

2016

Divergent Collecting Philosophies: Panza di Biumo, de la Cruz Collection, The Broad

Oliver Shearer
oliver.shearer@sia.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.sia.edu/stu_proj



Part of the [Art Practice Commons](#), and the [Fine Arts Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shearer, Oliver, "Divergent Collecting Philosophies: Panza di Biumo, de la Cruz Collection, The Broad" (2016). *MA Projects*. 2.
http://digitalcommons.sia.edu/stu_proj/2

This MA Project - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship and Creative Work at Digital Commons @ SIA. It has been accepted for inclusion in MA Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ SIA. For more information, please contact nylibrary@sia.edu.

MASTER'S PROJECT

NAME: Oliver Shearer

TITLE: Divergent Collecting Philosophies: Panza di Biumo, de la Cruz Collection, The Broad

DATE: Monday, December 19th, 2016

WORD COUNT: 8255

FORMAT: Journal Article – Journal of the History of Collections

TOTAL PAGES: 16

Divergent Collecting Philosophies: Panza di Biumo, de la Cruz Collection, The Broad

Oliver Shearer

The emergence of private museums in large numbers for the last fifteen to twenty years in municipal and quasi-metropolitan areas has offered critics and the like opportunities to question the validity of private museum status from a social point of view. Museums are traditionally believed to be conceived for public viewing and thus largely publicly funded in the hope that private interests will not occupy a large stake in their operation. The notion that museum experiences should be reserved only for an elite few is one which does not sit well with many. Private museums in recent history have largely been started by chief executive officers of multinational corporations or major conglomerates, or by very wealthy entrepreneurial patrons turned philanthropists. To name examples of the last twenty years whose collections will not be discussed in this article yet which represent that phenomenon closely, The Brant Foundation Art Study Center, The Frederick R. Weisman Foundation, The Cisneros-Fontanals Foundation and others have effectively taken hold of the mainstream contemporary Zeitgeist and furthered the dose of elitism associated with Contemporary art institutionalism.

This silent takeover will have its beneficiaries and supposedly positive impact for the section of the Contemporary art community which identifies with it, by both securing in place the prevailing dominant Zeitgeist on Contemporary art and preventing outside influences from modifying it. There has however always been a sector of the contemporary art community which has not been identified with the dominant mainstream discourse. The institutionalist character of contemporary art worlds has for the most part throughout time condemned to exclusion as a

result some of the most important artists of American art of all time, some which are still living today. The question at hand is what drives this dominant Zeitgeist, what determines that it stays so appealing to contemporary artists and most of the art community at large and not others, and what plays into its recurring disavowal of other artistic discourses which do not subscribe to its own.

Here in many respects is where collectors have their say. They may decide to go along with now well established rules and principles for building and preserving their collections throughout time by donating to museums for instance. They may also decide that building a collection is really just a way to put their names on the front page of every newspaper albeit for good reasons. One or the other will determine their philosophies in thinking about their collections. In the same respect, their collections' development will be reflective of either an extension of themselves or be understood as a representation and dissemination of the art that they collect. These two conflicting collecting philosophies are dissimilar in nature but examples have existed and will exist of them being practiced at the same time. In essence, the ways in which collectors will choose to make known their intentions to the art community at large will define them. They may believe personal publicity is their primary objective, or in furthering and enabling the body of work of the artists by distributing it across museums and the like, or possibly both.

The three collections which will be discussed throughout this article are the Giuseppe and Giovanna Panza di Biumo collection, the Carlos and Rosa de la Cruz collection, and the Eli and Edythe Broad

institutions and organizations. The first is a collection largely built on the premise that art should be collected only if the collector finds inherent value in it as well as perpetual personal satisfaction through looking at it. The second is a collection which carries similarities with the first but which does not present a clear enough message for its acquisition philosophy and appears to rely on public appearances and publicity to assert itself while at the same time engaging with its local artistic community directly and positively. The third is a collection known well enough for its collecting practice of the last two decades, building one institution after another, namely The Broad Contemporary Art Museum, The Broad Art Foundation and its lending library, and later The Broad private museum. This series of statements has created a sense of enigma over the definition of what the Broads would like to be perceived as and their true role to in Contemporary art America.

The Infrastructure of the Art Industry and Its Institutions

From the point of view of governance, museums may be considered some of the most complex organizations. If education were the main and accomplished function of all museums in the United States, all matters of arts education and dissemination of artistic culture would be nearly fully resolved. Some continue to argue that the true mission museums abide by for the most part is satisfying the elites that support them. Others will defend the idea that museums exist to serve populations at large. Accordingly, museums have gone from almost secluded enterprises only a few would frequent in early modern times to institutions open to the grander public.² Particular interest in the reasons for a reversal of that trend in the past twenty-five to thirty-five years, keeping in mind the multiplication of great fortunes in recent times since the 1980s which has enabled it is necessary.

The theme of participation in the arts is key to the problematic of defining the role of a collector in an artistic and larger community of patrons and visitors. The concept of an institution attracting visitors by itself owing only to its reputation is one that usually does not sit well with the constant demands of entertainment and intellectual stimulation of the artistic community. Patrons and visitors want to be entertained and made to feel that their presence inside a museum or other not for profit institution is one which deserves attention and respect. They want to believe that they are not bystanders and that the art on view is both approachable and relatable one way or another. A model of museum programming which takes these factors into account is one which will guarantee that patrons and visitors realize their aspirations through donations and other types of participation at one end, and multiple museum experiences at the other. The ongoing necessity to adapt to changing cultural environments is perhaps one of the greatest challenges museums face, whether private or public.¹

The role of governance structures in museum decision-making is key. It is the elites which continue to found new museums and continue to support these which guarantee that access to culture is approachable to those of us who can understand its complexities. There is nothing saying that ensuring the renewal of elites satisfies only the wishes of a few. Large groups of society benefit from decisions made at higher levels as museum attendance has been found to be linked to the appeal of collections. These same groups relate to the experience of owning what are social or aesthetic dividends,³ in forms of board of trustee participation, membership, attendance, or viewership. These experiences provided by museums for public audiences ensure that access to knowledge remains defined according to those who finance it and those who participate in its acceptance. It ensures that

popular taste continues to be guided by elite based definitions.

While important considerations concerning the three collections at hand and their reception by the public necessarily apply, a developed viewpoint on the subject of spending for the arts and its relationship to them takes on considerable importance. Private museums are often funded by single sources, which was the case in part for the Villa Panza in Varese, Italy but altogether the case for the de la Cruz and Broad institutions. The impact on the welfare of local economies of their creations has not been felt necessarily in the sense that those public communities have wanted something in return. Herein lies a problematic that needs to be addressed. Should museum like entities, in essence what the De La Cruz and Broad collections qualify as, not have any obligation to their communities besides showing their collections, it follows that control over defining the dominant message of their programming is theirs alone.⁴

Respective developments of the collection management and wealth management industries have been simultaneous. The importance of their activities translates itself in a symptomatic media euphoria surrounding their possible creation so much that a multitude of private museums have opened their doors worldwide. The uncertainties of economic times and the volatility of financial markets provides aspiring and existing collectors opportunities to diversify their assets and continue placing their confidence in art and other stable assets. Close to three quarters of privately funded private museums that number in the three hundreds around the world opened their doors since the turn of the century. When looking at numbers in percentage relative to the total number of its museums, North America is third behind Europe first and Asia second. Rapid growth in personal wealth has been paired with a growing trend among patrons and philanthropists having a permanent impact on their

local communities and larger groups of art and culture enthusiasts. Collecting is a practice not just done with passion but with an eye for investment which has had impact on the way the banking sector operates.⁵

Another important stipulation revolves around what has been referred to as the hybrid character of museum structures of ownership and operations, as museums are seemingly taking on more public or private particularities than before. Museums may be understood to be either public or private, or most of all private. As a means of establishing a more or less firm estimation as to the institutional patterns of behavior of museums, one may want to look at them as cultural organizations undergoing hybridization. Through this process and bearing in mind the taking on of public and private characteristics, museums encounter difficulties in the designation of roles for their different components as confusion more so than clarity of purpose appears to reign. It also may become clear that some museums are neither completely private nor public.⁶

The transitioning of private collections from the private hands of their owners into either public museum hands or private institutions of their creation needs addressing. There is a long tradition in the United States of patrons for the arts creating museums to either benefit the public good, themselves, or both. A consumer society for luxury goods in which Contemporary art collectors are key participants is more apparent today than ever before. One has to look to the end of the nineteenth century at the time of Gilded Age America to find definitions of art and culture products as luxury goods. Examples abound such as Henry Clay Frick's home in which was housed his own private collection, the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum where she did the same, the Duncan Phillips Collection in Washington, the Thomas Barlow Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, and the Albert C. Barnes Collection in Lower Merion, Pennsylvania. These enumerations might however be subdivided into

two main categories. Some may be considered as non-evolving actualizations of collections at a specific point in time, while others as ever-changing institutions having to adapt to modifications to the art industry.⁷

Panza di Biumo: Origins of Development

The Panza di Biumo Collection found its origins in Giuseppe Panza's personality, vision, and collecting philosophy. Throughout fifty years he collected art until culmination point which was the composition of the third collection now housed at the Villa Panza in Varese, Italy. His wife Rosa Giovanna always formed an integral part of his collecting decision making. No decision would ever have been made without both agreeing on acquisitions together. If one of them were to disagree, then the wishes of one would never have taken precedence over the wishes of the other. In his autobiography, Panza insists on the idea that personalities are shaped through independent thought, feeling, instinct, hopes, and desires in such manners that they later reveal themselves in the actions, choices, and resulting obligations which one assumes in their existence. A collector should be guided by principles and directives which govern his daily life as well as by his living surroundings. As one makes decisions, one may make mistakes along the way, Panza citing inescapable interdependencies that exist between the happenings and hazards of life and the discipline of collecting.⁸ Panza's approach to collecting was very much dependent on life circumstance in that his decision-making as to what he would choose along with his wife among the works of art available to him for acquisition was done only according to considerations of taste and personal judgment.

According to Panza's memories, his early life shaped his perceptibility of works of art tremendously. He recounts his first days in Varese as a child at the end of the 1920s, specifically mornings in springtime

when he could see Monte Rosa covered in snow, a massif located in the eastern section of the Pennine Alps. The colors created by the scenery were of blue for both sky and lake, and green for Varese's banks. At night the bells of the church tower of San Vittore would take him on a voyage to another world as their tolls carried with them promises of an outside unknown dimension. These recollections of a time when he was aged around five years old may have significance in relation to his collecting philosophy of preference for monochromatic and minimalist works of art which he and his wife collected during his lifetime.⁹ Serenity, timelessness, and a continuous relationship with the elements and sounds of nature laid the foundation for his future decision making process when selecting works of art for acquisition.

Panza had no reasons to be doubtful for his subsistence even though Italian society did not have the most promising of outlooks as he began in life. His one true motivation in life from an early age was a search for beauty in all forms of representations, artistic and other, and he would always come to the realization that he had access to privileges many others did not. He reminded himself often not to forget the crucial contributions made by the Heavenly Father, which Panza argues was the true architect of beauty. His father Ernesto was born into a lower middle class setting in the same general region as Varese in Northwestern Lombardy outside of Milan where he made his living from trade and eventually built his fortune. Traditionally the Panza family's origins were in San Salvatore Monferrato and its members had been subjects to the marquises of Montferrat, a state originally founded by the Lombards later taken over in the early 1700s by the Duchy of Savoy.¹⁰

While in his early teens, Panza spent time by the sea and the countryside in the neighborhood of Borgio-Verezzi in the region of Liguria close to the border with France, southwest of Genoa. Here, Panza made discoveries that would play an instrumental role in

furthering the definition of his aesthetic judgment. The villa was close to the railway station, therefore Panza could hear the sound of trains at night moving slowly away, interestingly highlighting his particular sensitivity to sound. His fascinated interaction with the color blue re-emerges here in what the collector referred to as his discovery of infinity. It was the infinity of the color blue omnipresent in the Mediterranean sky which provoked in him a sense of joy, one that would shape his aesthetic sensibility indefinitely, provoked by nothing other than looking at a blue both inherently immaterial and void sky. This same infinity consecrated in empty spaces he encountered when looking at the sea and its horizon line for hours on end.¹¹

Following the September 8th Armistice between Italy and the Allied Forces in 1943, Panza escaped and hid in Switzerland, a reasonably short distance from where he was. Had he stayed in Italy he would have had to fight for the Germans and Fascists against Allied forces. Remaining in Italy as a clandestine had high risks associated with it. He crossed the border towards the end of the month, journeying some six miles from the family house in Biumo, Varese, in a gig pulled by a horse. Transiting into the Swiss interior went without obstacle and one morning Panza woke up on the other side of the Alps at which point he had a vision, one suggestive of Switzerland of perfect order and in stark contrast to the world of his childhood he had left behind now in torn down state. The train journey ended at Munchenbuchsee, fittingly, the birthplace of one of the greatest Swiss artists of all time Paul Klee, where he stayed with a group of about a hundred other refugees in schools of the town.¹²

Panza's opinion of Switzerland was a good one, referring to it as the most democratic of similar countries in the world where trust was at the heart of civil life, where both maintaining political stability was essential and the individual was allowed to thrive freely through entrepreneurial initiatives. In his

admiration for the social and political system of Switzerland he emphasized the role and stature of the middle class in any society, portraying it as the class that made the world progress. Panza saw it as a class where one understood their obligations and valued an honorable work ethic and respect for moral and legal codes with regard for market economy principles. If bourgeois society was not a perfect society by any means, it was certainly in his view a better option than a bureaucratized and political one.¹³

He went on to live in Lucerne with the De Simoni family after an intervention from a representative of the Panza firm, Antonio de Simoni, came to see him in Munchenbuchsee. He would engage in many intellectual activities and interact with all representations of bourgeois culture, reading the likes of Tolstoy and Flaubert, while not forgetting the philosophical works of Kant, Nietzsche, and others. The artistic figures of the time such as Braque and Picasso, and the operas of Wagner, were discussed at length. Panza found himself lucky to live with a family which experienced their values spontaneously, a value setting in which he was able to develop his own philosophy surrounding the appreciation of life and art. His new mission was to arrive at an understanding of the invisibility in things which he could not see yet which he believed he possessed the ability to guess at, namely seeing the invisible within the visible. Fittingly he met with a sculptor around this time in 1946 named Vittorio Tavernari who introduced him to the world of art. The work of a friend, abstract artist Mario Radice, appealed to Panza and he went to Como to visit the artist's studio where Tavernari convinced him to buy pictures from Radice. Although Panza did not have the means, his brother did.¹⁴

Upon his first trip to New York in 1954 Panza was convinced that America possessed all the qualities which war torn Europe did not. It was the desire and the energy to create which appealed to him most of all.¹⁵ He would later realize in Italy that there were

artistic communities hidden behind the dominant established art community. Panza would make this removed and untold scene his arena for enjoyment and aesthetic gratification. The Milanese art scene was one that showed the oldest art in the famous galleries such as the Milione which sold Giorgio Morandi and Mario Sironi, yet there was no new art about the market. It was a society still closed in on itself following the Fascist era. The most prominent collectors such as Gianni Mattioli or Carlo Frua de Angeli whose collections are respectively in the Guggenheim Museum or distributed worldwide were not interested in current art. Access to art from outside of Italian shores was made difficult by the economic conditions of the time, namely the weakened lira. An encounter with Guido Le Noci's gallery named Appolinaire offered hope. Here was a man willing to speak to the inexperienced Panza. Le Noci's gallery was not a thriving business which made it possible for Panza to spend time there, speaking with the gallerist about art from abroad, especially that which was made in Paris.¹⁶

Panza and his wife Giovanna had moved to Milan after marrying in 1955. His buying philosophy from the start consisted in acquiring only works of high quality. He had respect for and listened to young critic Pierre Restany who launched *Nouveau réalisme* and others such as Germano Celant who was the promoter of *Arte povera*. The idea of having advisors upon starting his collection was something Panza did not identify with. His first purchase was a small Atanasio Soldati hung in Le Noci's private apartment. His intentions were to buy works of art he could relate to his inner self, works filled with life to such an extent he could communicate with them. In 1957 with the help of Restany, Panza bought a work by Spaniard Antoni Tapies titled *Composition en marron et gris* at the painter's second exhibition hosted by the Stadler Gallery in Paris. It was at that moment that his collecting officially began.

Panza would then go on to acquire a further thirteen paintings by Tapies, all of which are presently at MOCA in Los Angeles. The year was also one of chance discovery of Franz Kline's work. He would acquire his first Kline measuring 64 by 40 inches at a cost of \$550.¹⁷ The role Giovanna Panza has played in the building of the collection must not be underestimated. Essentially the entire collection has been built by the two of them together, even though he may have acquired the first works by himself. While Panza would be methodical when deciding whether or not to proceed with acquiring a work over a number of days, Giovanna would come to a decision in a more intuitive way. She referred to this as perceiving silence in a work of art while he looked for what provided him with an original view of the world.

On the subject of judging art Panza speaks of contemporary art and its ambivalent nature in that the appreciation and dedication the artist has for his work over time generally undergoes stages, specifically four. In its unappreciated form art has not been viewed enough to be recognized yet is at its most creative. The second is a state in which premature recognition is attained and the work becomes less relevant. The third stage is one where a larger community of artists takes on that success and builds on it yet never seems to understand the reasons behind the initial creative process. The final phase is one of market demand satisfaction. Fashion trends in Contemporary art undergo the same perpetual cycle that usually ends in crisis at which point everyone stops buying a type of art while in the meantime a new type of art emerges. When the work of an artist is being bought actively on the market a multiplication effect occurs which results often in many other buyers acquiring work from the same artist without taking into consideration the work itself. Even the most intelligent are not the most intelligent when it comes to judging Contemporary art, so easily tempted to agree with the dominant Zeitgeist.

Time is most often the judge when determining whether a work of art maintains its attributes for appreciation and study, and success is not a guarantee for timelessness. Art should be judged depending on whether one may understand it or not, which is in itself the entire purpose of interacting with a work of art, a struggle to arrive at an understanding of its many meanings of which the necessary multitude assign it quality. Our confrontations with that which we do not at first understand carry significance and force us to identify with works and determine what reflects on our emotional responses. The main struggle of our relationship with Contemporary art is to understand why it sometimes rejects taking on the role of disseminating ideas without proposing anything for the viewer in exchange. It leaves a void synonymous with longing and despair, and no hope for intellectual or aesthetic fulfillment.¹⁸

The practice of marrying works of art of high quality and new surroundings necessitates that the latter be of a high standard. Panza held an exhibition in 1996 of works by artists from the eighties and nineties at the Palazzo delle Albere (Museo di Arte Moderna e Contemporanea di Trento e Rovereto), northwest of Venice. The works were by mostly relatively unknown artists. Panza's prediction was that the artists in question would become better known in the future. The exhibition comprised eighteen American artists, two of which were Ruth Ann Fredenthal and Phil Sims, both of which feature in the Villa Panza's work on display to this day. The artists' works had nothing in common with the works which had made other artists during the same time gather high prices at auction. To discuss the situation at the time of one of the artists named in particular, Ruth Ann Fredenthal had been painting monochrome works since 1975 and yet had only begun selling two years prior to the exhibition in Trento. Panza would point out that ignorance and intellectual laziness on the part of the public but also on that of professionals in the field continually guaranteed that

high quality work was left alone and unsought in favor of perhaps more easily sold artwork of the moment at high prices.¹⁹

The right moment for a collector to buy is within the time period prior to an artist becoming famous. While it was difficult to know when that was, over the years the market at times followed Panza. No less than 20 or 30 years after he had acquired the works of Mark Rothko, Antony Tapies, Franz Kline, Robert Ryman, Donald Judd, Ruth Ann Fredenthal, and others, did the market actually follow him however. The first instances of museums becoming interested in borrowing his works were in the 1960s, when the Kunstmuseum in Basel and the Kunsthalle in Bern wanted works by Tapies, and the Guggenheim Museum Robert Rauschenberg's. The help of gallerists made it possible for him to buy some of his most important pieces. Gian Enzo Sperone in Turin facilitated his acquisition of Brice Marden and Pop art, while Konrad Fischer in Dusseldorf did the same for Judd, Carl Andre, Marden, and Ryman. In New York, Panza acquired Rauschenberg, minimal, and conceptual art from Leo Castelli, accompanied by Sol Lewitt and Claes Oldenburg from John Weber.²⁰

The de la Cruz Collection: Origins of Development

In terms of structuring and developing a collection, and framing a brand image, another perspective comes to mind when speaking of the Carlos and Rosa de la Cruz Collection. As early as the year 2009, the couple stopped hosting dinner parties for the celebratory occasion of the Art Basel Miami Beach fair. The reason was the parties were attracting so many to the extent that one year nearly a thousand crashers tried to make their way inside, forcing the de la Cruz couple to suspend the event until further notice. The year 2009 was the moment the de la Cruz Collection was moved to a new 30,000 square foot building in Miami's Design District, opening advantageously on December

3rd at the time of the Art Basel fair. At the time, critic Tyler Green said the opening of private collectors' own de facto museums was what he called the Miami Model. The philosophy behind building their museum was closely linked to that of the Rubells, Ella Cisneros, and Martin Margulies, while the square-footage exceeded that of the Miami Art Museum and North Miami's Museum of Contemporary Art. Although the couple had donated works from their collection to the Museum of Contemporary Art and could have continued in that vein by donating works to museums across America and possibly the world, the thought of starting their private museum seemed more appealing and more resourceful. Rosa de la Cruz remarked at the time that it was the youngness of new museums and their size, including hers, which justified their existence. Reflecting on the fate of monumental works of art in traditional museum collections, Rosa would mention that her museum could house without hesitation.²¹

Carlos and Rosa de la Cruz worked tirelessly to be granted a certificate of occupancy for their building in order to house works by forty-four different artists known worldwide. Rosa de la Cruz said at the time that what she wanted was for visitors to see the interior of the building as a work in development, the whole of the building working as an extension of the de la Cruz home.²² Laudatory reviews of the eventful opening of the de la Cruz Contemporary Art Space were mostly the order of the day, one citing go-for-broke exceptionalism as a way of putting emphasis on the extent to which the collection was a disinterested offering to the city of Miami,²³ and another praising Rosa de la Cruz as a "Miami Force of Nature," although not an imposing figure, an imposing character in all her stature.²⁴ Carlos and Rosa de la Cruz met in La Havana, Cuba as teenagers and have been together since. In 2012, it was recorded that Carlos de la Cruz was a senior trustee of the University of Miami, while chairman of the board of beverage distributor CC1

Companies, Inc. Rosa was a director and treasurer of the same company.²⁵

The opening of the Contemporary Art Space was the culmination of acquisition work that took an entire existence to materialize. It started with the accumulation of works of art over a period of forty-five years, including paintings, sculpture, and mixed media from names such as Gerhard Richter, Sigmar Polke, Pierre Huyghe, Ana Mendieta, and illustrious others, many of which have been lent to museums such as Tate in London, the MOMA in New York, and the Centre Pompidou in Paris. Rosa de la Cruz insisted that her and her husband were not the kind of collecting couple to select works from catalogues. The couple was in the habit of opening their Key Biscayne home to the public for the viewing of their collection for a period of fifteen years prior to the year 2009, so much that visiting the Casa de la Cruz was something non-Miami collectors would do frequently during Art Basel week from 2003 onwards.²⁶ Art adviser Wendy Cromwell said on the night of the opening that Rosa de la Cruz had a great understanding of the art in her possession and how it should be shown to the public, while Craig Robins praised her first class abilities and proclaimed that the creation of such an institution heralded a new beginning for the city of Miami's Design District. Rosa de la Cruz's manner of arriving at exhibiting art revolved then specifically around studying and thinking about independent works of art and their artists, all the while evaluating and maximizing the worth inherent to the works of art themselves.²⁷

The initial credibility behind the building of Contemporary Art Space found its origins in the project being dynamic and one that would promote arts and culture through educational advancement, not a mausoleum for the de la Cruz. She had co-founded an alternative art venue in 2001 with developer Craig Robins which eventually closed down in 2008. Architect and designer John Marquette was in the end the ideal candidate for the project of designing a

building taking over four lots of land totaling half an acre on N.E. 41 Street and North Miami. The de la Cruz initially intended to repurpose a building, however could not find a suitable choice. The main objective was to have interior architecture which would not interfere with the works of art, rather than having the architecture dominate the setting. A 20-foot wall of windows would on the north side of the building allow light to come through at all times of the day, and a sloped roofline provide protection from the rain and direct sunlight. The museum was divided into three exhibition levels. One would be reserved for large installation work, another would focus on sculpture and four project rooms comprising small exhibitions, and the third was referred to by Rosa de la Cruz as her loft dedicated to multimedia installations. The didactic mission of the museum translated itself in the event schedule which centered on the inclusion of educational programming and community outreach programs. In this respect the aim was to establish an internship program with Design and Architecture Senior High, a magnet secondary school in the city, and have the surrounding neighborhood invest itself into arts activities organized by the museum. Rosa de la Cruz wanted the larger community to make the museum its own.²⁸ In addition, Contemporary Art Space would allow visitors to access a reading and research department showing selections from the de la Cruz personal library.²⁹

In 2011, the de la Cruz and the Knight Foundation sponsored a contest involving forty-three students from Design and Architecture Senior High. The contest consisted in teams of two realizing drawings of three dimensional models for a school for the arts of the future, with the idea in mind that their school was one which represented the past more than the present. Design and Architecture Senior High, a former showroom dating back to the 1970s, is still located in the Design District, where at the time of the contest and even more so today could be found expensively

furnished and decorated storefronts. The school itself did not have the funds to make the work of contest participants reality by possibly building a new building. However, the winners of the contest would find their rewards in the form of scholarship money. Every one of the six winners were granted \$3,500, a further six honorable mention awardees would receive \$2,500, and every one of all remaining thirty-one students would be awarded \$1,000 for participation. The de la Cruz idea behind the project was for it to serve as financial aid because most students were not applying to major art schools not because of a lack of opportunity but because of a lack of funds. The year 2011 was the third instance of contest sponsorship on the part of the de la Cruz. The Knight foundation started matching funds the year before which meant the de la Cruz were not alone in financially backing the initiative from then on.³⁰

Besides numerous contributions to Design and Architecture Senior High, the de la Cruz also launched a study/travel program named DASH Takes Manhattan consisting in sophomores visiting New York's art infrastructure and taking classes at the School of Visual Arts. Another school the de la Cruz were supporting and still are is the New World School of the Arts. Rosa de la Cruz would say that only through knowledge of art and culture would the city be enriched and that there were no better advocates for it than the young.³¹ In the spirit of engaging with the young, the year 2013 saw the de la Cruz Contemporary Art Space hold art workshops directed at elementary middle school and high school students along with their teachers. Rosa de la Cruz indicated that they were important to the local community not only because of free access to the building but because they were aimed at teaching children about the many concepts involved in the making of art. In a series of workshops titled "The Castoffs": Sculptures and Found Art Objects, participants learned about the found object art form devised by Marcel Duchamp, creating sculptures with

stuffed animals and old clothing. In another series, titled “The Shadow Play” workshop, students were taught the techniques that go into the making of films using shadow puppets, designing characters, writing script and film score, creating storyboards, and creating light and sound designs. Altogether, these efforts on the part of the de la Cruz should be seen as crucial to the education of children as to the importance of the diverse history of artistic practices.³²

The Broad: Origins and Development

The city of Los Angeles starting from the mid 1980s became the second largest city in the United States. Thanks to the successes of the music industry and to Hollywood film studios’ growing status, along with important links to the Pacific Rim and its continuing encouragement of multiculturalism, the city gained importance nationally and internationally. The economic heights of the decade benefited Los Angeles, and its blessing in disguise was that unlike New York which saw its art world go through a period of over-speculation, it did not have that problem when the market went crashing. The scene left open by non-Los Angeles artists was now available for exploitation, and the development of an institutionally backed Contemporary art infrastructure would see its beginnings. Some of these buildings included a new Museum for Contemporary Art (the Temporary Contemporary) housed in a Little Tokyo warehouse, a permanent MOCA in the downtown area, a four-level Contemporary art wing at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art LACMA, and along with other projects undertaken in the city billionaire Eli Broad would open a contemporary art education center and museum in an old phone company building above Venice beach.³³

With Eli Broad, The Broad Museum for Contemporary Art at LACMA, The Broad Art Foundation, and The Broad in mind, one may pass judgment on the role of foundations and their close

relationship to ruling class elites. Much of the argument for establishing the link between the two relies on the assumption that elites encourage the creation of breeding grounds for art world intellectuals to develop. Along the same lines, these art world intellectuals would then run these elites’ funded foundations or institutions in order for the latter to maintain a stronghold.³⁴ When assuming that elites have a significant role to play in defining the extent to which the dominant Zeitgeist on the arts evolves in one direction or another, it is necessary to highlight the importance of their often unmatched financial power.

The signature quote from Eli Broad has always been known to be “I had a theory that the great collections of the world were made when art was contemporary.” What he meant by that statement is no better reflected than in the works of art which were initially present in his personal collection divided among three groupings. Initially, a rule to Eli and Edythe’s operation of the collection was that acquisitions of art from the 1960s and 1970s should remain in their personal possession while those of art from the 1980’s and onwards would be held by the foundation. Eli Broad also founded on the side two corporate collections focused on art specifically made in Southern California, the Kaufman and Broad Collection and the Sun America Collection. When in 1984 as the founding chairman of the Museum of Contemporary Art Broad orchestrated the obtention of 80 works from Panza, and the museum saw a new beginning. It would be a turning point for Los Angeles Broad believed would become the contemporary art capital of the world. Along with these new incentives would come an authoritative move on his part which was to donate \$60 million to LACMA. A new extension to LACMA opened in 2008 titled The Broad Museum of Contemporary Art designed by celebrated architect of the age Renzo Piano.³⁵

Broad’s parents were Lithuanian immigrants who lived in New York and later moved to Detroit when he

was six. That Eli and Edythe came to live in Los Angeles at all was a surprise mostly to Edythe. The Broad fortune came from Eli's founding of two Fortune 500 companies, Kaufman and Broad and Sun America. It was Edythe who first started acquiring works. As time went on Eli became interested as well, with the guidance of Taft Schreiber and of dealers Paul Rosenberg and Klaus Perls. His first purchase was a significant Vincent van Gogh drawing dated 1888 for \$95,000 at auction in 1972. Taft is known to have told Broad that one cannot ever overpay for a good work of art, and as recent history has shown us Eli Broad has done just that while staying an uncommonly studied collector according to most observers. A most significant acquisition for the Broad couple was a Joan Miro work titled *Painting* from 1933 in 1974. Like Panza in some ways, if there was one thing that connected them, Broad would spend time consulting books and archives on an artist's work before acquiring works of theirs.³⁶

After Rothko, Morris Louis, and Helen Frankenthaler, the breakthrough came in 1983 when selling a red Robert Motherwell at Christie's. With Philip Johnson and David Whitney at his side at the auction, the red combine Rauschenberg painting they had put up for consignment went to Broad. The Rauschenberg became one of the Broads' most important acquisitions as it was to them their signature work in its relation to the beginnings of Pop art. They collected during the following years Andy Warhol, Pablo Picasso, Roy Lichtenstein, and Jeff Koons, and had Richard Serra at one stage make a sculpture for their home at Brentwood. The work was a set of four 60-ton conical plates, and when Broad first expressed concern over shipment, Serra told him that there was no problem with it. It was later revealed that Serra had chosen to name the entire work *No problem*. The interior at Brentwood in 2007 featured works by Anselm Kiefer, Chuck Close, Richard Diebenkorn, and impressive Alexander Calder works from the

1940s. Works by Jasper Johns, Elsworth Kelly, Carl Andre, and others could be found on the interior. The rest of their story is as they once said, "we want to be remembered as people who had a great collection of the art of the last forty years, and who shared their passion with others."³⁷ A particularly revelatory public intervention at the time when Broad opened the Broad Contemporary Art Museum at LACMA was the following:

We truly believe that the Broad Contemporary Art Museum at LACMA will draw people to this great twenty-first century encyclopedic museum, not only from Los Angeles, not only from this country, but from around the world. You know, Los Angeles has truly become one of the four major cultural capitols of the world, alongside New York, London, and Paris. I believe Los Angeles can become the contemporary art capitol of the world.³⁸

In a turn of events which went against what was understood to be common practice, Broad decided to keep all artwork coming and going through the lending library mechanism at the foundation instead of donating his personal collection and the collection housed at the Broad Art Foundation to LACMA. It was understood that he would lend 220 prime works to the museum for a period of one year. The new building bearing his name had cost \$56 million. It seemed therefore that there was no sense arguing further about what the city and the entire art related media had been expecting. One certainty from the series of events was that Broad would continue to benefit from tax exemptions related to his well-organized mechanism of loaning works to museums, in essence seeing as many tax deductions qualify as public charity. In light of what Broad would do some years later with him opening a private museum of his own, he would say at the time: "We would expect that other major collectors might choose a similar route rather than creating their own museums or donating works to one or more museums."³⁹

Conclusion

As one considers the impact the three collections have had on the dissemination of works of art of high standard over the course of the 20th century, one may wonder which of the three collections has best achieved the objective. A more considerable part of this article has been dedicated to the collection of Giuseppe and Giovanna Panza than that of the other two collections for one specific reason, which is that their achievements were great yet often unknown. This article has sought in part to shed light on the major achievements of this extraordinarily observant and visionary collecting couple without the assistance of whom many of the great artists of the century would perhaps not have been appreciated by the art establishment later on. The idea that the establishment is always late or never on time when recognizing the best art is well emphasized by Panza in his introductory essay for the book *The Legacy of a Collector* in which he describes a time for about 25 years before 1999 when new forms of art were rejected:

The interest of the public – and of the media – focused on a dominant trend that followed the prejudices of a postmodern way of thinking. In reality it would be more accurate to define this trend as “anti-modern,” since it rejected all of the

values of modernism that made this century a great one artistically. This trend marginalized the best artists who did not share the philosophy of rejection; their vision of life was different.⁴⁰

Panza’s outlook on the situation then was something which Broad would have understood well, however he chose to approach it differently. He was in fact quoted as saying that art of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s would not have been collected during the time of its production because it could not have been understood then or viewers and buyers would not have grasped its historical significance.⁴¹ A rather different approach here is ultimately what has made the difference between Panza and Broad as collectors. The first collected art from unknown artists who had at times no careers to boast of, as one should mention the de la Cruz do presently, while the second waits for art to be understood and recognized to proceed with acquiring it. Here we conclude that there is perhaps only one good way to collect, one that takes into account the achievements of those artists which are unknown to the public, while one should also consider the absolute necessity of funding for the arts, in which respect Eli Broad has played a major role and will continue to do so.

¹ Diane Grams and Betty Farrell, eds. *Entering Cultural Communities: Diversity and Change in the Nonprofit Arts* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2008): 1-10.

² Sharon Oster and William N. Goetzmann, “Does Governance Matter? The Case of Art Museums,” in *The Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*, ed. Edward L. Glaeser (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 96-97.

³ Ibid, 90-91.

⁴ Pedroni, Peter and Steven Sheppard. “The Economic Consequences of Cultural Spending,” in *Creative Communities: Art Works in Economic Development*, eds. Michael Rushton and Rocco Landesman (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2013), 166.

⁵ Barbara Tagliaferri, “Foreword,” in *Art Wealth Management: Managing Private Art Collections*, ed. Alessia Zorloni (Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016), 5-6.

⁶ J. Mark. Schuster, “Neither Public Nor Private: The Hybridization of Museums,” *Journal of Cultural Economics* 22, (1998): 127-129.

⁷ Jan T. Letowski, “Museum-Making: Transition from Private Collection to Private Museum.” *George Washington University* (December, 2010): 1-3.

⁸ Giuseppe Panza, *Memories of a Collector* (New York: Abbeville Press, 2007), 13-14.

⁹ Ibid, 15.

¹⁰ Ibid, 16-17.

¹¹ Ibid, 30-31.

¹² Ibid, 40.

¹³ Ibid, 41-42.

¹⁴ Ibid, 43-51.

¹⁵ Ibid, 57-61.

¹⁶ Ibid, 67-70.

¹⁷ Philippe Ungar, *Giuseppe and Giovanna Panza: Collectors* (Silvana Editoriale, 2013), 47-53.

¹⁸ Giuseppe Panza, *Memories of a Collector*, 74-77.

¹⁹ Gabriela Belli and Giuseppe Panza. *The Panza di Biumo Collection: Some Artists from the 80s and 90s*. (Electa, 1996), 17-23.

²⁰ Philippe Ungar, *Giuseppe and Giovanna Panza Collectors*, 123-124.

²¹ Brett Sokol, "Rehousing a Miami Collection," *The New York Times*, November 29, 2009. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/29/travel/29headsup.html>.

²² Fabiola Santiago, "Private Collections: De La Cruz Collection Joins Mix of World-Class Spaces," *The Miami Herald* (Dec. 2, 2009). http://www.delacruzcollection.org/press_links/12_02-09_fsantiago_delacruzcollection_joins_mix_of_spaces.html.

²³ Steven Kaplan, "Art Basel Miami – First Takes: Let the Trophy Hunting Begin," *Scallywag and Vagabond* (Dec. 1, 2009). <http://scallywagandvagabond.com/2009/12/art-basel-miami-first-takes-let-the-trophy-hunting-begin/>.

²⁴ Ruben Natal San Miguel, "Rosa de la Cruz, Miami Art Collector," *ARTmostfierce Arts Blog*, December 10, 2009. <http://artmostfierce.blogspot.com/2009/12/such-inspiration.html>.

²⁵ New Times Staff, "Best of Miami 2012: Best Power Couple, Rosa and Carlos de la Cruz," *Miami New Times* (Jun. 7, 2012). <http://www.miaminewtimes.com/news/best-of-miami-2012-best-power-couple-rosa-and-carlos-de-la-cruz-6529690>.

²⁶ Luis R. Rigual, "Artistic Debut," *Florida International Magazine* (Dec. 11, 2009): 62-63.

²⁷ Fabiola Santiago, "Avidly Awaited De La Cruz Collection Art Space Greeted by Cheers, Tears," *The Miami Herald* (Dec. 3, 2009).

²⁸ Luis R. Rigual, "Artistic Debut," 64-65.

²⁹ Jesus Manuel Rojas, "Carlos and Rosa de la Cruz: An Expression of Their Imagination," Jesus Manuel Rojas, *What's Up Miami Blogspot* (Apr. 23, 2010).

³⁰ Ana Veciana-Suarez, "DASH Students Design their Dream School," *The Miami Herald* (Apr. 24, 2011).

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ricardo Mor, "The De La Cruz Collection Hosts Free Art Workshops for Children," *Miami.com* (Jul. 16, 2013). <http://www.miami.com/de-la-cruz-collection-hosts-free-summer-art-workshops-children-article>.

³³ Andras Szanto, "Hot and Cool," in *New York & Los Angeles: Politics, Society, and Culture: A Comparative View*, ed. David Halle (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 405-407.

³⁴ Barry D. Karl and Stanley N. Katz, "The Unintended Logic of the Philanthropic Foundation," in *Philanthropy and American Society: Selected Papers*, ed. Jack Salzman (New York: Center for American Culture Studies at Columbia University, 1987), 63-65.

³⁵ James Stourton. *Great Collectors of Our Time: Art Collecting Since 1945* (London: Scala Publishers Ltd, 2007), 182-183.

³⁶ Ibid, 183-184.

³⁷ Ibid, 184-185.

³⁸ Eli Broad, “Opening of the Broad Contemporary Art Museum,” Public Address, BCAM Opening Event, Los Angeles CA, February 7, 2008.

³⁹ Judd Tully, “Broad Implications,” *Art + Auction* (Mar., 2008): 41.

⁴⁰ Museum of Contemporary Art. *Panza: The Legacy of a Collector: The Panza di Biumo Collection at the Museum of Contemporary Art* (Los Angeles: MOCA, 1999), 11.

⁴¹ Bruce Altshuler. Ed. *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 10.

Bibliography

- Altshuler, Bruce. Ed. *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Belli, Gabriela and Giuseppe Panza. *The Panza di Biumo Collection: Some Artists from the 80s and 90s*. Electa, 1996.
- Broad, Eli. "Opening of the Broad Contemporary Art Museum," Public Address, BCAM Opening Event, Los Angeles CA, February 7, 2008.
- Dorfman, Alison C. "The Broad Model of Arts Patronage: The Cultural and Economic Investments of a Modern Medici." *Sotheby's Institute of Art*. New York: 2008.
- Fredenthal, Ann Ruth. "Interview." October 13, 2016.
- Grams, Diane and Betty Farrell, eds. *Entering Cultural Communities: Diversity and Change in the Nonprofit Arts*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2008.
- Kaplan, Steven. "Art Basel Miami – First Takes: Let the Trophy Hunting Begin." *Scallywag and Vagabond* (Dec. 1, 2009). <http://scallywagandvagabond.com/2009/12/art-basel-miami-first-takes-let-the-trophy-hunting-begin/>.
- Karl, Barry D. and Stanley N. Katz, "The Unintended Logic of the Philanthropic Foundation," in *Philanthropy and American Society: Selected Papers*, ed. Jack Salzman. New York: Center for American Culture Studies at Columbia University, 1987.
- Letowski, Jan T. "Museum-Making: Transition from Private Collection to Private Museum." *George Washington University* (December, 2010).
- Museum of Contemporary Art. *Panza: The Legacy of a Collector: The Panza di Biumo Collection at the Museum of Contemporary Art*. Los Angeles: MOCA, 1999.
- Mor, Ricardo. "The De La Cruz Collection Hosts Free Art Workshops for Children." *Miami.com* (Jul. 16, 2013). <http://www.miami.com/de-la-cruz-collection-hosts-free-summer-art-workshops-children-article>.
- Natal San Miguel, Ruben. "Rosa de la Cruz, Miami Art Collector." *ARTmostfierce Arts Blog*. (December 10, 2009). <http://artmostfierce.blogspot.com/2009/12/such-inspiration.html>.
- New Times Staff. "Best of Miami 2012: Best Power Couple, Rosa and Carlos de la Cruz." *Miami New Times* (Jun. 7, 2012). <http://www.miaminewtimes.com/news/best-of-miami-2012-best-power-couple-rosa-and-carlos-de-la-cruz-6529690>.
- Oster, Sharon and William N. Goetzmann, "Does Governance Matter? The Case of Art Museums." In *The Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*, ed. Edward L. Glaeser. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Panza, Giuseppe. *Memories of a Collector*. New York: Abbeville Press, 2007.

- Pedroni, Peter and Steven Sheppard. "The Economic Consequences of Cultural Spending." In *Creative Communities: Art Works in Economic Development*, eds. Michael Rushton and Rocco Landesman. Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2013.
- Rigual, Luis R. "Artistic Debut." *Florida International Magazine* (Dec. 11, 2009).
- Rojas, Jesus Manuel. "Carlos and Rosa de la Cruz: An Expression of Their Imagination." *What's Up Miami Blogspot* (Apr. 23, 2010).
- Santiago, Fabiola. "Avidly Awaited De La Cruz Collection Art Space Greeted by Cheers, Tears." *The Miami Herald* (Dec. 3, 2009).
- . "Private Collections: De La Cruz Collection Joins Mix of World-Class Spaces," *The Miami Herald* (Dec. 2, 2009). http://www.delacruzcollection.org/press_links/12_02-09_fsantiago_delacruzcollection_joins_mix_of_spaces.html
- Schuster, J. Mark. "Neither Public Nor Private: The Hybridization of Museums." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 22, (1998).
- Sokol, Brett. "Rehousing a Miami Collection," *The New York Times*. (November 29, 2009). <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/29/travel/29headsup.html>.
- Stourton, James. *Great Collectors of Our Time: Art Collecting Since 1945*. London: Scala Publishers Ltd, 2007.
- Szanto, Andras. "Hot and Cool," in *New York & Los Angeles: Politics, Society, and Culture: A Comparative View*, ed. David Halle (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003): 405-407.
- Tagliaferri, Barbara. "Foreword." In *Art Wealth Management: Managing Private Art Collections*, ed. Alessia Zorloni. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- Tully, Judd. "Broad Implications." *Art + Auction* (Mar., 2008).
- Ungar, Philippe. *Giuseppe and Giovanna Panza: Collectors*. Silvana Editoriale, 2013.
- Veciana-Suarez, Ana. "DASH Students Design their Dream School." *The Miami Herald* (Apr. 24, 2011).