

Barnes Watch

No more deplorable superstition could be found [than] the current belief that no one should be subjected to searching criticism if his intentions are good. . . . To refrain from bringing to light the harm done by well-intentioned persons is to resign one's self to futility.

Albert C. Barnes, "Construction and Controversy," *Journal of the Barnes Foundation*, Oct. 1925.

Barnes Financial Crisis: Reality vs. Myth

The Barnes Foundation's court petition to move the art collection to a new full-time museum in Philadelphia is based on the premise that the Foundation's mounting debt is a given and that there is no other way to solve the problem. The reality is that the Foundation's reported annual expenses of \$4.5 million are four times the 1990 budget, which was the last time the Foundation was truly in the black on a regular basis. No one in the press has critically examined how the Foundation got into this situation or whether it is reversible. Nor has the press taken a critical approach to director Kimberly Camp's spending practices. According to tax returns through 2001, she hiked the Foundation's staff-related expenses each year since she started in late 1998, but has yet to secure regular income to pay for the hugely overblown staff. She is lauded as bringing "professionalism" to the Barnes Foundation, while missing artwork was reported to police a month late, grant applications go out rife with grammatical errors and guards appear more idle than attentive on public visiting days.

The Inquirer recently reported that "under director Kimberly Camp the Barnes is gradually moving away from the threat of insolvency. . . . Professional management has invigorated the Barnes over the last four years." The more this story is repeated, the more people believe it; but the reality is that under Camp's increasing spending, the Foundation's losses have continued to mount. In the three full years of Camp's tenure for which IRS reports are available, the Foundation ran the following deficits:

1999: (\$1,376,831)

2000: (\$834,436)

2001: (\$855,940)

Indeed, Camp herself has admitted that "the Foundation lost a combined \$1.36 million in 2000 and 2001 . . . and has used funds released from the termination of its pension plan to cover its losses."

Yet, the Inquirer celebrates Camp's "professional management" stating that "since she arrived in Merion, Camp has reduced a [1998] deficit of \$3.313 million [IRS forms show \$3.204 million] to about \$800,000 last year." Inquirer, 3/10/03. This positive-sounding story ignores several realities, including the unique financial circumstances facing the Foundation in 1998 and the stopgap measures, such as liquidating pension funds, that have been used to counter expenses in later

years. The 1998 deficit was the highest ever and was clearly an aberration. For example, nearly \$2 million of the 1998 deficit was due to legal fees in the civil rights suit begun under former president Richard Glanton. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals, which dismissed this suit as "frivolous," was responsible for shutting down this gaping fiscal artery, not Camp. Another \$670,906 of the 1998 deficit was for "professional and consulting" fees. Presumably, a large part of this was a one-time forensic audit conducted on the Foundation's dime in order to stave off an independent investigation by the attorney general. Camp's admission in a September, 2002 court filing that "unrestricted expenses will exceed unrestricted income by more than \$800,000 in 2002" makes it clear that rather than invigorating the Barnes Foundation, she has established a four-year pattern of spending that annually exceeded income by anywhere from \$800,000 to \$1.38 million. Indeed, an accounting firm's assessment of the Foundation's finances showed that "there is a likelihood of all cash reserves being expended by the conclusion of 2002." This, for an institution that ran in the black on \$1.1 million a year in 1990.

Rather than invigorating the Barnes Foundation, Camp has established a four-year pattern of deficit spending between \$800,000 to \$1.38 million per year.

The same laudatory Inquirer article states that under Camp "earned income has increased," but ignores how this happened and further ignores the fact that while income has increased, expenditure hikes have outpaced those increases. Program service revenue for the past four reported years was: 1998: \$249,477; 1999: \$431,132; 2000: \$631,200 and 2001: \$691,078. The significant increase from 1998 to 1999 is mainly because of two court decisions in 1998. The Lower Merion Zoning Hearing Board allowed an increase from 500 visitors per week to 1200 and the Orphans' Court allowed the Foundation to admit visitors in July and August. Additional increases have come from charging drivers ten dollars to park in the on-site lot completed in 1999 and from tuition increases. Clearly, the bulk of the "earned income increases" have come not from crafty management but from structural changes that were in the works long before Camp arrived.

For a \$170,000-per-year manager, who has a \$72,000-per-year development director and myriad assistants, Camp has failed miserably at raising funds to support the operating costs of the Foundation, which, conversely, she has had no problem increasing each year. In November 2000, more than two years into her tenure, the Inquirer reported that "what [Camp] hasn't done is raise a lot of money. . . . Apart from a \$760,000 grant from the estate of former foundation leader Violette de Mazia and [a \$500,000] Getty grant, the largest private gift has been \$6,000 to pay for a new brochure." In-

quirer, 11/19/00. In 2000 the Foundation ran a deficit of over \$800,000. Did Camp cut back on costs? Hardly. In the next year the Foundation's expenses increased by over 30%. An August 2002 Deloitte & Touche report stated the obvious: "fundraising efforts are not generating sufficient support to cover the expenses of ongoing operations."

The large grants that have come on Camp's watch have, for the most part, not been in support of the Foundation's original program of art education, but rather have been for non-essential museum-oriented endeavors. For example, the Inquirer reported grants for a "collection assessment project" of \$1 million from the Pew Charitable Trusts, \$1.05 million from the Mellon Foundation and \$500,000 from the Luce Foundation. Another \$500,000 came from the Getty trust but was reportedly tagged for "planning expenses." Indeed, the one major source of operational funding—the \$760,000 grant by the Violette de Mazia Trust—is unlikely to be repeated as Camp has regularly maligned its founder since the grant.

The Foundation's reported annual expenses of \$4.5 million are four times the 1990 budget. If the fiscally-sound 1990 budget of \$1.1 million is adjusted for cost-of-living increases, the present budget should be about \$1.6 million.

Prior to the deal to sell out the Foundation to "big charity's" plans for a full-time museum in Philadelphia, Camp maintained what could charitably be described as a wishful thinking approach to the Foundation's future. In late 2000, after accumulating \$2.2 million in excess spending over revenue, Camp's response was "The money will come." Inquirer, 11/19/00. She must have believed herself, because in 2001 she spent over \$900,000 more than in 2000, racking up an additional \$850,000 in deficit. Camp, who believes she hears Dr. Barnes' ghost (Inquirer, 11/19/00) must also believe in genies. The Inquirer's Edward Sozanski got the point: "Camp says she still hopes that a financial 'angel' will materialize to stave off crisis. But a fairy godmother doesn't seem likely." Inquirer, 3/10/03.

The Barnes Foundation does not need a fairy godmother, what it needs is a surgeon to trim excess fat. In 1995, then-president Richard Glanton testified that the Foundation's operating budget for 1996 should be between \$1.3 and \$1.6 million. While even this estimate was high given Glanton's larding up the staff costs, it's a far cry from Camp's 2000 statement that the budget should be \$3 million. If the fiscally-sound 1990 budget of \$1.1 million is adjusted for cost-of-living increases, the present budget should be about \$1.6 million. One does not need a fairy godmother to realize that fiscal responsibility would result in a balanced budget given that the Foundation's reliable income from "ticket sales, licensing fees and other income" has been reported at \$1.7 million. Inquirer, 11/16/00.

Barnes Watch is not alone in this assessment. In late 2000, Robert Montgomery Scott, former president of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and an advisor to the Barnes Foundation said "it would be better for the foundation to focus on its core missions—the art and education program—and exclude ideas of expansion until financial stability was achieved." Inquirer, 12/21/00.

Attorney General Mike Fisher: "Backing the Move" After Ignoring Six Years of Deficit Spending

The critical player in the Foundation's bid to undo the rules in its Indenture of Trust that prevent movement of its collection and require gallery time exclusively for students is state Attorney General, Mike Fisher. Fisher's responses to letters opposing this wholesale sell-out have come from his deputy, Lawrence Barth. "[W]e intend to consider every aspect of the Barnes Foundation's request, including its financial condition, and limit our approval to those changes essential to its survival." (2/21/03, emphasis added).

On February 28, 2003 the Inquirer announced "Fisher backs a Barnes move, but voices caution." Backs the move? What happened to considering every aspect of the request? At that point no cursory, let alone searching, exam of the Foundation's finances had taken place. Indeed, this was still months before the Orphans' Court ordered the Foundation to release a detailed audit requested by Lincoln University, not Fisher. The same article states Fisher "does not oppose" the Foundation's petition. Not opposing the petition is effectively backing it since Fisher's office must do a thorough job of requesting documents, reviewing them and cross-examining witnesses, or the Foundation's court case will be a virtual free ride, like the 2001 hearing on the so-called "works in storage." In that case, the Foundation was allowed to present hearsay upon hearsay with nary an objection from the attorney general's deputy.

Incredibly, Fisher's deputy wrote to another concerned individual "[t]his is not a case of ignoring or "breaking" a man's will, but rather of insuring that the institution he created continues to exist for the benefit of the public." When the Barnes Indenture says no painting shall ever be moved and the attorney general "does not oppose" the elimination of this term, how is that anything but "ignoring or breaking a man's will?" Worse yet, Fisher and Barth have ignored the gross run-up of expenses and deficit spending including \$4.2 million in legal fees between 1997 and 2001 and \$8.3 million in total deficit spending for the same period, while the Foundation hired numerous employees and built a lavish guard house, both in violation of the Foundation's Indenture of Trust.

In late May, Fisher insisted that the Barnes trustees drop the little-publicized painting-sale aspect of their petition, preserve the Foundation's original educational program and preserve the painting "ensembles." On June 5, the trustees filed a new petition apparently aimed at placating Fisher while maintaining their requests to wipe out virtually every other significant mandate in the Indenture of Trust.

The new petition does not disturb the Indenture language preventing sale or loan of paintings, but only for works in the public areas of the gallery. The trustees want permission to be able to sell the significant collection in Dr. Barnes' former house, which is also protected by the Indenture. They base this on a dubious 2001 ruling that allowed them to loan those works. That ruling was based on the falsehood that the works were rarely seen by anyone, when, in fact, they were regularly used in the art program. (See "Credibility Gap ?" below.)

The new petition still requests a move of the collection to a full-time museum in Philadelphia. It still removes from the Indenture the entire three-and-one-half days per week currently reserved "solely and exclusively" for the art program. In its place there is nice-sounding, but toothless, language about preserving a "Barnesian" educational program. The new petition also removes the Indenture limits on staff numbers that the trustees have been regularly violating since 1990. It also removes the prohibition against social events that do not have as their sole purpose the benefit of the Barnes Foundation, thus allowing a "hall for hire" that the Orphans' Court had previously rejected as a violation of Barnes' wishes. Ridiculously, the petition even removes the ban on copying the works of art that the previous trustees patently violated anyway to produce myriad reproductions adoring everything from nightlights to coffee mugs to mousepads. Finally, the new petition still seeks to add trustees not nominated by Lincoln University, thus diluting Lincoln's role. In short, the only effective difference between the new petition and the first one is the elimination of the gallery painting sale and loan request.

Fisher and Barth have ignored the gross run-up of expenses and deficit spending that have seen \$4.2 million in legal fees between 1997 and 2001 and \$8.3 million in total deficit spending for the same period.

Fisher's demand that the painting "ensembles" be preserved is essentially worthless since the term is one the current management uses to describe individual wall arrangements of paintings and decorative objects. In fact, the paintings and objects in whole rooms relate to each other, and often to works in adjacent rooms. Verbatim preservation of the complete fabric of the Foundation's collection is not what the trustees want since their petition speaks of a "larger, more user friendly" gallery "while maintaining Dr. Barnes' ensemble vision [whatever that is supposed to mean] for display of The Foundation's art collection." Meanwhile "the new modern facility would offer added classrooms and ancillary services (food storage, gallery shop, etc.) that are more appropriate for The Foundation's collection." (emphasis added.) More appropriate than what? That which Barnes spent a lifetime creating? It is clear that the same intimate rooms of the present Merion gallery will not be duplicated since they cannot possibly accommodate the trustees' goal of greatly expanded public visitation. Also clear is the fact that, in complete derogation of the

method of study employed since 1926, the art classes will be excluded from the galleries and confined to classrooms to make room for tourists "more appropriate for the collection."

The new petition looks like a settlement between the trustees and Fisher, who seems to ignore the legal requirement that it must be impossible to operate the Foundation under the Indenture of Trust restrictions. "It's a tremendous thing for Philadelphia and for the Barnes Foundation. But we can't ignore what Dr. Barnes would want after that." Inquirer, 5/29/03. In other words, we'll make some face-saving nods to Dr. Barnes' intentions and call that a fair deal, but we are not going to work too hard to make the Foundation prove its case by playing the adversarial role that the law requires.

In a political twist that will have long-time observers of this case yawning, Pennsylvania Senator Arlen Specter has proposed Fisher for nomination to the Federal Court of Appeals—one step from the Supreme Court. Fisher, an anti-abortion Republican fits the Bush administration's central criterion for selection to the so-called impartial federal bench, but he has even asked pro-choice Democrat, Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell for support. Rendell's Democratic National Committee connections in the Senate may be helpful in avoiding a Democratic shut-down of Fisher's nomination. While Fisher "does not oppose" the move of the Barnes collection to Philadelphia, Rendell is a vocal supporter of the plan and has received hundreds of thousands in campaign donations from individuals connected to the charities supporting the plan. While Fisher's confirmation is in the balance, don't expect too vigorous an examination of the Foundation's case on his part. Indeed, he appears likely to declare the Foundation's removal of the painting sale aspect of the petition and the inclusion of two toothless features a victory and approve the move before long.

The federal court nomination, which came in late April, could have prompted the aforementioned face-saving demands to the Barnes trustees. It might be that the folks Fisher needs for his court nomination, like Rendell and Specter, want the Barnes deal closed pronto, before there is too much opposition and searching inquiry of the plan (and of Fisher's hands-off approach while millions evaporated). In case anyone was wondering, Specter, who proposed Fisher's nomination, has also received thousands in campaign contributions from certain donors named Annenberg and Lenfest.

Foundation Director Kimberly Camp: A Credibility Gap?

The fairy tale that the Barnes management has "done its best" to survive and that there is no alternative but to sell out to big charity's museum-on-the-Parkway scheme places a great deal of faith in one individual's credibility. We'll let the reader make that call. All quotations in this section are by Foundation director Kimberly Camp, unless otherwise indicated:

? "We have a balanced budget and are projecting to end the year in the black" Inquirer, 7/26/99. In fact, the Founda-

tion ended 1999 with a nearly \$1.4 million deficit on a budget that was almost triple the 1990 budget.

? Camp told an Inquirer reporter that the Foundation needs “a minimum of \$2.5 million to operate.” Inquirer, 11/16/00. Three days later the Inquirer reported “‘Our needs are very small,’ [Camp] said, noting that it would take \$3 million annually to keep the Barnes afloat until it can expand its endowment.” Meanwhile, the Foundation reportedly spent \$4.5 million in 2002.

? “We have reduced a \$3 million deficit to \$400,000 in three years.” Inquirer, 3/10/03. Camp is referring to the 1998 deficit of \$3.2 million. (See discussion elsewhere in this newsletter demonstrating that 1998’s deficit was an aberration). However, the Foundation’s tax returns show that three years later in 2001, the deficit was still over \$800,000—tot \$400,000.

? “Because of the Foundation’s poor financial situation, many of its current needs go unmet, including capital improvements, [and] upgrades of the . . . Merion Facility’s security systems.” Camp Declaration 9/2/02. In fact, funds for long-term maintenance are available. The Orphans’ Court restricted all surplus rental revenue from the 1993-95 painting tour for that purpose. This fund is at least \$4 million at last report. The claims for security upgrades are spurious, as state-of-the-art security was installed in 1995 as part of the Foundation’s \$12 million renovation.

? “Last year [2002] our expenses were 30% below expectations.” In 2002 the Foundation’s expenses were reportedly \$4.5 million. Inquirer, 3/10/03. Presumably this means the expected expenses were \$6.43 million, \$2.5 million above the 2001 expenses of \$3.9 million.

? “It is not [Dr.] Barnes’ restrictions that are at issue with regard to our survival. The restrictions posed by Lower Merion Township . . . are unfortunate. How is 1200 people per week, 400 per day . . . a reasonable restriction?” Inquirer, 3/25/01. In fact, Dr. Barnes only allowed for public visitation one day per week. The Orphans’ Court, not the township, limited the admission fee to \$5 per visitor.

? “We have received written support from 34 of 37 families who live on Latches’ Lane. The [Inquirer] likes to call the other three families the “neighbors” as though they represent the whole community.” Inquirer, 7/26/99. One of the “other three” neighbors asked each of the residents on the street if they had expressed any written support to Camp—none had.

? “We are not able to have any more than 1200 people per week—400 per day, three days a week, pulsed in at 20 minute intervals by advance reservation only.” KYW radio 5/29/03. The Lower Merion Zoning Hearing Board special exception granting permission for 1200 visitors a week only requires that there be a reservation system. There is no mention of “pulsed intervals” or that one must have a reservation to visit.

? “If you read Barnes’ intentions and his writing and his articles and the books and the radio addresses, Barnes was enabling public visitation, he wasn’t restricting it.” Inquirer, 10/28/01. The Inquirer editorial board bought this, stating “Barnes wanted to make the great art he collected accessible to the masses.” 6/08/03. The Indenture of Trust specifies only one day per week of public visitation. The Indenture also specifies that the gallery be open five days per week “solely and exclusively for educational purposes—to students and instructors of institutions which conduct courses in art and art appreciation.” Dr. Barnes himself stated in a 1942 radio address: “The Barnes Foundation is an educational institution with a well-defined purpose and a very full program and that is why it cannot be a public gallery.” (emphasis added).

? In a November 2000 grant application, Camp, apparently referring to Violette de Mazia, the Foundation’ Director of Education for over 40 years, stated: “The educational program of the Barnes Foundation faltered at the hands of one whom was assumed to be carrying out Barnes[’] original mandate. Instead, the programs became antithetical to the groundbreaking work done by Barnes and his first director of education, John Dewey.” Earlier, when Camp was wooing a \$760,000 grant from the Violette de Mazia Trust, she wrote: “We recognize that the contributions of Miss de Mazia are significant in the organization’s history and need to be commemorated through our continued collaboration.”

“I think Barnes would have been incensed by this kind of discussion. . . . Barnes certainly could have put the foundation anywhere he chose. He chose here.” Inquirer, 3/9/00. “Relocation is not the answer.” Inquirer, 3/25/01.

? In 1999, Camp stated that “we completed a two-year project digitizing 70,000 of the 120,000 documents in our archives. ” Inquirer, 7/26/99. Yet in 2000, the Foundation claimed it was “organizing and digitizing about 400,000 historic documents.” Inquirer, 12/21/00. Then in 2001 Camp stated: “We have half a million documents.” Inquirer, 10/28/01.

? “The township mandated a second gate house. . . . They also mandated that it be two-story.” Sworn testimony 5/3/01. It was the Barnes Foundation’s decision to build a two-story “gate house.” Lower Merion Township had no role in the design of the building, which, incidentally, was built in violation of the terms of the Indenture of Trust.

? Barnes attorney: “What, if anything, was done with the paintings among the works in storage after Dr. Barnes’ death?” Camp: “Nothing was really done with them that we’ve been able to determine. It is possible, during the period from Dr. Barnes’ death until about ten years ago, that the teachers may have moved the pieces in and out for classes. . . .” (emphasis added). It was more than possible, it was a fact, one which Camp herself had admitted in a document prior to

this hearing: “[a]fter Dr. Barnes’s death, certain instructors at The Foundation would bring a painting from one or more storage locations to the Gallery for teaching purposes.” Affidavit, 3/6/01.

? “While a number of the works in storage are hung on the walls of the present day administration building, they can be appreciated there only by the Foundation’s staff and the occasional visitor to the building. . . . The works in storage have not served [the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts] for more than half a century.” Affidavit, 3/6/01 (emphasis added). In fact, seminar classes were held in the administration building (as mandated by the Foundation’s Indenture of Trust) and used the paintings there almost from the day Mrs. Barnes died in 1966 until at least 1992. This is well documented in photographs in the Foundation’s *Journal of the Art Department* and in a 1971 court filing by the Foundation: “[S]pace in the administration building is currently being used as class rooms for a developing and growing seminar program.”

? Barnes attorney: “Do you know whether any of the works in storage [sic] in the present day administration building were displayed or kept in that building when Dr. Barnes was alive and using that building for a residence?” Camp: “The only definitive information that we have gotten so far is that there is a Denis painting. . . . Beyond that, we really are not sure.” This is a little surprising given the following: “‘He saved it all,’ Camp said. ‘We have gas station receipts. We have his parking tickets. We have shipping manifests and invoices. We have calling cards and letters. Barnes kept carbon copies of every letter that he sent. He also kept everything that was sent to him. We have half a million documents. Another 10,000 photographs’” Inquirer, 10/28/01. In all of that, there was nothing to show what Barnes had on the walls of his house?

? “‘I got the work done’ said Camp, who says she left the Detroit [Museum of African American History] with a \$7 million budget and \$1 million surplus.” Inquirer, 11/19/00. Contrast this with reports just months before Camp left Detroit for Philadelphia. “Indeed, it has only been through cautious money management and unexpectedly strong museum sales and space rentals that the museum has managed to keep its \$4.7 million operating budget—reduced from \$6.8 million—out of the red.” “First year attendance was projected at 600,000, a massive leap from the previous year when just 75,000 people came. But as the museum prepares to pass its first anniversary, attendance is under 400,000. And of that, just 225,000 paid for admission. The rest were there for free events.” Camp herself said “The goal now is to stabilize . . . the chances of failure are still high.” Detroit Free Press 4/15/98.

Disparaging Violette de Mazia and the Original Art Program

To Vio, who put into this book most of what makes it so much better than all previous editions.

Albert C. Barnes, handwritten inscription to Violette de Mazia in *The Art in Painting*, April 10, 1937.

In 2000, the Foundation’s board and staff created a “strategic plan,” which included “developing stronger programs to attract a broader audience and support for the Foundation’s mission.” This has resulted in a sidelining of the original art program that Barnes intended to operate “in perpetuity,” and to occupy the gallery five days per week, in favor of watered-down “user-friendly” entertainment. In a recent state grant application filed by Camp, the teachers of the Barnes-developed art program, whose tenure extends back to the 1950s, are now described merely as a “complement” to the Foundation’s other art instructors. Superficial references to the work of Dr. Barnes and John Dewey abound in the Foundation’s recent colorful brochures, but it is evident that there is little substance behind this talk as demonstrated by the free lectures given on public visiting days: “Gauguin was a joker. He put a dog and a snake in the painting [*Haere Pape*] as a joke because there are no dogs or snakes in Tahiti.” (Docent comment, 4/27/03). For readers unfamiliar with the Foundation’s approach, such superficial references to picture subjects are irrelevant to understanding the aesthetic qualities of the painting.

The Foundation’s education director has apparently been given free reign to “attract a broad audience” and to this end has rationalized the fact that much of what is being taught has little to do with Barnes or Dewey. “I don’t think there is a Barnes method per-se . . . I think Barnes’ and Dewey’s ideas are so broad and far-reaching that they allow lots of approaches.” Inquirer, 4/27/03. In fact, Barnes could not have been more specific about the method to be used at the Foundation.

This sketch of the distinctive purpose of art and the conditions of success in it, in defining the method of the artist has indicated the only method possible for the understanding of the work of art. . . . Any method for the proper study of plastic art must therefore be based upon the conception of plastic form, which defines the only relevant aim of painting. Albert C. Barnes & Violette de Mazia, *The Art of Renoir*, “Method” p.8, (emphasis added).

In a 1942 article in *House and Garden*, Violette de Mazia described the Foundation’s classes as having a “well defined purpose and a very full program.” Barnes himself echoed this statement in a radio address the same year. Today, that program has been relegated to the status of “complementing” the smorgasbord of more audience-attractive offerings dreamed up by Camp and her staff.

To effect this dumbing down of the Foundation’s educational “mission,” Camp has been disparaging the main link to Barnes’ original educational program and his colleague for over twenty years, Violette de Mazia. De Mazia, who coauthored Barnes’ exhaustive monographs on Cezanne, Matisse and Renoir, directed and lectured in the Foundation’s art education program for years when Barnes was alive. For over

thirty-five years after his death she continued the program and her teaching much as it had been when Barnes was alive. Not only did she continue the program, but expanded it to include a seminar program and revived the *Journal of the Barnes Foundation* to document the lecture material, and later financed and produced a similar journal, *Vistas*, when the Barnes board cut support for the first journal.

Camp's agenda to downplay de Mazia's critical role in the Foundation's development is evident in her dismissal of de Mazia as "Barnes' mistress" in a 2002 *New Yorker* article. This unsupported (and essentially irrelevant) charge appears to be part of a larger campaign to discredit and disappear over 60 years of de Mazia's serious educational work at the Foundation. For example, Camp testified in court: "It is very safe to say that there are marked contrasts between what Barnes initially intended for the Foundation and how it operated during his lifetime from the way in which it operated after his death with his disciples—in this case, Miss de Mazia." (Referring to de Mazia as a "disciple," like "mistress," appears to be an attempt to relegate her to the status of hanger-on, when it is clear she had an active, vital role in the Foundation's development.)

In fact, those who attended de Mazia's classes prior to Barnes' death and those who attended after his death attest to the fact that there was no change in method or substance. Students from both periods have class handouts that cover identical material. The most disruptive changes to the art program came after de Mazia's death as indicated in this letter from a Foundation teacher who studied there during Barnes' lifetime:

In the fall of 1991, the program as it was practiced at the Foundation since the 1920s was altered. Now it is necessary to move the students from room to room to compare paintings. Since it is difficult for the inexperienced to carry colors and lines in their heads, especially when looking at unfamiliar works of art, it is uncertain whether the students are always able to make the connections between the paintings and the traditions. (emphasis added).

Camp has also attempted to disconnect from Barnes' work the important documentation of de Mazia's lecture material contained in journals published after his death. "The *Vistas* were done by Violette de Mazia and seminar students and others, and while they were published as a publication of the Barnes Foundation [sic], their content is vastly different than the original journals of the Barnes Foundation." Sworn testimony 5/3/01 (emphasis added).

In fact, *Vistas* and the *Journal of the Art Department* were continuations of the work that was done during Barnes' lifetime. Indeed, the topic "Learning to See" received treatment from Mary Mullen in a 1926 the *Journal of the Barnes Foundation* and fifty years later by de Mazia in the *Journal of the Art Department*. The topics covered in the post-Barnes journals and the methods of analysis applied derive directly from the ideas contained in Barnes' *The Art in Painting* and from the books that he co-wrote with de Mazia. A copy of a

handout from a de Mazia class given May 16, 1950 (a year before Barnes' death) covers the topic "Form and Matter as Demonstrated with the Form of Renoir's Color." In her essay posthumously published in *Vistas*, (Vol V. No. 2, 1991) de Mazia covers the identical subject and makes the same observations as in the class notes from 1950 and points out that this analysis is part of Barnes' and her larger examination of Renoir's form in *The Art of Renoir*. Given de Mazia's co-authorship of every book Barnes wrote after *The Art in Painting*, it is startling that Camp would even attempt to claim that de Mazia's later work could be "vastly different" than the Foundation's earlier publications.

Perhaps the best testaments to de Mazia's contribution to the Foundation's work are these handwritten inscriptions Barnes made in the books that she co-wrote with him. In *The Art of Henri-Matisse*, 1933: "To Vio, who kept me from making many misjudgments as we worked together on this book." In *The Art of Renoir*, 1935: "To Vio, the balance wheel whose acute perception of essentials and unique sense of order, make of this book what I consider the best achievement of my life." In *The Art of Cezanne*, 1939: "To Vio, to whose modesty and generosity I owe the use of my name as co-author."

If there is a deviation from Barnes' work, it's Camp's doing, not de Mazia's. A good example of this is that under de Mazia, the Foundation continued to print and sell *Art and Education*, which was a compilation, edited by Dr. Barnes, of articles by him, John Dewey, de Mazia and other teachers at the Foundation. The Foundation continued to sell the book even under Richard Glanton, who once dismissed the educational program as "hokum." Shamefully, the Foundation no longer sells this fundamental volume. Indeed, one can barely find the poorly reproduced copies of *The Art in Painting* that are for sale amid the shelves laden with gaudy nonsense in the Foundation's store. Adding to the sense that the original art program is a sideshow is the fact that students report that the classes are routinely interrupted by other projects such as digital photography of the art collection and guests touring through the galleries as though the class were not there.

Camp's alienation of the Foundation's intended constituency—students and teachers of the art program that Barnes wanted to continue "in perpetuity"—is not without precedent. At the last place she ran, Detroit's Museum of African American History, which began as a community-oriented venture, "a surprising level of ill will has often been focused on Camp. 'This is no longer a self-determined project of African-American people. . . . We don't feel it to be ours anymore. We feel it to be Ford's and GM's. They appear to be more important' to Camp 'than the voice of the people.' [poet] Millard Porter said." Detroit Free Press, 4/15/98.

The Scapegoat Game

As demonstrated above, the Barnes Foundation could likely balance its budget, if it exercised fiscal restraint and returned to the efficient staff size and focused programs that its founder mandated. Rather than do this, the director and "CEO" (the position is not permitted under the Foundation's

bylaws) has blown up expenses to four times what they were in 1990. Meanwhile she would seem to have created an alibi in case her “fairy godmother” does not materialize. As the story has been told again and again—including a very loaded Inquirer editorial on June 8—it is the township’s and the local residents’ fault that the Foundation cannot balance its books, not the fact that it’s unchecked spending increases regularly exceeded revenue. For example, “It is not [Dr.] Barnes’ restrictions that are at issue with regard to our survival. The restrictions posed by Lower Merion Township . . . are unfortunate. How is 1200 people per week, 400 per day . . . a reasonable restriction?” Camp, letter to the Inquirer, 3/25/01. “We’ve even had notices saying we’re not permitted to hold fundraising events on our lawn.” Camp, KYW radio 5/29/03. “Some blame should go to Lower Merion Township and some crabby neighbors of the Barnes for imposing impossible restrictions on its operation.” Inquirer editorial, 6/08/03.

This story has been so often repeated that people who know nothing but what they read in the papers argue the point as if it were true. In reality, all the Township did was establish a public visitation limit (totaling 62,400 per year) which was significantly higher than the number of visitors admitted when the Foundation was in the black in 1990. At that time admission fees were \$1, parking was free and there was no income from a gallery store. Of course there was no \$170,000-per-year “CEO”; no \$70,000 development director, no \$57,000 director of merchandise and no host of support staff to go with them. As for the outdoor “fundraising events,” which in the past have amounted to wholesale corporate rentals that violate the Indenture of Trust, the Foundation has never sought the required special exception that the Township requires of all similarly situated institutions. In return for upholding its zoning laws, the Township, its commissioners and their constituents were sued by the Barnes Foundation in a “cynically brought frivolous action” that the Foundation spent millions dragging through the courts and is still fighting insofar as it owes legal fees to the residents.

In addition to legal, cultural and moral reasons why spending \$150 million in scarce charitable dollars to build a full-time museum for the Barnes collection is a mistake, there is a practical reason—the economic basis on which such ventures were once justified is no longer valid.

The present public visitation limitations (1200 per week) make sense given the small size of the galleries and the fact that the Foundation’s Indenture of Trust (as modified by the courts) mandates that public visitation at the Foundation be limited to three-and-a-half days per week. In 1996, there were no limits on gallery attendance and the rooms were so crowded one could hardly breathe let alone appreciate the collection. Under Camp, the Foundation itself proposed a 1500 person per week limit in 1998, yet she now whines that 1200

per week is forcing it to move. Does Camp direct her ire at the Orphans’ Court judge that limited admission to \$5? No. Why? One reason might be that to increase the fee would require the trustees to demonstrate that the Foundation cannot possibly operate without a higher admission fee. This would call into question why an institution running under the rules established by Dr. Barnes at \$1.1 million per year now has a \$4.5 million budget. It’s far easier to direct attention away from the Foundation’s books by wagging a finger across the street with *ad hominem* attacks on its neighbors.

The Wrong Place at the Wrong Time

In addition to legal, cultural and moral reasons why spending \$150 million in scarce charitable dollars to build a full-time museum for the Barnes Foundation collection is a mistake, there is a practical reason—the economic basis on which such ventures were once justified is no longer valid. The premise once was that spending huge sums to attract tourists would pay off for cities in the long run. September 11 changed that notion. Tourism is way off. Since then, at least one major museum has scrapped its reported \$200 million building expansion plans. In April, the Whitney Museum of American Art announced that it was shelving its expansion plans. “We’re feeling the pinch,” said Maxwell L. Anderson, the Whitney’s director. “A project like this would be a big challenge, and we’re not in a position to proceed with it.” New York Times, 4/15/03.

Not only has the tourism industry changed, so have the fortunes of the nation’s big charities, including two of the Foundation’s prime suitors, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Annenberg Foundation. “The Pew Charitable Trusts expects to award less grant money than at any time since 1988 because of the economy. ‘Every day I wake up hoping that we’ve hit bottom, but I don’t think we have,’ said Rebecca Rimmel, Pew’s chief executive officer.” The News Journal, 4/21/03. The same article noted that other foundations have been equally hit by the falling stock market including another Barnes suitor, the Annenberg Foundation, which “lost about 30 percent of its value between the end of 1999 and 2002.”

What happens when a new expensive museum is built in Philadelphia, costs exceed projections and the promised support dries up? The Pew, Lenfest and Annenberg foundations had provided for that eventuality. Their support was conditioned on elimination of all terms of the Barnes Foundation Indenture of Trust, including the one that was little mentioned in all the boosterist hoopla: “No painting shall ever be sold.” Under pressure from the attorney general the Barnes trustees removed this request, but should the Barnes Foundation move to Philadelphia, and its wealthy suitors find other things to do with their scarce charitable dollars, watch the painting sale resurface. Recall that the now-deceased founder of one of these charities proposed just that back in 1991.

This newsletter is published by Barnes Watch, a Pennsylvania non-profit corporation. To contact Barnes Watch by mail or to contribute to these efforts, write P.O. Box 225, Broomall, PA 19008, or visit www.BarnesWatch.org.