemporary art, who is not Jewish?

GOODWIN: Well, for instance, the Metropolitan Museum was planning to organize a show of African art collected by Los Angeles collectors, that there's such a concentration here.

WEISMAN: The Met was going to do this?

GOODWIN: Right. That there's no institution here that cared enough to organize the same material.

WEISMAN: I don't think there's that much here. The County [Museum] is full of Kat White's stuff.

GOODWIN: Yes. But--

WEISMAN: Oh, do you know who might have it is Franklin-- Harry Franklin. He's a dealer.

GOODWIN: Oh, sure. Well, for instance--

WEISMAN: He's Jewish. He has African and ethnic arts.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: I don't know that it's altogether fair to put this into ethnic groups and collecting. I don't know whether that's altogether so.

GOODWIN: I'm not trying to argue one point against another. I'm just pointing out the tendency.

WEISMAN: I know. I know. I'm not sure that it has to do with that. It may have to do with affluence. It may have to do with who we see, or who's the most visible.

GOODWIN: Well, I think one point which you explained is certainly valid. That there's the intellectual interest.

WEISMAN: Yes.

GOODWIN: The other point--I think--is economic, which you didn't emphasize.

WEISMAN: But if it's there.

GOODWIN: Right. But somebody explained it to me and said that the Jews are willing to spend their money, because they know that more can be made, whereas the older Gentile families are afraid of losing their wealth.

WEISMAN: Well, I think that's true of a lot of older Jewish families, too. I know older Jewish families by the tons. The second-generation Jewish families--the Loews and the Nordlingers, the Newmarks, et cetera, the Hellmans--they don't part with it so fast. You know, the second and third generations, they didn't make it. So they're scared that if they lose it, they know they can't make it again, like their parents made it.

There are a few exceptions: maybe Walter Haas's son, Walter, Jr., or Peter Haas. They might feel they can make

it again, while they're still controlling Levi Strauss. But they have run out in the middle of a few little dingies of their own, so that might have some problems. But my God, they were into every aspect of the cultural life in San Francisco. He with the opera and the symphony, and she with the visual arts, and their kids into the dance and theater and everything. I mean they were just totally involved in the arts in San Francisco. And some of it happens by pure happenstance. As the Galka Scheyer Collection was here, so was the Gertrude Stein Collection in San Francisco. And Tevis Jacobs, and that other lawyer that he was working for at that time--that's great--Lurie, an old-time lawyer in New York-- And he died in the middle of all those transactions that Gertrude Stein [brought] from Paris (and Sarah Stein and Leo) and moved down the [San Francisco] Peninsula, and Tevis Jacobs handled all his stuff. Now Tevis happened to have been-- His sister married an uncle of mine, so I knew this. He was trading legal fees for paintings from the Steins. Now, he wasn't a genius in collecting. He just figured-- He checked around and found out that it was worth a thousand dollars of legal fees. Well, subsequently he was known as a great collector. He never selected anything in his life that was really worthwhile, but he did accept good fees. So those things did happen. There

are many more Gentile collectors in San Francisco of twentieth-century art than there are in Los Angeles. There are more Gentile collectors of twentieth-century art in New York than there are in Los Angeles. Just naming the Rockefellers and Liza Parkinson and Babe Paley (or Babe and Bill Paley). I don't know which. Did she die? Yes, she did. I think there was much more going there at Storm King. Have you been up there?

GOODWIN: We talked about it.

WEISMAN: Yes, whoever it was [Ralph E. Ogden] that owned that was certainly not a Jewish man, and he collected all those David Smiths. So there's a lot more going there than there was here ever at the outset. There were a few major ones like the lady at the New School [for Social Research]. You know who I mean, [Vera List] who published posters--terrific person, anyway.

TAPE NUMBER: IV, SIDE TWO

AUGUST 16, 1978

WEISMAN: We drifted away from Southern California museums.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: So we faded out. It wasn't a total fade-out.

Maurice did the New York School show. He came and pled with us to loan things and to help him, and we did.

Fred must have talked to Barney Newman ten times, because he was always a man of a few thousand words. And to put him in a group show with Clyfford Still and Mark Rothko was a little much that he conceded, and he did.

[Fred] talked to Clyfford fifteen times, if once, and made him agree. [He said,] "How could you allow Mark and Barney to be in that show and not be represented? You can have as many or more, and more beautiful.

You must put it in, or otherwise you'll be conspicuous by your absence; and worse than that maybe nobody will even miss you, and that would be worse." [laughter]

Fred convinced Still, Rothko, and Newman to all be in that. He didn't have as much influence on Rothko. He spoke to him, but not in any great intensity, and it was more casual, when we were in New York prior to that show. And he wasn't as hard to convince. But Newman and Still were very difficult to convince, and Fred helped. We loaned eight major paintings to that exhibit.

And it was at that time that we came to realize that pop art, any art, that's any good will hang well with any art that is good. Whether it be Rembrandt or Warhol, because we took-- At that time we had a guesthouse outside the pool house and guest room. We had all pop art, and we used to call it our pop house. And in the pop house we had a [Tom] Wesselmann nude, one of the Great American Nudes. And then we had Flowers of Warhol, an eight foot square; we had Oldenburg, the Showcase that's in Fred's dressing room; and we have Segal. Anyway, we had many of the twentieth-century pop artists. And when we loaned out our eight big ones, which was Newman and Stills and Rothkos, and I don't know--Gorky, whoever else was in the show. We had empty walls, so we put our pop art in, and we found the ones that held up, and the ones that didn't. And there were some that didn't, and we got rid of them. And others-- Oh, Lichtenstein, others-- they hung in there just neat as could be with the ones that were here. And we came to understand that a good work of art is a good work of art no matter where you hang it.

GOODWIN: Do you like to lend?

WEISMAN: You get kind of mixed feelings about that. It's a very proud feeling when you go into the exhibition and see your things there, particularly if you think they

stand up to, or are better than, most everything around. And it's nice. It's very good. That's the ego part: it's very good to get the documentation of your work in a catalog, and the reviewing of it, which is important for the artist and the art. But it is treacherous in terms of what can happen in terms of safety for the work. And we have had some of the most devastating experiences.

At one time we had many meetings with Ben Johnson here about what can be done to ensure better care of paintings in museums, and what we can do. He started a seminar one time, I believe, in trying to teach museum directors the importance of handling their preparators and dealing with their preparators and teaching them how to handle paintings and artworks of all kinds. And if they could ever get that together, it would mean insurance rates would go down, so that it wouldn't cost so much to insure an exhibition, and consequently one could have better exhibitions, because people would be more tempted to loan to them. But as it stands now it's gotten so out of hand, the only way they get insured now is that-- They use another word now--they're underwritten by the government or Exxon or Armand Hammer or ARCO. And in effect, what are we saying? They're taking their chances: that if one out of twenty-five works or fifty-- Or like with

the Egyptian exhibition, the United States government underwrote it; their chances are pretty goddamn good, because they were only dealing with fifty-five works. And the hype on it was such everybody knew what was involved, and anybody that touched it felt they were privileged and put on white gloves with adhesive on it so that they couldn't drop them. So it was all well cared for. I'm sure there wasn't a bit of damage to anything in that Egyptian show, or nothing damaged that wasn't able to be taken care of for a reasonable stake. Now maybe I'm speaking too soon, and I'll knock on wood in case. But I think that's really where it's at. Anyhow, so they take a chance. What if they lose one thing? It's still cheaper in the long run if they lose a work of art that's worth a hundred thousand dollars or worth a million dollars. It's cheaper than buying the insurance premiums to travel these kinds of exhibitions all over the world! By the time they do that-- Maybe it's not cheaper, but it's not that much difference, and they get all the PR out of it in the meantime, and the promotion.

GOODWIN: Do you and your husband feel personally responsible for supporting, say, the County Museum?

WEISMAN: Oh, yes, I do. We both do.

GOODWIN: Why?

WEISMAN: Well, it's the only crap game in town, for one

thing. And every city must have its cultural centers, and we have never really supported the Music Center. We get season tickets from time to time, and we do nominal contributions; and I mean nominal, very nominal, because we've given so much to the museum. But it is the role we're interested in. And whether Maurice Tuchman is going to be there forever isn't really relevant. I shouldn't say whether he's there forever; that is relevant. [laughter] What isn't relevant is whether Maurice Tuchman is there today, because he'll be gone tomorrow. And if tomorrow is now, six weeks, six months, or six years isn't relevant. Because the museum will stand far longer than we; and all it's horrors of architecture--the inner parts of it--will be there. It will change, it will be altered, hopefully for the best. It's going to have its changes as it changes its staff. And the staff ever changes.

Now, we all know that Ken [Donahue] is leaving, because his time is up. And so who comes in is going to want to leave their mark, as it should be. And hopefully, it will be dealt with with a higher sense of excellence than that of Ken's. And I don't say that demeaningly to Ken. I think that every museum when they get a new set of staff--directors and curators--it should be with an eye to what are they going to do to improve on the last one. So you can't demean a whole system for one's own personal grievances.

GOODWIN: Why does it matter whether Los Angeles County has a distinguished art museum?

WEISMAN: Oh, come on. You're baiting me with that. That's a loaded question. Why does it matter that there be culture in any community? It's got to start from somewhere, and the earlier, the sooner, the better.

GOODWIN: But is the impact that the museum makes very wide, or is it only--

WEISMAN: Not yet.

GOODWIN: Oh, any museum, except the very greatest.

WEISMAN: Well, they should all be aiming to be the greatest. And it takes time, and I think twelve years is very young for a museum. And before that it was all part of a whole thing. It really wasn't meaningful at all, but I do think that it's-- Here is a city with a population of what, almost three million people? How could there not be a center of this kind? There should be five, based upon--

GOODWIN: Well, there are five--

WEISMAN: Well, I mean--

GOODWIN: --if you add them all up.

WEISMAN: I'm talking within a radius of Manhattan, as an example. And this is certainly not within the radius of Manhattan, if you're talking from Santa Monica to Pasadena. You can't call that five museums. I think of two museums

in the city of Los Angeles. Barnsdall [Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery] and the County-- Well, three, LAICA [Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art]. There's three in the city of Los Angeles. Now, Norton Simon's is in Pasadena, Getty is in Santa Monica, Northridge is in the San Fernando Valley, Cal State is in Long Beach, or in Fullerton, or wherever. And there is the University of California, but it isn't a museum, it's a gallery. They have as yet not had-- And that's true of LAICA and Barnsdall: they don't have permanent collections. So there's only one primary collection museum in Los Angeles, isn't there?

GOODWIN: Yes, except my feeling is the County Museum is the least important of them all.

WEISMAN: I couldn't agree with you more, but that has nothing to do with it, because whatever it is, you can't say, "Well, as long as it's no good, cut it off." You have to have a commitment to making it better, because if I don't make it better, then I'm leaving it to my children to make it better, and they may not care as much as I do. So it's got to start somewhere. I'm only sad that my mother and father didn't feel the same way about it, because it would have been an easier task for me. And if somebody had done it before them, it would have been easier, too, wouldn't it? So it starts from somewhere.

And now the green light's on. I think it is the responsibility of people who care to see to it that it's available to ensure that other people do care, that our children have something to learn from; and if they're not learning from it now, that they will in time. And if these museums on the periphery, like the Getty and the Norton Simon and the Northridge or the Long Beach or the wherevers, that those peripheral museums will give enough taste and examples of excellence that it will inspire them to give more and do more for that which is in closest proximity to their everyday life. That was a marvelous speech, Marcia! [laughter]

GOODWIN: Well, I used to think that way. But I've changed my mind.

WEISMAN: Why? You shouldn't change your mind.

GOODWIN: I don't--

WEISMAN: You're the ones we're counting on.

GOODWIN: Well, actually I wish somebody was counting on me, but I don't think that's true anymore.

WEISMAN: I disagree. I think we are counting on you. Listen. I think it's horrendous what happens there now. Shall I go into a spiel about what I really think of that museum as it's operated?

GOODWIN: Sure, get in on the record.

WEISMAN: Get it on the record? I think it's a disgrace the way Maurice Tuchman has handled the twentieth-century

department, and that's the one I know the most about.

Since I've seen you last I met Mr. [Pratapaditya] Pal.

Do you know him?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Did I tell you about this at last week's? No, I don't think so. I met him this week, or was it last-- No, it was last Sunday night. I was at a dinner party. And Mr. Pal was there; and amazingly in all my years of association with the museum, we had never met before. And we were at a dinner party--I without my husband, he with his wife--and we met. The dinner party was given by a cousin of my husband's who's a doctor. And Sydney Weisman, my husband's cousin, is Dr. Pal's physician. So that was why they were there. And of the whole people, all the people there (after he and me) involved in the arts were four people who had taken my class. So now you know where it was aesthetically, the group. But we spent the better part of the evening speaking. And we agreed that he was the only curator in that whole museum--and I don't think it was an ego trip on his part, it was right--that has handled himself as a curator should handle himself: to meet and seek the collectors of Iranian and Islamic art-- is that right?-- Indian and Islamic art, to go out and meet them, and greet them, and cajole them to bring their art into the museum, and he has done just that. He has

gathered together probably the most meaningful collection of Indian and Islamic art in the country today. It is the only meaningful collection in that museum. And when he said to me--and I know this is for the record, so that it won't be released too soon--when he said to me, "Can you imagine that they set back the show of Harry and Yvonne Lenart's 'Divine Guidance'"--or whatever it's called ["The Divine Presence" (1978)]--"to open a show of a collection that is being promised in"-- I don't know whether it's in its entirety, but it's certainly in its majority for the museum--"that they set the time back for two weeks?" He said, "Do you know that man could have died in that two weeks? He's been so ill. And I said to them, 'You mustn't do that. We must protect him and that collection, and he needs that support. And we won't get it if we don't give him that support.'" That is the responsibility of a curator. It isn't hard. It isn't cruel. It's his business. His business is to see that that collector is finding no other place to put his art. Because he is handling it so. He's cajoling him. He's doing all the right things. He is demanding of the museum to move space around, to make his collection the best and stand out in the most eminent way possible. And there isn't another curator in the museum that's done that. George Kuwayama has tried; he's very tenacious; he's

not strong enough to deal with the powers that be.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: Now, where else is there anybody in that museum?

GOODWIN: Well, it's true that Pal is the distinguished curator and scholar on the staff.

WEISMAN: Well, then what are they doing with staff members that are not distinguished scholars? There is no excuse for it. There is no excuse for Gifford Phillips never to have been put on the board of trustees of that museum. There is no excuse that Bob Rowan--when the Pasadena Museum closed--that Bob Rowan wasn't immediately asked, "Will you come and serve on the board of the Los Angeles County Museum?" Because if they had done that, those two things alone, they would never have had Bob Rowan on the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art board. They would never have had Gifford Phillips moving back and forth between Los Angeles and New York, and now being requested to join the board at the San Francisco Museum the minute his tenure is over at the board of the Museum of Modern Art. And furthermore, he would never ever have considered placing his collection elsewhere. William Janss would never have had his wife on the board at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. And Fred Weisman's wife would never have been on the board at the Museum of Modern Art in San Francisco. Those things never would have happened.

GOODWIN: Well, who's to blame?

WEISMAN: It's just rotten, lousy leadership.

GOODWIN: Is it the staff or the board?

WEISMAN: It's a combination of the two. It's a question of such a powerful board that everybody wanted to be chief: too many chiefs, not enough Indians. That's what it amounted to. And so they had to get a weak director to handle all those chiefs. And if they had handled themselves in a museumlike fashion, they would have had a scholar of the twentieth century, and that's really the only area I can speak for. Erica Feinblatt, I guess--is she the one there? Or is she at New York?--the print lady.

GOODWIN: No, she's here. Ebria.

WEISMAN: What is it?

GOODWIN: Ebria Feinblatt.

WEISMAN: Ebria Feinblatt. But she's obviously a scholar and a very, very concerned, concerned lady. And I think she's done a very fine job in the prints with no space. No space! What good is it to have a collection if you can't hang it? Now, certainly it's good to have it--don't misunderstand--but, you know, the whole thing has been handled with total irreverence to the arts.

GOODWIN: I agree with you.

WEISMAN: Total irreverence! They would never have had a big hole in the middle of that building. If you're

concerned with the arts, you don't make empty space. You don't make a whole vacuum that won't handle art. They could have increased the collection by a hundred percent--the hanging of the collection by a hundred percent--if they had filled in that atrium. I believe it's a hundred percent, maybe it's sixty percent. I went over it with Frank Gehry, and we talked about filling it in.

Listen, we gave works of art to the Oriental collections: screens--did I not tell you about this on the tape--

GOODWIN: Yes, right.

WEISMAN: --and how Fred went about doing it with George Kuwayama? After it was all done he said, "Now I'll put up the money to make the space better, and we'll change it around and move it." And as you've heard, that's how we've heard. My husband and I have had six meetings that I know of where I have been present--to say nothing of the ones where I wasn't present, because he's on the board; I'm not--in rearranging the third floor of the Ahmanson to hang twentieth-century art properly. Nobody hears you. So it's a disaster!

GOODWIN: I don't think it's getting better.

WEISMAN: It's not going to get better until Ken Donahue is gone, and until Maurice is gone.

GOODWIN: I don't think that's a reflection of the problem.

WEISMAN: Well, I think when they once find out that they

will not be able to hire a director of that museum without some better understanding from the board of trustees, I think it might begin to change the picture a little. And I think they have a president now that isn't all that hungry for power. I think that Camilla ["Mia"] Frost is a very wise lady, and she's showing indications of wanting to make it right. Already she's set up an exhibitions committee. And she's drawn into the exhibitions committee sculptor Robert Graham, and a collector--I forget who-- that is not on the board of trustees, and it's headed up by Michael Blankfort. When have they ever had a contemporary man as the chairman of the exhibitions committee?

GOODWIN: Well, tell me this. Why is she president?

WEISMAN: Maybe she was next in line. Maybe she has got sufficient prestige. I was very concerned about it. I wasn't excited about the idea of the Chandler family running the city, and they are running the city now. There is no question about that. But somehow or other, I think she has a husband that stands on his own two feet.

GOODWIN: I think it's the same old political--

WEISMAN: --nonsense?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: I have seen her twice since she's president. We were not at the opening party, because I was ill, which was too bad, and it was Dick's [Sherwood's] going away

party, as it were. But subsequently she has said to me that she's very anxious to come and look at our collection again, that she's never really digested it, and she'd like to see it and expose herself more. Well, I don't care if it's words, anymore than I care why Pal does what he does. Ken Donahue was director of that museum for four years, five years, and he had never been inside our home. He had been invited on several occasions. And then it came to pass I stopped inviting him.

GOODWIN: He's been here once?

WEISMAN: No. And then what happened one day, someone was here in this city, and he was present at a gathering for this someone who asked if they could come to the house. I said, "Well, we'd be delighted." And he said, "I'm with Ken and Daisy." [laughter] And I turned to Ken, and I said, "Well, that would be up to you. I don't know whether you care to come." He said, "Well, if you would have me." I said, "I've asked you before, I believe." And he came. And he stood and looked around [the house] in sheer amazement! He said, "I had no idea." I said, "All you had to do was ask." Now that is inexcusable for a museum director!

GOODWIN: For sure.

WEISMAN: And Maurice gets here maybe every six, eight months a year. But Maurice in the last year doesn't want

to come unless, I'm sure, he were assured that Fred wasn't here. Because as far as he's concerned, I'm sure, if he had his druthers he'd never speak to either of us again. Because all these feelings that I'm expressing here have been expressed before--piecemeal here and there--and I'm certain that a lot of it has come back to him. But in spite of all that, the building is there. There's a minimal amount, but there is an amount of good art in that museum, and it must be held. And it must be held in trust for the people to come, and it must be redirected, and it takes people to do it, and you can't ever get anything done by sitting back and saying it's terrible. And I for one am a doer. I'd rather do it.

GOODWIN: But I think the only people who have any input in the County Museum are trustees or comparably important people.

WEISMAN: Well, hopefully they'll start to get better trustees. You know, you got to try for that.

GOODWIN: See, I look at it more as a problem of a system, where the individuals don't really matter. The individuals continue to replace themselves, and the system tends to stay the same. And I think in order to improve the museum, there has to be certain structural changes or financial changes that will--

WEISMAN: There's one thing I think you're missing. As

people replace themselves--as you put it--as Ed Carter replaces himself with Phil Hawley--is that his name?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Phil Hawley is a younger man than Ed Carter. Phil Hawley ain't about to start collecting Flemish art or even impressionists. It's too late for that kind of acquisition anymore in any kind. And where is Phil Hawley? He says to me, "I understand you have modern art. I'd like to see it. This is where we're more interested." Why? They have no choices. The people coming on the board that are replacing these people have no choices. So they're going to have to move forward in spite of themselves.

GOODWIN: Well, that's the situation: that the people who usually become trustees either are not knowledgeable about art, or they don't particularly care how the museum functions as a social institution--how it relates to the people of the county. The trustees tend to be a certain kind of establishment personality.

WEISMAN: I think it usually divides itself into art oriented or civic oriented. And most of them are civic oriented. Now why are they civic oriented? That's their ego trip. That's their establishment, and I agree with that. But without that kind of establishment the art-oriented people are not the ones that get the money into the museum.

Now, you should face that. You know Dick Sherwood didn't bring--

GOODWIN: I want to talk about him.

WEISMAN: --didn't bring money into the museum.

GOODWIN: What did he bring?

WEISMAN: What did he bring?

GOODWIN: What did he do for the museum?

WEISMAN: He gave it a sense of camaraderie. He gave a better sense of feeling between the trustees. And I think he opened up-- I don't think all the chatter that goes on now could have gone on without Dick having been there. I think Dick opened the doors to conversation. I think Dick did open the path--

GOODWIN: No, I'm not aware of that.

WEISMAN: --for conversation.

GOODWIN: But I would agree with you that he represented-- before he became president--a certain hope, that he was a younger--

WEISMAN: --and art oriented.

GOODWIN: --art oriented. Politically, perhaps more liberal--

WEISMAN: I think he helped a lot in that direction, a lot. Look, he came from the bottom. Where are you going? Franklin [Murphy] has turned around--

GOODWIN: I don't think he had any impact on the museum.

I think he was a caretaker for Armand Hammer, for Ed Carter--

WEISMAN: I don't think he was used by Armand Hammer like you think he was.

GOODWIN: Well, I'm not particularly concerned with that. If I were asked what were Richard Sherwood's accomplishments as president, I would have to think a long time to come up with anything.

WEISMAN: I think he allowed us to open our mouths. I don't know that Franklin did.

GOODWIN: Well, maybe that's certainly true; I'm just not aware of that. But when I look at the museum--

WEISMAN: In the meantime Franklin is thinking differently now, too. Franklin is very aware of Maurice's weaknesses and failings, and admits to it. Franklin now talks about the importance of developing the twentieth-century collection. Franklin's talking a helluva lot--

GOODWIN: Where was he so long?

WEISMAN: Well, he wasn't into that. He was into old art.

GOODWIN: He was relatively ignorant.

WEISMAN: He was ignorant. Do you know what made him unignorant? When they had the UCLA sculpture garden. When it became the Franklin [D.] Murphy Sculpture Garden. When David Bright died and gave that sculpture to UCLA, and they named it the Franklin Murphy Sculpture Garden, and as the [UCLA Art] Council began to go to him, and he

demanded the right to approve everything going in there, and from that moment he became an authority on twentieth-century art. And if you talk to him now--He had wanted the Reuben Nakian [La Chambre a coucher l'empereur] that we had out in front; he kept begging for that. We said we'd do that. And then we decided to give the Fletcher Benton [Dynamic Rhythms Orange (Phase III)]. Have you seen that?

GOODWIN: Yes, I've seen them both.

WEISMAN: All right. So, when we gave the Fletcher Benton, we said we wanted to give that and gave it in memory of Linda Simon, our niece who died. We had commissioned the piece. He said, "Well, I think that will be very-- You could tell he was very unknowing and all. But do you know-- Now it was his selection. He selected the Fletcher Benton. Do I care? Does Fred care? No, that isn't the point. It's his garden. He put the plate. He designated the plates for it. He wanted the whole number. It's his! And so what does it do? It turns him on to twentieth-century art. You don't like the Fletcher Benton.

GOODWIN: Oh, no, I do. I do.

WEISMAN: I think it's a super piece.

GOODWIN: No, I don't like Franklin Murphy.

WEISMAN: Oh, you shouldn't be-- Franklin's a-- But he's a very powerful man.

GOODWIN: That's what he's about! He's not about art, he's about politics.

WEISMAN: But, baby, he gets the money for the museum. And so does Ed Carter. And without them there'd be nothing at all! There would be pits there. And I'll never forget when--what's her name? Oh, she's so darling. I can't think of her first name. Anyway, but when the Zadoks were out here for the opening of the museum-- Don't you know them from New York? Brilliant collectors of Bonnard and Giacometti; you could die from their Bonnards. And they're older; he must be ninety by now. And when they were here and she took one look at the museum, and she put her hand on my shoulder and said, "Don't worry, honey. When it sinks into the pits, you could always then fill it in and build the right kind of a museum." [laughter] And Philip Johnson says to me, "So every museum has its Kricke. What are you worrying about?" And I said, "But not out in front." And he said, "Well, soon enough it will be out in back." How true he was. It went to the back.

But I think one must take a longer-range look at it, that's all. And I hate what it's doing, I don't like it. I love telling them what Henry Hopkins is doing in San Francisco, and I love reminding them he was a mere little preparator at the museum; they didn't even want to pay

his salary. I love to remind them of this over and over again, because maybe somewhere along the line it wakes them up. And I think it will. And Fred's there now, and Fred's going to do things, and he is--

GOODWIN: Yes, you explained that he's had an impact.

WEISMAN: He's given hundreds and hundreds and thousands of dollars to them already in art and offered them more when they come through. And they know he has put his money where his mouth is. So he must. He's going to get Eli Broad on the board. (I don't know if that should go on tape, but somehow, someday.) Here's a man of influence, power, money, art, president [of the board] of Pitzer College, and at one time of all the affiliated colleges of it. He's a brilliant man and a successful man. He belongs on that board. Instead they took somebody-- Oh, my God, from Orange County, I don't know who it was. It was just not real. Fred at first was despondent. And then I said, "Now, you're not going to be despondent over that. They're going to need another vacancy filled soon, and you're going to get him. Because if you don't, I'm going to get him in San Francisco." We have openings in San Francisco that have to be filled. And they want to fill them from far and wide. So far, they have Glen Janss, they have Marcia Weisman, they have Bob Rowan, and that's for starters--from out of state, out of the city.

GOODWIN: I could complain about the County Museum forever, but there's one thing that at the moment particularly infuriates me. It sickens me. And that's the admissions charge. Now why is--

WEISMAN: Don't blame that on the museum.

GOODWIN: Why not?

WEISMAN: Well, I know, "everything is excuses, excuses." I just heard this out at Pomona today, at Pacific State Hospital. Don't tell me about the charges that they're telling us how much money it's going to cost to put a new facility in here or to refurbish a certain facility so we can get accreditation on it. Don't tell me about that. They keep telling me Proposition 13. Baloney. They're using that as an excuse for everything. And it's true, but it gave them the excuse. And they've shuffled the money around and juggled it around. I think it's unnecessary, but I can't say that. I don't know what their profit-loss statements are. I don't know how deeply they run in debt. I don't know what pressures the board of trustees have put on them. I know the kind of things that go on that I'm not at liberty to discuss, and I could cringe. But there are times when one's business judgment--when you have businessmen on the board of trustees--takes over in lieu of the aesthetic judgment. Now I just read--where? today in the paper?--that it hasn't affected

the museum attendance, but barely at all.

GOODWIN: I think that's dubious. I think it's too early to tell. And also the County Museum always projects a positive image which is often not accurate.

WEISMAN: Well, I'd rather do that than project a negative one, in many ways.

GOODWIN: Yes, well I was told by certain museum officials that the attendance is down 20 percent.

WEISMAN: Well, that might well be. Maybe they haven't got anything worthwhile to see at the moment.

GOODWIN: Well, to me it seems like a relatively small amount of money--

WEISMAN: What is it, a dollar and a half?

GOODWIN: No, no, that the trustees could raise in order to cover that expense.

WEISMAN: Well, it isn't, because I think they have other things they have to do first.

GOODWIN: What could be more basic?

WEISMAN: Well--

GOODWIN: See, this is what bothers me about the County Museum. There's a lot of rhetoric. The trustees tend to say how much they want to do for the people of Los Angeles County, and I wish they'd do that; that's fine. But that \$1.50 admissions fee, as far as I can tell, is going to act as a barrier to allowing many people to visit.

WEISMAN: Do you know Norton's had a dollar and a half admission fee from the beginning? And it's owned by the Norton Simon, Incorporated, Foundation of Art, a very affluent business that is dealing on a one-to-one basis with buying and selling and running and all things. They don't go to anybody. Do you think they need the dollar and a half? Do you think it's deterred their attendance? Don't you think that sticks in the craw of the county, that the taxpayers are paying--getting everyone in free while Norton is getting a buck and a half. Norton's getting a buck and a half, and they're letting everybody in free. Why? They need the money.

GOODWIN: But there's a reason.

WEISMAN: They need the money. Norton Simon doesn't need the money out there in the same way.

GOODWIN: Right, except the County Museum is a publicly supported museum. So, to some extent the taxpayers are already paying admission. In fact, with this new admissions policy they're paying three times, or more, for each visit. They're paying taxes, they're paying admission, and then if there're any grants from, say, the National Endowment, they're paying for that, too. So they are contributing toward the upkeep.

WEISMAN: Norton Simon gets grants from the NEA, too.

GOODWIN: Figure that out! That's outrageous.

WEISMAN: But I think that if it's going to be, at least the money they're putting in is taking care of a part of the deficit that Proposition 13 is anticipating to leave off. Listen, I'll tell you something more outrageous. You want to be really outraged?

GOODWIN: Sure, I can take it.

WEISMAN: There is the possibility that the Pru-- [Prudential] building thing is still going to go through. And you know something?

GOODWIN: That hurts.

WEISMAN: You know something? There is something in what little business judgment I have that tells me it's absolutely right.

GOODWIN: Right?

WEISMAN: Absolutely. When that land is gone, it is gone: G-O-N-E forever. I don't think they should do one thing to it. I think they should buy it and leave it as it is. Whether the tax structure of a museum owned by the county, whether they're allowed to continue to operate it as such as it is now, I don't know that. But my judgment would say they should buy it and sit on it, because it will only take two years at the outside for them to know what a hell of a buy they got, and how they protected themselves. And the county has protected itself for a cultural center in the heart of Los Angeles in very little time. To let that property go away would be a sin.

I would like to personally buy the property across the street, the empty parking lot to give the county or to sell to the county at a later date. Because I think that's where LAICA should be, is right across the street. I think that then you have the Craft and Folk Art Museum, you have LAICA, you'd have the Page Museum, you have the L.A. County Museum, and you have a museum center for the city of Los Angeles, just as there is a Music Center downtown. Now when you think in those terms, it's not so stupid to buy the Pru- property at all. However, how can we buy property for a museum when they're charging a dollar and a half from the poor devils that want to expose themselves and their children to a little culture?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: But it's almost an essential in terms of thinking ahead. What I would like the best to see is the Ahmanson Foundation and ARCO, who are the principal buyers for this, to be able to go in and buy it in trust and hold it in trust. I never thought of that before. That would be neat: if they could get three people to buy it and hold it in trust--or to hold it as a combine--collecting the revenue to go into the fund with the ARCO, and call it the Corporate Cultural Fund for the City of Los Angeles. And then upon the death of these corporations--or the need of this museum--they in turn will give this at the

appraised rate, and they get all the tax benefits, and then they give it to the museum at the proper time. But I think it would be a sadness to have that property go down the tubes.

GOODWIN: Well, tell me this--

WEISMAN: I want LAICA to take the first floor of that building from whoever owns it if they run into that kind of proposition.

GOODWIN: Let's assume that the county eventually gains possession of the Prudential Building, and it's turned over for use for the County Museum.

WEISMAN: Eventually?

GOODWIN: Yes, let's just make that assumption for a moment. What is going to be put in it in terms of art?

WEISMAN: Oh, very good, very good question. They're not going to fill in the atrium, because they say it costs so much to do, almost as much as the original museum now-- today's prices--which isn't really a fact of life, mathematically: that if it costs [\$]10 million to fill in that atrium, and the museum costs [\$]12-, you can't compare today's [\$]10- to eleven years' ago [\$]12-. They're two different numbers.

GOODWIN: It still seems like a lot of money.

WEISMAN: Oh, yes. I don't know if those are the exact numbers, but you can't compare the numbers because that

[\$]12- on today's market is a different number. All right. And I'm really talking off the top of my head. But to take that same [\$]10- to fill in the atrium, and leave that museum as it is right now and take that whole first floor-- not the Ohrbach's side but the other side--and make that into a museum of modern art, and to make the other side maybe into exhibition galleries, and then have the side that is now the Hammer Building into a library, or all conservation upstairs, and more offices or library downstairs, or whatever they want to do downstairs--I don't know, something: permanent collection of the seventies, or the eighties, whatever--

GOODWIN: OK, let's--

WEISMAN: --and now they take and move over to the other building, offices they could use over at the other building, they can have a whole gallery--there was something that I really had in mind. There was the modern on one side--

GOODWIN: OK, let's assume it's used for modern art.

WEISMAN: You can have the Indian, Islamic art on the other side.

GOODWIN: Let's assume that a large proportion of the Prudential's building space would be used as a showcase for modern art.

WEISMAN: And the other half, say, for Islamic and Indian, just for--

GOODWIN: Whose modern art is going to go in there?

WEISMAN: Well, that's the key to the whole thing: then if you have a building and a place and a specific plan, then you draw a great curator of modern art and you start to build then a great collection of modern art, and then you gather your collectors into the fold. Now, I think this could be done in the best possible way by having a subsidiary board. And you'll have a twentieth-century board of trustees as well as a general board of trustees. Maybe they don't call them the board of trustees. Maybe it would be something else, not just a council. Maybe it would be the executive board of the Contemporary [Art] Council. But whatever it is, it could be something that was run, not autonomously, but somewhat independently. And all the museum office space should be in the Pru- building in the middle.

GOODWIN: In other words, let's resurrect the Pasadena Museum and put it in the Prudential Building?

WEISMAN: No, I don't think it's to resurrect the Pasadena Museum.

GOODWIN: Well, build an institution--

WEISMAN: I think it's to increase the scope of the L.A. County Museum. And instead of having it all under one roof, because a museum today, I've heard from many sources, does not function-- [tape recorder turned off]

But you see, I think that there isn't room-- You know, I've discussed this with other people, too. Norton and I have talked about this somewhat. When he bought the property next to the Pasadena, those automobile dealers' properties, and one day I said, "Do you want to hear my dream of foolishness?" And he said, "What's your dream of foolishness?" I said, "Well, it's not a dream of foolishness. It's a dream that is really a dream, that I'm sure will never come true. But wouldn't it be great if there was the Pasadena Museum in all its splendor, the Norton Simon Museum in all its splendor of the art you've put in it, and below it in the-- You can look down on it even [laughter]--where there now exists automobile dealers, you could use the same four walls and build marvelous space, and have a twentieth-century museum in conjunction to it. And it would be the Frederick and Marcia Weisman Museum of Modern Art."

GOODWIN: I think that makes a lot of sense!

WEISMAN: And he said, "You really are a dreamer."

[laughter] I said, "Of course." And so we laughed a little about it, not hard. But in any event he said, "Don't you know that you cannot mix the two in one setup and have it come out successful? The Metropolitan Museum is having nothing but problems with their twentieth-century aspects. The County certainly has never functioned

with its twentieth century mixed with everything else.

It just doesn't work. The Minneapolis Art Institute was wise enough to split away with the Walker." And he says, "It doesn't work. That's why it's a dream."

GOODWIN: But I think your idea is valid in the sense--

WEISMAN: But I think the idea-- Wouldn't that be marvelous?

I would even--my husband wouldn't, but I would--be willing to call it the Simon Museum of Art, the whole thing, not for Norton Simon, not for Marcia Simon Weisman, but for our father and mother; you know, call it the Simon Family Museum of Art: his children, my family, his family. But obviously, I can't do that because it was my husband and his money that did a lot of this too: like all of our end. And so I can't spend his money so cavalierlike.

GOODWIN: Well, it seems to me that--

WEISMAN: But it doesn't really work well. And I've heard this from other sources, too. They don't function well under the same roof. They don't function in the same management.

GOODWIN: Yes, but I think that the only way to develop a strong museum is to do so privately, to get the county out of the museum business.

WEISMAN: Well, why is the Norton Simon Museum so good?

GOODWIN: Because Norton Simon--

WEISMAN: Is it?

GOODWIN: --did it.

WEISMAN: It's his.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: What you're saying really is the only effective form of government is fascistic.

GOODWIN: No, no.

WEISMAN: Yes, yes.

GOODWIN: No. It's--

WEISMAN: Particularly in a museum. It's the only effective way, the Albright-Knox [Gallery]--

GOODWIN: I'm not saying that the Norton Simon is the ideal museum.

WEISMAN: No, maybe not.

GOODWIN: I'm saying it functions very effectively in certain ways.

WEISMAN: So does the Albright-Knox, because Seymour Knox--

GOODWIN: Right, it has a great permanent collection. That is its achievement.

WEISMAN: Because the leaders know what they want and how they're going to go about doing it; and they can do it or not do it depending on their own whim and fancy.

GOODWIN: Right, and they don't have boards and committees.

WEISMAN: And they don't have taxpayers to deal with. They have none of those problems.

GOODWIN: And they don't have a lot of liberal rhetoric

about serving the little people.

WEISMAN: And the Guggenheim Museum was doing the same thing very well--wasn't it?--while Solomon Guggenheim was alive and functioning with it. I don't know who does that now. Well, while Nelson and David [Rockefeller] were the happy kids at the Modern, so it was, too. They've been nothing but trouble ever since.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: There are all these kinds of reasons, but there weren't those problems when Nelson was head of it--

GOODWIN: Right, but--

WEISMAN: --and David was the head of it.

GOODWIN: But the basic problem now is for the County Museum--or whatever museum--to build a collection. That's the first step.

WEISMAN: Well, then we should leave them alone and go have a private modern museum.

GOODWIN: Right. The County Museum, as far as I'm concerned, is never going to get its act together.

TAPE NUMBER: V, SIDE ONE

AUGUST 16, 1978

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, how did you get involved with the Pasadena Museum?

WEISMAN: Oh, I think at about the time of the break, prior to Fred's leaving the Contemporary Art Council, the Pasadena Museum had asked him to go on the board of trustees. And he had said no, no, he was otherwise involved with the County [Museum], and he felt that would be a conflict, and so he was not-- He had also, prior to that, been on the UCLA Art Council, and he had backed away from that also when he was involved with the Contemporary Art Council. So, when this break came about, it was maybe three, four months following that that they came to ask him again to go on the board, which he did.

GOODWIN: This is about '67?

WEISMAN: I would say he went on the board at the Pasadena Museum-- You know, I can't attach a time to it. I don't know why. When was the County Museum opened?

GOODWIN: Spring of '65.

WEISMAN: I would guess this must have been '66. It had to have been in '66. It was in '66. It was early '66, very early '66, because my husband had a very dreadful accident in June of '66, and I remember the letter that he received from Eudorah Moore. And Eudi Moore was at that

time the head of the design-- What was that?

GOODWIN: California Design.

WEISMAN: California Design. And it was truly a beautiful letter. I know that they became friendly as a result of Fred going on the board at the Pasadena Museum. And the whole thing was a very special thing. Well, in any event, so that must have been in early '66. So, Fred went on the board. And at about the same time, I was invited to go on to a council-- It wasn't a council; it was a group of people who, more or less, were really representatives from the various support groups, of which they didn't have that many. There was the Art Alliance, and there was the San Marino group--arts and flowers or something [San Marino League]; but the San Marino ladies we used to call them, and that's not what it was called. So, there was the San Marino group, there was the Art Alliance. There may have been another group, but I don't recall offhand. And they asked me--

GOODWIN: Docents?

WEISMAN: Maybe they did have docents. So, there were about a half a dozen--maybe eight, ten people--on this board, on this council or a group, whatever you might call them. And we used to meet upstairs in the museum and discuss what we could do to take care of attendance, and taking the money at the museum (I guess we did pay

admission in those days to the Pasadena Museum), and if we could have a dinner in the museum, as the Art Alliance used to do. It was really folksy. You know, they'd do these potluck dinners. Everybody would bring something. And then they'd have a whole big function and charge ten bucks a head and make \$3,700. And by the time they paid for the paper napkins, it was [\$]3,690. And then there was the men's group, and they acted as bartenders. Did you used to go out to those openings that they would have?

GOODWIN: No, but it all sounds familiar.

WEISMAN: Well, anyway that's what they used to--

GOODWIN: The Santa Barbara Museum still has--

WEISMAN: --functions in a similar way. And you know, up until recently, and maybe even now-- Several members of the board of trustees of the Santa Barbara Museum were former members of the board of trustees at Pasadena. In any event, it was all very folksy and very nice. One of the first things we did at Pasadena: we loaned them works of art in that front gallery in front of the oak-paneled room--you know, the oak panel, which was the director's boardroom. There was a room in front of that towards the street, towards Los Robles Street, and we put in recent acquisitions from the Weisman collection. You know, I never thought of that until this very minute? And in it

was our Kienholz Birthday; and we had the Great American Nude of Wesselmann's; we had these same pop pieces I related to before; and there was something else as figurative. Oh, I guess it must have been the Oldenburg. It seemed to me that there was something equally as figurative as the Lichtenstein. What could it have been? Oh, maybe the George Segal [Woman on Green Chair].

GOODWIN: Segal?

WEISMAN: Segal, yes, that was like that. That we had in this setting in the Pasadena Museum. Then from there--we did that. And Fred was participating a great deal. And in those days Bob Rowan-- At the end of every year, Carolyn and Bob would pick up the tab for whatever deficit there was in the running of the museum.

GOODWIN: About how much would that be?

WEISMAN: Oh, anywheres from [\$]30- to [\$]50,000.

And Carolyn has a great, great deal of wealth, you know. Her family owned the whole San Joaquin Valley, I believe, as well as Beverly Hills. Her name was Peck before she was married, as of Peck Drive in Beverly Hills. And the existing fire station had been their home, on North Beverly Drive. That was all their property where she was raised as a child. So in any event, Carolyn picked up the tab for a lot of this. So at that time, Ben Heller was going to sell his collection for a million and one [\$1,100,000].

And we had a meeting here at the house. And there was Melinda and Tom Terbell, and Sarah and Jerry Gregory, and there was Bob and Carolyn, and ourselves, and Geisen. What's his first name?

GOODWIN: Rowe.

WEISMAN: Rowe Geisen. And we all sat here. And this was before his wife had passed away. Is he remarried?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Oh, that's nice. Anyway, I guess Martha and Jack Padve must have been there, too. So we had this meeting to see what we were going to do about the Heller collection. So we sat around the room. I remember being overwhelmed by this whole enterprise. Sarah Gregory said, "Well-- " And Gerry said, "Well, we'll give a hundred thousand." And Sarah said, "Well, that's maybe what you'll all do. And I'll decide what I'm going to do." So he said, "Well, you can do whatever you want." And she said, "Well, you can put me down for at least a hundred." So Tom and Melinda said, "Well, you know, we may give a hundred ourselves--both of us." And with this Bob Rowan says, "Well, we'll give a hundred." And Carolyn said, "Well, I'll give a hundred." And Bob says, "But honey, that's the hundred I gave!" [laughter] And this is the way it went around the room, and it got to \$500,000. And no one thought to say to Ben--it came to about a half a million dollars, maybe [\$]600,000--

say to Ben, as I look back, "Now look, we'll give you [\$]500,000 now, and we'll pay off the rest." Because here were just five couples sitting in this room. Anyway, it was passed. Too bad, huh? But if it hadn't been, I don't know where it would have been today. Because I don't think it would have changed the status of the Pasadena Museum one iota. So that would have been downstairs too, maybe. But there would have been more impetus to get it up--possibly, I don't know.

Ben was out here; we had dinner at the Rowans one night. We tried to get people involved. Ben tried to get people involved to bring it about. Within thirty days, Ben decided he wasn't going to do that anymore. And he decided to become a dealer shortly after that. He decided not to sell it. At that point, in the meantime, I guess-- Was it that early on that Australia bought [Jackson Pollock's] Blue Poles?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: It wasn't. It was sometime after that. I don't know. Well, I guess he decided to do nothing at that time. Well, anyway, we went on working. Fred did his work at the museum, and I did my little things with the ladies, which kind of was boring for me. But nevertheless, we then sat down with-- Oh, then they put Bill Janss on the board. We got them to put on the board Lita Hazen. She

was Walter Annenberg's sister. Her daughter had died. She needed an outlet, and we felt, "Let her have this as an outlet for her, and maybe in turn she'll put funds into the museum," which didn't work out quite the way we planned. The last line is, we decided-- Bill Janss was on the board, and Bill and Anne and Fred and I sat down and decided-- Bill was on the International Council board in New York at that time, and we decided that they should have a comparable situation at Pasadena. Instead of having a contemporary art council, we were in a much better position to raise \$500 a couple, because it would only go for one purpose, modern art, because the museum was only modern art. And it would be just used for acquisitions, nothing else. (I think Walter [Hopps] was there then.)

And that's the way it was going to be. We decided we'd plan trips. And what we wanted to do was at that time, we tried to think of what we could do to set it off. We decided that Bill should be their leader. And then Fred and I loaned our six Clyfford Stills to the museum in the front galleries with the idea of a kickoff for the Fellows of Pasadena. And I guess we must have had a half a dozen people who were sitting in this room, and it took place, and [we had] the discussion. And we decided that it should kick off with the Stills. Fred and I gave a dinner at the Stuft Shirt following. And we were going

to have all the Stills up, have the opening, and Clyfford was coming in for the opening. And his daughter was sick in San Francisco, where he was coming from. And so he didn't get there for the opening, but got there the next day, because he was very nervous anyway about those things. And what we had hoped was we were going to ensure the acquisition of a body of work of Clyfford Still, another body of work of Barney Newman, another body of work of Mark Rothko; that's where that whole idea started. And so that wasn't coming off very well. But the Fellows started in, and I was their travel agent. And the first trip I put together was one to St. Louis. Why St. Louis, I might never know.

GOODWIN: Morton May's collection?

WEISMAN: Yes, there was more than him and Ernie Trova, and maybe the [Gateway] Arch had opened just recently. I don't know. And then I did a trip the following year to Chicago. Maybe Chicago was the first one, and then St. Louis. And then we went to Baltimore, Maryland--Baltimore-Washington area. And then the next trip went to Fort Worth, Dallas. And the morning we were to leave, we took a raise of hands, "How many wanted to go to Houston, to the Rothko Art Center?" They raised their hands yes, and that fast we switched the whole itinerary. And I found two collections in Houston, or three. [laughter] And we went to the [John]

de Menils, and we went to another man (whose name escapes me) who had an apartment with lovely art in it. And then we went to the Schlumbergers. We did all of that and the Rothko Chapel, and we left there at noon, because we had a couple of things to do that morning in Dallas, or wherever we were. We went on to Houston, and that night at six o'clock, out we went to L.A. On each trip that we took, there were a minimum of twenty-five people on-- There were twenty to twenty-five people on the trip, and a minimum of four on each trip came back sick, because I was so worried they wouldn't get their money's worth [laughter] that we were scheduled on the hour every hour. But I must say we saw collections second to none. And it was fantastic. We never made any money on the trips, but we did collect a lot of money for acquisitions from the Fellows.

Then came the opening of the new museum, and the building of the new museum. We were opposed to a new museum. They have the land, which made it right, because it was city fathers' land. And really it was being done-- Bob Rowan had a great sentimental feeling, because the land had been his father's, or something or other at one time. And the whole thing was such that we wanted to take the parking lot next door to the existing museum and build a square building that would house offices, storage, and

the necessities, and gut the inside of the existing building, and take the second floor where the offices were and all the drive, and make it all into exhibition space in the existing space. We would have ended up with an atrium just like L.A. County. [laughter] But it had a sense of charm (that building), and we could have always gone up on the other building as well. So we didn't even think in terms of a sculpture area, nothing like that. We just wanted it to work, and we could have done it for [\$]2 million instead of [\$]10-. Anyway, that was scuttled. Then they got into the building, and they decided to do the opening with the Alan Solomon show, and the New York painters of the sixties. I think I mentioned this all before, and how Perce Ullman wanted to do the Galka Scheyer Collection.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: But I'm not sure we put that on tape.

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: We did?

GOODWIN: I think so.

WEISMAN: It might have been "A.T.": After the Tape.

GOODWIN: Maybe.

WEISMAN: But in any event, so that was overruled. Then Alan Solomon died. And then who took over the show when Alan died? Walter?

GOODWIN: No. Maybe he was gone by then.

WEISMAN: Was he gone by then?

GOODWIN: Could it be [John] Coplans?

WEISMAN: Was it Coplans that took that over? When Walter [Hopps] was leaving Pasadena, he--

GOODWIN: Why was he leaving?

WEISMAN: Because he never got the catalogs done.

GOODWIN: So he got fired.

WEISMAN: He never got anything done. He just had a great eye, and he put together the most beautiful [Joseph] Cornell show I've ever seen in my life. He put together the most beautiful Johns show I ever saw. Was it Johns, or was it a group show? It was Johns.

GOODWIN: Could have been. I'd have to look it up.

WEISMAN: He had a fantastic Lichtenstein show. He put together, maybe, the best exhibitions around. He did that Marcel Duchamp show, fabulous. And Duchamp was here at that time, and he came over. I remember at that time we had a Reuben Nakian of a head of Marcel Duchamp. And we never felt that it really looked like him [laughter], but we thought it was a nice sculpture. Then he was sitting in the living room, and the Duchamp sculpture was over where the Moore Family is now. And as he sat and spoke and we talked and conversed, all of a sudden there he was. He looked just like the sculpture. He

brought it to life. It was very nice. Anyway, he did some marvelous things.

Well, when the thing came to pass, there were-- I remember vaguely when he left there was a lot of undercurrent and letters written and accusations made and lots of nasties. He didn't know what to do. He had to get out, and he didn't know what to do about it. He was having problems with Shirley Blum (at that time Shirley Hopps), and Shirley needed the money, and we took their Cornell in and loaned them money, I remember at the time. And when Walter went to leave he didn't know what to do, and Fred said, "Come on over," and he came in and stayed here for a week while they were looking for him.

And then Jim Demetrion took over, and Jim Demetrion we liked very much. We first knew Jim when he was in his master's course, at classes at UCLA. He came here to do cataloging for us, and we'd have him come in three afternoons a week to catalog our collection, which wasn't all that huge at that time. But Jim did start the cataloging, and so we were very good friends of his. And he was upset; everybody was upset.

GOODWIN: Why did he leave?

WEISMAN: Jim?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: I don't know. Who came in after Jim?

GOODWIN: Terbell. He was acting director.

WEISMAN: And then [William] Agee. I don't know. I think that Jim was never the kind of person that those people wanted, really.

GOODWIN: What is that person?

WEISMAN: I don't know. I guess Walter, with all his eccentricities and all, had a certain demeanor about him that was OK. Coplans, of course, was a-- I can't stand that man. He's a slob. [laughter] He's uneducated, and I mean literally. He doesn't speak the language very well, to say the least. And I think he put upon people and used them. I think his accounting for the museum and its mishaps and its failings and its gains and losses was disgraceful.

GOODWIN: In the article he wrote in Artforum [February 1975]?

WEISMAN: I thought it was a disgraceful thing. And he had no right to do what he did as director of that museum. He didn't do much to make it better. And I didn't think it was appropriate at all, what he did. And then he put together that exhibition of the serial imagery, which was a fair show, but a great catalog. So he really documented John Coplans and his thinking, which was fine. And it cost the museum a bloody fortune. And the show was a good show. Do you recall that show?

GOODWIN: No, but I have the catalog.

WEISMAN: What I meant was that you have the catalog, as does the world. And he made his name on that catalog. And the show was OK. And he got one Albers, red Albers, for the Pasadena museum--two, matter of fact--two of the red Albers that were in that show [Homage to the Square, Red Series II and III]. He got Albers to donate to the museum, and there were some very good exhibitions in that museum. There was a lot of good work done there. And it just seems-- I'm not thinking-- Oh, then they had the show from the Modern of the--not kinetics painting--

GOODWIN: "The Responsive Eye."

WEISMAN: "The Responsive Eye." That was a good show.

GOODWIN: The Sidney Janis collection?

WEISMAN: They showed that at another time. They also had other collections that were very wonderful. Bob continually filled in with their collection whenever it was necessary. And they built a not bad collection, considering the amount of years they were collecting. Tom Leavitt was the original director of modern art. And he had done a beautiful Tobey show. Then after Tom Leavitt came whom?

GOODWIN: Hopps.

WEISMAN: Hopps? Then Hopps was very ill. He was in the psychiatric department at Sinai Hospital. My husband was in the brain surgery [department], and they were writing notes to each other. And I was torn between floors. I

felt so badly for Walter. And I really felt that that whole museum scene did him in, really did him in. But in any event, he still has the best eye in the business in twentieth-century art, as far as I'm concerned. I think that he and Dick Bellamy have the two best eyes there are--four best eyes.

GOODWIN: Yes. You mentioned that.

WEISMAN: Yes, and they're really very good. And we've always felt very close to Walter. And he had marvelous art; he had great art in his gallery.

GOODWIN: Would it have been possible to let Hopps do his thing and hire somebody else to--

WEISMAN: An administrator on top? But people didn't think like that then. Supposedly there was an administrator there. I forget his name. There was an administrator that came in the middle of Walter's reign. I forget who it was. And he couldn't get anywhere with him. And if you think the L.A. County Museum had a civic board and a nonart board, you just think about that Pasadena board. Gifford wasn't on it then, I don't think. Maybe he came on--

GOODWIN: He was on at one time, went off, and later came back.

WEISMAN: No, and he wasn't on at that time, but it was people like Perce Ullman Fred collected. I was on as

a representative of the Fellows; I was on it. I was never actually a trustee of the museum. I represented the group on the board. Who else was interested in art there that was on the board? I don't know if the Gregorys, or one of them, were on the board or not. Martha Padve who never collected--which reminds me she still has two pictures of mine. But people that were really civic-minded-- Oh, Gene Burtons, the Burtons, and the other ones that lived up on the side of the golf course. Oh, my God! I know him so well; their faces are right in front of me. She has a daughter that's an artist in New York.

GOODWIN: Phelps?

WEISMAN: Phelps, thank you--Mason and Peggy Phelps-- Betty Jean and George Richter, Gordon Hampton--he had three paintings then--he was a collector [laughter]--but has more now. I'm trying to think who else was on that board. Oh, and Harold Jurgensen was president of the board on a couple of occasions. And then the other one that was president of the board was--at that time the museum folded and then went onto Norton's board--

GOODWIN: Esberg.

WEISMAN: Yes. Is it Esberg?

GOODWIN: Well--

WEISMAN: Alfie, yes, Alfie Esberg. And then when Norton

took over, Alfie, Giff, and Bob were on his board. And the three of them resigned recently in protest for the modern art, I guess is what it was about. Isn't that what it said in the--

GOODWIN: Yes, that's what we were told.

WEISMAN: I think that's true. Gifford was discussing some--

GOODWIN: Why did the museum crumble?

WEISMAN: Oh, it was very simple: dollars. They talked only of the cost of building the building. They never talked in terms of endowment; they would do that one day. They never even had enough money to finish the lighting; and that had to be altered later. They just weren't practical.

GOODWIN: But they were all businessmen.

WEISMAN: Who?

GOODWIN: Well, many of them.

WEISMAN: Harold Jurgensen, Alfie Esberg are businessmen. Who else?

GOODWIN: Rowan? He's in business, isn't he?

WEISMAN: Not really. He handles investments and real estate, of his family.

GOODWIN: Yes, OK.

WEISMAN: I wouldn't say that he was really into business in that sense.

GOODWIN: Well.

WEISMAN: There really weren't too many.

GOODWIN: They were businessmen, as opposed to artists and--

WEISMAN: They were civic people [as] opposed to artists and collectors. They were civic-oriented. Don Factor was on the board when Fred went on. He was into the arts and [had] some money, but not a lot. He was too young to have much money then. He was working for Max Factor, his father.

GOODWIN: Was there an antagonism between Pasadena and the West Side?

WEISMAN: I don't think so. I think they knew that's where the money was coming from, and that's why they tolerated it. I think they were basically a very close-knit, little Pasadena-San Marino group; and they knew that if they were going to expand and have money in this thing, they were going to have to expand themselves to the West Side. They saw what the Contemporary Art Council was doing. They saw what the monies that were coming into the County, and that they weren't going to get that kind of money. So they had to go to the private sector. And then I think the killer was the Warhol show, when the one painting sold at Parke Bernet for \$65,000. They were in the middle of having the Warhol show when that

happened, and everybody called in and raised the ante on their insurance. And they were lucky they had the money to pay the premiums for what they had for the period of time. They had to double up the ante at the last minute, and it didn't apply [to] the museums, where it had been. I guess this was the last stop of the Warhol show.

And they always did things with great flourish, you know. Andy was brought out; Carolyn would take care of that. Carolyn had dinners, and they always did fancy dinners at the museum. Carolyn always put it together, or Peggy or Martha or BJ or Betty Burton. The same people obviously put it together. There were others in there that were equally as involved, and I can't recall who they were.

I think the people that went on that board on the West Side went on it with hope, and it folded because there wasn't enough money. It wasn't handled in a very judicious way, and they just couldn't take the gap. Bob and Carolyn couldn't pick up the tab any more at the end of the year. It got too expensive. They needed twice as many cards, they needed twice as much of everything, and it was really too bad. They had marvelous plans. The art center for the children's classes [was] beautiful. But what a dreamer's idea! You know, they had ballet

classes downstairs, too. All that was lovely. And then they had their \$1,000-a-couple party to save the museum. And the only one that got their money back was Paul Kantor. [laughter]

But the other thing I was thinking about that I had forgotten is in the middle here in June of--this must have been in April of 1966, March or April of '66--a man that Fred had met businesswise, by the name of John?-- No. He owned the Fidelity Bank in Beverly Hills [Stanley Stalford]. Anyway, [he] had this building that's on Wilshire and Camden. I don't know what it is now. And upstairs National General had the top floor, and Eugene Klein had a beautiful big office. And the whole upstairs was vacated, because Gene Klein built a building over in Carthay Center for National General Theaters, and so forth. So we had an idea, and we went to the museum. We went to this man, whose name I don't recall, and asked him if he would loan us that floor. The whole floor was vacated. It was empty; it had been empty for several months. And [we told him] that we'd like to put art shows in there. And so what we did, the last line was, we had the doors taken off of the offices; where it was needed, we painted them white; we used all the offices and the halls; and Gene's office we laid fake grass, and we made it a sculpture garden. We had Bob Rowan, and Walter [Hopps] helped us

with it. We had Bob, we had Don Factor, we had ourselves, we had Joann and Giff. Walter was in on it. Irving [Blum] was in on it. And we all sent art up there. We took care of our own insurance, we installed it ourselves, and it was fabulous. We had one room that was all pop, one room was little pop, and another room was bigger pop, and we had sculpture in Gene's office. And we were going to rent some tables, and Milton Williams was going to serve tea--high tea--there around one o'clock with little finger sandwiches and tea. And we were going to have students from UCLA, who were going to come over and take docent tours around the area for the art. We were going to change the things around from time to time. And we were inviting collectors in the community: "Instead of storing your art, show your art." We got the whole thing going. We got all the offices painted--we used half for starters. We got half of it hung, we got a couple of pieces of sculpture in, and we were evaluating it. I remember going over there and visiting it, and so forth. And about that time my son was getting married, and he came out here with the whole wedding party and stuff. Then Fred had this run-in with Frank Sinatra and was hit over the head. You didn't know this? We don't have to document this, you know. Although the world knows, and every newspaper in the world carried it.

GOODWIN: We're not going to interview Frank Sinatra.

[laughter]

WEISMAN: No, we aren't. If you do, burn this.

GOODWIN: So tell me what happened.

WEISMAN: So what happened: Fred was at the Beverly Hills Hotel with Richard's prospective father-in-law at the Polo Lounge. And Sinatra was making some very nasty remarks about the Jews and about the blacks; he had just been admitted into Hillcrest [Country Club]. It was very annoying to Fred, and he does get his dander up relatively easily. But nevertheless, when he [Sinatra] was talking to Sammy Davis [Jr.] on the phones he says, "Well, you black Jew, you're not going to march in any march in Mississippi. You're going to ride in your big Jew Cadillac, you know it," and something like that. And Fred went over to him and said, "You know, you're talking too loud and too much." And with this Sinatra grabbed him by the collar with one hand and took his glasses off with the other. And Fred came around with a swing and caught him in the eye, and he couldn't even see. Fred can't see without his glasses. And with this, Jilly-- Sinatra's henchman, with the sap in his sleeve--hit Fred over the head, threw him on the table, knocked the table over, and an ashtray, and the phone and said, "That guy's drunk," paid off all the bartenders a hundred bucks,

and the waiters--paid them off with \$100 bills--and said, "Come on, let's get out of here." Sinatra's party was Richard Conte, Dean Martin, Jilly, and two black call girls. (We subsequently found this out). And they walked out and left him. And the security officer was paid off, everybody. Nobody knew what happened to him.

This was at ten o'clock following Richard's stag, which was at Chasen's. And Fred had had one beer at the stag, and the two men sat there and had three brandies apiece. And nobody knew what happened to him. Finally, they called the emergency hospital. They picked him up, and they called me at quarter of three in the morning and said, "Your husband is over here, and he's drunk. He's been rolled." They brought him home. Nobody knew what was the matter with him. I had them call our doctor immediately to go over there. The next day they still didn't know what was the matter. We didn't realize whether he was comatose or what, because he was thrashing around so, and subsequently proved psychologically that he was still thrashing around trying to make with the last blow when he was knocked out. He was taken to the hospital. He was in the hospital for two days undergoing examinations and tests. Finally by then it began to discolor, and they found that the skull was fractured. They had to go in, and they did brain surgery. He had a clot on the

brain. He had retrograde amnesia for-- Well, the amnesia was acute for maybe four months, and he was two and a half years recovering.

And another person that was interested in the art thing that we did up in the Fidelity Building was Jules Langsner. He was very keenly interested in what we were doing. Jules would come over every other night and take Fred for a walk, and they'd talk about art. And we were so involved that during this time we went back to the wedding in Boston. Fred was taken back with three doctors and a nurse, and he was there for the wedding. He remembered not one part of it. (Remind me and I'll show you something afterwards in this room.) While he was in the hospital-- prior to going--when he came out of the surgery that day, I went up and I took him the little Pollock drawing [4-1949] in our bedroom, and I hung it in his room. And he came out of it, and he says, "Hi, where have you been? I haven't seen you in so long!" And I said, "I know. I'm glad you're well," and so forth, and we chatted a little while. I walked out in the hall, and I come back in: "Hi, how are you? I haven't seen you in a long time!" And he couldn't remember from two minutes back. But he could remember from way back. And all of a sudden on my second trip in the room he said, "Hi. Say, have you seen that picture on the wall? I must tell you about that.

That was done by Jackson Pollock in 1948. And he'd bleed the paint onto the paper, but he knew how to use the fixatives and the paint in such a way that he could make the bleeding stop or start wherever he wanted. He had complete control of the use of the palette. And most people thought it was just thrown on, but that's not the way it was done. And he was born in Montana, or Colorado, and he worked in Los Angeles," and went on and on. And he told the whole story of Pollock's life: how he painted, why he painted, and what he was doing in his painting.

The next day I brought him the Gorky drawing [The Liver Is the Cock's Comb]. Everyday he gave his doctor, all the doctors, lectures on art. And I'm sure that this is really where the whole thing started with the hospital--the art in the hospital. The joy that gave him to look at those artworks, and he was turned off to everything else. But that he was into and he adored it. And so for two and a half years we went through that little number.

But at that time, as I say, Jules would come over and take him for walks. And they'd talk about it and so forth. Then all of a sudden they called from the Fidelity Bank and said, look, they can't leave the space like this ad infinitum. We hadn't manned it. We were taking people up privately, as were others involved.

The last line was they had an opportunity to rent it, and we had the art all taken out and returned, and it was over and out. At that time Fred felt the need to sell things, because he was confused, and he was afraid that we were going to lose everything, because he couldn't think straight. He said, "There's something wrong with my brain." And the way he would say it, we would giggle. Because I think we didn't have enough know-how to know not to. He'd say, "There's something the matter with my brain, when I can't remember certain things. So I think there's some of the art that we have we ought to sell." Now, some of the art that he wanted to sell was based on the fact that it was new, and he didn't remember as much about it, like the Lichtenstein, the Wesselmann, and those things. So we sold them to Nick Wilder. And it was there that we ran into our first art dealer difficulty, which we'll go into at another time probably. But in any event, that was after he'd been on the board at Pasadena, and the Pasadena situation went on after that for several years. But in the meantime he began to get his faculties back.

GOODWIN: So he wasn't able to help in Pasadena?

WEISMAN: No, he couldn't be much help at Pasadena after that for a couple of years; but then he got back involved again.

GOODWIN: Why didn't the Rowans turn the museum around?

Why couldn't they save it?

WEISMAN: Because I don't think anybody had enough money to save it then. How could one person turn it around?

How could one person turn it around, and they'd have to pick up the tab for the whole thing?

GOODWIN: Well, you know, cut the expenditure down.

WEISMAN: They did. They were down to two guards. They had a guard downstairs and a guard upstairs, and all the other doors were bolted. They even went against fire laws. You know they covered all the windows with draperies. They weren't happy with the Thornton Ladd-- Was it Thornton Ladd?

GOODWIN: No. Ladd and Kelsey.

WEISMAN: But Thornton Ladd was the architect?

GOODWIN: Yes, right, right.

WEISMAN: And they weren't happy with him. I thought the space was very good. I didn't think the windows and doors were all so necessary, but I think it was done quite well, as a matter of fact. I think that they had a good shot at it. I loved the way the Campbell's Soup cans hung around those round corners so that it became a straight line. And I think that happened in the big galleries, too. I think that the round corners weren't bad. I liked them. Most people think--

GOODWIN: Do you think the Rowans can be faulted for not giving?

WEISMAN: No, I don't think they can be faulted for not giving. They gave one hell of a lot: they gave a lot of art; they gave a lot of money. They really masterminded it. And Carolyn worked her tail off, and so did Bob. They really did. And the only fault you could have called them for would be if they had changed the name to the Rowan Museum. No, seriously.

GOODWIN: Was that a possibility?

WEISMAN: Well, that's the whole thing. It wasn't a possibility. I never counted, but I would assume they felt they couldn't afford to do that. And that's what in effect they had: the Rowan Museum. So that the people couldn't pick it up and handle it; and as a result, where were they going to go, and what were they going to do? They just really didn't have any choices. I think they tried everything they knew how to do. They wanted to get absorbed by the County and make a modern extension of the County. I think they tried all the potentials available.

I know Paul Kantor and others thought that there were other people who would have bought it besides Norton for more money and so on. Maybe that's so, but it's easy to say after the fact. And maybe it should have

gone on the auction block or whatever, and it might have come out differently. But do you know something? I think those are all after-the-fact things. Sure, Norton got one hell of a deal. It was a steal. But at the same time, it was a very smooth turnover for the city of Pasadena. And as far as everything was concerned when this happened he was going to spend money in it. He picked up all the debts. He paid what, a couple of million dollars in debts. He fixed the lights, he fixed the air conditioning, he watered the lawn, and he put art in the museum. He continued to show the modern art for a year while he got his act together. So that one year of the five, he had the permanent collection up, which took care of the 25 percent or 20 percent, or whatever it was supposed to be. And when there is another-- You know, there are two sides to every story.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: He was offered the situation. He didn't go out begging. Now, he may have begged in another way. You know, he may have sent his own feelers that created the offer in the first place. And if so, so he did; nobody else was wise enough to do that. And they were able to have a smooth transaction and pay off all the debts. And I guess that's what they were looking for: to get everybody out comfortably without having anybody hurt,

because there must have been an awful lot of creditors around the museum. And who else was going to pick up the tab?

GOODWIN: I just have one question--

WEISMAN: Yes.

GOODWIN: --which relates to the Pasadena and the County Museum: What gives you hope that this region can have a successful museum of modern art, based on the precedent of Pasadena?

WEISMAN: Well, I don't think Pasadena was run as a community twentieth-century art museum, one. Two, it was very poorly located for a twentieth-century museum, in that the Pasadena--and San Marino--is a noted conservative area. And there were many people that worked there taking admissions. And I was sitting there days, and many a time when people would say, "For this exhibit, I will not sit here and collect money," and would walk out. These were ladies that were working as docents. All right, so the location was poor. It was not run as a community program. It was a privately endowed thing without enough funds. And there was no organization; there was no leadership. Now, I'm not saying the leadership at the County is better--God only knows--but there was more. There was more leadership. They at least had--

TAPE NUMBER: V, SIDE TWO

AUGUST 23, 1978

GOODWIN: We're continuing to discuss museums in Southern California, and also in Northern California. You played an important role in the development of LAICA [Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art]. Can you tell me about that?

WEISMAN: Well, I don't know how important my role was in LAICA. I hope it offered them some assistance in the beginning, which they really needed. I think the basic thing that happened was that they were all ready to pay \$1,000 a month rental for a space in the ABC Entertainment Center in Century City. I suggested that that was out of line for them with no budget, and certainly out of line with ABC to accept rent money for an eleemosynary institution that was only being started for the first time. So I called Mr. Goldenson, the chairman of ABC, and he in turn spoke to Mr. Pompino and Jack Easton-- Pompano, or is it Pompino? I forget--of ABC. And the arrangements were made that they, as I explained-- After all, they had film, theater, and music of all sorts; and it was only fitting that they have the visual arts. They said, "But they were half full." And I said, "Oh, no, you're half empty. And I would suggest that you do that accommodating thing. It will only be good for you."

It can't hurt you." And they complied, and they had two years rent free. And it certainly gave them a very good head start to where they were going. Subsequently, they went into the present building, which belonged to Architectural Potteries. And while it's been very good, on the other hand it's \$1,000 a month again. And it certainly isn't a \$1,000-a-month property, in terms of--compared to nothing. And I think the time has come that they are going to have to move again.

GOODWIN: What is your opinion of LAICA as an institution?

WEISMAN: I think it's a growing institution. I think it's a necessity in a community of this size--a community that has a considerable number of collectors that are good collectors. And more important really, I believe it's the first greatest productive area in the arts, in all the country, and they need a showcase of some sort. And the artist registry that they have is excellent, second to none. I think that Bob Smith and his wife, Toby, who run it, are very apt and able people. I feel that they have been very busy trying to give all of the artists a chance at doing their thing, and they have done that. My feeling now is--as I keep telling Bob over and over again--"For two years you let the inmates run the institution. Now it's time for you to become their leader and lead the institution and act as a

responsible director and get yourself a board of trustees that makes sense in the community, that will be able to give you the necessary supporting funds with the grants"-- that he does extremely well. He does an excellent job of writing grant applications and getting them and consequently has done some very meaningful work. Now, some of the things that he has done that are very meaningful are not very appealing to the general public, not even the art public, and not even in many cases the sophisticated art public.

GOODWIN: What did you have in mind?

WEISMAN: Well, I think some of the tape, the videos. I think videos are hard to get to, and they have to be seen because nobody is going to ever get to them unless they've been exposed to them. But I know I find it an effort, and I guess I would have to put myself into the category of a sophisticated art public. And I find it difficult to put myself into the frame of mind to take the time to look at videos. We even went so far as to put videotape in our home--the three-quarter-inch professional tape, not recorder, but the viewing tape situation. And even in having that, with that as an incentive that I can see them at home, I've yet to really buy a tape. I've never seen anything that I was really that excited about. And I find it difficult to accept it as an art

form, although I accept it. But I don't find it something that I'm going to sit down and look at. Whereas the art on our walls or the sculpture on our tables, or whatever, are there to be enjoyed at all times. And they just seem to seep in the pores without having to sit down and say, "Now we shall look at a tape." And the phone rings or the doorbell rings or my husband has papers to do and it's not something you do in a peripheral way.

GOODWIN: Do you think there would be a need for LAICA if the County Museum were doing a better job in the area of contemporary art?

WEISMAN: If the County Museum were doing a job in contemporary art, LAICA would be a part of it. LAICA would be an extension of it under the auspices of the County Museum. It wouldn't be LAICA. There would be the twentieth-century department of the Los Angeles County Museum, and there would be the today of the County Museum-- in other words, the contemporary art. And so, the contemporary art part would be backing and filling for twentieth century. So, if LAICA were there--I grant you this is my opinion right off the top of my head, and I haven't thought it through--but it would seem to me if LAICA had a twentieth-century art department that was really a going situation, that was of great meaning and importance and portent in the community, where they had

both exhibition space and permanent collection space, or even if it was just permanent collection space-- If for example, the whole Hammer Building, that kind of space, including the--what do you call it?--the conservation department, if that were all devoted to twentieth-century art, and no twentieth-century art were in the other space at all, in the Ahmanson, then I would say they would have room also, if they did a first-class museum job, they would be able to have another space devoted to the exhibition of the vanguard, or the now art.

GOODWIN: Why is it important to have that work displayed in a museum setting?

WEISMAN: What? The now art?

GOODWIN: The contemporary art. Isn't that the role of commercial galleries?

WEISMAN: Yes. In fact, it really is. Except that there is some that the more sophisticated director or curator of modern art should be able to see and know to be the kind of vanguard work that is giving credibility to the vanguard situation. In other words, if a gallery is showing a [William] Wegman--is that his name, the videotape artist?--if a gallery on La Cienega, or wherever--Santa Monica Boulevard--is showing a Wegman tape, and it really is meaningful, and someone with the understanding and

the taste says, "Now, this is a good tape," why shouldn't a museum give credibility to that which is happening right now? And the only way they really get credibility is if they have a little show of sorts periodically of what is going on today, not the little cliquey or the little groupie of the last ten years or fifteen years of Los Angeles, I'm talking about whether here, there, or anywhere--it doesn't matter what city it comes from--but it should be a twentieth-century--not just twentieth century--it should be this month or this year.

GOODWIN: I'm personally not convinced of that.

WEISMAN: I'm not convinced of it.

GOODWIN: I think that's to some extent a misuse of a museum.

WEISMAN: Of museum space? Well, I wonder is that more of a misuse than a Max Bill show?

GOODWIN: That's the same thing.

WEISMAN: Oh, what's the name of that place?

GOODWIN: Marlborough [Gallery].

WEISMAN: Or a [Ronald] Kitaj.

GOODWIN: Yes, that's a danger, that you prostitute the values and standards of the museum.

WEISMAN: Well, I would certainly say that that would be true in terms of Max Bill, and I'd say it's true in terms of David Smith. It would be true in terms of Kitaj, any

artist that has already had the opportunity for establishment or has been established, that I think is true. But when you're talking about art that nobody sees, and nobody knows enough to look at, to have a museum say "Yes, go into that gallery."

GOODWIN: Well, I don't think anybody's entirely right or wrong. But I think to some extent the museum presentation of contemporary art is a disservice to the artist. The artist wants the validation of the museum.

WEISMAN: How can they validate that which isn't proven?

GOODWIN: Right, right. It's just premature for that to happen.

WEISMAN: Oh, but don't you know that museums are being used day after day in a premature fashion?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: Constantly. So are you going to clean up the whole act, or just part of it?

GOODWIN: Well--

WEISMAN: It would be nice to clean up the whole act, wouldn't it?

GOODWIN: Yes. [laughter] I wish there were a way to make LAICA more impressive.

WEISMAN: I think there is a way. And I think the way is to get a good board of directors, or board of trustees, and to get people in there that really count and make

it happen.

GOODWIN: But that is a total transformation of what LAICA sets out to do. It attempted to be democratic.

WEISMAN: Well, when it was democratic, what does it bring about? The kind of commentary you just made.

GOODWIN: Oh, that's right.

WEISMAN: All right, so then it isn't any good, is it?

GOODWIN: I think that's right.

WEISMAN: So, they're not obviously showing it in the proper manner. I know I'm no good at curating or directing a museum: that is not really my forte. I really think this is what I had hoped for when I curated that show, and I curated it poorly at LAICA. I had hoped to put across a message, and it should be the format for the whole thing. That is, showing what you believe in from the past, in relationship to what exists today that you believe in. So you see that the person who is saying to you, "Yes, Wegman is a good videotape artist," also said the same thing about de Kooning twenty years ago. So that you can look to that, not to that person as a tastemaker, because it can be not just one person, it's many people. And nothing is a pure judgmental thing. You can't accept the judgment of somebody else, but at least you're getting the exposure of what he says and she says and they say and we say and whoever. Now, maybe

if they selected twenty years ago, maybe there are those that selected someone like Barnett Newman in-- They hated Barnett Newman, so you're going to hate what they selected now too, because their eyes cross, instead of focusing in and looking straight on at the same thing. So that's a relatively understandable criticism or question to rise.

GOODWIN: Do you ever have any doubts about the accomplishments of the New York School?

WEISMAN: Of course.

GOODWIN: I mean, do you think it was perhaps premature to glorify even those artists?

WEISMAN: There are times I walk through this house, and I look at the things here, and I say to Fred, "My God, do you think we're out of our minds? What have we done? Who said this is any good? This could be just a bunch of garbage! What have we done?" And he looks at me, and he says, "Are you crazy?" [laughter] And I say, "I don't know. Are you?" And we look at it, and we look at each other. And then eventually after maybe a whole thirty seconds say, "But how can you doubt it, when you look at this, or you look at that? It's so right. It's so right." And you know it, and you feel it, and it's not like--you know when you're on, and you know when you're show-bizzing it, and you know when you're selling

it, or you know when you're promoting it. And I don't mean dollars and cents selling it. I mean, you're telling somebody, "I did a bright thing." We all go through these moments and deal with our ego and our vanity and validation of what we did. And heaven forbid we should be proven wrong! We all know those things. But we also know from our very insides what turns us on and what doesn't. And what we really believe and know to be a valid inner experience. And that is something that nobody can tell you is right or wrong, nobody can tell you it is or it isn't, or anything about it. But it happens just as sure as the sun rises and the sun sets.

Now because that does it to me, it doesn't make it right. We sold a painting in the hospital the other day, and a lady stood there after spending \$750 on an artist named Creo. Have you ever heard of him? Neither have I. I never saw such a pile of junk in my life. And she said, "What a bargain. It's one of the most beautiful things I've ever seen in my life." She had the same feeling. She came back seven times in one day bringing all her friends to show the painting she had bought. Well, you know, everybody has their own level of standards and judgments and so forth. But I do think that if you looked enough years, you can't help but develop some kind of a judgment. I shouldn't say judgment--some kind of a

standard that has to raise.

GOODWIN: Except the arrangement of the works of art in your home is particularly enticing. Everything goes so well together; it's so comfortable; it's relaxing.

WEISMAN: Don't you know that those change every week, every two weeks?

GOODWIN: Yes, but the atmosphere must remain the same.

WEISMAN: How long have you-- You've been coming here now five weeks, right? And in the five weeks, have there not been any changes in the art?

GOODWIN: Yes, I wasn't really referring to that.

WEISMAN: Well, I'm referring to that in relationship to this: tomorrow the [Duane Hanson] Cleaning Lady goes out; at the end of the week the two Rothkos are--yes, I guess at the beginning of the month--the two Rothkos leave, and so we're going to have to rehang the house again. So it will all change. And Friday we have some new Giacometti furniture coming in. So it's going to all be changed--everything, again. And every time that happens each work gets a new meaning. And you know, it really doesn't matter where you place it. It has nothing to do with that. Certainly, the one thing we are absolutely concerned with at all times is when we hang a work of art we try to define the space, so that it becomes that space individual to that work of art. Maybe it's a painting

divided by a lamp on the wall to another painting which gives the feeling of two walls rather than one. Maybe it's a fireplace [which] indicates one world, where the wall next to it is another world. We have really tried desperately to have each thing have its own world. Now, granted you can't walk into a small room and see two Clyfford Stills and two huge walls, but they each have their own wall whereas they're not in one huge wall side by side or on top of each other. The Rothkos are side by side, but Rothkos do better that way, I think. But we're very careful about that; and it isn't that we're styling them, I don't think.

GOODWIN: I don't feel that. It just seems to me that it's particularly easy in this setting to have the works come across so positively.

WEISMAN: Well, for one thing everything else is keyed down. All the furnishings we try to keep as low-key as possible, and still have them look like they belong in a house not in a museum. Another thing is--I think my husband always puts it very well when he says, "A good work of art is a great work of art no matter where you hang it. A great work of art is a great work of art. No matter where you hang it." Well, that may be true, as long as you don't junk it up with too many things around it. But that's true, too. What difference does it make if that Dubuffet tree

is where the Pevsner is, or Pevsner where the Ernst is? They're great works of art, and we're going to give them a world that's going to work for them, or we're not going to put them there. It doesn't make any sense otherwise. So it does make it more comfortable for living maybe, and it makes it a comfortable situation, and it feels easy, and the art becomes positive, and there's little fighting against it.

GOODWIN: Right, and you become accustomed to it.

WEISMAN: And you become accustomed to it. It becomes easy, and you live with it, and you don't feel like you're in a museum. Even though if you were to stand back for a second and look, of course, it's feeling like a museum. But it doesn't really. It has an ambience of home, I think, along with it. And if it didn't, I'd feel very uncomfortable about it. And I know homes that don't have that: where they have all the Pollock, de Kooning, Rothko, Newman, Still all line up--and Gorky--all the lineup of the twentieth-century New York School abstract expressionist painters in one room. Well, I think that would be very sterile. But Ben Heller's apartment was like that. But he had objects and antiquities and different objects on his table tops. But I don't know. I just don't like that kind of sterility, and I don't like that kind of look. I think our taste is more--catholic is the word, isn't it?--and that

it moves from various and sundry directions, which makes it better for that reason, or more comfortable. I don't know. I guess everybody does their own thing in their own way, and it works usually.

GOODWIN: Yes. Well--

WEISMAN: But I do think that LAICA has got a good chance. I don't think Bob [Smith] is a strong leader. Because [a good leader] could be used there, and I think they've gotten enough of a start now, thanks to him. And the name has gotten around enough now, but I think that if someone went in there that really knew what they were doing, they could make a hell of a deal. They could make it terrific. I think it would be neat if LAICA were to show-- Well, they're coming up with a Billy Brice show. But say they have the Billy Brice show, and in conjunction with the Billy Brice show, they had another artist of the same time, of another world, from another place, and then maybe have two artists from those same places of today. So, what if they showed Billy Brice of the fifties, and they showed-- Who would be comparable to a Billy Brice if they were in New York in the fifties?

GOODWIN: I don't know. Alice Neel, a figurative painter.

WEISMAN: Who? Alice Neel? So, what if they showed Alice Neel--I think that sounds pretty dullsy, too. I don't know. Maybe that's not the wrong person because

the Billy Brices are going to be very different, the ones I guess they were showing there--a new body of work.

But the point is that if they were to show someone of the forties of the same ilk as Billy Brice, comparable to him from New York, Chicago, wherever in one-half of the space, and the other half of the space some two people of today that would kind of relate to that type of work, it shows something of a scholarly nature.

GOODWIN: Yes. Well, I think that alternative is much more attractive: that the institution could be used very loosely to serve many different kinds of purposes just as the Museum of Modern Art has shown pre-Columbian art and American Indian art, not necessarily twentieth-century masters. But I think LAICA falls short when it has to push young local Los Angeles artists, when there are many other things which it could also do.

WEISMAN: See, and of course I couldn't agree with you more: I don't think anybody should ever push any specific group of art. I've said this before. I'll say it again and again. I don't think it really matters whether they're California, white, yellow, purple, green, or orange; men, women, or something in the middle. It doesn't matter. I think they should be pushing art that they think is good. And I think more and more, excellence is the only criteria. And that's the way it should be.

GOODWIN: What do you think of the Newport Harbor Art Museum?

WEISMAN: Well, I must say that I think it's the most positive thing that's happened in a long, long time. Here are some people [who] got together and decided they needed more than a little storeroom or an office building for an art thing-- [tape recorder turned off] The thing about Newport is that here are a group of people (as I started to say) [who] got together, and they'd been in a store or some kind of a rinky-dinky situation, and they got together and decided they needed a museum in the Newport area. But they didn't do what everybody else has done: first they built it, and then they paid for it. They got together, and they bought the land with money and paid for it. They bought the building and built it and paid for it. They bought an annuity, or an endowment plan, paid for it, and are getting money from the endowment plan. Now, the endowment is beginning to fall short. And they were in use of grants and situation grant monies from, I presume, the California Arts Commission and elsewhere. But I'm sure that Proposition 13 has not helped them; that puts them in a difficult situation. And what with the sliding dollar and the advance of inflation, it isn't helping. Their situation isn't great. I was there, as a matter of fact,

yesterday. And Tom Garver was saying they do have problems. But like they were putting on a Halston show--a fashion show--in the museum, and the beneficiaries of this were the fact that Halston's opening up a boutique in Fashion Island there. It will net the museum maybe \$10,000, which will take care of a show or two for them. And it's a very refreshing thing to be a part of--to see a museum, I'm not a part of it, I'm a member--to see a museum flourishing, or at least growing and gaining. They have a cafe outside they're running; they're making a few dollars on it. They have support groups supporting it. And they're not running an institution that they're fighting to service their loans, instead of-- You know, that's in itself a very beautiful thing. Now, maybe that isn't intelligent from a businessman's point of view; but I think it is when it comes to a museum, because it isn't like a business. And if you're not running it-- I mean, it's like having a widow operate on bank money, because she gets more money in reinvesting it in other things. Well, that's fine except widows and orphans don't invest like that, because they haven't the judgment to be able to reinvest their money at higher rates of earnings and interest. And while I might understand that, because I have a husband standing by my side telling me about it, if I had to do it on my own, forget it, I couldn't. So

I'm better off being all paid for, free and clear, to get my best values received. And I would think of a museum as being more like a widow and orphan. They're not business people. [laughter]

GOODWIN: Well, I'm surprised you have such a favorable view of the Newport Museum.

WEISMAN: Oh, and I think their space is very good, and I think Tom Garver is being very creative. Don't you?

GOODWIN: I'm very much disappointed by the whole affair.

WEISMAN: Why? Why? I think they've done some very nice shows.

GOODWIN: I think there's hope, there's potential.

WEISMAN: But it's only two days old--two days!--two years old. [laughter] Big deal.

GOODWIN: Well, I think the shocking situation is that there's obviously a great deal of money in the area.

WEISMAN: Why is that shocking to you? It's all the Republican--Nixon, Haldeman--

GOODWIN: Right, but so little of it seems to go toward the museum. I think the building is ugly. It's small. There's no collection.

WEISMAN: Painted white it wouldn't be so ugly. The collection? What do you expect in two years in a collection? At least what they have is good.

GOODWIN: It's not quite that young.

WEISMAN: All right, five. But the point is that nobody gave them anything to speak of before. They had their new building. They're a young museum. At least they have some qualitative things. What's wrong with that [Jack] Zajac or that Bob Graham that's sitting out there in the lobby? Those are very good works of art. I don't know if they own them or--

GOODWIN: I don't think they own them.

WEISMAN: I think so.

GOODWIN: Really?

WEISMAN: And the [Joseph] Raffael. Even if they're not [owned], those are nice expressions of artists of our time that are working in our community, or are from our community. I think that's neat. And then to go in and see the [Frank] Stella show which-- I found it was very interesting to me, because I had a lot of background for it and hated it so vehemently when I first saw it-- his new work. And all of a sudden I find myself being turned on by it a little bit. I never thought I could. I knew I was going to end up feeling something in the last line; and I didn't know when the last line would take place, and it did sooner than I anticipated. And I'm shocked that I had any positive feelings whatsoever. But anyway.

GOODWIN: I liked that. I like Stella, and I like his

latest works.

WEISMAN: The new things? His birds?

GOODWIN: Right, right.

WEISMAN: Well, when I first saw them I just had to hate them. I couldn't help it. I hated them! And then when we left Fred said, "They're the worst." Just a minute.

[tape recorder turned off]

GOODWIN: I think Orange County is one area that needs a historical art museum rather than a contemporary art museum. Of course, that will never happen.

WEISMAN: Why? Pasadena has that. I know it's not close, but how many of those kinds do you think you can have?

GOODWIN: Oh, I don't mean California history. I mean art of the past.

WEISMAN: Well, that's what I'm saying. Pasadena has that.

GOODWIN: Oh, right.

WEISMAN: And you can't have another one to meet the needs of those Orange County Republicans, the reactionary Republicans that are there now. Because it's apt to change, you know.

GOODWIN: In what way?

WEISMAN: Well, there's younger people moving in and different people; it could take a change.

GOODWIN: Well, actually I think it's unfortunate that both

Newport and the art gallery at UC Irvine are doing contemporary art. They don't have much of a choice.

WEISMAN: Well, what else are they going to do? They don't have anything to draw from. You can't go out and buy the other paintings. This is Pasadena's great importance now. It's the only real museum in this part of the world that has old art.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: And that's its real major offering. I don't think it functions like most museums do. And I think that it has its shortcomings in that respect: that it isn't a community-oriented or a community-supported museum. And the community isn't really given an opportunity to support it. And I think we talked about the fees to get in and out. And now it's the same as every place, of course. But it isn't really fair. But, you know, those things-- You're beating a dead horse at this point. But at least it's there. Now, who wants to go in competition with that thirty miles away? You can't.

GOODWIN: No, no.

WEISMAN: It would be nice if Norton Simon Museum took the stuff out of the basement and gave it to Newport, wouldn't it?

GOODWIN: Hmm.

WEISMAN: I think the Newport scene is very good.

GOODWIN: OK. Let's talk about--

WEISMAN: I think it has possibilities.

GOODWIN: Let's talk about the Bay Area. You're a trustee of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. How did that come about?

WEISMAN: Well, first I was appointed by what's his name? Al--what's his name? The chancellor at UC Berkeley?

GOODWIN: Bowker.

WEISMAN: Al Bowker. (Isn't that dreadful?) Anyway--
[tape recorder turned off] I was asked by Bowker if I would go on this advisory council to the UC Berkeley--the Chancellor's Advisory Council at UC Berkeley--art galleries and University Art Museum. I agreed to do that. And one of the reasons I agreed--although for several reasons--one: Jim Elliott and I have been friends for many, many years, from the days when he was at the County. I felt that if I could be of any help to him, it would be good. And he was new there and feeling this way and not getting along--not having easy row because they were still left with the stigmas and the taints of Peter Selz's direction in the galleries, although Peter Selz may have some scholarly aptitudes, although I can't swear to that one way or the other. Certainly he was a terrible museum person, and terrible inasmuch as he could not muster any kind of support or camaraderie amongst the people who

should have been interested and devoted to the University Art Museum.

GOODWIN: Was that his fault?

WEISMAN: Oh, I don't think there's any question about it. I think everybody agrees to that. He determined what he was going to do. He'd go out and do it, and then they'd come up with a budget afterwards. And the budget was tenfold what they could afford to spend. So they'd take it out of what do they call it--tuition fees. They have a name for it. What do they call those fees? "Reg fees." And they'd take it out of reg fees. The students were against it, and the faculty was against it. Why should they be paying for that museum in addition to taxes and tuitions? It was just a whole big bag of worms. It was dreadful. Well, all of that's well and good, but it just distorted the whole picture, and it was dreadful. When Jim came in-- He's a very fastidious, organized, tedious, plodding, knowing-where-it's-at kind of person, slow talking, really getting it together.

So I thought this might be very good. It's certainly in contrast to the fast-talking, do-it-and-talk-about-it-later person from a university point of view. And I think Al Bowker is a learned man. He and I had spoken about it, and I thought he had good purpose and intent. He wanted to know where it was at, and where it was going, and what

it was doing at this present time. Although I wasn't on the board more than-- I hadn't gone to more than two meetings when I called him and told him I felt the first thing he ought to do was decide if he was going to fish or cut bait, that it would make an excellent chemistry building, because it was very secure and sturdy [laughter]. And I don't mean that facetiously; I meant it honestly. And if that's the case that's what they should do. But if they're going to keep it an art museum, then get behind it and support it as an art museum, and not give them \$50 to do \$100 worth of work, because you're going to get nothing but \$50 worth of work. Only it will be worse because you're spreading it out. So if you budget it to \$50, you keep it closed part of the time. But if you're not, and trying to make it do \$100 worth of work, you're just going to get it thinner than thin. Better you should make it thick half the time than thin all the time. And I thought that it was up to the regents, or the chancellor, or whoever the powers to be are, to see to it that it's functioning at a full do-able basis, and not halfway; and that frankly I wasn't even interested in working on something on a halfway basis, because it's no fun to struggle if you don't have to. And certainly there isn't a need, a desperate need, for another museum. There's Oakland [Art] Museum, there's San Francisco, there's the--what is it?

the three?--the Asian, the de Young, and the Legion--

GOODWIN: Legion of Honor.

WEISMAN: Pardon? Yes, the Legion of Honor, as well as the Art Institute. What do they need another museum for? Unless they're going to do a good job. So they should decide what they're going to do with it. So they're still deciding while they're hiring. And they did increase the budget somewhat. I don't think they've really made a positive stand yet. But in any event, Jim is doing some good shows. I think the "Matrix" thing is excellent, which is just a cross-section: gathering what you can from where you can, and having shows of art that people haven't seen before, which gives exposure. Well, one of the things I believe in so very much: get the art on the walls, get any art on the walls as long as it's good art for people to see.

GOODWIN: What hope does the university museum have in building a collection?

WEISMAN: Well, they have the nucleus with the Hans Hofmanns, of course. They have--what is it?--sixteen, twenty-six--

GOODWIN: No, more than that.

WEISMAN: Twenty-six?

GOODWIN: No. I think it's close to fifty.

WEISMAN: Yes, maybe you're right, fifty-two? Something like that. Anyway, a very considerable amount of Hofmann

paintings. They also have some excellent things in their collection, few very good old things. Very good from a scholarly point of view. All right. So with some good exhibitions it's a meaningful museum. But they have to have the funds for that, and they have to be supported. Well, when I went on that board, coincidentally within a matter of weeks, I was invited to go on the Art Institute board--San Francisco Art Institute board. And I felt they really weren't in conflict and better they should-- Maybe it was good to have someone from out of town on two learning institutions: one of fine arts learning, one of historical learning. And then it might give some objectivity to seeing the overlaps and doing away with overlaps and working hand in hand. So I accepted that. And I may have erred in doing so, but--

GOODWIN: Why?

WEISMAN: Well, because I find the responsibilities that are of a trustee are greater than what I would care to be involved in. [tape recorder turned off] The Art Institute has no permanent collection to speak of. They have a few things. They have a great deal of need for funds to support an educational program. They also have to draw from whatever fund raisers they do that are local and [from] the trustees. And what I have to give a museum has to be art and me. It can't be cash. It can be,

but it's not comfortable to me from my point of view. And they can't use the art, and I'm not feeling comfortable giving them art to sell. And so I don't feel comfortable in my role. Furthermore, they wanted me to chair a committee, and now I'm cochairing a committee that will be deaccession, which was an idea that I had of putting all the museums together on a deaccessioning program within one auction sale, or two auction sales: have a series of sales but [in] twentieth-century museums of San Francisco, and the Bay Area. Well anyway, I wasn't on that board two months, three months in San Francisco, [when] Henry [Hopkins] called me and said, "As long as you've gone, go the route and take on the three." And they couldn't have been nicer. They all worked together to see the museum dates, the meeting dates, coincided, so I wouldn't have to make too many trips up there. In the beginning I must say it was hectic. I was going up there every week. And oh, God! Well anyway, I accepted the Modern job on their say-so that there wasn't any conflict and so forth. At this moment I find the Modern job the most rewarding, the most exciting, the most productive. I feel I offer them more, they offer me more, they offer the city more. I think the University situation is better, and I think the Art Institute is terrible for me. I think it's probably one of the best

art institutions for learning today. I think it's a great learning institution for people wanting to paint, [and] that's not where I am. And I'm in no position to direct that, or even take a stand that, yes, it should be this way, or no, it should be that way. I don't feel like I have any knowledge--

GOODWIN: Well, unfortunately I guess [there are only] a few people who can fulfill that function. You have the commitment to modern art, which most people don't have. But who is particularly interested in training artists?

WEISMAN: I would be very interested in training artists, except I don't know how.

GOODWIN: [laughter] I don't think anybody knows how.

WEISMAN: Of course not, but I think that certainly it's a role I would think more suited for academicians than it is for lay people that have art, know a little about art. I don't think I serve them well. If I could handle a lot of money I'd serve them well, like Harold Zellerbach did--gave them money all the time, that's fine. But he really didn't serve them. And I feel you should be on a board to serve that board. I would say that what the Art Institute should have on their board would be a Peter Selz from the scholarly point of view--but maybe he's wrong, because he's art history, but somebody that is really super from Berkeley. Maybe Peter Voulkos, who's on the teaching

staff of UC Berkeley and is a former student of the Art Institute of many years back. I just don't know the people's names in the area. But who's that guy that-- not Stanton MacDonald[-Wright]--painted in impasto, black and white from San Francisco with the hyphenated name. You know who I mean? [Gordon Onslow-Ford] Anyway-- He's an older man, but he's a painter, and he's painted in that area. He knows the problems of the painter, the needs of the painter in an art school. Those are the kinds of people that can help, people who've actually had their hands in it with years and years of experience and can say, "Look, you're not going to learn sculpturing in a photography studio, and you wouldn't want to learn photography in a sculpture studio." You've got to have people who understand and know the specifics of that aesthetic, and know how to deal with it that can teach, and have taught, that understand the kind of teachers and the kind of staff that that kind of institution should have. I have no comprehension of that. So, on the other hand, at Berkeley it's really more of what's good art that you can show the students to look at. And that I feel more equipped to be able to do. Also, it's trying to push the board or regents into better financial support, and seeing that you do get a better permanent collection at Berkeley. And also, I think, to get Berkeley and the

San Francisco Museum of Modern Art to work hand in hand, which is having very little problem in doing that because of Jim and Henry being good friends.

Now, when I went into the [San Francisco] Museum of Modern Art, that was just like throwing roses in the sky; it was beautiful! Number one: I'd known Henry for years when he came to work at the County. I think I related this earlier: I paid his fare for a year. He must get sick of hearing that story, but nevertheless it's true. And I have a very deep feeling for that. Henry has done what I think is the epitome of what a museum should be doing today that's dealing in twentieth-century art. I think that I discussed this, or did I not, about how he's directing his permanent collection?

GOODWIN: You didn't discuss this on tape.

WEISMAN: Well, what he is doing is putting together-- I think I did because I read the letter from Bob Motherwell--

GOODWIN: Oh, that's true.

WEISMAN: --which relates to it. But he is putting together-- He's got the twenty-two, or whatever, Clyfford Stills. He's now got nine or twelve or fourteen Philip Gustons. He'll wind up getting the Motherwells, and the Sam Francis, and the Diebenkorns, and the other major artists of California showing in a body of work within that museum. And if he does that for that museum, they will have a

permanent collection second to none. Because all of them are scattered, and they feel like they have an in-depth collection if they have three de Koonings. Well, we have three de Koonings: that's in depth, but it isn't really museum in depth. This is going to be an in-depth collection. And I think it's going to be super. I just think it's great, and I think there's a spirit there, and a concern. And I think that it's just a neat situation. And a lot of things are now deaccessioned. And the two-- the Institute and the Modern--are going to--and Berkeley too, I believe--are going to go into a program where Sotheby Parke Bernet are opening an auction house in San Francisco. And they hope they'll kick off the season with an opening sale in October of next year with an auction of deaccessioned material from the three museums. I think that's just super. Now, whether they'll get buyers in that area is another thing. And it's funny: they sure sold a lot down here.

GOODWIN: How come Henry Hopkins is having so much more success than Gerry Nordland?

WEISMAN: Oh, Henry's a more formidable man. He's more personable--I don't know. He expresses an idea, and he's not afraid of himself. He says, "This is what I'd like to do," and he has a sense of humor, and he has a manner about him that turns people on. I sit in on those

board meetings at San Francisco. It's really very, very interesting. People who've been on that board for twenty, thirty, forty years--you know, it's a self-perpetuating board, and they are old families. You know, we sit in the deaccessioning meeting, which is acquisitions, and I'll sit on the acquisitions committee meeting, and somebody will show a picture, "What do you think about this?" And one lady says, "Oh, I remember when we got that painting. Yes, that was in 1932, I believe. Really lovely. She was a wonderful painter. Her mother was such a nice lady. I really think we should keep that." So this is where I think, I hope, I'm serving a purpose in that I say, "Look, I'll bet her mother was lovely, but her daughter didn't know how to paint. And I don't think this stands up to anything in the museum collection. Now, if you want to have a box full of nostalgia, I think you should have that. But let's not count it for hanging on the walls." And I may not win out in having that lady think I'm the loveliest thing she ever met. But I really couldn't care less. I don't live up there. I'm serving the board for a reason, and it isn't to win friends and influence people. I happen to be a second-generation Californian, but I'll never be a fifth-generation--

TAPE NUMBER: VI, SIDE ONE

AUGUST 23, 1978

GOODWIN: You were saying you're not going to win any points--

WEISMAN: Oh, that's right. And I'm never going to be a sixth-generation Californian. But, you know, I'm not attending their parties, and I'm not going to be having the kinds of situations up there that really matter that much to me. That's not where I'm at. I certainly have a social existence and enjoy it, and I like to meet friends and all that-- I'm sure I will be; I don't think it's the end of the world. Because in the one instance that that happened everybody agreed, "You're absolutely right." And even the lady agreed finally. [She] said, "Well, I guess you are right. It isn't great art, is it?" I said, "No, you should put your best work up. You should really be doing this deaccessioning in a room full of the works you're really proud of."

GOODWIN: I've always wondered about a certain situation in museums, that is, why the trustees get involved with the professional matters of running museums, such as exhibitions, acquisitions, staff.

WEISMAN: Very easily--to answer that--because they hope that if they express themselves strongly enough they'll pay for it. I think it just boils down to that. And as a

result, it's a vicious circle.

GOODWIN: It's very dangerous.

WEISMAN: Of course it's dangerous, because then as a result of having popped up with the money, then they think they've got a say in everything. Well, what do you think happened at L.A. County? That was exactly what happened. Howard Ahmanson said, "OK, I'll give you \$2 million for a building. It'll be done by Millard Sheets." Then Norton Simon said, "I'll take my two million away"--or "my million," whatever--"I'm not doing a building by Millard Sheets, and it's not going to be called the Ahmanson Building if I put a million into it." And so what happened, the whole thing fell apart. Granted, the building got done, and it looks like hell. It isn't serving the purposes it should be serving, and all these things. And why is it? It all happened for one reason, because they were using money against power, and vice versa, and that's not what makes an efficient board of trustees. And I don't think they do belong, but that's-- Now we're back to Newport Harbor. They are not going to have that problem. They don't have that problem.

GOODWIN: Because they don't have the interest among the trustees to build a museum.

WEISMAN: Come on, they don't have the money! They don't need their money.

GOODWIN: They need it. They're not going to get it.

WEISMAN: What do they need it for? They don't need it to that extent today. They don't have to go out and raise \$6 million.

GOODWIN: Well, if they want to have a collection, they're going to have to spend some money.

WEISMAN: Hopefully, they can get the collection as gifts. They don't have to make money from the collectors. They can take art from the collectors.

GOODWIN: Right. Well, I think you have a maverick viewpoint about the role of trustees.

WEISMAN: That's only part of it, obviously.

GOODWIN: Yes, but many trustees have defended the need to resolve those professional questions. I don't think anything like that would ever happen in a university: where the trustees of the university would decide what courses should be taught, who would teach them.

WEISMAN: But everybody considers themselves an art expert.

GOODWIN: Right!

WEISMAN: So why shouldn't the trustees come in and say, "If you hang that thing in my museum, I'm giving you no money," or "That I'll buy for you, but I won't buy that. And if you buy that, I won't buy that." And they're going to end up with all that. Because they're all experts, and they have the money. And in a university they wouldn't

dare be that, you know what?--that's no different than the jokers that come into this house and say, "OK, you prove it to me. You tell me." The ones that say, "Which half of that painting do you like best," when they look at the Newman. Or, "Come on, tell me about it. You're so smart. You can't make me believe that's a painting." You know, they're experts. They know it isn't a painting, and they are willing to put it down. It's only really a reflection of their own ignorance, and they have to defend themselves. They defend their own ignorance by trying to make you feel ignorant. So this is exactly what these trustees do. But the trustees are all people of money. You don't find many poor trustees, very few. They have a great service to render, or they wouldn't be there.

GOODWIN: Well, that's why I think most museums will always have very serious professional or staff problems. Because it's natural that the staff will always be overruled.

WEISMAN: Beholden. Well, I don't think so. I think if you have a good director, that isn't necessarily true. I think the National Gallery is probably the best example of it. I grant they've got a lot of money.

GOODWIN: Well, the situation there from my vantage point is that the director, Carter Brown, is in effect a trustee. I mean, he has the same social status as the trustees.

WEISMAN: He has the social status of the trustees; but he

also--as a result--he can tell the trustees, and they accept it.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: But he also has the accreditation of a director.

He's done all the--

GOODWIN: No, he doesn't.

WEISMAN: Yes, he has all the schooling-- He does not?

Where did I just read that he did?

GOODWIN: I think that's unfortunately one of the--

WEISMAN: I mean, he studied with Bernard Berenson.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: But what's the accreditation needed for a director?

GOODWIN: Well, it obviously varies from museum to museum.

But when you take the National Gallery, even in the United States--

WEISMAN: What about--

GOODWIN: --you're supposed to have, ideally, a person with very impressive credentials.

WEISMAN: Tell me, did John Walker have impressive credentials?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: What museum has impressive credentials?

GOODWIN: Well, unfortunately, very few, and in my way of thinking, a very serious problem with museums.

WEISMAN: Well, of course it becomes a more serious problem today when there are so many people with those credentials

available. There are a lot of people with the credentials.

GOODWIN: Right. But there's--

WEISMAN: But you see, the people with the credentials don't necessarily have taste.

GOODWIN: I agree.

WEISMAN: So, what are you talking about? We're getting back to the age-old question now--becoming age old--it's probably four years. Does a museum really warrant two directors: an administrative director and an aesthetic director, an art director? Yes, they do. And one should be dealing with money, and one should be dealing with art.

GOODWIN: Which is the--

WEISMAN: --prevailing?

GOODWIN: Yes, who is superior?

WEISMAN: The one that prevails is the aesthetic director.

GOODWIN: But that's not the way it usually works out.

WEISMAN: Well, that's what it should be. After all, the institution is devoted to aesthetics. So that should prevail.

GOODWIN: But whoever controls the money controls the power.

WEISMAN: Of course. But the point is that the aesthetic director should be able to go to the administrative director and say, "Hey, this is what we're going to have to have. This is our budget. And this is what's up to you to do."

And the administrative director should be able to put it together, or damn close to it. Or they should sit and have their meetings together and work out a program that's amicable to both. So then they each go their separate directions, and they come to the point where, "I can't give you five million [dollars], but I can give you three." "Well, I really need three and a half minimum, or I'm not going to be able to get that Monet show, or I'm not going to be able to buy that particular painting that's coming up that we need; and I will feel derelict in my responsibility as a director if we don't get that picture." And so together they agree: instead of five million, they're going to get three and a half; and they each go their own ways. And now he makes the money, he assigns it, he balances the budget; and this one goes out and adheres to the budget that's presented, that they both agreed on. That's ideal. Correct?

GOODWIN: Yes, I suppose so.

WEISMAN: But it won't work.

GOODWIN: Right. But shouldn't the president of the board be, in effect, the administrative director of the museum, at least the money man? I mean, I'm thinking now of the situation at the Metropolitan Museum where, for the first time, there's now a paid president.

WEISMAN: Who's the paid president?

GOODWIN: Well, as a matter of fact he's not an art historian, and he's never had any museum experience. He's a retired diplomat from the foreign service.

WEISMAN: What's his name?

GOODWIN: I can't think of it at the moment. [William B. Macomber, Jr.]

WEISMAN: He's an administrative director or an aesthetic director?

GOODWIN: Administrative. [tape recorder turned off] In other words, the situation at the Met is that the position of president became so demanding--the president of the board became such a major burden--that no layman--

WEISMAN: Isn't Douglas Dillon president of the Met [board]?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: What was he demanding of?

GOODWIN: Well, he felt that he was having to devote so much time to the museum that a paid position should be created to handle many of the administrative matters that--

WEISMAN: --he was doing?

GOODWIN: Yes, that he was doing. I don't think that's going to work, because essentially the president of the board, or the board itself, is going to be responsible for fund raising. And the staff members aren't going to be able to accomplish what the board should be able to accomplish.

WEISMAN: Maybe that is the way: that the treasurer of the board of trustees should be a paid worker that has experience in both aesthetics--to a surface way, should be a fund raiser--have fund raising experience--which are special kinds of people, and there are special learning courses you can take in that. And then there's also the fact that they do balance the budget. But you're not going to find all that in one person.

GOODWIN: Right. It's a superperson, superman.

WEISMAN: You can't do that.

GOODWIN: Unfortunately, it seems the major responsibility of the board is to raise money. Right?

WEISMAN: I haven't hit that yet. And I made it very clear at the Modern that my role there is not to raise money, because I can't go in to the Los Angeles area easily to pick up money for the museum in San Francisco. Furthermore, I don't intend to give money. I'll give paintings, which I have. We have given already: a Frank Stella, Double Protractor, which is a beautiful painting--which gives them, incidentally, something like six major Frank Stella paintings. But the point is that I don't see the-- I think it would be very difficult for this to be a working situation. I think the two running parallel is the ideal thing. I don't know how it would work any other way. I really don't.

And they have to go out, and they have to work very hard for it. And anybody that takes on the position of chairman of the board of trustees must assume you can't take on the chairmanship of anything without having a responsibility--I know it--as a trustee. That's why I'm going to resign from San Francisco Art Institute. I can't take the space and not do a job for them. I won't be there in name only. That's just not nice. More than not nice: it's not very effective for the museum.

GOODWIN: I want to return to an issue we discussed briefly another time: that is the impact of a museum on its community. [tape recorder turned off] What impact do you think the San Francisco Museum can ideally have on the people of San Francisco?

WEISMAN: I think it's already having an impact. They're beginning to take pride, because they're hearing from other people around the country that there is an effectiveness of what Henry is doing. He's giving the museum a stronger name and a stronger image than they've ever had before. And all of a sudden San Francisco is becoming something that they once were and had lost. And they have the makings of it to do it in spite of themselves, not because of themselves. And that they have the Legion, the de Young, the Asian Museum, the Museum of Modern Art, the Art Institute, the Berkeley museum, San Francisco State

University--which is a very art-oriented state university--
the Oakland museum. And with all of this--

GOODWIN: Stanford Museum [laughter]

WEISMAN: Excuse me. Are you from Stanford?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Yes, absolutely--Stanford Museum. They find
themselves right in the hub of a museum world. There isn't
too much more to the New York museum world, and with the
potential of it becoming as good--maybe not, never as good.
Nothing is allowed to be as good as New York--I buy that--

GOODWIN: Becoming much better--

WEISMAN: --because nothing is as old as New York. But it
could become much better in time, because New York may get
worse.

GOODWIN: You think it really matters whether, say, the
San Francisco museum has any impact on a very broad audience,
people who--

WEISMAN: No, I don't think it matters.

GOODWIN: I really don't think it does either.

WEISMAN: I don't think it matters. I think it's there for
those who care. And it's there for the city.

GOODWIN: Well, who are those people who care?

WEISMAN: All those people who are really involved in the
arts care. And then there are those people in the total
art world that give-- San Francisco's a funny city. Not

funny. San Francisco I always relate to Boston, and the counterpart to New York I think of as Los Angeles. Boston and San Francisco are steeped in tradition. They may not be involved, but they want to be able to say they have it best. You know, "Oh, I don't work at the museum. I'm not really interested in that. But we do have the best museum there is." [laughter] That is the way they talk at the Boston [Museum of] Fine Arts. Am I correct?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: This is how they talk in San Francisco.

GOODWIN: That was a good impression. [laughter]

WEISMAN: But they have to have a good impression in the whole world of being the best there is. Now, New York doesn't sit back and say that. They say, "Oh, I'm the president of the board of trustees at the Museum of Modern Art." Or "You mean you didn't know I'm a trustee at the Met?" That is important. It is very important and prestigious to be on those boards. San Francisco people and Boston people-- That makes you a working person, you know, and that isn't necessarily what they want. They just want it should be best, and if they can make it best, it will be best. And that's all--

GOODWIN: Do you think that's even so?

WEISMAN: Oh, yes.

GOODWIN: Well, look at the de Young Museum. As far as I'm

concerned, that's a very mediocre museum.

WEISMAN: Not nearly as mediocre as the Legion. The Legion is really abominable.

GOODWIN: [laughter] Right.

WEISMAN: You know, I haven't been in the Legion in years and years and years. And I walk in there and I find the Fantin-Latour that Frank Lloyd had sent to us. We had loved Fantin-Latour: we always admired it. I had been ill, and I was bedridden for two months. And for another two months I was allowed to have visitors, or go out either in the daytime or the nighttime--but never both--and only one thing a day. And that went on for many months. I was really home. And so Frank Lloyd came to town, and he had some pictures he was showing, and he had amongst them a Fantin-Latour of lilacs. And I thought it was absolutely beautiful. And so he said--and it was a [reproduction] and here I was ill--and he said, "You really like that?" and I said yes. He said, "You don't want to buy that. It doesn't go with what you have. But I want to tell you something. You're ill, and I'd like you to enjoy it." And do you know, he had it sent. And in three days that painting was here, and he wanted to hang it here until I was out of bed, which was maybe the nicest thing that man ever did in his life. And I told him I couldn't accept that kind of a thing and he said, "No, you do that. I'd

like you to live with it and compare it and find out what you really think about it." Subsequently, Norton came over and saw it on one of his visits. He saw it and said, "It's really not a good painting, and you shouldn't own it. And just to prove it I'll show you." So he comes back again and brings two or three of his Fantin-Latours, which were really fantastic. And I learned the difference, and it was nice, it was a great education. A good Fantin-Latour has to have a light background and not a dark background. The colors should be crisper in the flowers, and so forth. Anyway, lilacs were my favorite flowers. It served its purpose, and I learned from it. We returned it, and I said I felt very embarrassed not to buy the picture. He said, "You shouldn't be embarrassed." He said, "But tell me, what did you ultimately think of the painting?" And I said I didn't think it was a class-A Fantin-Latour. He said, "You're absolutely right." I walk into the de Young, and there's the Fantin-Latour on the wall.

GOODWIN: Palace of the Legion of Honor.

WEISMAN: The Palace, yes, it's in the Palace. There it is. It was a gift from somebody. Well, that's fine: if you get a gift you take it. But wouldn't it be nice to sell it and get the money and again steer towards excellence.

GOODWIN: But if San Francisco was really a city that

supported its museums, all the museums would be more impressive.

WEISMAN: Well, I guess it takes time. I mean, they can't all be more impressive. There isn't any place that supports museums like New York, but I wonder who all supports all those museums in New York. Do you know?

GOODWIN: Well, the more we talk about the art world the smaller it seems to get.

WEISMAN: It is. Isn't that amazing? It is terribly small, because, really, those museums are supported here as well as there. And why do we get the feeling of obligation to support there? They never feel that obligation--I don't think--to support here. I often wonder about that. You know, like we feel an obligation to be a Friend of the Whitney and to be on the International Council when we're invited, because we feel that gives credibility and strength to the California area, to be a part of it, and also we learn from it. Nobody thinks that here, or not too many.

GOODWIN: I don't personally feel any obligation to support the New York museums.

WEISMAN: Don't you feel any obligation about the National Gallery?

GOODWIN: Maybe the National Gallery least of all. I don't feel that the National Gallery is, in fact, a

national gallery. It is the art museum of the Smithsonian Institution.

WEISMAN: It is, though.

GOODWIN: Right. It is on paper. But it seems more exclusive than any of the other private art museums.

WEISMAN: You know, it is the same thing. Give me your money, and you can be a part of it. But at the same time you look at the board of directors, or the board of trustees, of the National Gallery, that's quite a group. And the very fact that the chief justice of the United States is the chairman, and always is the chairman, along with Paul Mellon, who'll be the president, and rightfully. But you know, when they asked us to go on the Collectors Committee, we jumped at it. And do you know why? Because the Collectors Committee was formed for the purpose of the new east building that was going to devote itself to twentieth-century art. So I'm told. And we felt it was very important to have the National Gallery have a place for twentieth-century art that would be considered the masters, because there they're being selected--one hopes--and they're being curated appropriately, so that they will only have excellence, because they are in the National Gallery. And by the same token the great paintings of the twentieth century in the National Gallery gives credibility to all our collection and all of the great

painters, doesn't it? All the twentieth century becomes credible.

GOODWIN: Not really.

WEISMAN: Certainly, it becomes--

GOODWIN: It would happen without the National Gallery's participation.

WEISMAN: Yes, but it credits them. It gives them credibility faster.

GOODWIN: It helps. It helps.

WEISMAN: It sure does. Listen, what does Rauschenberg mean if Rauschenberg isn't seen in a good museum?

GOODWIN: Right, but the National Gallery--

WEISMAN: Obviously Rauschenberg at the National Gallery and part of the Smithsonian, the head of our United States museums--by gum, it does have a meaning.

GOODWIN: I think it would mean a lot more in Europe. But I think the point I'm realizing now, appreciating more perhaps now than before, is that this country doesn't have a national museum system. And in spite of the Smithsonian, the national museums are the Met, Boston, Chicago--

WEISMAN: --in Washington. No, the national museums are in Washington.

GOODWIN: No, no. The national museums are simply the best museums, whether they're supported by the public or not.

WEISMAN: What about the Smithsonian's?

GOODWIN: The Smithsonian also has some crummy museums.

WEISMAN: Yes.

GOODWIN: Look at the National Collection of Fine Arts

WEISMAN: I knew you were going to say that.

GOODWIN: How? [laughter]

WEISMAN: They don't have such bad stuff anymore. As a matter, Walter [Hopps] has done a good job of hanging there from their permanent collection, and he's brought in better shows.

GOODWIN: I personally don't think there's a reason to have a national collection of arts. Given the National Gallery, the Hirshhorn, the Corcoran--

WEISMAN: I don't either. But Washington is becoming as eminent a city in the museum world as New York today.

GOODWIN: Yes. It's certainly come a long, long way.

WEISMAN: And the National Gallery is fast taking over from the Met, and there's a tremendous amount of competition.

GOODWIN: Well, in terms of the exhibitions.

WEISMAN: Ha! You know that the National Gallery will not show an exhibition unless they show it first or last.

And that's it. There is no other way. And last is rare.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: And that is--only if it's last--they'll rearrange the whole thing in such a way that you can hardly recognize

it from its original state, i.e., Katherine White's African exhibit. But I just think that that's a policy that they had declared for themselves, which is not the law of the land. They've made it so. It's a hell of a law. I mean, if they want to be first, I think the L.A. County should say we want to be last. [laughter] And make it [so] we won't take it first. We want to close it here at all times.

GOODWIN: Well, I think it's unfortunate; but there really can't be a national gallery in this country for geographical reasons.

WEISMAN: Well, and not only that. There can't be a national gallery for geographical reasons, and also because there will never be federal funding to make a system of national galleries. Actually, the Smithsonian Institution should be spread throughout the United States.

GOODWIN: Right. Right.

WEISMAN: But they can't do that. What would they use those buildings for then?

GOODWIN: [laughter] Storage.

WEISMAN: Storage. To put all the papers from the Pentagon that they've outgrown, or whatever other building it is. It's truly unreal, because they find themselves in these terrible pockets at all times, all of the museums. And it's become a competitive world unto itself, instead of

being what it was really intended. We forget originally a museum was a repository to place your art when you died. Or if you had something more than you could hang, you deposited it there for people to look at; and you went in to muse. They didn't have exhibitions, and they didn't have great libraries.

GOODWIN: And they didn't acknowledge living artists.

WEISMAN: And they didn't acknowledge living artists. And all they did was just hang it there and have one or two guards around, and people would come in and rest. And look at the art. [laughter] So they mused in a museum. And today they're making learning institutions out of museums, social institutions out of museums--

GOODWIN: --and amusement parks.

WEISMAN: --amusement parks out of museums, a tremendous funding--whatever you want--economic situation out of a museum and political footballs out of museums. They have become everything. And probably the last thing on the list they've become are museums in the real sense of the word, but which nonetheless means that they have to exist and they should be there, because taking away the arts, the culture will die, it seems to me. Can you imagine living without things like this around you? You must have things in your apartment, or your home, where you live--

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: --that are meaningful.

GOODWIN: Yes. I agree with you that the culture would seem deadly without the arts--to you and to me. But for the vast majority of the population, I really don't think it matters.

WEISMAN: I don't think that's true. I think you go into a house any end of town and you see a calendar on the wall. You rarely see a calendar that doesn't have a picture on the cover. You rarely go into a house that doesn't have something over the sofa--good, bad, mediocre.

GOODWIN: Yes. but just because it's a picture, that to me doesn't make it special.

WEISMAN: Doesn't make it worthwhile especially, but it means that something in here or in here says they have to have something to feed on. They need food for their soul, for their memory, whatever it is. They need that. They don't want to look at an empty wall. Why?

GOODWIN: Why?

WEISMAN: Because it's decoration.

GOODWIN: Because it's boring. It's lonely.

WEISMAN: It's lonely and it's boring. So then it says when something is there it's no longer boring. They have company. So, it says it's doing something for them no matter how horrible it is. And the next step is: I found

another calendar that has a better picture, or the month changes.

GOODWIN: Right, that's the next step. But the question is how many people reach for the next step?

WEISMAN: Well, hopefully, the children reach for the next step. And I think that is what's happening. Certainly this world that we look at that's very small has to be larger than the collecting world, or the interested world of yesteryear. I think you once said it was a lot bigger.

GOODWIN: I did.

WEISMAN: I don't believe that, because there weren't more people. But there weren't more things to divert them either. Percentagewise maybe you're right, because there weren't the diversions of television and automobiles to run out: you were stuck at your house or--

GOODWIN: I tend to view the situation [as] society consisting of various subcultures; and there's the art subculture, and there's the other subculture. And they don't mix.

WEISMAN: Gee. You're worse than I am. You say the "art" subculture and the "other" subculture.

GOODWIN: The "nonart" subculture.

WEISMAN: All right. But the point is that--that's better--because the other subculture is everything, and the art subculture is really infinitesimal by comparison.

GOODWIN: Yes. I really have my doubts as to whether the situation is going to improve in the future. I think it [could] easily dissipate.

WEISMAN: It may dissipate, but I think it's improving on the way to dissipation. Improving in that museum attendances are getting bigger, the museums are now striving to find the Mexican shows, the Pompeii shows, the Tut shows. And they'll keep picking these up and picking them up. And hopefully, the museums will get wiser, and they'll find what Fred was screaming about all through Tut at the County, that they'll squeeze in these other things at the same time. So as they're showing Tut--before you can get into the Tut--you've got to go through the Jackson Pollock show; that they're going--well--

GOODWIN: They don't do that, though.

WEISMAN: Of course they don't. But in time they'll indoctrinate people.

GOODWIN: I think unfortunately--well, [at] the moment one of the biggest barriers to the appreciation of art on a large-scale basis in this country is the state of public schools. My experience has been that students will never be able to respond very positively to art unless they become just basically educated in other areas. If they can't read well, they can't express themselves, they're not curious people; then art will always be unavailable

to them. And unfortunately, I think schools at the time being are performing a miseducational function.

WEISMAN: You don't think they take them to museums and they teach them reading and writing properly?

GOODWIN: No. Well, unfortunately, I haven't been exposed to outstanding students. I've been teaching at some state colleges, which tend to get very mediocre students, but those students are frightfully ignorant.

WEISMAN: But that's why they're there: to learn.

GOODWIN: Yes, except--

WEISMAN: Then that's your responsibility.

GOODWIN: --they shouldn't be there. They should still be in high school. The situation is that they need remedial instruction.

WEISMAN: Well, they graduate them to get them out of the way.

GOODWIN: Right! It's simply an assembly line process.

WEISMAN: Yes, but hopefully along the way, there are those that, while they're in high school, that doesn't happen to them, that there are teachers who care enough that will teach them, and if they don't get it there, somewhere along the line in the first twelve grades, or in the junior colleges or state colleges, that they'll meet someone like you that cares that can teach them properly.

GOODWIN: Yes. [laughter]

WEISMAN: No, I'm serious.

GOODWIN: Yes, that's the goal, the dream.

WEISMAN: That's the dream.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: And they don't have 100 percent of the teachers like that. But if they start with 1 percent and get to 10 percent and get to 20 percent, maybe in time-- Maybe there are more than you realize. But unfortunately, where you are, you're not getting that cream of the crop, because those people when they once learned how to learn, to find out how fascinating it was, they went on to bigger and better things. So now these are the ones that didn't quite make that kind of aspiration. They didn't get to that point of thinking, but now you've got to turn them on.

GOODWIN: Right, and it's a much more difficult task than I ever imagined, because--

WEISMAN: Oh, I know. [laughter] From both being a learner--trying to be a learner--and also trying to be a teacher, it's very difficult. It's frustrating as hell!

GOODWIN: Well, I think it's impossible in many cases to change people's behavior.

WEISMAN: Did I ever tell you about--? That's not true, not always.

GOODWIN: No, but--

WEISMAN: I had a marvelous experience: I had a man--a couple--in my class, in a class. And this couple--she was interested, and she brought her husband, and so they took the class. And this man's in the lumber business. He would sit there, and he would ask some of the most inane [laughter] questions you've ever heard like, "I'd understand it if there was a man in the middle. But I don't understand it, because there's nothing there." I would try to explain to him, "But if the man were in the middle, what would the rest of it have to do with it? Would it make it better, the rest of it?" Anyway, I would go through the natural--hopefully normal--process of trying to get him to understand this, and nothing seemed to penetrate. And I tried to tell him there was art in the streets: the city, the traffic light signals have an aesthetic expression to them; the trees, the way the sidewalks weave, the grass on either side of the sidewalks. Everything, if you look at it, can have an aesthetic sense. If you strive for it, if you look for it, it's there. And I go through this whole process. During the course of the classes he says to me, "Oh, from the way you talk even lumber is a work of art." I said, "Certainly. If you look at the grain of a piece of lumber, there's some lumber that is beautifully grained, and

some that's less beautifully grained, and the way the knots are placed and so forth, and how it would be stained, and what its potentials are; of course, there's aesthetic beauty in lumber.

[During] the last class I had a panel, and in the panel was Ed Moses. We had an artist, a collector, a dealer, a painter, a museum person. So, during the course of this panel discussion, this same man says to the panel, "Well, from what I see," he said, "to me there's a sense of beauty in a piece of lumber, too, which means that my business offers me aesthetic sense." And Ed Moses said to him, "Mister, you're full of shit." [laughter] Well, my whole class broke up. I almost died of embarrassment. So, I don't know if this was appropriate to say on the tape. But, nevertheless, it's a fact of life.

Subsequently, two years went by. And this man who was truly striving to find something and couldn't-- Loren Madsen we designated to be the artist to do a sculpture for the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. And we wanted to get National Endowment grant money for it, because we felt it would give a sense of credibility to the art program at the hospital and so forth: art in public places and what not. Anyway, we applied for the grant, and they said they'll do it. I talked to the proper people, and I talked to Loren, and he was willing to do it. He would

give, if he charged \$20,000-- He was going to charge \$20,000 for the making of the piece, and he was going to give ten thousand himself. Then we had to get one other ten thousand, or the equivalent, for matching funds from the NEA. I went in to the hospital and said, "Who do you know that's in the lumber business?" They suggested this man, and I said splendid. So, I went to him, and I said, "Here's an opportunity for you to see that lumber can be an aesthetic form--take on aesthetic form--and that you can be a part of the arts." And I sold him the bill of goods, and he gave us \$11,000--

GOODWIN: Wow.

WEISMAN: --worth of lumber to build a Loren Madsen.

Have you seen it?

GOODWIN: Not yet.

WEISMAN: And so, in any event, he agreed. As we walked out of the house his wife said to me, "I am in such a state of shock I'm going to go in" (this was at nine o'clock in the morning) "and pour myself a stiff drink. [laughter] I don't believe he did this!" Because it really amounted, as I say, to about [\$]11-, \$12,000 worth of lumber. Do you know, periodically I get a phone call, "Are we going to ever dedicate it? Are you really going to dedicate it? It's so beautiful. I'm so excited about it. It's the first art I've ever related to." His wife says they go

nowhere without passing by that hospital. They can be going to Santa Monica from Beverly Hills, and they go by the hospital to get there. And he feels so proud, and it's made him look, and it's made him become involved and interested in a way never before. We're going to have a dedication. And it's a great thing.

So, I've had these kinds of people, but it's so impossible. It seems an endless procedure for them to ever learn, and some of them never will. When you get all through--and I'll spend ten weeks going over the whole thing--somebody will say to me, "But do you think that will be worth anything someday? Do you think it will be able to be worth anything?" And it's so hard, but sometimes I just say, "It's worth something now if you like it." You know, but it's impossible. But those are people one has to struggle with, and the people I'm getting through to--or trying to--are people that you haven't gotten through to, that are even beyond that. They're old now. They haven't even had an education, a full education. And then there are those young ones, too, that really respond and make it worthwhile.

GOODWIN: Why don't you explain how your classes evolved?

WEISMAN: Well, it actually evolved for a few reasons.

One, I had started putting art into offices of people in the community that knew that they needed art--lawyers,

doctors, businessmen, accountants, whatever--where they had a suite of offices maybe anywhere from four to ten, twelve offices in a suite. But they knew they needed art, and they figured they wanted to do it right and didn't know how to go about it. They certainly weren't going to get into a situation where they had an art consultant that was going to sic them on to [\$]25-, \$50,000 worth of art. And so I said, "Well, I think I can help you out," and I did. I did posters or reproductions or lithographs, and once in a while a painting would come along that would be right for them. And I would in effect decorate with art and see that it looked right, and that the images were good and the spirit of the work was good. So that if somebody were to come into their reception area or their offices, they may sit down and never know there was a work of art on the walls. But if you cared anything at all you'd say, "Hmm, they selected very good reproductions," or, "This is a very pleasant room to sit in," and they'd like what they're seeing. And so that's what I've done. It was a maybe a [\$]200- --anywhere from [\$]100-, [\$]150-, [\$]200-, [\$]450-a-month kind of rental. And it was very workable, because they could deduct it and so forth.

Well, from this I became friendly with the people I was installing art with into their offices. They'd call me in great gratitude or [ask me to] please come and

exchange something. I also lease it with the opportunity to sell, and apply the leasing against the purchase price. Well, all that was very well. And then pretty soon I began to get little messages from little gals I knew that were young marrieds and had just gotten into their first homes and saying, "You know, I have a place over my sofa, and I really would like to buy a painting. Would you help me do this?" Finally, I got six of them together and I called the class "I Have a Place over My Sofa and I Want to Buy a Painting." And I worked out a format. We met once a week for six weeks. And I put them in my station wagon and took them. And I charged them \$25 for the lesson for the ten weeks--or six weeks, which it was at that time--and I would give them a membership to a museum of their choice, any place in the country; and I gave them a poster for a diploma. And I felt this would give them material for a year that would be valid, good material for them to learn from. They would have the learning experience of a class for six weeks. And they would also have something to look at, that the image was good. I always framed it and had a frame for them wholesale, so that it meant they hung it instead of rolling it up in a closet. Well, from this their husbands were excited about what their wives were doing, and they wanted to do it, and it grew. It was like Topsy. It's become very

meaningful now. It's no longer just a little pitchie-koo thing. It's become very--

GOODWIN: This is the eighteenth time you've done a class?

WEISMAN: Is that what it is?

GOODWIN: Seventeenth or eighteenth.

WEISMAN: Yes, I believe so.

GOODWIN: So, you do it two or three times a year?

WEISMAN: Well, at the beginning I was doing-- There was a time when I'd do a Tuesday night class, a Wednesday day, and a Wednesday night. [laughter] Sometimes a Thursday night.

GOODWIN: That's a full-time job.

WEISMAN: And then I realized I was out of my mind. You know, I was exhausted from it, and I would do it so that I staggered it. I'd have the Tuesday night class the first class, and then I would skip a week. Then the night that I had the second class of the Tuesday night class, I had the first class for the Wednesday day class. Then the Wednesday night class I'd start on the third class, and the Thursday night class I would start on the fourth class. So the six classes ran ten weeks for me. Or they would run twelve weeks depending on how many classes we had. Well, I couldn't hack it. [laughter] It really got very terrible. So I stopped that, and eventually it's now come down to twice a year. I do it

twice a year and sometimes do two classes at a time
twice a year. So it might make two different--

GOODWIN: You also have weekend sessions for the alumni.

WEISMAN: Yes. Then I have the "seminars," I call them,
for the alumni, which I may do the twenty-third, twenty-fourth
of September this year. I hire a bus, and I have
refreshments on the bus. They have breakfast here at
the house--if you can call it that--like coffee and
donuts and juice and bagels or whatever. Then we get
on the bus, and the bus takes us to artists' studios,
a few private collections (but very few), and we go to
basically artists' studios, maybe a gallery or two if
they're showing California artists or artists of the
locale. And then in the morning, we may go to Venice;
then we stop for lunch, and that's included in it. And
then from lunch we may go to downtown Los Angeles,
Culver City, through the area, and coming back around
through Eagle Rock or Glendale into artists' studios.
Then they're back to this house by six o'clock. And
then the next day we start again at breakfast, and then
we'll go all the way to Pasadena--well, usually we go
not downtown but to Eagle Rock; we'll go Santa Monica,
Venice, Culver City, Inglewood, and through there, and
come around Los Angeles way: Western, Normandie; that's
as far as we'll go.

GOODWIN: Do sales often result from this business?

WEISMAN: Oh, a tremendous amount of sales.

GOODWIN: Really?

WEISMAN: Yes. Well, Steve Harger sold out on the first one. He sold everything he had in his studio. So did--

GOODWIN: The dealers must be mad at you.

WEISMAN: No, they aren't. Because it's created a-- These artists hadn't sold before. They had not had dealers before. And then the other one was Nancy and Claude Kent-- practically sold out. Nancy sold a lot. Don Sorenson didn't even have a gallery, and subsequently Nick [Wilder] took him on. But that's what happened. It created the desire and the need on their part to go to a gallery when they found out they could once sell. Another one was Tom Leeson that sold a great deal. But you know there are those that are easy to sell. Vasa sells all the time. Constantly. And the artists are delighted.

Well, the second day we do the same thing. We go to another place for lunch, and then we come back here for cocktails and buffet at six o'clock. And I have all the artists and the dealers that we went to, the collectors that we went to. We have cocktails and buffet so that the students can have the opportunity to have interchange and speak and have one-to-one conversations with these people that they've met, which they can't do

really during the day, because it's in and out. We covered thirty-four artists in two days.

Then ten days later, or a week later, we meet again at our house, and I always advise, "No notebooks or anything." The cream rises to the top. You remember what you like. And there it is. And it isn't just the last one, because it's a week later, and it does sift itself out.

GOODWIN: Do you ever regard yourself as the leader of a salon?

WEISMAN: Oh, my God.

GOODWIN: I think you have a nickname or--

WEISMAN: "Teach," let it go. And sometimes I blow a whistle. That reminds me, I must bring a tape with me tonight. But, no, they call me Teach, and that's the whole number. When I send out my alumni letters, [I] sign "Marcia" and in parentheses underneath ("Teach"). And that class is only for people who have taken it before. Now, if I don't get a full house and I can get others, I will, to make it a full load. And a full load is twenty-five for that. But it does work very nicely.

Ach, how can you say that's a salon?

GOODWIN: No, just a very informal--

TAPE NUMBER: VI, SIDE TWO

AUGUST 30, 1978

WEISMAN: Geez, it's a long time taping, right?

GOODWIN: Yes. Last week we were discussing your class, and today you mentioned you received a gift from Andy Warhol.

WEISMAN: Well, that was a birthday gift--which I thought was very sweet of him. He is really a most generous person. In fact, the gift that I mentioned to you before, that our son gave us for Christmas--a painting that Andy did of the children--now those were the first children that Andy had ever done as portraits to my knowledge. The portrait came; I didn't have any idea what it was when the crate came. It could have been anything being returned or that my husband would have bought neglecting to mention it to me. So I opened the crate, and when I opened it and saw those two children I burst into tears, ran to the phone, called my son to thank him for the Christmas gift, and I kept-- On the back it said, "To Mother and Dad, with love, Christmas '78, or Christmas '77, and Happy New Year '78." So, I get Richard on the phone, and I'm blubbering on the phone, "Thank you for the gift. It's the most beautiful thing that ever happened to us." And he said, "Well, mother, stop crying. God, I didn't even buy it. Andy gave it to me as a gift. [laughter] He

surprised me, and I said to Andy at the time, 'Come on Andy, I want to turn it over, and I need a pen.' I got a pen, and I wrote on it for you. Because after all, I have the kids; you should have the painting." And I said, "Richard, stop it! You're making it worse, not better." But Richard was sort of thoughtful as to want to give it to us. And Andy thought it was so touching; because he gave it to Richard, because he and Richard have been good friends and all, that he immediately did another one for Richard and gave it to Richard. So Richard now has one as well as do we, and I'm sure Beth will have--Richard's almost ex-wife.

GOODWIN: Did you mention you were going to invite Warhol to your class?

WEISMAN: Oh, well, Warhol comes in and out of this house very frequently--with and without invitation. We're very good friends, and I felt that it would be a meaningful treat for the class. I always have done these classes with--as I think I mentioned before--with the fee including a membership of a museum of their choice and a poster at the end of the class framed for their keeping, so that it means that they have something to hang on the walls. Well, when Andy was coming to town-- I had completely forgotten about there's an exhibition opening at Ace Gallery of Andy's Torsos, which is a dubious exhibition in my eyes,

not necessarily because it tends to be kind of porno-y, or erotic, or whatever you want to call it, but they're nude torsos and so forth; and the paintings are good. I don't know whether they're great. I haven't seen them all. But I've only seen a few of them back of, you know, Warhol's place. But I had received a note from him thanking me for a--from Fred Hughes who was at my birthday party. He said that he'd see me on the twentieth, and I forgot--I didn't know what the hell he was doing on the twentieth. And then today I received this gift and-- yesterday rather--and then I get a call saying that--from Doug Christmas--that the twenty-fourth he's opening the Torso show here, and on the twentieth he was coming in. I said, "Oh my God, I'm going to grab him for my class that night." And so Doug and Andy and Fred [Hughes] and Fred Weisman and myself and three specials, whoever--but maximum ten people--will be here for dinner. Then we will follow that with my class, and I will have posters from Andy that I'll get at Doug Christmas's and have Andy sign them for the class as their diplomas. And they'll be autographed to the members of the class, which we've never done that before. Then following dinner the class will come in after dinner; that's when Andy will sign the posters. And then we'll have the question and answer period for the class to Andy and to Fred Hughes, who's his business manager. And

it's possible David Hockney will be in town at the same time, which if that happens I'll have David here, too. And the two of them ought to be very interesting together.

GOODWIN: And my comment was your students don't deserve that treat.

WEISMAN: Right. And I think they do, because I think they really don't know where it's at. I think they have all kinds of mixed feelings about collecting art, and the art world, and what it means; and I think all the kinds of feelings they have are valid feelings, and it means different things to different people. And for one thing I'd like to get straight in their head [that] the art world really isn't such a big bash as one might think, that my final statement would be after a party with Andy for them: OK, now you're in the art world. You've met a great artist in Andy Warhol. You've met great dealers from New York in Irving Blum as well as the dealer locally. You've met a good auctioneer, who happens to be head of twentieth-century art, Ian Dunlop from Sotheby Parke Bernet in New York. Now you've met the artists of all artists, Andy Warhol, along with the artists in Southern California. They will have gone to private collections that show what great collections are. They now have a talking, verbal, viewing image of all of the constituency of the art world. Now you are in fact a

part of the art world; you can get rid of that and weave from that connotation. And now it's time to get into the real art world by acquiring art.

Now, you can't help but understand, I think, that people who know nothing about this are awed by it no differently than we're all awed by the fact that if we were invited to a party--and I was at a dinner party and I had--if I had Robert Redford on my right as a dinner partner, and Paul Newman on my left, and across the table from me were whoever, that I would think would be equally gorgeous. Isn't it funny, I can't think of another actor that would turn me on like that. Well, I guess Cary Grant, but I know him, so that's different. But in any event [laughter], that's the kind of a situation it is, and that doesn't make films. That only takes care of awe. And that only takes care of being in touch with the PR of it all and the--what would you call?--the ambience of art. It has nothing to do with art, in effect. Well, we are all turned on by those kinds of things. We're turned on by politicians. If you're at a dinner party and on one side of you is Alan Cranston, and on the other side of you is Ted Kennedy, and across the table from you is--name me one--my friend John Brademas whom I like tremendously--well, you're in the ambience of the political arena. And of course if Jimmy Carter were there--like him

or not--that's certainly the epitome of the political arena. And then you get Jerry Brown and you get the conflicts which makes it even more so. But you get that in the ambience and you sit at the dinner table with them, you could be delighted and thrilled at that ambience, but that does not make you a part of the political world. Because there's more to politics than that.

And so consequently, I think it's important to kind of get that stuff out of the way. And then get down to the business of politics, or filmmaking, or art and the making of art, the buying of art, and the living with art. That is a whole other ball game. And that's what I think is truly important. And you know, I hope I impart that to the class, and I think this is the best way I know of doing that.

And certainly they're neophytes and it's really a bunch of junk. What difference does it make? And nobody knows it better than Andy Warhol. As he'll sit there while we're talking and asking questions--making with questions, hoping for answers--he'll have his tape on, taping the whole thing. And that's his thing. And he's the first one that will readily admit it. I remember one night in New York at a dinner and-- We were at someone's house for dinner; there were eight of us, I think, or

ten of us--sitting around a table and chitchatting. And Andy and I were talking. An article had just come out in some periodical; it could have been Newsweek or Time or something about Andy. And I said to him, "My God, that article was just awful! It made you out to be an imbecile. And I don't think that's very nice." And he said, "Shhh! Don't destroy the myth. You can't tell anybody what the real Andy Warhol's like. And if you do you'll spoil everything for me." [laughter] And he's absolutely right. And most people don't realize he is truly without question or without doubt one of the greatest connoisseurs of opera that you'll ever know.

GOODWIN: Really?

WEISMAN: He attends every major opera available to be seen in the city of New York. He is just as awestruck by the world of opera as you and I might be by the world of art. He is that into it. He's into art deco as totally-- His offices are totally all art deco at the Factory. His home-- He has absolutely exquisite antiques and they're all intermingled with beautiful art deco. So, he has another world that most people don't know, and he is a very kind and generous person. Now, I know he's flaky, and I know he's had the drug scene, and I know he's obviously gay and been gay before people spoke of it with any kind of understanding or concern, but instead with

a put-down. But, you know, you get to know someone and all those things drop away. And so, I think of him as a very nice person. He's a very smart businessman for sure. And he knows it, and I know it. And anybody that doesn't think so, all they have to do--if they could--is check his bank account and see the style in which he lives and the staff that he keeps around him doing his thing--they're doing his thing--and boy, when they don't, out they go. And there's no question about that.

GOODWIN: Do you plan to continue with your class indefinitely?

WEISMAN: I hope to, because I think it's such a marvelous learning experience for me. I just love it. It does for me exactly what it does for my class. It gets me to the galleries, it gets me to the artists' studios, it keeps me in touch with what's going on twice a year, and it puts me back into the world of the real art instead of the ambience. Because I tend to get into the political factions: involved in the arts, trying to get bills passed in Washington, or Sacramento, or whatever--in a menial way, because I really don't know what I'm doing--but wherever I can lend support. It's something that I think will help the artists. And I do get into all of these other situations, like the hospital, and now my new project of putting sculpture throughout the city. I think we talked about that?

GOODWIN: A little. We'll get on to that in a while.

WEISMAN: All right. And I think that it does bring me back to the real, and to the art. And I don't want to give that up; I'm not ready to. [tape recorder turned off] I try to continue the classes twice a year, besides which I've been doing a seminar for alumni. I've done one, and I'm doing my second, whereby we go to the artists' studios primarily. And we just really-- I think that's what they call barnstorming. They barnstorm around a table with ideas; this is barnstorming art. And I think it should work well, and it has in the past. I think that it really creates-- It gives people an opportunity to make some decisions, to make judgments on their own. I think that's just terribly important. And I hope-- I know I've made collectors in the community, and that makes me feel good. I think it's well worthwhile, and as I say, it makes me feel very good.

GOODWIN: It's certainly a bargain.

WEISMAN: It's a great bargain.

GOODWIN: We didn't officially mention what it costs to take your course.

WEISMAN: Well, please, put it on the tape. This is 1978; we don't know what '79 will bring. When we started them they were \$25 a person. And they got a membership to a museum, and a poster and transportation. But now they

don't get the transportation. The class is too big, and they take their own cars. But they still get the membership to a museum and the poster at the end. And it also includes dinner at the house at the beach, and we wine and cheese them when they're here. But actually, I've raised the price through the years; but everything else has gone up, too. And so now we're up to \$100 a person--[\$]150--what is it? I think it's \$100 for a person, and [\$]150 a couple. And by doing that they get one membership, and they get only one poster; and it makes it easier on--

GOODWIN: And it's ten sessions.

WEISMAN: And it's ten sessions. It creates a better thing for me--not a lot better, but a little. And then also that I do a-- I think it's [\$]175 a couple, as a matter of fact: it's [\$]100 a person, [\$]175 a couple, and the seminar is [\$]150 a person straight. And there they get lunch two days, Continental breakfast here, and then we have a dinner at the end at our home. And this time, since Andy will still-- No, he won't be coming back at that. We're going to him, I forgot. There's a big bash following the opening on the twenty-fourth, might be interesting. It supposedly is going to be the most bizarre art party given in Venice, ever. It's going to be given for this show. I think it must be ever for

this part of the country, because I don't think you can get more bizarre than some that I've been to up at Leo's [Castelli] for openings of Andy's, and others as well, and Bob Rauschenberg's, and so forth.

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, you said that you were an adjunct professor at Cal State Long Beach.

WEISMAN: That means free.

GOODWIN: What do you do for free?

WEISMAN: What do I do for free? Well, for first, we gave a sculpture of Guy Dill's to Cal State Long Beach. Then after that came the adjunct professorship. That means that I go and I talk to their--what do you call--a postgraduate art-- What do you call that?

GOODWIN: Grad students?

WEISMAN: Graduate students in the art. I speak to the graduate students of the arts once a semester.

GOODWIN: About what?

WEISMAN: About collecting art, and what constitutes collecting, and how a collector looks at art, and how a collector fits into the museum picture, and what the museum orientation should be to collecting, as well as the collector's orientation to museuming and to gallerying, and so forth. I think it's meaningful. I think they might have started it in a token-y kind of a way.

Although I had gone to Connie and Jack Glenn's gallery

and to their homes with classes in the past. So they were aware of the kind of things I taught.

I really feel that while what these people learn is not profound in terms of art history and so forth, and it's certainly-- Oh, I know it doesn't. I have no misgivings about whether it deserves accreditation; it does not in a scholastic manner. But I do think that probably it's very important for students in graduate school that are planning to go on into museumology in any way [to] have an understanding of what a museum's responsibilities are to a collector, to a community, and vice versa. And I think that might be one of the great problems with our present museum staff in and around the Southern California area. There isn't a real responsibility to the art community. And I think it's time they learn it. And I think that maybe I can offer that at Cal State Long Beach. And I would do that anywhere if I thought it would help. I think it's been treated very lightly in--from what I know of museum people--in the museum world. It might be something for you to think of in terms of your teachings--

GOODWIN: I know. Well--

WEISMAN: --at UCLA. Don't you think so?

GOODWIN: Oh, for sure. No, I was thinking I'd like to have you speak at Art Center College.

WEISMAN: At your what?

GOODWIN: At Art Center College. I'll make you adjunct professor there, too.

WEISMAN: I'd be delighted!

GOODWIN: Great.

WEISMAN: Because I think that it's very-- Is that graduate work in museumology?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: But see, I think if Maurice Tuchman had such a class--a serious class--not from an adjunct professor like myself, but some serious expressions from collecting people, gallery people, and other museum people that really know, maybe we wouldn't have curatorial problems like we have. And I think there is something to be learned from a collector's needs. A lot of it being their ego, but their ego is justifiable. I was talking to Dick Bellamy yesterday about offers-- People come to us with requests. We would like to show the collection and asked him what he thought. He said, "Well, you know, the one thing I--knowing you and Fred--the one thing I know that would concern you is that you would be concerned about it being an ego trip. And I think the first thing I think you ought to understand is it should be. [laughter] And you're entitled, and it's only right. If it weren't an ego trip it never would have started. There has to be

something of your own ego in it to make it what it is, and your ego is strong enough to have demanded only the best. So," he said, "why shouldn't you have an ego trip?" I said, "Well, let me put it this way then: You're making me feel very good, and you've taken what people normally think negative and turned it into a positive from the standpoint from where we sit."

And it can't help but remind me of the time when we were considering placing our daughter in an institution when she was five years old and mentally retarded. And everyone kept telling us how good it would be for us and for Richard, and that she should be put away in a school so that we could live a normal life. And not until a doctor said to us, "You're depriving that child by making her live in a competitive society [in] which she can't compete. How dare you do that to her when you can make it better for her!" And that's all we needed to hear. But it's rare that you find that person that takes it, and turns it around, so that you can see it in its proper vantage point.

And it made me feel very comfortable, much more comfortable about showing the collection. But then there were a lot of other things that come to play, and which he understood totally. That is like when I think of some of the damages that we've had in showing singular

things. If you sent a whole show out of this whole collection--if only 5 percent damage was done, and we sent 150 paintings, we could lose seven or eight pictures! And which seven or eight would we be willing to lose? Zero! So Fred wants to do videos of the whole collection and have it done with scholars' commentaries on the specifics that they're involved in. And he'd like to do a really major video of all of the art, and it would make it all visible: sculptures that would otherwise not be movable, and so forth. I think it'd be a marvelous idea, except for one thing. I kept remembering what Barney Newman always said: "There is no substitute for the real thing." And, again, Dick Bellamy said, when he walked in he said, "You know, I remembered the images of so many, but I forgot the feelings. You forget the feeling until you're in the presence of it, even though you remember the images." And it's true. And every time I show it to someone like that and I walk through, I see it differently, too. That's quite nice.

GOODWIN: Let's talk about the hospital.

WEISMAN: Didn't we do that?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: Not at all?

GOODWIN: Well, some references to it. How did you get

involved with the Cedars-Sinai hospital.

WEISMAN: Well, this sounds redundant, it feels to me. Because I've said it so many times when people ask, but it's really kind of a nice story. Fred's been on the board at Cedars-Sinai for some--I hate to say how many years--maybe thirty, thirty-five years. And early on in our married life, that was my first charitable endeavor, to go to meetings for-- I worked at the hospital as a-- What the hell did I do? I used to work in the clinic as a chart keeper or whatever. I would stand-- At the old hospital I would have a-- There was a desk, and all the clinic patients would come in. I'd call out their names and take them to the proper place and so forth. I used to act as a nurse taking histories in the doctors' offices. And I was a fast nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two [years old], something like--twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two--something like that. So I've worked in the hospital for many, many years. And then I was the head of the first women's division they had. I remember we raised, I think, \$7,500 or \$10,000, something like that--which was a vast sum of money in those days-- with a luncheon at the Beverly Hills Hotel, and they had Bill [Dr. William] Meninger there speaking.

Well, they decided to combine the two hospitals and build a new medical center, that exists at Beverly Boulevard and Robertson. And Fred went to a board meeting at the

new building, and they all wore hard hats to go through the building. Fred was so overcome by the size of it and all, that he said to the other members of the board, "Look, you're going to have to do something, like making this soft and loving. It's going to be the coldest, biggest building in the world. And if it's big to you now, you should know how big it is when you're seeing it with scaffolding and raw. Oh, my God, it's painful." So he suggested that art be put into the hospital. And they said, "Well, that's fine. But we haven't the money for it. How do we do it?" Fred said, "I know how you'll do it. I'll give you Marcia. [laughter]" And so with this they said--I guess what they really felt was, "How do we know we want her?" And he came home and suggested that I go down and look, and I did, and I came home and said, "How could I do it? It's tremendous!" He said, "I'll tell you how: You just take a room and start there and do it." And he said, "And I'll give you enough to start the first room, and I will pay for all the installation for the first year, and you go ahead."

Well, the hospital got to working and being there for maybe about six months prior to its actual opening, and I went to work. And I started by taking works of ours that we were willing to give. Oh, first I called a council. I put together a council, inviting curators and

directors from all the museums of Southern California; people from all the universities in music; everybody in theater that I could think of, from Gordon Davidson to--whoever was it?--[John] Houseman at UCLA and Charles Speroni at UCLA and Bloch--what's his first name?

GOODWIN: Maurice.

WEISMAN: Maurice Bloch at UCLA and Don Brewer at SC. And then I had the [Marvin and Walter] Mirisches, and Jennings Lang, and all the people from all the big film companies. Well, I got them all here at my house and said, "Guess what we're all going to do? We're going to put art into Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. And we're going to put it on the TV cameras, closed circuit; we're going to have music coming through those closed circuit televisions, and radios. We're going to have art in every patient's room."

Now, I had worked at Mayo Clinic. I was commissioned to do consulting work there, which I did. And we acquired several things for the Mayo Clinic. They ran out of money, and they were not in a position to go begging and borrowing. I wasn't close enough to them physically to be able to do the kinds of things that I would be able to do locally. I did give them whatever I could. I was there for about two years and made about four or five trips to Minneapolis. I must say they paid me a very handsome fee, and after

thirty days I was so guilt ridden that Fred gave it back in a contribution. [laughter] But then how can you help it? Then also prior to that I had been asked by Didi Hirsch-- who subsequently passed away and had started a mental health center over on Washington Boulevard and Sepulveda-- if I would consider, when the building was completed, putting a picture into the lobby, you know. I went over there, talked to Fred, and we gave all the art, and we installed it and put it in. And it really turned out very nicely. And then I did the Suicide Prevention Center down on Vermont and put art in there that we gave them.

So it wasn't like it was a foreign thing to me. It was just the size that was so overwhelming. So it didn't take too long. My first commitment, of course, was to the hospital. And it was important to me, and to them, that I didn't go after people that would say to me, "Well, I gave you a painting for the hospital. I don't have to give you any money anymore." I never went to anybody that hadn't made a contribution in capital funds for the Medical Center, so that I didn't conflict in that way. If they hadn't I made it clear to them that this had nothing to do with capital funds. This was making tax deductions for them. Well, the last line is we have approximately 6,000 works of art in the Medical Center. We had one sculpture, the Loren Madsen sculpture, on

Beverly Boulevard and San Vicente, that the artist gave one-third. The Stanley Brown family gave the lumber, which was the equivalent of the third. And the National Endowment for the Arts funded for the remainder. It's really quite beautiful with the dedication about to take place. The Los Angeles County Museum gave us an extended loan of ten, ten, and ten years--which is thirty in total--of the Norbert Kricke sculpture that formerly was in front of the museum.

I think Tony Berlant put it very well--when people are continually saying, "You made a museum out of a hospital." In fact what we did, we--quoting Tony--we "humanized" a rather inhuman situation, and a situation that's filled with anxieties, fears, trauma, every kind of discomfort possible, not only for patients and their families, but for the staff as well--medical and administrative. Nobody really feels comfortable around sick people. And particularly when that sickness brings about an imminence of death. It's a very uncomfortable feeling, and it's done a great deal to eliminate some of that discomfort and trauma. We have many, many documents to prove it in letters from strangers and friends alike, about how they didn't know what it really meant when they gave us something for the hospital. They knew it was good and that was fine. "But now my little boy was

in for a week, and I don't know what I would have done during the two hours of surgery had it not been for the art," and all kinds of things. My original purpose in what I was going to do was see that there was artwork in every patient's room. There's I think 1,200 patient rooms.

Does that sound right?

GOODWIN: Sounds huge.

WEISMAN: It is huge. Well, we long since filled that. And you realize the patient rooms really weren't as important as the corridors. But when a patient today is operated on they're out of bed the next day. And the doctors insist that they walk. And they never could get the patients out of bed and get them walking in time. They do this for circulation, or for whatever reasons, and they had difficulties in promoting this. Now they say, "Now, I want you to walk down as far as the last Picasso," and, "I want you to walk down to the end of the California Suite," or, "I want you--"

GOODWIN: The doctors don't know that much about art.

WEISMAN: They're learning. They've learned. They really and truly have. And they've given so much themselves. They really have. Pediatrics is all photography. There's a doctor--an X-ray doctor, one of the heads of X-rays-- has given the majority of photography. And it's marvelous. It's animals, and it's flowers, and it's sporting figures;

and they're all hung low so that the kids can see them at their small height or at a wheelchair level. They're all the kind of things that appeal to children: Yosemite, and Yellowstone National Park, and all of the sporting figures, and it's really very nice. And the kids do like it. And the doctors have given-- One doctor did this, and the next thing another doctor came up with great big blowups of his trip to Europe (some of them are good and some of them aren't). Then subsequently, a niece of mine, [Linda Simon] who's a very good photographer, had marvelous photographs of Nureyev dancing in the San Francisco-- in the Metropolitan Ballet--the Paris Theater Ballet-- Ballet Theater Corps. And she had taken these and said, "Would you like some for the hospital?" and I took them. She subsequently passed away, and we have these five of Nureyev in dancing position and two of the L.A. Ballet Company dancing that she gave us. I might add that subsequently Andy gave us a suite of Flowers in memory of this niece that he was friendly with, her and her cousin particularly (in the course), and so he gave us a suite of Flowers for the hospital in the lobby.

So, the doctors have come through and they've done really nice things. Sherm Holby--I don't know if you know him; he's an endocrinologist and chief in endocrinology at Cedars-Sinai. [He] has been treating Tony Berlant for years.

He's a diabetic, I believe. I don't want to be quoted; I guess I shouldn't be-- And Tony gave us one of his marvelous sculptures called Blue-Eyed Blonde. It's a house with two big blue-eyed windows with a yellow roof and a pink front and a red front door. And it does become a blue-eyed blonde. Then Dr. Macklin Wade, who's chief of OB/GYN, has long been interested in Gemini and now in Ken Tyler and has invested in Ken Tyler's graphics in the East. He's given us all the Albers lithos that are in the hospital. He's given us Johns. He's given us Rauschenberg. He's given us marvelous graphics, all in the medical center. He trades us all the time: things that I can't use, because medically they're inappropriate, or psychologically. Mac will take them back and give me things of his. He's given us paintings of Norman Ives in the lobby-- Oh, it goes on and on. All of them do. They've been most supportive. And staff [who, when we] put things around the hospital, [would] say, "You're not serious, are you?" and be yelling and screaming at me in the beginning, are now coming to me and saying, "You know, I have nothing in my office. Why don't I?" And I tell them, "We don't put them in the offices; we only put them in the hallways. You want to buy some from us? Fine."

Well, at the end of the first year Fred had taken care of--as I say--all of the framing, the hanging costs, and

additional lighting that was necessary. Now, what we do is we sell works. Andy again did me the favor on two trips. One, he sold his book [The Philosophy of Andy Warhol: From A to B and Back Again (1975)] at the hospital. He gave me the book and autographed it--I think seventy-five copies--and sat there and autographed it at the hospital, and we sold them. He also autographed a hundred posters at the hospital, and we sold them. The posters were given by Doug Christmas, and Andy signed them. We got the money of selling fifty posters at fifty bucks apiece that cost us nothing, which was marvelous, and it defrayed expenses. Roy Lichtenstein gave us paper plates. He signed the paper plates, and we boxed them, and we sold them for an outrageous price. But we've sold them, and that's helped maintain the program. Now we also did--almost simultaneously--an exhibition gallery. You have been there, haven't you?

GOODWIN: I've been in the hospital.

WEISMAN: But not with me on a tour.

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: I'll have to take you. In the coffee shop we hung a suite of Jim Dine's Vegetables and a painting that we gave of an artist named Charlie Brown. I don't even know if you have seen his work--big Smiling Tomatoes, that when you walk in, and then all around the

coffee shop is the Vegetable suite of Jim Dine's that somebody gave us the money to acquire. So, in the cafeteria I was very concerned about what we were going to do and came up with an idea, and I called eight artists in the Southern California area. I think one from Pasadena, or two from Pasadena, two from downtown L.A., two from Venice, two from Santa Monica, two from the other end of L.A., whatever. We made up eight artists. And we had our curator, Noriko Fujinami, come over, and we had them all for the evening and said, "Guess what? You've all just been elected to the first exhibition committee of the Cedars-Sinai Medical Center Gallery of Alternative Space. And they said, "Oh?" And I said, "And this is what we're doing. Noriko will be your director, and you will all be the exhibition committee. You will select a curator, and you will put up exhibitions every two months. You will have two weeks down, six weeks up--making the two months. And that means six exhibitions a year, and you can knock off one." Because at Christmastime, I had been told, in pediatrics they have a play therapist who would have the children do children's drawings at Christmastime to show. And I said, "You make up the exhibitions. The galleries will have to waive their normal fees. Any sales made in that gallery, 10 percent goes to the hospital, 90 percent to the artist. We want this

to benefit the artist, and we want it to benefit the hospital. And it gives them an added exposure. We prefer artists that do not have galleries, for starters, so it gives them an opportunity to show. Now, you can do it anyway you want, and I promise you I'm not going to interfere. I'll interfere if it's a question of policy for the medical center, if the work is totally obscene, or if the work has a quality about it that might be disturbing to a mental patient or a physically ill patient. You'll have to accept that, because we have members of an advisory council board that are doctors or psychiatrists." And they agreed somewhat reluctantly. I said, "You're going to have to do all your own installation. You're going to have to bring the paintings there and get them back, and that's up to the artist."

They agreed and then I told them how I felt they could work it: that they would appoint a different curator each time for each exhibition. And the curator would ask the artists to bring in their own work and help install. I also suggested that the committee of eight should replace themselves. The first committee would have to remain a committee; the four of the first committee would remain [in] that committee for one year. At the end of six months four people on that committee should replace themselves, and at the end of the next six months the other

half replace themselves. So that it continually revolves, and they will never be self-sustaining. And they can't be a forever situation. It doesn't lock them in so that it becomes an interference to the other things that they do. So that every six months they went off-- Was it every six months or every year? I guess it worked on a three-month replacement, so that it meant that they were on six months. Would that work? I forget. But however, it was--

GOODWIN: Yes, they rotate off.

WEISMAN: They rotated off, so that they never served over six months, which was reasonable enough time to get them started, and reasonable enough time to help them get the next group indoctrinated. And we've now put on something like fourteen shows.

This last February we had our first catalog done, and we raised the money for it, so that it came out scot-free. We received contributions by just sending out a letter saying that "If you would like to help us, we'd be very grateful. This is going to be our retrospective exhibition." We invited all the artists that had ever shown to show again. And we did a catalog of the whole thing that was printed in Pasadena--what's his name?--Harry Montgomery's place? Typecraft. [He] prints the best catalogs in the business, and it was really

quite beautiful. It was all black and white, but I've never seen a better black-and-white catalog. And we did two thousand of them, hoping to sell them. We sold maybe twenty [laughter], and we have an awful lot of them left. But we distributed them to museums all over the country, and to universities all over the country, to show what can happen. And it's really been very good.

Now, I have interfered in two instances. I interfered when at one time there was going to be a women's show at the County Museum, and all of the galleries around town were cooperating by having women's shows simultaneously. I proposed to the committee, "Look, I want to be part of the mainstream. I'm opposed to women's shows, but it is necessary that Cedars-Sinai Exhibition Center be a part of the mainstream of exhibition galleries in the city of Los Angeles. Please, do me the favor of putting on a women's show." And they did. And it was the first review they got without any push or pull or shoving around; and Art News gave a review on their women's show as being one of the better women's shows in Los Angeles. We were really-- That was quite a coup! Of course, when the NEA agreed to fund the sculpture, that was great. We now have two CETA workers making artworks for the hospital.

GOODWIN: What do they make?

WEISMAN: One of them is making a sculpture, Eugene Sturman. And the other one is [William] Fedderson, who works in Lucite. He's making rings that hang from the ceiling that put together--fit inside of each other--and spread out and make it cunning. It's really quite lovely. They're prisms and they'll throw light all over the main lobby of the hospital. So we've tried to approach all of the various directions we could. Unfortunately, we applied at the California Arts Council at a very poor time, because it wasn't two months after that that Prop 13 came in, and we got the same ugly letter everybody got. And so we never made it with them; but we have made it otherwise. We've gotten letters of commendation from senators in Washington, and from senators in California. Alan Sieroty has been a great booster and helper, and he's done a lot for us, as has Ken Cory and other people in Sacramento. Even Jerry Brown, when he went to visit his father at the hospital when he had had surgery. I had put a poster of Nixon--you know the one that Andy did about McGovern with a picture of Nixon? And I had that in Pat's room when he came down from surgery. Jerry subsequently said to me, "My God, what were you trying to do? Kill off my father?" And I said, "No, I wanted to make him laugh." And he said, "But didn't you know that the only time it hurt was when he laughed?" Anyway,

it was very cute. But we've done things like this, but made it meaningful. We've definitely put special art in certain people's rooms, but we've gotten feedback as a result in terms of getting art or getting money for the Arts Council. And I feel very proud for what we've done.

One of the best things about it is the letters we get from other hospitals throughout the country. I've gone to New Orleans, to the-- It's called the Touro Infirmary, which is a medical center. They've just built a huge new building. It heard of what we had done and wondered if I could help them. I was going East, and so I came back and routed myself through New Orleans. They were perfectly lovely to me. I spoke to their art council, and then I sent them twelve posters for starters. I went through the whole center and told them how to do it. I now get letters, "Guess what? Now we have eighteen!" And I get another letter, "Now we have twenty . . . now we have forty. We have art in our hospital." I got a letter from a hospital in Honolulu just last week, and they had started an art program and an exhibition gallery. I've had letters from a hospital in Australia, from other hospitals in Canada, and it's happening all over the country. And I think it's marvelous.

And of course, the most flattering thing was when the Veterans Administration contacted me: Would I take over the art in the Veterans Administration hospitals--129 hospitals. I said, "If I lived to 129, I couldn't do that." And I said, "But I'll give you all the information I can, and good luck." So I gave them my outline of how we did it, how we handled it, how we cataloged it, and how we exhibit. They're now doing it, but they're buying art, which I think is too bad in one way. In another way it's supporting the artists. So that's good, too.

I might add that we have developed this, and we did it in a very professional way. Every painting, artwork--I should say artwork--has a tag on the side of it that is exactly like the tags with the same meanings of any museum with the number, the year it was donated, and the order in which it was donated for that particular year. We have a cataloging system in the office where you can find any work of art that's hanging in that hospital by either the artist's name, the donor's name, the number that's on the picture as well as on the label, or by the location. So that there's a four-way cross-file system. And that's on over six thousand works of art. We sell things off the walls and we pick a number from one to ten by the looks of the person who wants to buy

So that that's the money that feeds the funding of framing. And so far the hospital hasn't spent any money on it; and it makes me feel very good that it hasn't.

GOODWIN: Did you say that you wanted to step down as chairman?

WEISMAN: I've said that now for six, eight months; and now I am. I really feel that we put about as much art in as we can. We are going to finish off the Thaliens, which is the mental health hospital in back. I have someone that's doing that now [Ursula Kalish], and she'll finish it off before she moves back to New York. And we're now going to do--

TAPE NUMBER: VII, SIDE ONE

AUGUST 30, 1978

GOODWIN: You were explaining how you were planning to step down as chairman.

WEISMAN: Oh, so we're now going to do the original Sinai Hospital, which is now for dialysis patients [who] come in and spend five and six hours at a time sitting in a chair having some blood transfusions, I guess it is, or whatever. So there's a floor of that, another one of rehabilitation, and another of terminal illnesses that need to have hospital care. We're going to finish that. We've got a great deal of the work now that's going; and we have a former Time-Life magazine photographer [Leigh Wiener] who's contributed something like fifty works of art--just fabulous: shots that you'll remember of President Kennedy in an airplane dozing off on a campaign trip, another shot of Bobby and Jack together talking over a problem--some of the original shots of this man in the rocking chair in the Oval Office. The same for LBJ and Nixon, and some really marvelous shots of presidents, and also-ran presidents--people who also ran for president--and a lot of theater. He has a whole suite of Judy Garlands that are fantastic. Anyway, we're going to do one floor of that kind of thing. And then we're gathering together others. And now we just got

fifty-some posters from Vera List in New York, who did all the posters for-- She's a great benefactress to the arts, and she is one of the great sponsors of the New School in New York, the New School for the Arts. She funded a program of posters for Lincoln Center. So this organization sent us fifty posters this last week. Ken Donahue was over the other day, and he just promised me another fifty, sixty posters from the County, which is nice to get. And I didn't mention there's a man named David Ginsburg who gave--for all the wrong reasons--very good works, because he was a subscriber to Gemini in the early days. And he made me take a lot of junk before he gave the good stuff and then take high contributions and so forth. Guess I shouldn't have mentioned names, but there were people who did the right things for the wrong reasons. But I couldn't question those things, because I was interested in getting art in the hospital. So we have a very extensive situation of Gemini graphics.

I might add about the putting the art in the hospital: I think the most important thing that makes it the most special is I've done all the hanging with a learning experience in mind. Obviously, the patient rooms are all single, or in some instances two pictures in a room. But the hallways were something

else. And I made it be something else, like Times-Mirror-- Franklin Murphy has given us now something like 150 pictures that he's framed, reproductions that have been published by Harry Abrams. And Armand Hammer gave us many hundreds of reproductions from the Hermitage out of Knoedler's, and he framed them. And what I did with these big bulks of works that we got--some of the things I did for them were, for instance, on the fifth floor is the Hall of Flowers. I took floral paintings from Andy Warhol to Vermeer, or vice versa I should say, and did the whole fifth floor hallway in nothing but flowers. For all the neophytes [who] say, well, they only like realistic paintings like flowers, I can take them down the fifth floor and say, "You only like flowers? Which flowers? They have van Gogh, and Manet and Monet and Warhol, and on and on and on to choose from, and Redon, and on and on.

GOODWIN: Fantin-Latour?

WEISMAN: Fantin-Latour, the whole thing; and they're beautiful. Another hallway is all the visionary artists from San Francisco. Another hallway is all Karel Appel lithographs, which we happened to be able to gather in. So you'll never miss Karel Appel again. I have two other hallways that branch off of that: one is in Monet and one is in-- No, one is in Renoir and one is in--Renoir

and Monet, I guess. Because people so often, lay people, very often confuse the two. Another hallway is all Rauschenbergs, another is all Jasper Johns. The elevator banks are different on every floor. One is Calder, one is Johns, one is Rauschenberg. But as you look around they're all the same artists in a given point. So they really learn something from it. The main lobby is Norman Ives, and off of that lobby is a whole--two Norman Ives paintings--and off that lobby is a hallway of Norman Ives silk-screen prints; and they're beautiful. And on the other end of that same lobby around a whole hallway is all Japanese art by Japanese artists; they're beautiful. There's a sublobby of shaped canvases. We gave them a Sven Lukin, and we gave them a Charles Henry that are major paintings. Mitsami Turoka gave us the fantastic shaped canvas he had done early on, and he gave it to us. It makes-- It comes out from the wall, making a diamond--and it's all fluted on the edges. I don't know whether it was publicly seen here. It's all white and the shadows play on it; it's beautiful. This whole sublobby is all shaped canvases. Now we have on the other sublobby, the counterpart of that, is all Claes Oldenburg. We had eight of the Notebook series; we went to Gemini and said, "We only have eight of the twelve. It's wrong." And he said, "You're right, it's

wrong. Here's the other four." So we have the twelve, and we had them framed, and they're up on one wall. Somebody gave us the Ice Bag [Scale B], and somebody gave us a Mickey Mouse. Claes gave us The Kiss with the Clothespin, and Margo [Leavin] gave us the one of the Mickey Mouse, and the Oldenburg [self-portrait] as a clown, and the Yale Lipstick. So that here's a sublobby in Claes Oldenburg. And it's fantastic. You walk in there, you just want to clap your hands with joy. [laughter] It really is--to me at least--it's very exciting to see it. Now, the eighth floor, which is for deluxe accommodations, is all pre-World War II--Picasso, Miró, Leger, Edward Hopper, that kind of art. And the hallway--the professional tower hallway, which is the long one--is all Miró. And we have the Constellation Suite in the offsets that were done by Heinz Berggruen in Paris that we gave them. And then there are lithographs set into it, some posters put in. But they're all framed the same; they're all labeled, and it's a learning experience in Miró. And it really becomes very special when you do this. A lobby of all Sam Francis lithos. The lobby of the eighth floor are two Picasso lithos, and there are twenty-nine of the Picasso imaginary portraits that we had and we gave them; another lobby is all David Hockney; another window wall is all Ellsworth Kelly from Gemini.

And so they're really very meaningful.

GOODWIN: What's your husband going to have you do next?

WEISMAN: I'll kill him. [laughter] I've done his offices in Maryland, I've done his hospital--our hospital. No, I've loved what I did there. It was probably the most rewarding thing that could ever happen to anybody. The feedback on it has been such-- It's really touched on a certain magic wherever I go. I honestly feel if I were in-- If I were to die tomorrow the eulogy would read: "And she put art in Cedars-Sinai Medical Center," and nothing else would be remembered, maybe. But that's OK, because it probably touches more people in anything than any one person could ever do. When you think there are 100,000 people a year that are in and out of that hospital in one way or another, or more--probably more than that--and when you think of that, you know, that there's art touching more people than any one museum could possibly do.

And not all of it is good; a lot of it is crap. But little by little we've upgraded it, and we're now in the middle of a sale in the cafeteria, between shows. We had a two-week sale, and we took all the crap that we couldn't sell and the things that we--or the things that we couldn't hang, wouldn't hang, or shouldn't hang--and we put it up with low prices, and we've sold \$3,000 worth

of junk, which is absolutely marvelous. And the fifteen, twenty things that are left, we're going to give them away. We'll give them to the Martin Luther King Hospital over on the other end of town. They'll add it some way somehow, and maybe it will help them start on a program. But in the meantime we've got funds now to take care of another project of framing. So, I really think that it's pretty well done. It's nothing now that somebody else couldn't move in and do it. I think the theme is set; the learning experience is there. I don't think anyone would want to, or could, disturb that learning experience. As major works would come in--which they do from time to time--I think what I would want, they would call me and ask me what they should do with it.

Incidentally, we have one long professional tower hallway. That hallway is like two and a half blocks long, two blocks long. It's the whole length across San Vicente Boulevard. In one hallway we have all California artists, and that's on the third floor. And down the patient hallways, too, are all California. But another thing we did: under the street and the lower level is radiation therapy and nuclear medicine. And to say it has to be the most depressing place in town, I know it wins, if that's winning. We knew we had to put something down there that would be good, and we started with posters.

They were ripped off, because the security down there was very bad. Everything is bolted to the walls and takes two kinds of screwdrivers to get it off, or a very heavy hand and an ax. So we have lost a few things, sadly.

Well, the outcome is I finally came up with an idea. Fred has an interest in a travel agency, and I went to the travel agency and I said, "I want all your posters." I went through them, and we took all the beautiful travel posters. We framed them, and my thought was that these people walking down these horrible, long hallways going in for radiation, or whatever, [and] these were remembrances of good times passed, or thoughts of what they'd like to do next. So it had to give a happy note. And there wasn't any great loss if the things were lost, and who would want to steal a travel poster? It's worked out very successfully. And so, oh, I would say we put up maybe 150 of those posters down there. But of course the expense of the thing is that we had to frame them, and we have to have someone go in and hang them. And we have a hanging man, who's been marvelous and very dependable and very good. So that's the way the program's going. It's going very well. We've built a great mailing list. The openings now have two, three hundred people. We serve wine at the openings, and on special occasions we even serve cheese. [laughter] And we do very nice things.

But I feel very elated about it really. And I don't know what he'll have me do next. He'll find something. I have a project of my own I'm going to do next, one that I care about. And, hopefully, it will happen.

GOODWIN: Are you going to tell me what it is?

WEISMAN: Oh, you mean you really want to know? It may not happen, and then I'm down on the records for "she lost." Actually, what it is: When the Triforium was put up in the downtown mall of the city of Los Angeles near City Hall, and it slipped into town, and it was put up, I believe, at midnight one night--because nobody I knew had heard anything about it--and this was put up as a sculpture for the city of Los Angeles for \$1,200,000. And when this came to pass I was so shaken by the-- I can't think of the right adjective, because stupidity isn't the word. Ignorance can't be the word. "Poor politics" might be closer to the words. I don't know how to describe such a fate. But it was already a fait accompli, and the day that it came out, I was just in a wrath. By the next day I was next to hysterical. I was going to Pat Brown's for dinner that night. Fred was away. He was having a dinner for the American Council of the Arts. They were meeting in Los Angeles at that time. This is an organization of which at that time David Rockefeller, Jr., was chairman. Now Lou Harris of the Harris Poll is chairman,

and Pat's on that council. So he was having a dinner, and he invited me to come.

The first person I met there was Wes Uhlman, who was the mayor of Seattle. And I've known Ginny and Bagley Wright from Seattle for a long time; and I knew they had acquired the Barney Newman Broken Obelisk for the city of Seattle. I also knew that the mayor of Seattle, as a result of that, had utilized that and gone after them and others and put together a lot of good sculpture in the city of Seattle, such as Noguchi and Heizer, et cetera, et cetera, being placed throughout the city. When we met I said, "You know, maybe you could help me. I am so frustrated." I told them how angry I was. And when I get angry, boy, I get angry. And he said, "Wait a minute, wait a minute. You sound like a lady with a great deal of energy. And you're putting it all out in such a negative way. Save all that energy and be positive. So they've thrown away a million, two. In city government they don't think anything of a million, two. Let them have their turn. Calm down and put your energy to a positive use. Go show them next what you can do for a million, two. And show them where they erred. Now, you go to them in a year and say, 'Now it's my turn.'" And I said, "You know, you're absolutely right. I hope I can wait a year."

Well, it so happened that I was busy with the hospital, and I was busy with senators' offices in Sacramento, and one thing and another. Consequently, I recently met up with someone that--well, Sol Marcus, who's the commissioner for public works for the county in Los Angeles, and Joel Wachs, who's chairman of the city council or chairman pro tem, I don't know. Anyway, they were very instrumental in getting the Kricke moved to the hospital at no cost to the hospital. And Sol subsequently has come to me and asked me to help him put together a Festival of the Arts in downtown Los Angeles. It was in the mall. It's been done all over the country, and it's sponsored by Schlitz beer. Have you heard about this?

GOODWIN: I'm familiar with the festival in New York City.

WEISMAN: And they've done the Newport, Rhode Island, Jazz Festival. Always produced by Schlitz beer. They spend \$300,000-- [\$]100,000 promoting Schlitz, [\$]200,000 is raised in another way, shape, or form for promotion of the arts. Now, maybe that's fine that they promote the arts. But I, for one, when Mr. Marcus came to me, said, "I'm sorry. I don't work for Schlitz beer. I'll work for the city of Los Angeles. But I won't work for Schlitz beer." And there was another lady at the meeting who had been asked to call me to this meeting because she wouldn't speak for me. Her name was Esther Wachtel, and she's been a very

devoted member of the Music Center councils of all sizes and shapes. She's raised millions of dollars for the Music Center, she's been chairman of their volunteer services, she's been chairman of their Blue Ribbon Four Hundred; she's done everything for the Music Center. And when she was asked to get me, she said (I can't believe that she would go along with this, but she arranged the luncheon)--and when I answered, she said, "Sol, so help me, I never said a word." She had said exactly as I had said so.

I said, "But I'll tell you what I'll do. The time is right. You finish your Festival for the Arts for two days, and you put all that energy and money into Schlitz beer and a festival that lasts for two days for Chicanos and blacks to participate in, and let them see the lack of excellence that comes out of what they're doing. And that's OK with me. But please, I can't have my name into that. It's impossible, as much as I want to say yes to you." And I said, "But I'll tell you what I will do. When that festival is over I'll do something for you that I've been wanting to do for a long time, if you'll help me." And he said, "What's that?" I said, "The city of Los Angeles owes me \$1,200,000 in art." And he said, "How do you figure that?" And I told him why. I said, "And now [with] Proposition 13 I figure I need

twelve donors for \$100,000 each from companies who have saved upwards of \$20 million a year in property taxes. I'm going to get those twelve donors at \$100,000 each, making \$1,200,000. I will get \$50,000"--no, excuse me-- "\$500,000 to boot from the National Endowment of the Arts, which will then give me \$1,700,000"--actually a million, eight, because I should get [\$]600,000 for a two-to-one match. "I get [\$]600,000 from the National Endowment, which gives me a million, eight. I'm going to put excellence in sculpture throughout the city of Los Angeles.

"And I don't mean in one place. And I don't mean Chicano art for Chicanos to learn from, because they don't learn from that kind of art. They learn from looking at excellence. And I'm crossing the word elitism out of the dictionary in California. We are now dealing with excellence instead of elitism. And it starts with having people learn by experiencing excellence. So, I propose that for approximately \$100,000 per, I will go to Henry Moore and get a sculpture. Maybe it will be one he has, or maybe we'll commission one especially. But I would suspect it will be one that he has. I want it in the city of Los Angeles, installed and made for \$100,000, and we will designate the site. It could be in front of the Martin Luther King Hospital; it could be near Watts Towers; it could be in front of the county hospital

in downtown Los Angeles; it could be in front of that big hospital in the San Fernando Valley. It could be on Whittier and Sunset [in Beverly Hills] in a little private park that was built there; it could be at the park at Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny; it could be in Century City, because I do think those are where most of those people come from that will be donating the money; it could be in Hancock Park on one of the Wilshire Boulevard corners, or near one of the schools in that area. Cedars-Sinai has done their share for that area. It can be on the Santa Monica Palisades; it can be in downtown Los Angeles over on Washington and Main, or Washington and Los Angeles Street; it can be in Venice. It can be all of these places.

"I propose to put artists such as Anthony Caro, Robert Graham, Richard Hunt, who is black, Robert Graham, who happens to be Mexican. I will have Claes Oldenburg. I will have every eminent sculptor--Louise Nevelson-- I will get every eminent sculptor that is worth his salt for \$100,000 to install a piece in the city of Los Angeles. We will make a sculpture garden out of the city of Los Angeles. And I maintain that is what I must do to compensate for the Triforium, which is the only sculpture that we can claim as something that the city has done in the arts. And I refuse to stand by and let that be it. This is my city. And I won't stand for it."

Now, we have art on the Wilshire-Fairfax district-- sculpture in the museum. We also have the Lipchitz [Peace on Earth] down at the Music Center, be it what it may. There's a Claire Falkenstein near the museum [outside California Federal Savings and Loan], be it what it may. But maybe when they see the light of day, Cal-Fed will take the shrubbery out of the Claire Falkenstein and allow it to be what it should be: a sculpture, not a flower garden. I get angry that these things exist as they exist when there really is no excuse for it. There is no excuse for it. The money's here, the art is available, and let it get started. And if that works, I think other things will happen as a result. I think you'll find more art in front of buildings, and it will be placed there by the owners of the buildings. It will be their way before someone hits them for the money. They'll go out and put their own piece of art in front of their own building. And that's just perfect. And if it pushes them into doing that, that's fine.

And I find the best projects for me to get into are the ones that make me angry. Because then I seem to get them done. [laughter]

And my next big one, I guess, since I've been working at the mental health hospital--which you know--in Pomona (I think I discussed that), and I'll undoubtedly get into

something in getting some art there, too. I think that we should eventually extend this program to the state of California, not just the city of Los Angeles. And there should be meaningful art in front of every state institution, be it a prison, hospital, or whatever. But not crap that the inmates are making! It should be excellence for the inmates to design their work from, to utilize to make themselves better so they can improve themselves. You don't learn sixth-grade reading from a first-grade primer. You must read sixth-grade work. And the chances are you're going to learn more if you read eighth-grade work when you're in sixth grade. You should be reaching, not digging. And I feel that this is where it lays in the city--is that good English; is it "lay there" or does it "lie there"?--in the city of Los Angeles to make a place for themselves in the state of California, because I think the art is here, and it's fabulous, and the people are here. They're slowly being driven out. But, hopefully, we can get them back or keep them here and develop the kind of an art scene here that's valid and worthy. And the people are here to do it with. And I like to see it come forth.

GOODWIN: Good luck. [laughter]

WEISMAN: I think it will. I really do. I hope it will. I think the only way one can ever expect it to begin to happen is to give it a whirl yourself. I think you have

to do that. One has to give it that shot. I might add I also might-- I'm really about to go back into my art leasing business, too. I've got to start to earn a living. Otherwise I won't be able to buy any more. But anyway, I find it challenging and rewarding. It sure as hell beats the stores and playing cards--for me at least--and having lunch with the ladies. I can't handle that too well.

GOODWIN: Why don't you tell me about the art you put in the senators' offices?

WEISMAN: Oh, a lot of that was loaned; most of that was loaned by the artists. That happened because a friend of mine, Armand Deutsch-- You know Armand and Harriet Deutsch? Well, Armand and Harriet were very friendly with John Tunney, as we were friendly with John. And he said he wanted to put some California artists into his office. He thought it would be very good, and would I consider helping him? And I said, "I think that's a brilliant idea, Arnie. Just fabulous." I'd love to help him; we'll do it for Alan Cranston, too. He said, "Oh, no. I don't care about doing it for Alan. I only want to do it for John." I said, "Fine. We'll do it for John for you, and we'll do it for Alan for me." He said, "I don't want to get into that at all. I just want to do John." I said, "Well, you've given me an idea. But I want to put it in both their offices. They're senators of the state of California, and you can't

single them out. Be grateful that you didn't mention someone that's a member of the House of Representatives. Because that would have been more than I could have handled." [laughter]

So, the outcome is he got back to me, and he said, "John thought you were absolutely right. He wants it that way. I want it that way. Will you help?" And I said yes. Well, help meant he left for Europe, and I went to the artists' studios and selected some works that I thought were worthwhile. [I] called John's aide and Alan's aide, both of whom were very nice people that I knew and had in many ways more sensitivity to the art of today. We gathered the art all up at Cart and Crate at that time and had them look at it here before we shipped it east. They approved it, and we sent back, in a van, art for both senators' offices. I had obviously been to their offices in the interim period to determine what they wanted, where they wanted, why they wanted. It was an interesting job for me, because John does not have the "neatsers." He's not a compulsively neat person. That is the nicest way I can say he's a slob.

GOODWIN: --he's a slob.

WEISMAN: And there are papers and filing cabinets and more papers and more papers and more papers all over the place. On the other hand, Alan is about as compulsive a man as

anyone I've ever known. And so I went into the two offices, and we hung about forty--thirty-five, forty works of art. And Harriet and Arnie timed their return from Europe in time to be in Washington for the opening reception and press preview of the art in the senators' offices.

GOODWIN: What were some of the pieces?

WEISMAN: And it hung for I think one year, and then we took it down. There was a Tom Holland, there was a John Altoon, there was a Natalie Bieser, there was a Mel Ramos, there was a Claire Falkenstein, and a Peter Voulkos. [telephone rings, tape recorder turned off] There was a-- Let's see, who else? Well, I've forgotten. Tom Leeson, I think. It's just hard for me to remember. This was a few years back. Anyway, I thought we would inspire them to put art in their offices. What it did was to inspire Alan to start painting again, which he did; and then it inspired John to run for reelection, which he didn't make. And that was the end of that. But subsequently Alan Sieroty wanted me to do it in Jerry's office. Jerry was busy then with the Blue Whale drawings from the first and second grade in some schools, and then the Chicano art that was in his offices. Ken Cory asked if he could have art in his office. So we did that and used our own California artists and put those in there. That remains very good. We just withdrew that, and it's gone to

Long Beach. They're putting together an exhibition of the Weisman collection of California artists.

GOODWIN: Which will open in the fall?

WEISMAN: It opens November twenty-seventh, I think. And I expect it should be very good. I hope so.

GOODWIN: It better be.

WEISMAN: Well, it better be, or otherwise we've lost face. But we have some very nice things and major works of California artists. We have a large Don Sorenson; and we have a marvelous Fletcher Benton, an early piece; and we have a great Paul Dillon; two very big Joe Goodes; and we have a Chuck Arnoldi, a sculpture and painting; and we have a Lita Albuquerque; and we have Laddie John Dill; and three Altoons; and we have a John McLaughlin; and a good Ed Moses painting, and five drawings of his, recent ones; and we have a marvelous Ron Davis; a couple of Mel Ramos; some photographers; Sam Francis; Arneson, two of his plates: one a Rose, and the other--what do you call a figure like this, that--?

GOODWIN: Oh, Vitruvian man?

WEISMAN: Is that what it is, from Leonardo?

GOODWIN: [affirmative]

WEISMAN: Vitruvian man.

GOODWIN: No, it's from Vitruvius. That's where Leonardo got it.

WEISMAN: Vitruvius being a country?

GOODWIN: No, no, an ancient philosopher who formulized the space relationships--

WEISMAN: Oh.

GOODWIN: --that the figure would fit inside the circle.

WEISMAN: Oh. Well, this one is of Arneson's face and nude body, so that the two plates hang well together. We also have a portrait that was done of me by--what's his face? The guy that did them in inks, the friend of--? Don Bachardy. And who else have we down there? Then we also have a very major work of-- Oh, what's his name? He paints in all black, or all white, and they're wiggles, and they're large canvases on Lucite--plastic, painted on plastic. I'll think of it. It will come to me--David Trowbridge. That's it. We have Leeson. We have Har-- --somebody--a very good painting of his. I'm trying to think of who else. We have John Mason here; we have a couple of Grahams here; a couple more Sam Francis here. We, by and large, have a pretty good cross section: Falkenstein; Ken Price, very early. Oh, and we have a John McCracken plank, a Larry Bell box. Anyway, it pretty much covers a good part of the waterfront. We did have a Kienholz that was destroyed in a mammoth mud slide in the basement of the Corcoran museum, and subsequently rebuilt by Ed. But it wasn't the same to us.

GOODWIN: Which piece was that?

WEISMAN: Birthday. So, it pretty much covers the whole span of California. Oh, we also have-- No, I think we gave that away to Billy Brice a long time ago. Oh, and then a marvelous, big Lorser Feitelson, a wonderful Feitelson. In fact, we're using that for the cover and the poster and the announcement of the Long Beach show, and making a whole show in memoriam, which I think is a kind of nice thing to do.

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Do you like his work?

GOODWIN: I'm really not very familiar with it. I've never seen a large show.

WEISMAN: I don't think you're interested in hard-edge paintings, by and large.

GOODWIN: I'm not. I'm not. That's true.

WEISMAN: Interesting. And Fred's always liked hard-edge painting a great deal. [Of] course sometimes there's a difference in what is hard-edge and what isn't. So many people will refer to Barney Newman as a hard-edge painter, and I just don't think he is at all, or even Motherwell today, and it isn't at all. And I think that that's too bad; but, you know, people don't quite always understand. Gee, Lichtenstein would be a good sculptor for my project, too, wouldn't he?

GOODWIN: Sure. You've been friendly with Jerry Brown.

You mentioned him. But I'm sure you can say a little more.

WEISMAN: I think Jerry is an enigma in many ways. Because I think that-- In the first place you must understand I have feelings for Jerry that are maybe not usual feelings for a person that's the governor. I've known his father since I'm five years old. He and my brother were in a high school fraternity together. They'd come to the house and play bridge all the time. Pat's always said that he's the first man I ever slept with, because I'd fall asleep on his lap while he was the fifth hand in the bridge game or whatever. So I've known him forever; and I've known Jerry as a little boy from time to time growing up, [although] there were long gaps between the times when we'd see each other and so forth.

But we've been big-- We've always been major supporters of his various campaigns from the board of education to secretary of state to governor. There are areas that I've felt where he was very derelict. I think his manners were atrocious in that he never wrote a thank-you note or did the proper pleases and so forths that I felt he should have when running for public office. He seemed to have his hand out; [but] when office sought was gained he was looking out the window. He never saw you again. Well, neither my husband nor I have ever wanted personal favors. There were

areas we felt we could have been helpful in the arts. My husband could have been very helpful for him in bringing industry into California. For one thing, he had tried to lay the groundwork for him to bring Toyota automobiles, as an example--assembly plants--into the state of California, and he was working on it in his own way, knowing that the wheels of progress in Japan grind slowly. You must sip a lot of tea in the garden. And Jerry went in, like, where angels fear to tread and bombarded the whole thing and lost it. [tape recorder turned off] Anyway, Jerry bombed out on that one, and it was very frustrating to my husband. He felt he could have done something.

I was very frustrated by what he did with the Arts Council. He put in someone that was someone he knew, a fine poet--Gary, whatever his name is. And the next thing he has a bunch of artists in there that aren't necessarily the best-known artists, which doesn't make them not the best artists; but it became a situation of the inmates running the institution again, which is one of my favorite expressions. I became well aware of it when I went to the first meeting held in Los Angeles down at Barnsdall. Somebody asked how often do the meetings take place, and they said, "Well, we're allowed to hold meetings every six weeks." Or, "We have to give six-week notice before our meeting, so that means we couldn't have a meeting more than every six weeks."

So we have them every six weeks." "Well, do you get paid for the meetings?" "Yes, that's why we have them every six weeks." So it costs them \$300,000 or \$500,000 a year to pay all the people coming in to the meetings, plus the director's fee and the man--the whoever-whoever. And the last thing is, "But it's only 30 percent of the budget, and everybody spends 30 percent of the budget." I said, "Is it a law you have to?" You know, I never heard of such a thing. I was totally upset by it. He has a man [Jacques] Barzaghi, whatever his name is--who I am convinced doesn't know a painting from a sculpture, who is leading him with the art thing. It was very upsetting.

Anyway, all these things were taking place--mental health situation in the state is very bad. All of a sudden I think it began to turn around. And I think what happened is, knowing Jerry as little or as well as I do, I think that what happened is he's a student. And he doesn't really trust himself to delegating responsibilities as well as he could. He is wanting to do it all himself. I understand that. I tend to do it also. But at the same time it's one thing to do it all yourself about the things you know. About the things you don't have any pretense to trying to say you know, that's something else. I think Jerry is a very political animal. I think he has studied. He has learned what the game of politics is all about. And consequently, I think

he has turned around the mental health hospitals. They are independent now, one of the other. I think when he saw the atrocities and the terrorizing things that were happening, the inhuman things that were happening, in the mental hospitals in California, he immediately got these people out. He formed individual boards of seven people per hospital, and arranging those appointees in such a way as to know there could be no machinations or maneuvering and manipulations within the hospital, as long as the boards consisted, as they did, of a group of people--or certainly not as easily could it happen. I think that was a positive thing. I think that it was also-- And that these members of the advisory board are not paid commissioners; they get mileage, period.

I think the fact that Proposition 13 came along--and it was a lousy bill, there is no question about that. I think the people that voted for it are crying. Absolutely, they're crying the hardest now. They got relief, they say, from property taxes, but the poor renters have been gouged and killed along the way. And it's been a disaster for everybody and particularly the state. I think that had he not had the surplus funds that he had, we would have really been down the tubes. I think it shows good management-- financial management--when you compare the cities and states throughout the nation, such as New York as the flagrant example of poor fiscal management and monetary management.

I think it was the greatest thing that ever happened to this state. That he fell on this bill and acted within it as he did, indicates to me that he's willing to work, to deal with the expression of the people, and make it work. He's political in doing it, because if it doesn't work, having put forth a full effort, he can always go back to the people and say, "Look, I didn't want it; you voted for it. I gave it my all. I took your mouth when you called me Jerry Jarvis in working so hard for it, and it still didn't work. Now, I'm telling you, listen to me." I think he has every right to say that and do that. And I think he handled it, politically, class A. I think that the [California] Arts Council is going down the tubes is super, because I think it's been a way out for him. He's going to capitalize on it, and he'll make it a good scene again. I think he will, if he wants an art scene at all. But I think he'll either go to zero for the arts, or he'll make it a good art scene from here on in.

Now, this is how I read it. I think he's learned his manners. He's found out from people around him; never again will he forget a thank-you note. And I think he's moving forward. I think he is another example to me of four-year terms of office are no good--absolutely bad and evil they created. I think that it should be one six-year term of office, not for reelection. And even though in public

office-- [telephone rings, tape recorder turned off] So I think this: he's learned his lessons. He's done his goods. Sure, he's done his bads. But I think he thinks. I think if you were to compare him to other governors in other states on a scale of one to ten--who's one? who's ten? I'd say he'd hit three or four, if one is perfect. And I'd say that's reasonable. By comparison to all the others, he's a kid. He's fresh out of school. He's green behind the ears. Or are you not green behind the-- You're wet behind the ears. [laughter]

But I think all that is true. I think he's shown flagrant disrespect for his father. I don't know whether it's his disrespect or the press picking up on things that should not have been reported--a press that's been angry, and a press that's found themselves in a driver's position as a result of Nixon. I don't think he--knowing from the inside--I don't think he's been all that bad to his father and mother. Now, he hasn't been a class-A son. He didn't get there on his mother's birthday, but he did call her. And hell, my son doesn't get to me on his mother's birthday all the time either. But by the same token my son is not as busy as Jerry Brown. He's not running the state of California. But when his mother and father had a fiftieth wedding anniversary, he was there. And on down the line. I think he's been a good boy, and I think he's been a bad boy.

And I think compared to what, is how one has to think.

And tell me the last great governor you've known? You know of one?

GOODWIN: [pause in tape] His father.

WEISMAN: His father was a great one. [laughter] You're right. His father was an excellent governor. But that his father being a great governor is what part of the problem is with Jerry. And I remember early on when Jerry was getting all his hoo-ha and Pat was getting a lot of it, too, and we were talking. I said, "Pat, you're forgetting something. Your son's gone into your business. Richard and Fred didn't work well when Richard was trying to be in his father's business. It isn't any good for fathers and sons being in the same business. They tend to be competitive and get angry at one another. And Jerry's gone into your business. Either you get out of his business or be supportive, because you have no other choice." So he said, "Well, I guess you're right. I never thought of it quite like that." And it is hard to think of politics as a business. But it is, and I think that he's going to be a very good president. And I think Linda Ronstadt is going to make a great first lady.

TAPE NUMBER: VII, SIDE TWO

AUGUST 30, 1978

WEISMAN: I was just going to add: I don't mean to be facetious about that--about Linda Ronstadt being-- [laughter] I do think, though, that our choices for president in the next presidential election are going to be very slim. And I think that when you're thinking in terms of Jimmy Carter or Jerry Brown, I don't think you have much choice. If Teddy Kennedy comes in I think it's the most frightening thing in the world. I can't imagine his giving up being top dog in the Senate--with no conflict, no confrontation, no battles to win or lose, but only sit there as a winner, and the senior senator of the world, as it were--to go into the battleground for what? To risk his life? I just think he'd be out of his mind! But I don't know what those kind of political genes are that would have made-- You know, created those kinds of people. And I think it would be nice if-- [passage unclear; tape recorder turned off]

GOODWIN: Would you explain what your project was in Venice to build a museum.

WEISMAN: Our project started very simply [when] Fred bought a piece of property. It was a piece of property in the middle of a block on Main. I forget the street [Hampton Avenue] that runs parallel to Main behind it, and then there's Sunset and Rose on that area. I don't know how many--

It's three and a half acres or something, the whole piece of property. Then it was divided in thirds. The two outer thirds belonged to a company called Richlar [Partnership], and they sold off this middle piece to my husband. And on that piece is just blacktop and a building that was the old gas company. It has a lower floor of ten-foot ceilings, a huge freight elevator, a bathroom, which indicates running water, and a brick building, and concrete and hardwood floors. So what was going to happen to the building? Nobody really knew. Fred bought it with Frank Gehry--the two of them--and I think Frank's position was a very minor financial position in it: he found the property, he knew the Richlar people, [then] suggested it to Fred.

Well, property in Venice, as you know, has taken off, and this was not the first time we were interested in properties. Some twelve years ago he had a couple of pieces on hold when he had an accident, and when I was called about it, before I said I wasn't interested, because I wasn't interested in anything at that point. So anyway, this was something we had thought about before, or he had thought of before. The outcome is he got the land, and Frank came up with this brilliant idea, and he convinced Richlar to work in coordination with us. He said he would design the greatest center for the arts around, and it

would still be a profitable venture for them, because everybody has to be a winner or it doesn't win at all, which is, I think, a very good, fair philosophy. So the outcome was going to be-- There was another building on the Richlar place, which is a framed building. It's small, one story, but adequate in size to have made maybe-- maybe it had 3,000 feet--it would have made a good restaurant to have left that particular building there. The idea was that there would be a setback--how long is an automobile? Eight feet? six feet? whatever--two feet more than an automobile all around the edge of the property so there'd be parking, for one thing. Then he wanted to build a row of houses that would skirt the whole property inside this setback--not houses, buildings. These buildings would be two stories and three stories intermittently, all different.

They would be-- One building would have one three-story segment, and two two-story segments. The next building would be two three-story and one two-story. The next building might have been one one-story, and two two-stories, and so forth. Altogether there were going to be nine three-story buildings. I'm not positive of numbers, but something like this: eighteen two-story buildings, maybe three one-story buildings, maybe none. I don't know. In between these little buildings would be walkways that

you could walk into the middle. And where the middle was that's blacktop now would be this big brick place, and it would be grass all around it with park benches. We were going to put our California collections and residuals from our other collection in the upper part; the lower part was going to be a restaurant, a music and theater facility that Gordon Davidson was going to bring theater to and Larry--what's his name at the Music Center? Fleischman--was going to bring music to. There would be parking, as I say, all around the outside, and that would bring the arts in. These buildings on the first floor would be shops. They already had Swensen's applying, they had a leather goods place applying, a dress shop, an antique shop--the usual. The second floor were going to be law offices, doctors' offices, accounting offices, whatever kind of offices. Lawyer--I said lawyer--any kind of offices.

Then on the three-story buildings, as a result of the rents they'd get from the two-story buildings, they were going to be able to make artists' studios--walk-ups. Each floor would be 3,000 feet. There would be the equivalent of two artists' studios. They would only be allowed one car per studio for upstairs; and they would never be allowed a retail license to sell out of their studios. The stores below would have to have accommodations

for five cars per space, I think, according to whatever the Coastal Commission required. So that it was going to allow for eighteen artists to have rent at \$200 or \$250 a month, which meant low rents to keep the artists there. And in this park they were going to invite in all these people out on the boardwalk to bring their pushcarts on the weekends, the jugglers, the skaters, whatever. It could be a family park situation. And Frank really designed a beautiful complex. And the people in the regional Coastal Commission approved it. When it came to the overall Coastal Commission.

So anyway, the thing was going along very well. Then all of a sudden, unbeknownst to us, there was one person that was against it or one-- There were two or three that spoke against it at the regional Coastal Commission meeting, which I went to at City Hall in Redondo. And this one person was very belligerent about it. Unbeknownst to any of us he went to a place called the Israel Levin Aged Society. I don't know.

GOODWIN: Center.

WEISMAN: Huh?

GOODWIN: Center.

WEISMAN: Center, whatever [Israel Levin Senior Adult Center], where a lot of aged citizens--retired citizens--were, and got these people all stirred up, I guess, and gave them

placards and, I even heard, paid them to come with their placards to wherever the next meeting was. I was told to stay away. And Fred was told to stay away, because we didn't want to look like elitists--that shitty word.

(Excuse me, tape.) We stayed away, and lots of artists had come to plead the case for us. And these people got up there with all these statements about how it was going to raise rents and destroy their way of life, and [how] they were used to the dirty alleys and the old houses, and [how] they'd been driven out of concentration camps and now they're being driven out of their homes in Venice, because these people are going to come in and cause a rise in property rates and rentals and destroy the whole setting of Venice. And it was voted out!

GOODWIN: By the Coastal Commission?

WEISMAN: By the Coastal Commission. Now, it was applied to be heard again in October. Fred's decided against it. At this point he can sell the property and not do a thing to it and make money on it. And let somebody else worry about it. I say he should put a sulphur plant in it, and somebody who writes for the Venice papers quoted me in saying this, because he caught me one day. He stopped me one day in front of Ace Gallery and asked me why I tried to influence the artists not to go to the meeting of the Venice Town Council. Well, what he was talking about was

five or six friends of ours, like Bob Graham and Laddie Dill and Ann Thornycroft, [who] were good friends of ours, and Frank Gehry and Noriko and myself and Fred, and I don't know who else, we got together in our house to decide "Should we go to this Venice Town Council meeting?" We discovered that the Venice Town Council is not the city council. It's just a group of people that call themselves the Venice Town Council. They are no civic body of people at all. All they wanted was to get us there to lay us on the--to lay the artists out. When we found out that, what-- We knew of an artist lady that was loaning her studio for this. Noriko called her and said, "Do you know what they're doing?" And she said, "I had no idea." So she said, "Well, if I felt that way, I wouldn't let them have my space"; she said, "I think you're right." So she refused them the space. So they said we tried to run them out of business. Well, we didn't at all. All we did was tell them what the facts were, as we knew them. And all the artists decided they weren't going to go and be laid out into being pointed at.

At that point they were calling the Larwin people-- one of which [Lawrence J. Weinberg] if ever a man could be called charitable, this man could. He's been the honorary person for dinners, for City of Hope; he's been the honorary person for the dinners for Bonds for Israel; he's

done everything that you could do for Jewry in this city. And they called him a Nazi. It was the most crushing blow that ever happened to him. They called Fred a Trojan horse. They referred to me in the papers--these were all editorials in the Venice papers--I was Norton Simon's sister for six weeks, and never had a name. Every week another article about Norton Simon's sister and all the money that Norton Simon was bringing into Venice to throw the poor people out, through his sister. Fred and I never had a name--Fred had a name, but I never had a name. I was only "that awful lady," and it was a very sad thing.

Well, as I say, I wanted to make a sulphur plant out of it. Fred said that was ridiculous. I said, "Well, shouldn't it be? Look at what they've done. Artists are now packing up and moving out of town. It's not nice that we're losing this." It could have been the greatest thing since the wheel down there. It could have made a really first-class art community. And it could have been a SoHo with something to cling to. We would have made some sort of a museum situation--I didn't want a museum and neither did Fred. We wanted a repository for paintings from all the people in this city that have collections that have more paintings than they can handle in twentieth-century art, and a place downstairs for the Venice artists to show their work, and sculpture

gardens where they could show their sculpture. The Phillipses have a warehouse full of paintings; well, the [Stanley] Grinsteins have extra paintings; the Weismans have extra paintings all over. [telephone rings; tape recorder turned off] So anyway, we felt that these people, of which there were the Rowans-- All these people around that have so much art that we could be putting up, you know-- How much can a space like that handle? Twenty-five paintings, fifty paintings on the outside? It could have been done and done and done a million times, with people just showing what they have; and downstairs letting the artists run it, and doing a Jerry Brown: let the inmates run the institution.

So anyway, this is what we wanted; they ran us out. And now, Fred came up with a brilliant idea, but I don't think he was serious. He'd like to have Annabel's Venice and have a disco, like Annabel's in London, or a Studio 54 of Venice, whatever, and really have a great disco. It would probably make a [jillion dollars]. And it would be a good holding pattern until the property went up more, and then we'll sell it. So, whether he's going to do that or not--I think he was laughing, but I think it would be super--wouldn't it?--to have a restaurant upstairs and have a disco down, or vice versa. And the disco could be by membership. You don't like that idea?

GOODWIN: That doesn't interest me personally.

WEISMAN: Yes. Well anyway, I think it could, again, create the ambience of an art world. [laughter] But anyway, I think that the whole thing is kind of over and out; and we felt it was too bad. We felt it could have been a great case for making Venice into a marvelous art community. We envisioned it as a mini-Beaubourg, in a sense. It could have been all of that, and more. So, over and out.

GOODWIN: What are your other thoughts about the future of your collection?

WEISMAN: The future of our collection, who knows? I think that there are lots of things that we talk about that we'd like to own and we don't. We'd like to go more heavily into sculpture, but we don't have all that much space. But we would like a couple of major outside pieces. And we've been turned on to a few people; but obviously not enough, because we haven't done anything about it; and yet we've bought additional paintings. So, I think sculpture is probably the unsung hero of the arts at this point. It's hard for a lot of people to handle it, but I think there are people-- We've toyed with Richard Serra and we've toyed with Anthony Caro, toyed with Tony Smith. We've wanted a David Smith; we missed the boat completely on that one. And so, time will take care of that, and

we'll find the one, one day. We'll walk in, and we'll both go, "Huuuuuuuh!" And that will be it. [laughter] We'll have a terrible asthmatic attack, fall on the floor, and say, "Charge it and send it," and it won't fit.

GOODWIN: So that's how it's done. [laughter]

WEISMAN: That's how it's done! And then we'd say, "Send it," and they'd get it there, and we can't get it in, and then they have to take it back, and get a crane and lift it over the house, and hope it doesn't break the roof down that just was fixed. And so that's how it's done, exactly! I think that's the kind of direction it takes, and I think we're moving forward in our taste. I hope we are. I hate to be stagnant. And yet we find ourselves going backwards, too. I think it just will always be the thing that hits us at that given moment in time and, hopefully, we have enough to buy it with. If we don't, we'll trade something else in, and Fred will have the additional fun of wheeling and dealing as he's acquiring something that he really loves. And I think that's all part of it, too. I think that's kind of an essential for him. And it's an essential for me to know where it's going to go, but I never really do. I get it all laid out in my head, and then comes another; you hang it, and it doesn't look that way at all, and then you have to do it again. We rehung the whole house yesterday, because the Rothkos went

to New York.

GOODWIN: To your son's?

WEISMAN: No, to the Guggenheim.

GOODWIN: Oh, right.

WEISMAN: For the big Rothko show. They'll be gone a year.

You know, he doesn't like Rothko or Newman. Isn't that nice? I should say they're not among his favorites.

Consequently, he had said--Fred said to me the other night,

"I know what we should do. We should put the Lichtenstein in the dining room; it's too crowded in Nancy's room."

I said, "Great idea." So he got up and went to work, and

I went and did my thing. And I came home and Noriko had

the dining room hung. I said, "Uh, I forgot to tell you;

and I forgot about it, too: let's put the Lichtenstein here."

And she had just hung the whole thing with the Pollock

where the Lichtenstein is. And it looked better than I've

ever-- The Pollock looked better than I'd seen it look in

a long time. But when we tried the Lichtenstein--because

that's what Fred had suggested--it looked so smashing there

just was no question. And we thought, time to switch the

others around, too. And Fred loves the Pollock, and it

looks good where it is, I think.

GOODWIN: Do you have thoughts about what you want to

happen to the collection--after you're not--here?

WEISMAN: Oh, God. Yes, we have. We have thought about

it a great deal. Haven't we ever talked about this? Oh, we've had all kinds of thoughts. We've seen all kinds of plans put in action, and it's a very difficult thing, to say the least. In the first place, what we have here, and then we have what's in the office, and then we have what's in Maryland, and then we have what's in Richard's apartment, and then we have what's in Beth's apartment, and then we have the Century City office, and the Malibu house, and those few extra things that are stashed for when the Rothkos go, or whatever. So altogether we're talking about approximately 500 works of art. And there ain't too many museums that can hang 500 works of art in addition to what they have.

So we thought for many years what we would do is give it to a museum (and there was someone who did this in Chicago with the stipulation that every third year the total collection should be shown), and he realized it afterwards--thinking it through and so forth--that's a very difficult stipulation to give to somebody. Putting 400 or 500 works of art into one situation is going to mean they're going to have money to take care of it and have space for it and so forth and so on. And it wouldn't make them altogether happy besides. Well, after a lot of talking and planning and a particular conference meeting that I had with Franklin Murphy and someone from Fred's office--she helps us with art insurance plans and this

kind of plan--Franklin came up with an idea that we think is probably the most practical and the best of all. It's kind of complicated and we're working on it, but I think it's good. Example: The San Francisco Museum has twenty-three Clyfford Stills, and it's obvious they need no more Clyfford Stills. But they don't have any de Kooning. So, probably what we should do is give the San Francisco Museum the three de Koonings we own. And the chances are they'll have them up all the time. It gives them a nucleus for a body of de Kooning work. On the other hand, Los Angeles County has no Clyfford Still. So, that's the perfect place to give six Clyfford Stills or seven Clyfford Stills. And that's where those would go. And at the same time, Yale University is very involved in drawings of the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century--and American particularly, in that area. Why not bring them up-to-date and give them all of the drawings of the twentieth century, of which we have a considerable amount of drawings? And then on the other hand, we could give maybe the Walker [Art Center] all the Motherwells, because they have no Motherwells. And so we could go all through the house making determinations where various things should go. Sculptures that UCLA doesn't have they should have. Sculpture that UCLA does have we could put throughout the city someplace else.

Cedars-Sinai could have a sculpture someplace else on their property, or whatever, or the University of Southern California, whatever it may be. And so in doing this, we're really spacing the art all over the land. So that when our little children grow up--whatever city they're in--they can go into a museum and say, "See that? That belongs to the Weisman family. And the Weisman family collection is my daddy and my grandma and grandfather," and so those roots, which I say, everybody lives here and few people leave footprints; and if we ever had a footprint to leave it would be the art. So that would be our footprint on the sand that we're leaving for our kids and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Now, the one proviso that we would want is that every one of these museums that would be participating in the contribution, once every five years those museums must get together and determine which museum it will be that will show the total collection. Which means once it might be at the National Gallery, once it could be at L.A. County, once it could be at the Walker, once it could be in Houston, once it could be in St. Louis, and once it could be in San Francisco. By the time it got to San Francisco, it's fifty years later; and that could be forty years after they'd seen it in Los Angeles. So, it becomes a treat all over again, and the eye of Marcia and Fred Weisman isn't

lost. And really the art is the thing, and the ego trip is the eye. But a lot of people have eyes, and their eyes are looking at the wrong things at the wrong time. And I feel like these eyes looked at what we felt was the right thing at the right time, and maybe we weren't wrong. And they should be shared. And it's much easier to share them that way than give them to a museum and have them go in a basement and that's the end of it.

And by the same token I can't think of anything duller than the Bobby [Robert] Lehman Collection where they built a building, and there it's hung and there it stays and it never changes. Or the Frick, which is absolutely exquisite, but it's changed so rarely that you know when you go in that's going to be. When you walk into that room straight ahead is the Polish Rider. And over there at the Met you walk in and that's where the lady with the fingernails is--a Rembrandt--and you know where every picture is at all times, and it doesn't give any of the spirit of change. Does that make any sense?

GOODWIN: Sure.

WEISMAN: Complicated to do, but I think it's worthy of doing it. I think it can be done, and it will give museum directors something to do to keep them out of trouble [laughter] for a while. And there's something for all the museums of the twentieth century. There are a lot of

things that aren't as good as others, but there're a lot of places that don't get any art at all where those lesser things will be very meaningful. I'm sure there's a museum in Iowa or Kansas or in Vermont or in Montana that never sees anything, and they'll have an opportunity to have something, too. And, hopefully, there will be enough to distribute something within every one of the fifty states, which would be good. And then there are those that are our favorites, which we would hope to probably do better by. And because we would give the six Stills to the County doesn't mean that would be it, because they don't have Lichtensteins. So, maybe we would give them two Lichtenstein paintings and a Lichtenstein sculpture as well. So that it rounds them out. And the fact that they have one Rauschenberg, maybe we'd give them a couple more.

But what we'd want to do is fulfill something for each center that would give them something meaningful in that particular department. And we think at this moment it's probably the most intelligent way of handling it that we can think of. I can't think of a museum that would take it all. We couldn't see our way, money notwithstanding, of ever building a house, as so many people have suggested, to glorify the collection, which we think is a lot of nothing, because no house is going to glorify this art. The art glorifies the house. And so why waste that money

in the building when we could be buying art with it?
We made that decision a long time ago. Philip Johnson was going to design the house for us, and we were all ready to go, and all of a sudden we decided we're going to end up with \$1 million in a house. And look at the art we could buy for \$1 million. And it was over and out. And that was the end of it. And we sold the property. And it was a beautiful property in Bel Air.

Well, in those circumstances this is exactly what I mean. ([gasps] My watch is still quarter after five! I couldn't understand it.) So, this is what I mean by distributing it so that it will be taken care of in a good way. By the same token I don't want to spend that \$1 million for some university or some museum to build a building either when they could be using that money to acquire other works that would go with the art that they have that's more meaningful. And, you know, \$1 million doesn't buy that much art, even though it buys a lot of building. And on the other hand, it really doesn't buy that much building anymore, does it? Very little, I don't think. Is that it?

GOODWIN: It's time for you to leave. Thank you very much for participating in this oral history. It's been a lot of fun.

WEISMAN: Well, it's been marvelous, and I've loved it. I've particularly enjoyed my interview.

GOODWIN: Good. Thank you.

TAPE NUMBER: VIII [video session]

SEPTEMBER 28, 1978

GOODWIN: This is George Goodwin interviewing Marcia Weisman in the home of Marcia and Frederick Weisman on Angelo Drive in Beverly Hills. This videotape comes as the conclusion of a series of audio tapes which we've done the past several weeks. And we're just admiring the Robert Graham sculpture which the Weismans commissioned.

WEISMAN: I'm glad you're admiring it.

GOODWIN: Right. Tell us about the sculpture.

WEISMAN: Well, it was commissioned by my husband, actually, at the outset. He had just remodeled his offices in Century City, and the door to his office he thought he would like to have something of a rather impressive door. He didn't know what exactly and suggested something to Frank Gehry, who was our architect and a very close friend and admirer of Bob Graham's as well. He said, "What can we do that will really be smashing with a California artist?" And between the two of them they came up with this idea of the Graham door, of the door to the office. They spoke to Bob, [and] he came to the office. He said, "I think it would be fantastic. But what a waste to put a door into an office, and then you move, and then what?" He said, "Let me measure your front door at home, and let's see if we could make it interchangeable," which he was able

to do. [telephone rings] So that was the original concept. We went to look at the maquette, we approved of the maquette, and the last line was that the door was designed--and the telephone doesn't seem to stop in this house, and it makes it very much like all the other tapes, doesn't it?

GOODWIN: Right. [laughter]

WEISMAN: Anyway, the door-- We saw the maquette, and from that point he said, "You'll not see it again, and it will be a surprise." On the twentieth of August this year was our wedding anniversary. (Excuse me, I can't help it. He's long-distance--my husband. I'm sorry.) [tape recorder turned off] So, on our anniversary it was unveiled. Bob's request was to make it a formal unveiling, which we did. And it was something that we tried to have people that were really involved in some way with Bob Graham or the art of the door or the art in particular. I must say, when it was unveiled it was a very emotional moment for everybody. It has patinaed in a way that Bob isn't totally satisfied with it this time. I wanted the figures at the top to remain as green as they are. I felt it looked good, and he said, "No, it's wrong. You're doing wrong things to it," and I understand that. Now, actually it was intended that where the gates are--between the people on the top level of the door--that those gates were to be eliminated in most instances, and there would have been

glass in there so that it would have made the door secure; and no air would be coming in, and bugs flying in and out of the house, or the office, whatever the case may have been.

And when it came to the point of putting it here Bob said, "Look, I don't want it at the front door for the beginning. I'd like it outside as a sculpture for starters, because I think it's the only way we can really view it, and I want you to have the opportunity to view it for a few months." Well, he ripped up the whole outside patio, and there are I-beams underneath supporting it. It weighs 3,000 pounds. And you know he's a perfectionist in his own way, and he has his own atelier and his own foundry, and he does it all himself. I must say, I have a tremendous amount of respect for him as an artist and a technician, and he's still a very humanized kind of person in relationship to his art. The name of the piece is called Dancing. And it changes all the images the minute you know that. At least to me it did.

GOODWIN: I think it helps.

WEISMAN: It helps it a great deal, because you really get the figures moving and coming in and out, just as they do when you dance and when people dance, like some of that dancing is done. And some of it's ballet, and some of it's rock, and some of it's waltz, and some of it's everything.

It's every kind of dance imaginable. And I think the lintel, the post and lintel, has a sense of formality about it that the rest doesn't have that I like very much, too, because of the contrast and of the freedom. The door will eventually-- The hinges must be replaced, and the door will swing through to the other side. And we shall leave it as it is in all probability and have it open to the other side and opened more so, so that you'll look through and see the Moore [Queen] on the other side of the door. I think that will be very nice.

We would like to travel it because we feel it's important, and it's important to travel. I would have loved to have been able to send it to Washington at this moment in time, because Bob, along with George Segal and Leonard Baskin, have been commissioned and proposed by the landscape architect Lawrence Halprin, who is designing the Franklin D. Roosevelt monument in Washington. So, everything has been approved but the appropriations from the Congress, the Ways and Means [Committee], or whoever does money in the federal government. All of that's been done. But now the Congress must approve the whole project as a package. And before it came before Congress I would have loved to have this at the Smithsonian or the Hirshhorn or the National Gallery for the Washingtonians to see the kind of work that he does. But unfortunately, it would not

have worked timewise. It wouldn't work from a logistically sound problem. He says that would be movable. But, you know, it's easy for a sculptor to say, "Oh well, we'll pick it up and put it in a truck and take it back." That's fine; and there I am left with my concrete hole in the wall, or the floor, or whatnot. But even that I wouldn't object to, because I already have plans for that hole when it travels.

GOODWIN: Mrs. Weisman, is this the first sculpture that you and your husband have commissioned?

WEISMAN: The first sculpture that we have commissioned, yes. [doorbell rings] I believe so. I'm trying to think. We did commission portraits by Andy of the two of us separately. We really did those with more of a feeling of posterity for our children than anything else.

GOODWIN: That reminds me-- Andy Warhol. Tell me about his visit to your class a week ago.

WEISMAN: Well, he was his usual exuberant self: he said yes and no. [laughter] [doorbell rings] (The doorbell-- all right.) The point is, you know, Andy isn't much-- Andy loves to use tapes also. He carries his recorder with him wherever he goes; whether he actually records or not, I'm not sure. And the consequences are that-- Shall we cut? The consequences are that as a result of Andy carrying that recorder, which I think he does for security purposes--

it's like a blanket--but the class went very well. They were very pleased and, you know, there is an ambience of just having him in the room. Then we had posters from his new Torso exhibit at Ace, which he signed to the members of the class.

GOODWIN: He didn't make any kind of statement?

WEISMAN: Well, one statement he made, which I thought was kind of interesting. For my birthday, which was two days following the christening of the door--the unveiling of the door--at that time Andy sent me a gift. And my husband had given me a surprise party two nights afterwards. So, he had sent me a gift of a self-portrait that he had just done. It's not very large--yea-big. Maybe we'll get it on camera later. It's painted red, and it looked like George Washington more than it looks like Andy. So, when I called him to thank him I said, "You know, Andy I haven't decided whether this is the father of our country or the father of pop. But maybe, in any event, we should call it Pop." And so he laughed and didn't say anything on the phone. So, during the class I did reiterate this, and I brought the picture out and hung it in the living room. He said, "Oh, it's very simple, what it's called. It's called A Cherry Pop." Well, we just got hysterical; everybody loved that. And then when asked about the reason for his redundancy in his work he said, "Well, it's just

because I'm such a poor silk-screener that I have to do it over and over, and they never come out the same. So that's how they become unique." Well, he always has a good answer. He's a very bright man, and I find him very interesting-- I like him. What else can I say? I respond to him, and he to me, and we're very good friends. And I think he usually has a very smart fast line for everything. And he's very subtle about it as a rule. The class adored it.

GOODWIN: How was the opening? Was it the party to end all parties?

WEISMAN: I didn't go.

GOODWIN: You didn't?

WEISMAN: I took the class on the seminar, and I'm so glad, because subsequently he told me that he walked in the front door, which he never should have done, and he realized it the minute he walked in. There were something like 3,000 people in the Ace Gallery. And when he walked in the front door, he said he wasn't in two seconds, but he knew that he never should have done this. He was swept and pushed, and he said he was so frightened. As he was being swept into the gallery, Doug [Christmas] unlocked the back door of the gallery, which leads into his personal quarters, and they pushed him through into this room. Doug saw to it that he was pushed into the room,

and then they locked the door and he went out the back way and never came back. So the party later was somewhat controlled, more controlled or more contrived. But I had my class that night, and I just could not get it together at ten o'clock after a two-day weekend ranging 106 to 112 temperature, and buses with air conditioning that broke down. So, we passed on that. But Andy understood, and he had come to the [Hillcrest Country] Club a couple of times and seen the Athletes ["Collectors' Fine Arts Exhibition" (September 1978)]. Did you see those?

GOODWIN: Yes. Were those yours?

WEISMAN: Those are ours, yes. Our son had published the series [Ten International Athletes]. There is a series of seven suites of those ten, and each one is [an] individual, unique painting. They are available individually, and we loaned the ten to the club for the specific-- I was just going to loan them [Jack] Nicklaus and Chrissy Evert because of it being a golf and tennis club. A friend saw them, and when she saw that we were selecting them out of a crate of ten paintings that had been shipped, and we hadn't uncrated yet, she said, "What about the others?" So we hung all ten. And in a men's grill in a country club I think they're smashing. So, there's hope that they'll buy a set.

GOODWIN: Oh, I don't think that will happen.

WEISMAN: Well, on the premise of what they're operating on, it might. This lady, Mrs. Kirk Douglas--Anne Douglas--who's a very dear friend, is trying to get eight members to each buy one portrait. Then we said we would give one, and I'm trying to prevail upon my son to give one. Now we found a way that we think it can be done, where the members of the club wouldn't be as resentful: if they gave them to the Los Angeles County Museum, and the museum in turn put them on extended loan to Hillcrest for maybe four- five-year periods, with the option to be able to use them for exhibitions whenever they so desired. And in that way it's obvious that it would be much more plausible for members to see themselves spending that kind of money on a painting, because they'd be servicing the club, but primarily the museum, and putting good art into the museum. I think that might be just the perfect way to do it. So, if it happened we'd be very delighted. Obviously, for our son we'd be delighted.

But it puts me in a very difficult position--and Fred--because we can't really sell them. It looks like we're trying to promote self-interest. I don't think Richard needs us to sell paintings for him at this point; and we seem to be faring very well without all the profits we'll make on those paintings [laughter], which we will not make--those ten belong to us. I might add, we didn't even

get a 10 percent collectors' discount.

GOODWIN: I think the Warhols and the Hanson were the only examples of contemporary art.

WEISMAN: Also the Lichtenstein. And then there were two Giacometti sculptures in that show.

GOODWIN: Were those yours?

WEISMAN: No, no. They were not. But there were two Giacomettis.

GOODWIN: There were relatively few.

WEISMAN: There were very relatively few, and deliberately. Because when they began to ask for the art for the club show it came about that they were, again, getting a majority of this kind. So, they immediately crossed off and said it will be all impressionist or postimpressionist paintings, and that the sculptures could be all centuries. Unfortunately, they got no pre-Columbian, no Indian, or anything. But if you would like, I'd like to tell you the outcome of the show--

GOODWIN: Please.

WEISMAN: --is this the proper time?--that hopefully is going to take place. You know, we have a new acting director at the Los Angeles County Museum. Mr. Donahue has had a coronary, and he was just about due for retirement. So Dr. Pal--and I cannot pronounce his first name [Pratapaditya]. Do you know?

GOODWIN: That's why everybody calls him Dr. Pal.

WEISMAN: I don't know why they don't just call him Pal, but he does have a nickname, and he's a charming, lovely man. So, when this show took place--and it became as good as it was--there was only one screen of not-so-good things that we tried to move off to the side as best we could. It became so obvious that there were so many collections in this community that had never been tapped, and the collectors not known and so forth, that what we did was that Fred and I invited Franklin Murphy and Dr. Pal to lunch at the club. They were so excited and enthusiastic over what they saw loaned by people that they had never heard of before, that they are now working toward putting together something of an exhibition from collections in Southern California. And our whole premise has been for years that this should have happened. Because if you once ask someone in the community, "Would you loan your painting to an exhibition at the museum?" Of course, the collector is flattered, and he feels involved; and maybe it will be a stepping-stone toward a greater community involvement in the Los Angeles County Museum. And so, maybe this will come to pass. We feel very good about it. Franklin and Dr. Pal were absolutely thrilled over the whole thing. They were so excited, and they can't wait; and they want to go ahead and do great things.

GOODWIN: Well, my first thought was, "Has Maurice Tuchman been here; does he know about these pieces?"

WEISMAN: Well, may I say that I invited Maurice for lunch, and my husband made me uninvite him. [laughter] I don't know if that should go in the records or not.

GOODWIN: So he didn't see the show.

WEISMAN: He did see the show; someone told me that they brought him in. I'm glad he saw it, but I told him-- After I had invited him, I had my secretary call and say I had a conflict of timing. Subsequently, he found out that we did take Dr. Pal and Dr. Murphy; and I know he's going to adore us more than ever before. [laughter] But that's not going to be a lot different from the past, because it's not a very good feeling, unfortunately. But anyway, I think it's an indication of, again, an alternative space in the community; and there's room for a lot more.

GOODWIN: Are you going to do another show at Hillcrest in another few years?

WEISMAN: Hopefully, they would do one next year in twentieth-century art, but whether it will happen, I don't know.

GOODWIN: Let's talk about some of the art in this room.

WEISMAN: How long are we going to be doing this?

GOODWIN: Another few minutes.

WEISMAN: OK. Well, what would you like to know? Do you

know Giacometti's Dog? My husband's Chinese associate lady says this is really a portrait of her [laughter] at the end of a day's work. I think it's really a self-portrait of Alberto Giacometti--in his own way.

GOODWIN: Why do you think that?

WEISMAN: Because I think of him as being kind of a shaggy dog in appearance and a person that always had his nose to the grindstone and constantly lifting it, trying to find his way. I don't think he ever had the feeling that he had attained the success that he had. He knew-- I'm sure he was reaping in dollars. But I don't think that he was the kind of a man, if you knew how he lived and where he lived, and the conditions in which he worked, and taking into consideration that the garrets of Europe are very different than the garrets of America, or at least we think our situation is better in some ways--our living conditions. By the same token, he lived and worked in the most squalorlike conditions, and I don't think he ever thought of himself as being very different than that. And I just think it's beautiful. I do. I'm extremely fond of it.

GOODWIN: When did you acquire the Dog?

WEISMAN: I would say in the mid-sixties, early to mid-sixties; I'm not sure. I do get my dates confused; but I would say-- So many things were bought between '60 and '65, '67--but

I would say '62, '63, something like that.

GOODWIN: Tell us about the furniture, which we've never discussed.

WEISMAN: Oh, these chairs are Diego Giacometti. I wouldn't be surprised, but what Alberto designed these, but Diego executed them. I don't know that they were executed prior to Alberto's death, and they may have been. I think it could have been these were among the last things that Alberto designed. But the lamps that he's done--and we have a few in the living room, and then the den, and the chandelier in the hall--those were actually designed by Alberto and made by Alberto at a time when he designed furniture to eat and to live by. There are a couple of tables you may see in the background there that we've just received. Those were also designed by Alberto, as were these two stools that are about to be picked up tomorrow and be re-covered, as these are with the same fabric in the living room. And then we're going to have a little grouping here, and a little grouping here, of a table and three chairs, and a table and three chairs. So that we'll open this whole thing out then to the door. And then we're going to find a new place for our little friend here, our Dog. And, of course, he looks most beautiful at the edge of the pool, but I worry about the gardeners and so forth and so on. But I love him at the edge of the

pool when you see the reflection into the pool.

GOODWIN: Why don't we talk over to the Lipchitz.

WEISMAN: OK. This was done in 1917. It's called Seated Bather, and in the rear it has Lipchitz's thumbmark, which is how he has always designated his works of art.

I believe this is one out of seven--yes, number one out of seven. It's obviously beautiful in the front. But the thing about Lipchitz was, in these particular kinds, that he never failed to do the right thing. On the back of the sculptures and the sides and almost from any place that you would look at it, you would see that it is a total work of art. He certainly was one of the precursors of--or not the precursors--in the running with all of the analytical cubists who were the painters and sculptors of the time. And while this is a little bit later--oh, this is 1917? Does it say?

GOODWIN: I don't see a date; it sounds right.

WEISMAN: I think it's '14 or '17--I'm not sure--and Picassos ran from about '11, '12, '14. I know the Légers are '14 and '17; but it was in the period of the analytical cubists. Personally, I feel that this period of Lipchitz he reached his highest peak, and it is my idea of his best work. He did a few things: I think The Song of the Vowels at UCLA is marvelous. I'm not crazy about the Seated Bather there. I think when he took these things into too grand

a scale, they didn't work as well, because they lost the tightness. And this, I think, is part of the beauty of this. I do think The Song of the Vowels is marvelous.

GOODWIN: Before we go into the living room, why don't we just mention a few of the other pieces.

WEISMAN: Well, this is a Roy Lichtenstein that was done in 1967 [Modern Painting with Floral Forms].

GOODWIN: We better come closer to the microphone.

WEISMAN: Oh. It was done in 1967. The Roy Lichtenstein was done in his art deco period, and we love that. We did have a Lichtenstein before called Scared Witless; it was technically called Scared Shitless, but my husband asked Roy to change the name, because he doesn't use language like that. Anyway, I think this is quite beautiful. We sold that one early on under strange circumstances, but our son has a marvelous one called Blond Waiting of the comic-strip period of Roy Lichtenstein. And then we subsequently bought the sculpture which is exactly of the same time. They look marvelous next to each other, but a little contrived.

Over here is Hans Hofmann. This is toward the late middle of his career, going toward the end of it really. Well, obviously, I love it. Obviously, I'm going to tell you that I love all the things that are here. We've selected them and care a great deal for them. The

Giacometti stool underneath it without the seat in it isn't very attractive, maybe, at the moment; but we had to place them till they were picked up. I think this is probably one of the best of Hofmann's pieces of that period; it's called Equipoise. I think there's such a shift in the squares in the way they recede and come forward and go backward, and the use of color. And while its immediate feeling is all primary colors, in effect it isn't all primary colors. There are pinks and lavenders and mauves and chartreuses and all kinds of pastel colorings that are not necessarily what you would expect when you think of a primary-colored Hofmann. And knowing this [videotape] is in black and white, this is a very pale yellow, while that's more of a sun yellow. This is a wine-ish sort of red; this is a royal blue; this is lighter than royal blue. This is a very heavy primary red, I would say. This is more to the blue and vermilion orange. This is yellow toward chartreuse, and not far from the chartreuse in here. And here again is royal blue, and this vermilion orange repeating itself; and then again this is apple green--or as I would call it, apple green. Then all of the greens through here are such a total mixture. So that it has everything going in it; and still it has a vibrancy and a life. I haven't known many pictures that we acquired that took us over so quickly.

And we've only owned it a couple of years. It was probably the most expensive thing we ever bought in dollars laid out, because we bought it late on.

We had had a Hofmann very early on, and our only experience of this kind. It turned out to be a hot painting. It was stolen. And we bought it, and we knew it was a good price; but it seemed like a very respectable person who sold it to us. But it turned out that it had been part of the Hofmann estate paintings of the Renata series--you know, at the end of his career?--that were dedicated to his wife [and] were at the framers at the time he died. And the framer returned only a portion of them--in New York this was--and then proceeded to send that portion all over the country that he had and sold them very quickly at reduced prices. And we didn't know, and we bought it; and one day the FBI was at the door and they took our picture away. Well, we were very fortunate we received the money back. And it was a long time before we found another one; and this is really better than the one we had.

GOODWIN: Why don't we pause here.

WEISMAN: All right.

* * *

WEISMAN: This is Jean Dubuffet [L'Arbre de lait]; he's a French artist. I think he must be eighty-eighty. [laughter]

Eighty-eighty! Eighty-nine, or ninety; something like that. His vision is eighty-eighty, I guess, because he seems to see things quite well. We acquired this relatively recently, in the last year or so, from Pace Gallery in New York. He had worked in-- We had had a painting of his once called Metallurgique, I remember, where he does a lot of collage appliqué, making like a landscape of it. We owned it and--it didn't live well. It didn't stay in long and we didn't-- We had it for maybe four months and then returned it. And exchanged it, I might add, for a Rothko and a Gabo and a couple of other things. And I think our exchanges were very good, but nevertheless-- Then when he went into this, we were much more drawn to it and we acquired this. Subsequently, we saw the piece that was at the Kröller-Müller Museum [Otterlo, Netherlands]. I don't know whether you've seen that. It's a piece that you walk into, under, and on top of. And it's-- Oh, the circumference is probably the size of our whole garden. And he constructed this whole thing. You walk up a tunnel, and you walk over on top. It's just beautiful. Someday you must go there. It is really the most--one of the outstanding museums of the world. Very few people know about it.

In any event, these are all segments that come out, and they all lift. I hate to touch them; it's so difficult

getting them-- Oh, here's one that comes and goes. Did I break it?

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: All right. So this one comes and goes; and this whole thing-- They're all-- Now this [piece] is hooked into a leaf. The leaf is hooked into the trunk. And it's-- I call it Styrofoam, but I don't think it is. It's some other kind of a material. I think it's attractive. I like it. It's definitely French art. And somehow or other, twentieth-century French art and I don't get along as well as we might. I think this might be more a his than a hers piece, although I like it very much. I like it better than anything I've seen of his. And I respect the work. I think it's good. Well, what is there about French art that does that to me?

GOODWIN: We talked about that in one of the tapes.

WEISMAN: It feels decorative, I think.

GOODWIN: Right, exactly.

WEISMAN: Is that what it is?

GOODWIN: It feels decorative, and you preferred more substantive pieces.

WEISMAN: I like things that are gutsier, I think, that create more of a challenge. I think this is pleasant, and I like it; it doesn't wear out, and it's very nice. But it just doesn't hang in the same kind of way--

GOODWIN: It's a nice contrast with the real thing.

WEISMAN: Yes. And then this is Roy Lichtenstein [Modern Sculpture]. If I can take the liberty, while we're doing this, I'll move it over a little, because I don't like where it's placed. This I refer to before as being of the same period as the painting that we have over there [Modern Sculpture] of a 1967 art deco piece. It's most handy for me, because it does supply a living room mirror. [laughter] But I really love it. I've seen other works of his that he's done of this nature. It's so art deco. It belongs in a theater with ropes between-- In fact, the old Pasadena Museum has one [Long Modern Sculpture] that's very extended with mullions hanging between it, and they're quite beautiful.

GOODWIN: I like that piece, too.

WEISMAN: Yes, that's marvelous. It's not a very home-oriented piece, whereas this is. But I really and truly love this. I think it's quite nice. And it wears very well for me. I don't know whether you see the Franz Kline painting.

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: No. The Pevsner sculpture? You want me to go into this? This is Antoine Pevsner. It's unique. I don't believe he ever did multiples; did he?

GOODWIN: I don't think so.

WEISMAN: I don't think he ever did, either. And there are little fine wires that have been welded together to make this final piece. I wish I knew the name of it, and I don't off the top of my head [Surface Developable]. Nor do I know the year it was done [1938]. He was the brother of Naum Gabo, whom we have in the living room. And interestingly, they didn't get along. One lived in the United States, one in Paris, I believe. They worked separately, never looking at each other's work and came up with similar kinds of work. One took the name of his mother, and the other his father; I don't know which was which. But we do have both.

GOODWIN: This looks like it could be a monument.

WEISMAN: It does, doesn't it?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: It could be. It could relate to the Winged Victory at the Louvre--to me, and particularly if you look at it like this. I think it's a great piece. I really love it a lot. And, you know, it's interesting. It's not something that you walk in the house, and you say, "Hey, wow!" But it just sits there, and it does its thing handsomely all the time. It never turns off, and it's just there. It picks up different lights at different times. And as I look at it now, I'm seeing it differently than I've seen it in a while. And the light is

hitting it very nicely, I think--the way it's responding--
don't you?

GOODWIN: To me this is not a typical Weisman sculpture.

WEISMAN: It's French.

GOODWIN: I don't feel that it's French. It seems
different.

WEISMAN: But it's very gutsy! Really. But when you
think of it, it is very challenging. Look at all the planes
and surfaces that are involved. And none of these are
really the same, the way he's worked this out. I think
it's a very complicated piece.

GOODWIN: Oh, it is.

WEISMAN: Well, it isn't Kline-esque. It isn't Lichtenstein.
But I don't know that it's so far from [Julio] González
or so far from Lipchitz; and I presume they were all working
at around the same time--and Giacometti. They were all there.
Do you think maybe that this was acquired with something
else in mind?

GOODWIN: No, no--no. I think it's a very underwhelming
piece.

WEISMAN: It is, exactly. As I say, it sits there and
minds its own business and keeps doing its thing.

GOODWIN: It's easier to fall in love with other things.

WEISMAN: You fall on your face over other things. You
may not fall on your face with this, but it's always

there--very comforting. It's almost like grandma [laughter], you know. It's always there to take care of your needs, and you hope she'll always be there--or grandpa, whatever. But I think it has that kind of a feeling about it; but it still wears well. There are other things we've had that have a similar feeling, but then they bomb out in time. They just don't make it all the way. But I think it's a very special kind of art. I think it had its place at the time in the century.

GOODWIN: Let's just mention the Calder. We took a look at it earlier.

WEISMAN: All right. Well, the Calder is called Nine Elements--three and two are five, and four are nine, yes. I have to count, because our son has one similar to this, and his is something else, and I forget which is which. But this is Nine Elements. And interestingly, Klaus Perls was having a show--not Klaus--Frank Perls was having a Calder show in Los Angeles. We went next door to Paul Kantor, and this was the only one we'd seen out of all the Calder show and everything that we really fell in love with. So when was Klaus [Frank] Perls on Camden Drive? You know how long ago that we bought this. And it's been there ever since. Now the Calder in the garden, the stabile out there: it's a stabile mobile [Yellow Disk], bought more recently and that was out of the Buddy Mayer's--

Buddy and Robert Mayer's--collection of Chicago. When it was sold off, we bought that. But I really like this. And then we have another little teeny one in our bedroom, very teeny-weeny, and then a little teeny-weeny one as a result of-- When we bought it it probably cost almost half what this did. So it's interesting how times and prices change. Could you see the Rauschenberg behind the Lichtenstein? Over here.

GOODWIN: Can we get into the corner?

WEISMAN: We could move the Lichtenstein back a bit. This is a 1954 painting of Robert Rauschenberg. Am I in the way? It was quite a monumental step in Rauschenberg's life as an artist, in that he was beginning to change in 1954 from an abstract expressionist to a combine painter, which later came into all of the wild and woolly things that he's done. I really think probably of all the living artists today he is the most creative man around. He never quits. He never says die. He's always up with something else. And it isn't like he's just doing to be doing. To me the fantastic thing was when his retrospect was coming to a close and he saw the end in view, maybe halfway through--and incidentally, this painting was in it; it was done in 1954, incidentally. At that time he knew that if that retrospect closed without his having another exhibition elsewhere of new work, he might be

dead--literally dead, aesthetically. And he knocked himself out, and he put together this show, of which that piece came out of. I think that was called Spreads and Veils or something of that nature. And he did a whole new body of work different than anything he had ever done before.

Then he came up with this show at Gemini; and subsequently, he did another called Publicons, rather than "Icons," because they're for the people. And they're splendid. We certainly don't need multiples in our house, but we got taken in, and we did buy one. I would have bought another, but we decided that was ridiculous. He now has a show going on up in Vancouver in the museum up there that's even more gorgeous than this show. I never saw such-- I just saw the catalog. I never saw such paintings! But how much Rauschenberg can one person own? And we did acquire one from the [County] Museum out of this series, too.

GOODWIN: There's a saying I've heard here a few times.

WEISMAN: What?

GOODWIN: "You can't own everything."

WEISMAN: Oh, yes. That's true. I've heard that from my husband; he tells me that. But then every now and then I have to tell him that, too; because he's really the greater offender of the two because I don't write the checks; because I can't. [laughter] I could write them,

but it would mean nothing behind them. So, that's really how it goes.

GOODWIN: We will move into the living room.

WEISMAN: OK, very good.

* * *

WEISMAN: The Clyfford Still is one of six that we own. We did have another--seven. But we did sell one, and that really was kind of the end of our relationship in a way with Clyfford. However, it's a palatable relationship, but not as intimate as it had been. We acquired our first two Clyfford Stills in 1959--or '60, I believe--and subsequently the red and black one in the bar [1947-M]. Then he gave this painting to my husband as a gift, this yellow painting [1951 Yellow]. Then we have a small pastel in our entry that he had given to me as a gift [untitled]. We have one that's on loan at the County Museum now, [and] one in our daughter-in-law's apartment in New York. I think that accounts for them. We became involved with Clyfford Still's work when we were taking an art course at UCLA Extension, and Walter Hopps had slides of Clyfford Still. And through Jim Elliott, who was then the curator of modern art at the museum, at the L.A. County Museum. We began to pursue Clyfford, trying to obtain a painting. He's a very difficult man in terms of acquiring works of art. He

releases them in exchange for money--at his will--if he believes that you are really involved in the painting and in the work, and if it will hang in a place that will be appropriate, so that it isn't hung with other things, and on and on and on and on. And he's, as I say, a difficult man. I think this is a particularly beautiful Still, and maybe one of the best we have, although the black one is gorgeous also. The National Gallery borrowed this painting for their exhibition of "American Art at Mid-century," which was their first exhibition of living artists--American artists--prior to the opening of the East Building in Washington.

GOODWIN: I think your Stills are the best ones I've ever seen.

WEISMAN: Well, then you haven't been to San Francisco [Museum of Modern Art], have you?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: Have you seen all twenty-two of those?

GOODWIN: No, not all of them.

WEISMAN: That one big blue one: that was supposed to be ours. At the time we ordered this painting we were in his studio. We bought this painting and that blue painting. This one came, and another one that was just nothing anywheres near what we had wanted. We wanted the blue one, and we sent the other one back, and Fred wrote

him a very stern letter. And he wrote back and said, "You're absolutely right. You're a man of your word. And I want you to accept this painting as a gift from me as a declaration of independence, because you are as much George Washington as anyone," and da di di da di di da. He went through this whole thing over it, and he gave it to my husband, which was really very generous of him. He acknowledged he had done the wrong thing, but we never got the blue painting. In the meantime, it's at San Francisco, and we do see it often, which makes us feel very good.

Do you like that?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: This is a relatively new acquisition. We both love it. I think this might be a piece that we love, but we bought it without seeing it. It was in a sale. And I knew enough about González's work, and so did Fred, that we could tell from the photography on it that we liked it a lot. I think maybe it was one of the few things we ever bought with the fact in mind that historically we had to have it. And, you know, most everything-- And we did fall in love with it the minute we saw it, I might add. But we did see the reproductions and slides and transparencies and so forth; and we knew enough of his work certainly to know exactly what it was about and all about it. And it didn't disappoint us a bit. We really love it.

GOODWIN: What's it called?

WEISMAN: What's it called? "Untitled," I presume.

Everything is, isn't it? [laughter] I don't know what it's called. It's got to be untitled, or cactus; but it's untitled, I'm sure [Cactus Man]. I think all his things were untitled. And I'm not even sure the date it was done. I think it was in the early part of the twentieth century, in the teens someplace, would you guess? Later?

GOODWIN: I don't know.

WEISMAN: I could find out for you if you'd like to know.

GOODWIN: We've talked before about the fact that your collection is as much sculpture as painting, as well as drawings and other things.

WEISMAN: I think it's pretty well distributed between sculpture, paintings, watercolors, drawings. Everybody thinks of it as being all-American, the twentieth-century masters. But I think that's just because they're so huge that one doesn't realize how much surrealism there is, how much there is in German expressionists, and small pictures that are not necessarily American artists of mid-century.

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: Such as the Kandinsky and the Max Ernst just behind it. Do you see that?

GOODWIN: The sculpture in the foyer?

WEISMAN: You can't see it? In any event, there is a

sculpture there called Moon Man of Max Ernst's, which is certainly surreal. It's European, and it's excellent sculpture.

The Kandinsky, on the other hand, is a 1911 Kandinsky; it's called Yellow Nude. We bought that quite early on. It's one of those glorious things that never wear out. That is my annuity. [laughter] If the world crashes down, and everything goes to hell, and Fred never sold another Toyota, [laughter] and I never gave another art class to help support him, then we could always use the Kandinsky. And I think possibly one of the reasons I relate to it that way is I think it's so beautiful, and it's so simple, and it's so elegant, that it's ever etched on my mind. I couldn't lose one square inch of that painting. And consequently, I would never lose it if we didn't have it. And it would be always with me, and it would reap us more--monetarily--maybe than anything in the house; and consequently it makes me the perfect annuity to have in terms of dollars and cents. To have something that you'd never lose and be able to get rid of it and reap all those dollars would be fantastic. But, hopefully, we wouldn't have to do that.

GOODWIN: Is it always hung in this corner?

WEISMAN: Oh, no. We never have anything always hung anyplace. It very often goes over where Pink Angels is.

It's been here where the red Reinhardt [Red Painting] is. It's been in the dining room, it's been in the bar, it's been all over the place. I don't know. Fred would like to have it front and center all the time. And I think there is something to moving it into another kind of a location, let's say a lesser location, that gives it a sense of belonging to us more--like the Pollock [untitled] being in Fred's dressing room--is really very nice, and he loves that painting so. It gives him a much more intimate relationship with it, and that's nice. I'd like to have this [Yellow Nude] in the bedroom. He'd faint. He'd absolutely collapse if we moved that into the bedroom.

Here, again, is an example of what is not American painting, and a perfect example to me of a Léger contrast of forms [Eléments mécaniques]. And maybe because I've never lived with a painting of this period that I have the feeling that--can you see it all right?--that I have the feeling that it expresses the moment in time better than the paintings, because it is smaller and it is tighter--I guess that refers back to the Lipchitz a bit--that the paintings seem to spread out more to cover the canvas. And it's so typically European in that it doesn't come to the edges. I like that because it does do all the right things for the right painting. And I think that the way it spins out and the whole attitude of that picture is

absolutely a perfect example to me of analytical cubism.

That was done in 1914. Is that what it reads?

GOODWIN: Right.

WEISMAN: And I think it's quite lovely.

Here is Gabo again--of Naum Gabo--who was Antoine Pevsner's brother. And I think it's quite lovely

[Linear Construction Variation]. I always regretted that when Gabo sent it to us-- He just died recently, I believe. Didn't he?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: When he sent this, after we acquired it, the crate that it was packed in, the way it was packed--I never in my life saw anything like it. It was a negative of the positive. We should have kept it. It was a sculpture unto itself. It was so marvelous. And I don't know; it got lost in the shuffle. It's quite beautiful and we keep it in a vitrine of this kind, because everybody that came near it was strumming it. We had two wires broken on it, and that's all it took for us to realize that that could never be: we would be forever replacing it.

GOODWIN: I just noticed your Noguchi [Little She (1970)] is not in its--

WEISMAN: Where is it? My husband's moved it! And I don't know where he put it. I can't believe it! [laughter] I don't know where he's put it. He must have taken it to

the office. That must have been it. He does this. He rises very early in the morning, and sometimes during the night, and I wake up and I don't find the pictures. I didn't notice that, and I realize it wasn't there yesterday either. Well, we'll find it; it's a very nice Noguchi. [laughter] We're not going to lose it, I promise.

This is de Kooning's Dark Pond. I believe it was done in '45. And the back of it has a drawing of Pink Angels. It was started to be painted, and I don't know what prompted him to do that. Whether it was done before or after, that's something we'll never know. But in any event, it's a combination of Pink Angels and the big picture of--oh, what's it called, at the National Gallery, this huge tapestry that he did? Well, anyway, it was a tremendous piece that he had done in New York, oh, early on. But anyway, Pink Angels was the definitive painting from that study, which is on the back of this, and also this huge tapestry that at one time hung in the Four Seasons [Restaurant]. It's now at the National Gallery; and whether they've purchased it or not, I don't know.

GOODWIN: This is easily a masterpiece in his career.

WEISMAN: Oh, I don't know what you could say about that. It's just impeccable. I think it's as gorgeous a painting as has ever been done. I'm trying to think what we've ever had over the fireplace besides that. Oh, once we

had that Arp that was hanging on the door when we first started to collect, and I think we had the Picasso Dora Maar that's in our son's apartment now. That might have been over the fireplace, but how can anything go over there? It's just so nice. Oh, I know what else was there. When Andy Warhol did a portrait of my granddaughters, and our son gave it to us for Christmas, I said, "Throw out that de Kooning and put up a good painting." So we had our granddaughters hanging over the fireplace all through Christmas. [laughter]

This is one of the first sculptures we ever bought, the Arp on the fireplace. We bought that through a closed-circuit sale that took place at the County Museum from the Museum of Modern Art. It was for the purchase of-- The monies were going for the monies to build the new Philip Johnson wing at that time onto the Museum of Modern Art. It's called Self Absorbed. It was done in 1956 or '57, I think. It was maybe one of the last things that he really worked on himself. You know, in the sixties he began having other people do his work, which doesn't make it any the less, I'm sure. But I was such a naive soul at that point I decided that I wanted to have it a shiny bronze like other Arps, and started to clean it. I realized what I had done, and I didn't know what to do, and I didn't want anyone to know. So, I quick

took it outside. Can you imagine?

GOODWIN: I don't want to hear this.

WEISMAN: I took it outside. I watered it with the sprinklers and left it, and in three days it was right back where it was. [laughter] It was just perfect, absolutely perfect. And I don't know why I was so lucky. I did use a very soft steel wool, which I'm told is perfectly all right to do, subsequently. And then I put it out and weathered itself, and it's lovely now. It never had a mark or a spot or a thing since, so-- It's a very good little piece, and it's behaving itself.

This is [a] Giacometti, called The Glade. It has nine figures on it. It's unique in that it's painted. And there were certain works that he did that he did paint, one of each edition--not too many of them. I particularly love this. I love the fact that it's painted, and I like the fact that it continually changes, because wherever you look you only have to move your head a fraction of an inch, and if you move the camera just the teeniest amount you get a totally different concept of what it's about. It really is, I guess, all of us in our world that we live in--we're all alone no matter that we're all together, whether it be a family or whether the planet or whatever, we all really stand alone. And we become pretty gray and dismal from time to time. But if

we are all looking that beautiful as we were gray and dismal, wouldn't it be nice? I just think it's marvelous. And there're all kinds of ways you can exploit this piece. We used to have a buffet in our dining room. We had it on the buffet; and with a light in front of it and the shadows on the wall, wow! And that buffet was pretty good. It had this on one end and the Dog on the other and the Johns Map over it. But space became-- Walls became a necessity. But I think this is a particularly special piece.

GOODWIN: It also feels monumental to me, that this could be a huge sculpture.

WEISMAN: Well, this is exactly what I meant when we were talking before about in the Galerie Maeght, that indoor patio. They set up figures like this inside of a patio, and it became, in fact, a living place, which is what this is called--a Place. And the way he shapes the base, it isn't a rectangle; it's a nothing. It's the way things are. They're not always perfect. And it relates well to the pieces that when you see that big Place at the Maeght, and you look at this, you know that it is monumental. And it's colossal. My regret is that we had another one of three figures and a head called Sand. But we were young, and we didn't know any better. And we thought, well, as long as we had the Dog, and we had

the Plâce, we didn't need it. And we had [The Glade]; we really didn't need another one, too. [gasps] I hate myself. That's the "iffy" collection we've referred to so many times. Haven't we? If we hadn't sold, if we had bought it, or if we hadn't given it away. Oh, well. Hopefully, somebody is enjoying those "iffys." Then this Léger-- I think we have to move this.

GOODWIN: Can we stop for a moment?

WEISMAN: That's OK. OK? This Léger [Contraste de formes], I believe, is 19- -18, -17? Can you read? It's a little--

GOODWIN: -17.

WEISMAN: It's a little-- -17. I know it's later than the other one. This we bought at an auction also. He did four or five on sepia-tone paper with a black and white pastel. And they were considered the Kahnweiler Légers because Kahnweiler, I guess, was the one that acquired them all and subsequently sold them. And he didn't sell them all. This came up at an auction, as I said, and we bought this. I think it's quite beautiful. There are those that think it's a much more masterful pastel than that [painting] is. I think it possibly is because of its size. But if you can put on your blinders and look at a painting--and I like to think that we can do that with most everything from time to time--and you put on your blinders and look at that and look at that, they're very comparable. Does

this have an object in it or a subject matter to you?

GOODWIN: Yes.

WEISMAN: What is it?

GOODWIN: It looks like a seated figure: a head and body--

WEISMAN: Do you know what? It always looks like a French poodle, a head, to me. Does it to you? [laughter] I think it's one of the things that disturbed me about it.

GOODWIN: No.

WEISMAN: That head looks like a little French poodle with a peaked nose. But it's not. It's a seated figure? OK, I'll take your--

GOODWIN: That's my interpretation.

WEISMAN: I'll take your word for it. And this, of course, the Henry Moore Family of Four. The swivel, unfortunately, was loaned to the club, and it hasn't come back. Hopefully, it will be here sometime today. And that's a Family of Four figure. I think his families were particularly good, and also the Queen--I think you took a picture of earlier--which I think is lovely. I think his figures were really excellent. We have a Family of Three also that's in our daughter-in-law's apartment.

GOODWIN: I particularly enjoy Moore's smaller figures.

WEISMAN: Well, I agree. I think the Queen is probably as big as he should go. And we have an Animal Head in the

den, that I like very much. But I think it's a one side-- It has its better side, like, I presume, we all do. But I think the families are great. I even like the other one, which is a family of three, which I really prefer in a way. I think as he condensed them they became richer in some way. And then one piece I've always wanted was the Rocking Chair with the mother and the baby, where the chair and the mother's back were one. And then the ladder back was nice, too. I like both of those.

Behind you is a Robert Rauschenberg. This is Spreads and Veils. I think that's what it's called. I'm not sure. And I know you'll not get it properly on the video, because really the whole thing is looking into this partition that you're seeing the side of, where it has all the Mylar paper and the transfers on fabric, so that you really get a great deal of depth and a huge amount of space out of a small space.

GOODWIN: You're supposed to walk right up to it?

WEISMAN: I do, and go into it. And then you look from the left on the bottom, and to the right on the top, and you get the images transferred. And I think it's very nice.

Do you go over here to my favorite sculpture maybe? The Barnett Newman? And I know I'm very partial to it for lots of reasons that may have nothing to do with reality of sculpture, but it was done in 1950. It was in his studio.

He asked me to come and see a sculpture, and I asked him at the time, "Barney what could you sculpt that relates to your painting?" And so I went and I saw this piece. It was in plaster, and I just couldn't believe it. I asked him when he had done it, and he said 1950; and at that time it was 1960. I said, "Well, why haven't you cast it?" He said, "I'm thinking about it," and I said, "You've thought long enough." I prevailed upon him by calling him practically daily until he cast it. And he did two casts, and he gave one to his wife, and one we acquired. It's called Here I (To Marcia), because he said he would never have cast it had I not prevailed upon him. So, it's a very special piece to me. I think it's a very special sculpture. As he put it, it wasn't making space; it defines space. And I think it does that exactly. He works much in the way of Giacometti, but in a very American style, a very Americanized style.

I don't know whether you can see the Newman painting going through it. That's called Onement Number Six. That was very special in that I saw that, fell in love with it, called Fred, and he wasn't interested in a Newman painting. I was calling from Barney's studio. We were very close friends and still--the Newmans and ourselves--and still see a great deal of his widow. So, Fred wouldn't have any part of it. And then two, three months later he was in New York

and hit Barney's studio, and he saw the painting. He called me and said, "Guess what. I've just bought a Newman painting. And it's so gorgeous. This one you'll like." He had completely forgotten about my conversation with him, and Barney just sat there and chuckled. He was so pleased we'd each fallen in love with it on our own. And I guess, maybe that's my favorite painting in the house. But probably because there's emotional involvement, as well as the visual concepts. I guess I can't judge, but I do think he probably will go down as the master of them all. When everybody gets through with the de Koonings and the Pollocks and the Hofmanns and everything, and they get down to the basic simple arithmetic of aesthetics, Newman's going to be there telling where it's at, where it came from, why it is. And there it is. And his Onement certainly had a religious concept. When he started doing his Onement paintings they did relate to "there is one God," and that's it. I think it's very special.

GOODWIN: Thank you for sharing your collection with us.

WEISMAN: My pleasure.

INDEX

- Abrams, Harry, 376
 Ace Gallery, 169, 171, 343, 408, 426-28
 Agam, Yaacov, 76-77
 -Cycle, 76-77
 Agee, William, 257
 Ahmanson, Howard, 185, 192, 196-97, 308
 Ahmanson, Mrs. Howard, 112
 Ahmanson Foundation, 237
 Albers, Josef, 364
 -Homage to the Square, 164-66
 -Red Series II and III, 258
 Albright-Knox Gallery, Buffalo, 131, 243
 Albuquerque, Lita, 393
 Alexander, Jill, 179
 Algonquin Hotel, New York, 94
 Altoon, John, 392-93
 Amazing Blue Ribbon Four Hundred, 385
 Ambassador Hotel, 23
 American Broadcasting Company, 275
 American Council of the Arts, 382-83
 André Emmerich Gallery, New York, 101, 168-69
 Andrews, Oliver, 87
 Ankrum Gallery, 171
 Annenberg, Walter, 251
 Appel, Karel, 376
 Arden Farms Company, 24
 Arensberg, Walter, 110-11
 Arensberg, Mrs. Walter, 110-11
 Arneson, Robert, 393-94
 -Rose, 393
 Arnold, Anna Bing, 112-197
 Arnoldi, Charles, 82, 88, 393
 Arp, Jean, 62
 -Figure recueillie, 40
 -Self Absorbed, 61, 455-56
 Art Alliance, 246
 Art Center College of Design, 103, 353
 Art Institute of Chicago, 32, 323
 Artforum (periodical), 257
 Asher, Betty, 183
 Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, 299, 316
 Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO), 213, 237
 Bachardy, Don, 394
 Barney's Beanery, 170
 Barron, Stephanie, 115
 Barzaghi, Jacques, 398
 Baskin, Leonard, 424
 Beaubourg (Centre Georges Pompidou), Paris, 412
 Beckmann, Max, 186
 Bell, Larry, 394
 Bellamy, Richard, 176-77, 259, 354-56
 Bengston, Billy Al, 71-73, 82, 155-56
 -Dento, 72
 Benton, Fletcher, 393
 -Dynamic Rhythms Orange (Phase III), 230
 Berenson, Bernard, 311
 Berggruen, Heinz, 378
 Berlant, Tony, 361, 363-64
 -Blue Eyed Blonde, 364
 Bieser, Natalie, 392
 Bill, Max, 280
 Blankfort, Dorothy (Mrs. Michael), 189
 Blankfort, Michael, 189, 224
 Bloch, Maurice, 359
 Blum, Irving, 133, 170-71, 265, 345
 Blum, Shirley Hopps (Mrs. Irving), 256
 Bonnard, Pierre, 90-91, 191, 231
 Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 318, 323

- Bowker, Al, 296-97
 Brach, Paul, 36, 61, 129
 Brademas, John, 346
 Brahm, Carol Ann, 144
 Brahm, Maralee, 144
 Brancusi, Constantin, 206
 -Sleeping Muse, 60
 Brewer, Don, 359
 Brice, William, 174, 186,
 288-89, 395
 -Rocks in a Garden, 40
 Bright, David E., 183, 189,
 229
 Bright, Dolly (Mrs. David
 E.), 112-13, 128,
 130, 183
 Briskin, Sarah, 174
 Broad, Eli, 232
 Broadway, The, department
 store, 32
 Broderson, Morris, 174
 Brody, Sidney, 189-90, 200
 Brooks, Evelyn Simon (sis-
 ter), 1-2, 12, 14,
 16, 18, 23
 Brooks, Harold (brother-in-
 law), 7, 23
 Brotherton collection, 113-
 14
 Brown, Charlie
 -Smiling Tomatoes, 365
 Brown, Edmund G. ("Pat"),
 22, 370, 382-83,
 396, 401-2
 Brown, Edmund G., Jr.,
 ("Jerry"), 105-6,
 347, 392, 395-403,
 411
 Brown, John Carter, 117,
 310-11
 Brown, Polly (Mrs. Richard),
 193-94
 Brown, Richard, 187, 191,
 193-95
 Brown, Stanley, 361
 Bruni, Anna, 144
 Burton, Betty (Mrs. Gene),
 260, 263
 Burton, Gene, 260
 Byrnes, Jim, 110
 Calder, Alexander, 121, 161,
 377, 444-45
 -Nine Elements, 161, 444
 -Yellow Disk, 444-45
 California Arts Commission,
 290
 California Coastal Commis-
 sion, 407-8
 California Design, Pasadena
 Art Museum, 246
 California Federal Savings
 and Loan, 388
 California Institute of the
 Arts (CalArts), 103
 California Palace of the
 Legion of Honor, San
 Francisco, 299, 316,
 319-20
 California Sea Food Company,
 162
 California State Arts Coun-
 cil, 370-71, 397,
 400
 California State University,
 Fullerton, 103, 217
 California State University,
 Long Beach, 160, 217-
 18, 352-53, 392-95
 California State University,
 Northridge, 217-18
 Caro, Anthony, 52, 84, 169,
 387, 412
 Carter, Edward W., 189-90,
 192, 195-96, 200,
 227, 229, 231
 Carter, James Earl ("Jimmy"),
 346, 403
 Castelli, Leo, 167, 169
 Cedars of Lebanon Hospital,
 19, 25
 Cedars-Sinai Medical Center,
 24, 47, 106, 145-47,
 333-35, 356-82, 387,
 417
 Centre Georges Pompidou
 (Beaubourg), Paris,
 412

- Cézanne, Paul, 13, 34, 45,
 51, 64, 91
 Chagall, Marc, 77
 Chandler family, 224
 Chocolate Soldier, The, 14
 Christmas, Doug, 157-58,
 166, 169, 177, 344,
 365, 427
 Constable, John, 78
 Conte, Richard, 267
 Coplans, John, 255, 257-58
 Corcoran, James, 166
 Corcoran Gallery of Art,
 Washington, D.C.,
 136, 324, 394
 Cornell, Joseph, 177, 255-
 56
 Cory, Kenneth ("Ken"), 370,
 392
 Craft and Folk Art Museum,
 237
 Cranston, Alan, 346, 390-
 92
 Crawford, Joan, 29
 Creo, 284
 Cummings, Sue (Mrs. Ted),
 181
 Cummings, Ted, 181, 183
 Cupie Toilet Tissue Com-
 pany, 5

 Daumier, Honoré, 14
 Davidson, Gordon, 359, 406
 Davis, Gray, 106
 Davis, Ron, 82, 88, 101,
 169, 393
 Davis, Sammy, Jr., 266
 DeAndrea, John, 52
 Degas, Edgar, 202
 de Kooning, Willem, 35, 84,
 120-23, 138, 184,
 282, 305, 416, 462
 -Dark Pond, 62, 160, 167,
 454
 -Pink Angels, 160, 451,
 454-55
 -sale of works, 202-3
 de Menil, John, 253
 de Menil, Dominique (Mrs.
 John), 253

 Demetrion, James, 256-57
 Deutsch, Armand, 390, 392
 Deutsch, Harriet (Mrs. Ar-
 mand), 390, 392
 Diebenkorn, Richard, 88-89,
 96, 159, 304
 -Ocean Park No. 64, 88-
 89
 Dill, Guy, 352
 Dill, Laddie John, 393, 409
 Dillon, Douglas, 314
 Dillon, Paul, 393
 Dine, Jim, 176
 -Vegetable suite, 365-66
 Donahue, Daisy (Mrs. Ken-
 neth), 225
 Donahue, Kenneth ("Ken"),
 108, 187, 191-93,
 215, 375, 430
 -leadership of Los Ange-
 les County Museum of Art,
 222, 223, 225
 Douglas, Anne (Mrs. Kirk),
 429
 Dubuffet, Jean, 148, 152-55,
 286, 438-40
 -L'Arbre de lait, 52,
 438-39
 -Metallurgique, 439
 Duchamp, Marcel, 255
 Ducommun, Charles, 205
 Ducommun, Mrs. Charles, 205
 Dunlop, Ian, 345
 Dwan, Virginia, 171-72

 Eastman, Lee, 95, 97, 123,
 141
 Elliott, James, 123, 134,
 140, 181, 447
 -at Los Angeles County
 Museum of Art, 182-85,
 191
 -at University Art Museum,
 Berkeley, 296, 299, 304
 Emmerich, André, 101, 168-69
 Ernst, Max, 42-43, 83, 206,
 287, 450-51
 -Gai, or Man with the Bot-
 tle, 60-61

- Ernst, Max (continued)
 -Jeune homme au coeur battant, 60
 -Moon Man, 450-51
 -Tortue, 47, 60
 Esberg, Alfred ("Alfie"), 260-61
 Esther Robles Gallery, 41, 171
 Evans, Ned, 71
 Evert, Chris, 428
 Everts, Connor, 175
- Factor, Betty (Mrs. Monte), 183
 Factor, Don, 173, 181, 262, 265
 Factor, Lynn (Mrs. Don), 173, 181
 Factor, Max, 262
 Factor, Monte, 183
 Falkenstein, Claire, 71, 82, 388, 392, 394
 Fantin-Latour, Ignace, 319-20, 376
 Fedderson, William, 370
 Feinblatt, Ebria, 222
 Feininger, Lyonel, 12
 Fietelson, Lorser, 82, 171, 395
 Felix Landau Gallery, 41, 171
 Felsen, Rosamund, 169
 Ferus Gallery, 41, 170-71, 173, 175
 Fidelity Bank, Beverly Hills, 264-65, 269-70
 Flavin, Dan, 129
 Fleischman, Larry, 406
 Foreman, _____, 4
 Four Seasons restaurant, New York, 454
 Fourcade, Xavier, 128
 Francis, Sam, 82, 95-96, 304, 378, 393, 394
 Frank Perls Gallery, Beverly Hills, 41
 Frankenthaler, Helen, 94, 206
- Franklin, Harry, 207
 Freeman, Betty (Mrs. Stanley), 181-82
 Freeman, Stanley, 181
 Frick Collection, New York, 418
 Frost, Camilla ("Mia"), 205, 224-25
 Fujinami, Noriko, 366, 409, 414
- Gabo, Naum, 439, 442
 -Linear Construction Variations, 153-54, 453
 Gainsborough, Thomas
 -Blue Boy, The, 13
 Galerie Maeght, New York, 457
 Ganz, Joanne (Mrs. Julian, Jr.), 116, 118, 205
 Ganz, Julian, Jr., 116, 118, 205
 Garland, Judy, 374
 Garver, Thomas H. ("Tom"), 291-92
 Gates, Katie (Mrs. Freeman), 112
 Gateway Arch. See Eero Saarinen
 Gauguin, Paul, 32
 Geary Street Theater, San Francisco, 5
 Gehry, Frank, 223, 404-7, 409, 421
 Geisen, Rowe, 249
 Gemini G.E.L., 172, 364, 375, 377-78, 446
 George C. Page Museum, 237
 Gersh, Beatrice (Mrs. Phil), 183, 206
 Gersh, Phil, 183, 206
 Giacometti, Alberto, 148, 231, 285, 430, 437, 443
 -works
 -chariot, 44, 74-75
 -Dog, 433-35, 457
 -furniture design, 434
 -Glade, The, 62, 456-58

Giacometti, Alberto (con-
 tinued)
 -Place, 457-58
 -Sand, 457-58
 Giacometti, Diego, 148, 434
 Gilmore family, 195-96
 Gilmore Stadium, 195
 Ginsburg, David, 375
 Girls' High School, San
 Francisco, 10
 Glenn, Connie (Mrs. Jack),
 352
 Glenn, Jack, 352
 Glickman, Louis (uncle), 13
 Glickman, Morris (maternal
 grandfather), 2-4
 Glickman, Rose (maternal
 grandmother), 3
 Glickman, Zadel (aunt), 13-
 14
 Gogh, Vincent van, 31, 32,
 38, 110, 186, 203-4,
 376
 Gold, Betty, 144, 171
 Goldenson, Leonard, 275
 González, Julio, 443
 -Cactus Man, 449-50
 Goode, Joe, 393
 Gore, Florence, 12
 Gorky, Arshile, 45, 84, 168,
 212
 -Liver Is the Cock's Comb,
 The, 269
 -Orators, The, 152
 Goya, Francisco
 -Marquesa of Santa Cruz
 as a Muse, The, 193
 Graham, Robert, 70, 82-87,
 224, 293, 387, 394,
 409
 -Dancing, 82, 421-25
 Grant, Cary, 346
 Green Gallery, New York,
 176
 Gregory, Jerry, 249, 260
 Gregory, Sarah (Mrs. Jerry),
 249, 260
 Grinstein, Stanley, 411
 Grinstein, Mrs. Stanley, 411
 Guggenheim, Peggy, 148
 Guggenheim, Solomon R., 244
 Guston, Philip, 34, 61, 92-
 93, 95-96, 304
 -Winter Flower, 39-40, 93
 Haas, Elise (Mrs. Walter),
 200
 Haas, Peter, 208-9
 Haas, Walter, 208-9
 Haas, Walter, Jr., 208-9
 Haas, Walter, Jr., Mrs. 209
 Halff, Bob, 187
 Halprin, Lawrence, 424
 Halston, 291
 Hammer, Armand, 164, 192,
 229, 376
 Hampton, Gordon, 260
 Hancock, Allan, 195
 Hanson, Duane, 52, 89-90,
 285, 430
 Harger, Steve, 340
 Harris, Lou, 382
 Hawley, Phil, 227
 Hazen, Lita, 250-51
 Heizer, Michael, 383
 Heller, Ben, 34-36, 128, 140,
 248-50, 287
 -collection, 248-50
 Heller, Judy (Mrs. Ben), 128
 Hellman family, Los Angeles,
 25, 208
 Hellman family, San Francisco,
 201
 Henry, Charles, 377
 Hess, Thomas B. ("Tom"), 86
 Hillcrest Country Club, 24-
 25, 266, 428-32
 Hirsch, Didi, 360
 Hirshhorn, Joseph, 111
 Hirshhorn Museum and Sculp-
 ture Garden, Wash-
 ington, D.C., 324,
 424
 Hockney, David, 345, 378
 -American Collectors, 169
 Hofmann, Hans, 102, 299-300,
 436-38, 462
 -Equipoise, 116, 437-38

- Hofmann, Hans (continued)
 -Renata series, 438
 Holby, Sherm, 363
 Holland, Bud, 176
 Holland, Tom, 392
 Home of Peace cemetery,
 Whittier, 8
 Hoopes, Donelson, 118-19
 Hopkins, Henry, 92, 131,
 139-40, 184-85, 231,
 301
 -as director, San Fran-
 cisco Museum of Modern
 Art, 93-97, 108, 304-5,
 316
 Hopper, Brooke (Mrs. Dennis),
 173
 Hopper, Dennis, 173
 Hopper, Edward, 378
 Hopps, Walter ("Chico"), 71,
 133-34, 137, 140,
 170, 175-78, 264-65,
 324, 447
 -at Pasadena Art Museum,
 251, 254-57, 259
 -illness, 258-59
 -UCLA Extension course,
 133, 181
 Houseman, John, 359
 Houston Museum of Fine Arts,
 417
 Hughes, Fred, 344
 Humphries, Ralph
 -Victoria, 36
 Hunt, Richard, 387
 Hunt Foods and Industries,
 Incorporated, 6, 29-
 30, 68, 162
 Huntington Apartments, San
 Francisco, 14
 Huntington Library and Art
 Gallery, San Marino,
 109
 Ianco-Starrels, Josine, 144
 Inch, Becky, 205
 Irwin, Robert, 184
 Isaacs family, 25
 Israel Levin Senior Adult
 Center, 407
 Ives, Norman, 165, 364, 377
 J. Paul Getty Museum, 109,
 217-18
 Jackson, Martha, 122
 Jacobs, Tevis, 209
 Jakobson, Barbara, 104
 James Corcoran Gallery, 155-
 56
 Janis, Martin, 171
 Janis, Sidney, 171, 258
 Janss, Anne (Mrs. William),
 221, 251
 Janss, Glen, 233
 Janss, William, 221, 250-51
 Jawlensky, Alexei von, 61
 -Still Life with Citron,
 40
 , Jilly, 266
 John Burroughs Junior High
 School, 10, 12
 Johns, Jasper, 72, 82, 117,
 206
 -in Cedars-Sinai Medical
 Center collection, 364,
 377
 -exhibition at Pasadena
 Art Museum, 177, 255
 -Map, 34, 457
 -relationship with, 120-
 21
 -in Weisman collection,
 46, 56-57
 Johnson, Ben, 213
 Johnson, Lyndon Baines, 374
 Johnson, Philip, 196, 231,
 420, 455
 Jurgensen, Harold, 260-61
 Kahnweiler, Daniel, 44, 74,
 458
 Kalish, Ursula, 373
 Kandinsky, Vassily, 75
 -Yellow Nude, 64, 160,
 450-52
 Kantor, Paul, 65, 159-67,
 264, 272, 444
 Kantor, Ulrike, 162
 Kasmin Gallery, London, 169
 Kauffman, Craig, 173
 Kelly, Ellsworth, 147, 149,
 172, 378
 -Blue on Blue, 112

- Kennedy, Edward ("Ted"),
346, 403
Kennedy, John F., 374
Kennedy, Robert, 374
Kent, Claude, 71, 340
Kent, Nancy (Mrs. Claude),
340
Kienholz, Edward, 89, 90,
173, 248
-Birthday, The, 89, 394-
95
Kirchner, Ernst Ludwig, 186
Kitaj, Ronald B., 280
Klee, Paul, 64, 74, 167
-Little Red Train, 64-67,
161
Klein, Eugene, 183, 264-65
Klein, Tony, 106
Kline, Franz, 35, 45-46, 58,
71-72, 441, 443
Knoedler and Company, New
York, 128, 376
Knox, Seymour, 131, 243
Kricke, Norbert, 189-90, 231,
361, 384
Kröller-Müller Museum,
Netherlands, 439
Kuwayama, George, 113-14,
220-21, 223
- Ladd, Thornton, 271
Ladd and Kelsey architects,
271
Landau, Mitzi, 179
Landon, Patrick, 139
Lang, Jennings, 359
Langsner, Jules, 268-69
Larwin Company, 409
Leavin, Margon, 166, 169,
378
Leavitt, Thomas, 174, 258
Lebrun, Rico, 174, 186
Leeson, Tom, 340, 392, 394
Léger, Fernand, 13, 158, 378,
435
-Contraste de formes, 458-
59
-Eléments mécaniques,
452-53
Lehman, Robert, 201, 418
- Leisure, Hoyt, 205
Leisure, Mrs. Hoyt, 205
Lenart, Harry, 220
Lenart, Yvonne (Mrs. Harry),
220
Leo Castelli Gallery, New
York, 352
Levi Strauss Company, 209
Lichtenstein, Roy, 145, 147,
149, 160, 206, 365,
395, 419, 443
-exhibitions, 160, 255,
430
-in Weisman collection,
157, 212, 248, 270, 414,
430, 445
-works
-Blond Waiting, 436
-Long Modern Sculpture,
441
-Modern Sculpture, 441
-Modern Painting with
Floral Forms, 436
-Scared Witless, 152,
436
Lieberman, Bill, 104
Lincoln Center, New York,
375
Lipchitz, Jacques, 83, 121,
148, 443, 452
-Peace on Earth, 388
-Seated Bather, 435
-Song of the Vowels, 435-
36
Lipchitz, Yulla (Mrs. Jacques),
148
List, Vera, 210, 375
Lloyd, Frank, 152-55, 177,
319
Lloyd, Mrs. Harold, 33
Loew family, 208
Lorjou, Bernard, 56
Los Angeles Angels, 195
Los Angeles Art Association
Galleries, 171
Los Angeles Ballet Company,
363
Los Angeles County Museum of
Art, 34, 40, 110,
259, 262, 304, 430-

Los Angeles County Museum
of Art (continued)
432, 446, 455

- admissions charge, 233-35, 237
- architecture/physical plant, 193-97, 222-23, 231, 236-39
- Art Museum Council, 195
- board of trustees, 111-13, 192-93, 226-28, 233
- collection, 116, 240, 244, 416, 419, 430-32
- community involvement, 272, 361, 375, 429
- Costume Council, 118, 195
- exhibitions
 - "Art and Technology," 173
 - Bonnard, Pierre, 191
 - "Divine Presence, The," 220
 - Gogh, Vincent van, 110
 - history of, 110
 - Monet, Claude, 110
 - "New York School, The: The First Generation," 172, 211
 - scheduling of, 325
 - Smith, David, 154
 - "Treasures of Tuthankamen," 214, 329
 - "Women Artists: 1550-1950," 369
- Graphic Arts Council, 118
- leadership, 108-18, 191-93, 218-32, 274, 304, 447
- Modern and Contemporary Art Council, 111, 172, 183-89, 195, 240, 245, 262
- twentieth-century art, support of, 172-74, 228-29, 241-42, 278-81
- Weismans' involvement, 111-13, 137, 181-83, 214-17, 226, 245, 417

Los Angeles County Museum
of History, Science,
and Art, 194-95

Los Angeles County Museum
of Natural History, 110

Los Angeles Dodgers, 195

Los Angeles High School, 10, 12, 28

Los Angeles Institute of
Contemporary Art
(LAICA), 217, 237-38, 275-78, 281-82, 288-89

Los Angeles Municipal Art
Gallery, 217, 397-98

Los Angeles Service League, 24

Los Angeles Times, 98

Louis, Morris

- Beta Rho, 144
- Unfurled, 116

Lowell High School, San Francisco, 9-10, 22

Lukin, Sven, 377

Lurie, _____, 209

Lynch, Becky (Mrs. Terry), 185

Lynch, Terry, 185

Lytton, Bart, 192, 197

M. H. de Young Memorial
Museum, San Francisco, 299, 316, 318

MacDonald-Wright, Stanton, 303

Macomber, William B., Jr., 314

Madsen, Loren, 106, 333-34, 360

Magritte, René

- Ceci n'est pas une pipe, 115

Manet, Edouard, 376

Marchand, André, 33

Marcus, Sol, 384-85

Margo Leavin Gallery, 49

Marisol

- Kennedy Family, 188

- Marlborough Gallery,
New York 154, 280
- Martin, Dean, 267
- Martin Luther King, Jr.,
Hospital, 380, 386
- Marx, Sonny, 22-23
- Mason, John, 394
- Matisse, Henri, 12-13, 44-
45, 51, 53, 56, 64,
75, 92, 96, 158,
163
- May, Morton ("Buster"), 186,
252
- Mayer, Buddy, 444-45
- Mayer, Louis B., 26
- Mayer, Richard
-SB986, 70
- Mayer, Robert, 445
- Mayo Clinic, Minnesota, 68,
359-60
- McCracken, John, 394
- McGovern, George, 370
- McLaughlin, John, 393
- Mellon, Paul, 322
- Mellon Family, The, 11
- Meninger, William, 357
- Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Film
Company, 29
- Metropolitan Museum of Art,
New York, 207, 241,
313-14, 323-24
-Robert Lehman Collec-
tion, 418
- Mies van der Rohe, Ludwig,
196
- Mills College, Oakland, 10,
12, 16
- Minneapolis Institute of
Art, 187, 242
- Mirisch, Marvin, 359
- Mirisch, Walter, 359
- Miró, Joan, 34, 38, 52, 77-
78, 158, 378
- Modern Museum, Paris, 103
- Mondrian, Piet, 165
-Composition in Yellow
and Blue, 161
- Monet, Claude, 31, 38, 110,
186, 376-77
- Montgomery, Harry, 368
- Moore, Eudorah, 245-46
- Moore, Henry, 52, 121, 140,
142-45, 386
-Animal Head, 43, 459-60
-Family, 255
-Family of Four, 43, 459-
60
-Family of Three, 43,
459-60
-Queen, 43, 424, 459
-Rocking Chair, 461
-Stone Reclining Figure,
144
- Moore, Irina Radetzky (Mrs.
Henry), 142-43
- Moore, Mary, 143
- Moses, Edward, 101, 333,
393
- Motherwell, Robert, 51, 81,
91-97, 100, 120,
170, 206, 304, 395,
416
-Blackness of Black, 57
-Elegies to the Spanish
Republic, 57, 93
-In Red with Two Ovals,
46, 57, 74
-Summer Seaside Doorway,
57
- Murphy, Franklin D., 111-12,
189-90, 192, 228-31,
376, 415, 431-32
- Museum of Modern Art, New
York, 33, 40, 44,
181, 221, 244, 258,
289, 455
-International Council,
103-4, 199, 251, 321
- Music Center of Los Angeles
County, 215, 237,
385, 388, 406
- Nakian, Reuben, 71, 255
-Chambre a coucher l'em-
pereur, 230
- Nash, David, 154
- National Endowment for the
Arts, 235, 333-34,

- National Endowment for the Arts (continued), 361, 369, 386
- National Gallery of Art, 63, 310-11, 321-25, 417, 424, 448, 454
- Neel, Alice, 288
- Nevelson, Louise, 387
- New School for Social Research, New York, 210, 375
- Newhouse, S. I., Jr., 128, 130
- Newman, Annalee (Mrs. Barnett), 123, 125, 128, 145
- Newman, Barnett, 203, 211, 252, 356, 395, 414
- character, 126-27, 132
 - excellence of work, 84-85, 283, 462
 - memorial exhibition at Pasadena Art Museum, 128-30
 - relationship with, 94, 120-21, 123, 127-29, 132, 145
 - in Weisman collection, 45, 62, 117, 212
 - works
 - Abraham, 127
 - Broken Obelisk, 383
 - Cry, The, 128
 - Eighteen Cantos, 117, 128
 - Here I (to Marcia), 117, 123-29, 461-62
 - lithographs Number One and Number Two, 117
 - Onement series, 127
 - Onement Number Six, 117, 123-36, 128-29, 461-62
 - Synagogue Designed as a Baseball Diamond, 127
 - Third, The, 130
 - Tundra, 130
 - White Fire II, 130
- Newman, Paul, 346
- Newmark family, 201, 208
- Newport Harbor Art Museum, 290-96, 308
- Nicklaus, Jack, 428
- Nixon, Richard, 370, 374, 401
- Noguchi, Isamu, 62-63, 102, 383
- Little She, 62, 453-54
- Nolde, Emil, 75
- Nordland, Gerald, 305
- Nordlinger family, 25, 208
- Northwestern University, Illinois, 29
- Norton Simon, Incorporated, 6, 162
- Foundation of Art, 235
- Norton Simon Museum, 109, 199, 217-18, 235, 241-43, 260-61, 272-73, 294-95
- Nureyev, Rudolf, 9, 363
- Oakland Art Museum, 298, 317
- Ogden, Ralph E., 210
- Oldenburg, Claes, 52, 56, 59-60, 145, 169, 176, 248, 387
- Baked Potato, 59
 - Brancusi's Muse as a Baseball Mitt, 60
 - Ice Bag (Scale B), 378
 - Kiss with the Clothespin, 378
 - Lipstick, 378
 - Mickey Mouse, 378
 - Monument for Akron, Ohio, 59
 - Notebook series, 377-78
 - Pastry Case, 59
 - Pickle Slices in a Jar, 59, 172
 - Showcase, 212
 - Toilet, 59
 - Typewriter Eraser, 59
 - Washbasin and Mirror, 59

O'Melveny and Myers law firm, 175
 Onslow-Ford, Gordon, 303
 Ossorio, Alfonso, 139
 Otis Art Institute of Parsons School of Design, 103
 Pace Gallery, New York, 171, 439
 Padve, Jack, 249
 Padve, Martha (Mrs. Jack), 249, 260, 263
 Pal, Pratapaditya, 219-21, 225, 430-32
 Paley, Babe (Mrs. William), 210
 Paley, William ("Bill"), 210
 Park La Brea, 195
 Parke Bernet, 153-54, 262
 Parkinson, Liza, 104, 210
 Pasadena Art Museum, 40, 174, 240-41
 -board of trustees, 245-46, 250, 259-63, 270
 -building, 253, 271
 -closing of, 221, 261-64, 271-73
 -collection, 248-52, 441
 -Galka Scheyer Collection, 40, 105, 209, 254
 -exhibitions, 128-30, 137, 174, 177, 254-55, 257-58
 -Fellows, 251-53, 260
 -fund raising, 247, 251, 253, 264
 -leadership, 254-58, 274
 -Weismans' involvement, 36, 92, 245-52
 Paul Kantor Gallery, 41
 Pereira, William L., 196
 Perls, Frank, 96, 158-59, 161, 444
 Perls, Klaus, 44, 158, 444
 Pevsner, Antoine, 287, 441-42, 453
 -Surface Developable, 442-44
 Phelps, Mason, 260
 Phelps, Peggy (Mrs. Mason), 260, 263
 Phillips, Gifford, 142, 181, 183, 185, 205, 221, 259, 261, 265, 441
 Phillips, Joann (Mrs. Gifford), 142, 181, 205, 265, 411
 Picasso, Pablo, 13, 43-44, 53, 60, 65, 92, 158, 378, 435
 -Dora Maar, 43, 64, 74, 455
 -Trois nus assis, 43
 Pissarro, Camille, 32
 Poindexter Gallery, New York, 88-89
 Pollock, Jackson, 35, 45, 84, 96, 329, 414, 452, 462
 -Blue Poles, 250
 -4-1949, 268-69
 -Scent, 64, 116-17
 -Scout, 80
 Price, Ken, 394
 Primus, Ed, 171
 Primus-Stuart Gallery, 171
 Proposition 13 (California primary election ballot, 1978), 95-96, 233, 236, 290, 370, 385, 399
 Prudential Insurance Company, 236-39
 Quick, Michael, 116, 118-19
 Raffael, Joseph, 293
 Ramos, Mel, 392-93
 Rauschenberg, Robert, 40, 129, 138, 147, 157-58, 172, 206, 352, 364, 377, 419, 445-46
 -relationship with, 120-21, 145

- Rauschenberg, Robert (continued),
 -works
 -Dervish Profile, 116
 -Hoar frost, 157
 -lithographs, 46
 -Publicons, 446
 -Spreads and Veils, 58, 446, 460
 -untitled (red, 1954), 79-80
- Redford, Robert, 346
- Redon, Odilon, 376
- Reesberg, Frances (aunt), 1
- Reinhardt, Ad, 132
 -Red Painting, 452
- Reis, Bernard, 47
- Rembrandt van Rijn
 -Polish Rider, 418
- Renoir, Pierre-August, 32, 376
- Reynolds, Joshua
 -Pinkie, 13
- Richenbourg, Robert
 39-40, 61
- Richlar Partnership, 404-5
- Richter, Betty Jean (Mrs. George), 260, 263
- Richter, George, 260
- Rickey, George, 70, 84, 87, 121-22
- Ringling Museum of Art, Florida, 192
- Robinson, David, 138
- Rockefeller, Blanchette, 104
- Rockefeller, David, 244
- Rockefeller, David, Jr., 382
- Rockefeller, Nelson, 164, 244
- Rockefeller family, 110, 210
- Rockefellers, The: An American Dynasty, 11
- Rodia, Simon
 -Watts Towers, 97-98
- Ronstadt, Linda, 402-3
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 424
- Rosenberg, Harold, 86, 148
- Rosenquist, James, 176
- Rothko, Mark, 35, 102, 120, 132, 141-42, 211, 252, 413-14
 -works
 -Rothko Chapel, Houston, 253
 -in Weisman collection, 212, 285-86, 413, 415, 439
 -untitled, 153-54
- Rothschild, August, 21
- Rothschild, Kathryn Wolf (Mrs. August), 21, 23
- Rowan, Carolyn Peck (Mrs. Robert), 248, 250, 263, 271-72, 411
- Rowan, Robert, 128, 130, 221, 233, 250, 253, 261, 264-65, 411
 -contribution to Pasadena Art Museum, 248, 258, 263, 271-72
- Ruscha, Edward, 101, 106, 169, 173, 175
 -Los Angeles County Museum on Fire, The, 175
- Saarinen, Eero
 -Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (Gateway Arch), 252
- Sachs, Samuel, II, 117
- Samaras, Lucas, 176
- San Francisco Art Institute, 105, 299, 300-302, 305, 316
- San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, 298, 316-17, 417
 -board of trustees, 92, 221, 232, 296, 301, 304, 315
 -collection, 92-95, 152, 304-5, 315, 416
 -deaccessioning, 306-7
 -Stein Collection, 92, 209

San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (continued),
 -Still, Clyfford, 138, 416, 448-49
 -leadership, 108, 231, 304
 San Francisco State University, 103, 316
 San Marino League, 246
 Santa Barbara Museum of Art, 247
 Schenley Distillery Company, 24, 29
 Schlitz Brewing Company, 384-85
 Schlumberger, _____, 253
 Schreiber, Rita (Mrs. Taft), 181
 Schreiber, Taft, 142, 181-83, 187
 Schueler, Jon, 78
 -Scottish Skyscape, 78
 Scull, Ethel (Mrs. Robert), 154
 Scull, Robert, 140, 176
 Segal, George, 90-91, 189, 212, 424
 -Girl Looking into Mirror, 91
 -Lady Washing Her Foot in the Basin, 188
 -Woman on Green Chair, 248
 Seldis, Henry, 142-43
 Seldis, Mark, 144-45
 Selz, Peter, 296, 302
 Serra, Richard, 412
 Sheets, Millard, 196, 308
 Sherwood, Harry, 181, 189
 Sherwood, Phyllis (Mrs. Harry), 181
 Sherwood, Richard, 111-12, 175, 224, 228-29
 Sieroty, Alan, 370, 392
 Sills, Beverly, 9
 Simon, Donald Ellis (nephew), 16
 Simon, Lillian Glickman (mother), 1-4, 17
 Simon, Linda (niece), 230, 363
 Simon, Lucille (Mrs. Norton), 25, 36, 174, 194
 Simon, Lucille Michaels (Mrs. Myer), 1-2, 4, 6-9, 12, 14, 17-18, 20, 22, 27
 Simon, Myer (father), 1, 4-7, 14-15, 18-19
 Simon, Norton (brother), 1-2, 5-6, 14-16, 18, 22-23, 157, 164, 187, 242-43, 410
 -collection, 194, 197-98, 320
 -and Los Angeles County Museum of Art
 -board of trustees, 112, 192, 198-99
 -new building fund, 193-97, 308
 -interest in art, 34, 36-37
 -and Pasadena Art Museum takeover, 260-61, 272-73
 Simon, Virginia, 21-22
 Simon family, 242
 Sinatra, Frank, 265-67
 Smith, Becky Inch (Mrs. Pete), 205
 Smith, David, 104, 154, 210, 280, 412
 Smith, Hassell W., Jr., 133
 Smith, Louise, 104
 Smith, Robert, 276-77, 288
 Smith, Toby (Mrs. Robert), 276
 Smith, Tony, 412
 Smithsonian Institution, 322-25, 424
 -National Collection of Fine Arts, 137
 Solomon, Alan, 254
 Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, 244, 414
 Sorenson, Don, 340, 393
 Sotheby Parke Bernet, 137, 305, 345

Soulages, Pierre, 61, 71
 -January 3, 39
 Soutine, Chaim, 191
 Speroni, Charles, 359
 Spy, _____, 14
 Stalford, Stanley, 264
 Stanford University, 317
 Stein, Gertrude, 209
 Stein, Leo, 209
 Stein, Sarah, 209
 Steinberg family, 77
 Stella, Frank, 293
 -Double Protractor, 315
 Still, Clyfford, 35, 84, 96,
 138, 203, 205, 206,
 211, 252
 -character, 130-32, 137
 -relationship with, 70-
 71, 120-21
 -works
 -Indian Red, 134
 -1951 Yellow, 135, 447
 -1947-M, 134, 447
 -1947-R-No. 2, 80, 134
 -in public collections,
 92, 95, 186, 304, 416,
 419
 -in Weisman collection,
 45, 116-17, 131-37,
 140-41, 212, 251-52,
 286, 447-49
 Still, Pat (Mrs. Clyfford),
 133, 137-38, 140
 Storm King Art Center, New
 York, 103-4, 210
 Straus, Beth, 104
 Stuart, David, 171
 Sturman, Eugene, 370
 Suicide Prevention Center,
 360
 Sutro School, San Francisco,
 10, 21

 Tamarind Lithography Work-
 shop, 172
 Tanguy, Yves, 170
 Tate Gallery, London, 143
 Terbell, Melinda (Mrs. Tom),
 249
 Terbell, Tom, 249, 257

 Third Street School, 10
 Thornycroft, Ann, 409
 Times-Mirror Corporation,
 376
 Tobey, Mark, 174, 258
 Touro Infirmary, New Orleans,
 371
 Triforium, 382-87
 Trouva, Ernie, 252
 Trowbridge, David, 394
 Tuchman, Maurice, 95, 114-
 15, 172, 211, 215,
 226, 432
 -leadership at LACMA, 218-
 19, 222-23, 225-26, 229,
 354
 -selection as curator,
 187, 191-92
 Tunney, John, 390-92
 Turnbull, Bill, 121
 Turoka, Mitsami, 377
 Tyler, Ken, 364
 Typecraft, Pasadena, 368

 Uhlman, Wes, 383
 Ullman, Perce, 254, 259
 United Jewish Welfare Fund,
 19
 United States Veterans Ad-
 ministration, 372
 University of California,
 Berkeley, 103, 296
 -University Art Museum,
 296-301, 303-4, 316
 University of California,
 Davis, 103
 University of California,
 Irvine, 103, 295
 University of California,
 Los Angeles, 16, 29,
 103, 256, 265, 353,
 359
 -Art Council, 229, 245
 -Extension, 41-42, 71,
 133, 447
 -Franklin D. Murphy Sculp-
 ture Garden, 104-5, 229,
 435-36
 -Frederick S. Wight Art
 Gallery, 31, 62, 109,
 174, 217, 416

- University of California,
Santa Barbara, 103
- University of Minnesota, 28-
29
- University of Southern Cali-
fornia, 417
- Val Vita Food Products, In-
corporated, 6, 162
- Valentiner, William Rein-
hold, 110-11
- Vasa, Velizar, 70, 340
- Venice Town Council, 408-9
- Vermeer, Jan, 376
- Virgil Junior High School,
28
- Virginia Dwan Gallery, 171-
72
- Vista del Mar, 19-20, 197
- Voulikos, Peter, 302, 392
- Wachs, Joel, 384
- Wachtel, Esther, 384-85
- Wade, Jane, 44
- Wade, Macklin, 364
- Walker, John, 311
- Walker Art Center, Minne-
apolis, 242, 416-17
- Warhol, Andy, 146-47, 149,
262-63, 342-45, 347-
49, 351-52, 425-28
- works
- Campbell's Soup, 271
- in Cedar-Sinai Medi-
cal Center's collec-
tion, 363, 365, 376
- Cherry Pop, 426
- commissioned por-
traits, 425, 455
- Flowers, 212, 363
- Philosophy of Andy
Warhol from A to B
and Back Again, The,
365
- poster, 370
- Ten International
Athletes, 428-30
- Torsos, 343-44, 426
- Watts Towers, 97-98, 386
- Wayne, June, 172
- Wegman, William, 279, 282
- Weinberg, Lawrence J., 409
- Wiener, Leigh, 374
- Wesselman, Tom, 176, 270
- Great American Nude,
212, 248
- Western Museum of Tokyo, 103
- Weisman, Beth (daughter-in-
law), 141, 343, 415,
447, 459
- Weisman, Frederick (husband),
7, 17, 22-30, 48, 92,
139-40, 198, 211,
265-70, 357; and with
Marcia Weisman, pas-
sim
- and Los Angeles County
Museum of Art
- board of trustees, 111-
17, 223, 232
- Modern and Contemporary
Art Council, 182-83,
185-88, 191
- interest in art, 31-32,
37-38, 113
- Weisman, Mary Zekman (mother-
in-law), 27-28
- Weisman, Nancy (daughter), 4,
355, 414
- Weisman, Richard (son), 4,
49-50, 60, 143, 146,
355, 402, 415
- marriage, 265, 267-68
- Warhol portraits, 342-43,
428-29, 455
- Weisman, Sidney (cousin),
219
- Weisman, Steven (brother-in-
law), 28
- Weisman, Theodore (brother-
in-law), 28
- Weisman, William (father-in-
law), 26-28
- Weisman grandchildren, 342-
43, 434
- White, Katherine, 206-7, 325
- Whitefield Company, Fuller-
ton, 6, 8

Whitney Museum of American
Art, New York, 199,
321
Wilder, Nicholas, 166, 177,
270, 340
Williams, Milton, 265
Wilshire Boulevard Temple,
8
Wilshire Crest Elementary
School, 10
Wilshire Ebell Theater, 24-
25
Wilson, William, 98
Winged Victory (Nike of
Samothrace), 442
Winston, Donald, 186-87
Wittman, Otto, 117
Woodbury School, 16
Wright, Bagley, 383
Wright, Frank Lloyd, 113
Wright, Ginny (Mrs. Bag-
ley), 383
Wudl, Tom, 82

Yale University, 416
Yunkers, Adja, 36

Zadok, _____, 231
Zajac, Jack, 293
Zellerbach, Harold, 302