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Abstract

From The Dia To The Chinati Foundation:
Donald Judd In Marfa, Texas 1979-1994

Melissa Susan Gaido Allen

This thesis concerns the artworks of Donald Judd, particularly those created between 1979-1994 and installed at Fort D. A. Russell in Marfa, Texas and conserved by the Chinati Foundation. A brief examination of Judd’s early sculpture and experimentation with serial imagery, as they relate to the Marfa works, is provided as are some of Judd’s writings which assisted the development of permanent installation sites. A discussion of Judd’s move from a traditional gallery/museum environment to an outdoor site in Texas during the 1970’s is provided as well as a history of the Dia Art Foundation which developed partially in response to artists’ needs. Two series in particular installed at Fort Russell--one hundred milled aluminum boxes and fifteen concrete groups--are given thorough examination. The ensuing litigation between Judd and the Dia, the creation of the Chinati Foundation, and later permanent and temporary installations in Marfa are also considered.
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Fig. 1. Judd, "Untitled." 1962.
Cadmium red light oil paint, wax, and sand on canvas and wood, and black enamel
on wood with asphalt pipe. 50 1/2 x 45 x 9 5/8 in. Collection of the artist.
Photo by Geoffrey Clements.

Fig. 2. Map of Marfa, drawn by Judd, c. 1987.
Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Fig. 3. Map of Texas, drawn by Judd, c. 1987.
Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Fig. 4. Judd, "Untitled," 1974.
Plywood. 36 x 60 x 60 in.
Collection of the Art Museum of South Texas, Corpus Christi.
Photo by Eric Pollitzer.

Fig. 5. Judd, "Untitled," 1974.
Plywood. 36 x 60 x 60 in. Collection of the artist.
Photo by Eric Pollitzer.

Fig. 6. Judd, "Untitled," 1978.
Plywood. 19 1/2 x 45 x 30 1/2 in. Collection of the artist.
Photo by Leo Castelli Gallery.

Fig. 7. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #75) 1980-1984.
Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 8. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #34) 1980-1984.
Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 9. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #12) 1980-1984.
Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 10. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #88) 1980-1984.
Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 11. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #9) 1980-1984.
Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 12. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #6) 1980-1984.
Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 13. Interior of the south artillery shed, facing north.

Fig. 14. Description of the one hundred mill aluminum boxes.

Fig. 15. Detail of screws in the construction of the mill aluminum boxes.
Fig. 16. Detail of “mill marks” on exterior plane of mill aluminum box.

Fig. 17. Detail of “mill marks” on interior plane of mill aluminum box.

Fig. 18. Judd, “Untitled,” (detail of Group #14) 1982-1984.
Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 19. Judd, “Untitled,” (Group #14) 1982-1984.
Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 20. Judd, “Untitled,” (Group #9) 1982-1984.
Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 21. Judd, “Untitled,” (Group #10) 1982-1984.
Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 22. Judd, “Untitled,” (detail of Group #3) 1982-1984.
Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 23. Judd, “Untitled,” (Group #3) 1982-1984.
Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 25. Concrete groups with indigenous Texas pronghorn antelope, facing northeast.

Fig. 26. Concrete groups, facing southwest.

Fig. 27. Description of the fifteen concrete groups.

Fig. 28. Detail of surface of early concrete structure.

Fig. 29. Detail of surface of early concrete structure with visible plywood patterning.

Fig. 30. Judd, “Untitled,” (Stack) date unknown.
Installed at The Block, Marfa, Texas. Collection of the artist.

Fig. 31. View of artillery sheds from concrete groups, facing northwest.

Fig. 32. Plan for the installations at Fort D. A. Russell, drawn by Judd, c. 1987.
Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Fig. 33. Interior of the north artillery shed, facing northeast.

Fig. 34. Exterior of the south artillery shed with open window.
Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Fig. 35. Exterior of the north artillery shed with four-part windows.
Fig. 36. Exterior of the south artillery shed with roof elevation.
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Fig. 39. Inscription on an original wall in the north artillery shed.

Fig. 40. Interior of the Arena.

Fig. 41. Interior of the Arena.

Fig. 42. Door/window construction by Judd in the Arena.

Fig. 43. Door/window construction by Judd in the Arena.

Fig. 44. Exterior of the Arena with freestanding door/window construction.

Fig. 45. Detail of adobe labyrinth adjacent to the south side of the Arena.

Fig. 46. Interior of the Wool and Mohair Building with Chamberlain installation.
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Fig. 49. Detail of a Chamberlain sculpture.

Fig. 50. One of the six barracks intended for renovation and installation of Flavin works.

Fig. 51. Plan for installation of Flavin works, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Fig. 52. Plan for the construction of concrete buildings, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.
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Fig. 55. Claes Oldenburg dedicating “Monument to Last Horse: Amino et Fide,” 1991.

Fig. 56. Partial list of Judd’s private assets in Marfa.
Preface

I was first introduced to Donald Judd’s work in Marfa in 1989 by an art professor at Trinity University, Bob Tiemann. He asked me if I would be interested in working at “Judd’s place” in Marfa for a weekend in October. At that time, I knew nothing of the work that Judd had installed there. I went, and was assigned to the north artillery shed, as a guard and to answer questions with what little knowledge I had about the fifty-two mill aluminum boxes installed within. After spending four hours in the shed and still finding myself interested in the boxes, I realized my desire to study these works more intensely in the future. That weekend I introduced myself to Judd and we talked briefly about a figurative abstract expressionist, Jan Müller, whom he had reviewed as an art critic in the early 1960’s. Surprisingly, Judd maintained a respect for Müller despite his well-known opinion that painting was finished and his dislike for anything “new” attempting figuration. Afterwards, Judd held a fiesta for invited guests (there were about four hundred that year) and had a Scottish bagpipe band play for entertainment while a giant bonfire burned where the Richard Long is now installed.

Overall, the whole weekend was very exciting, impressive, and memorable. Two years later I returned to Marfa and again worked as a guard in the artillery sheds, and again spoke to Judd, this time asking his permission to write my thesis on his work there. He agreed, and told me I should return at a time when there were fewer people around in order to study the works without distraction. Soon thereafter, the in-depth research for this paper began.

Since that time, many changes have occurred both in the scope of this paper (it was originally only to cover the one hundred mill aluminum works and fifteen concrete structures) and in the Chinati Foundation. Most recently, and most importantly, Donald Judd passed away on February 12, 1994 in New York City after battling lymphoma. Dr. Marianne Stockebrand, his companion, was appointed director of the Chinati Foundation before his death and assumed her office in July 1994. The Judd Foundation is in the process of being formed to encompass all of Judd’s extensive private holdings of art and property in Marfa, New York, and around Europe, and will be considered a separate non-
profit entity from the Chinati Foundation. Over the next few years, the structure of both of Judd's foundations and holdings will undergo reformatations, the extent of which is yet to be seen.

Currently there is a lack of comprehensive, extensive, formal study of Judd's work in Marfa, both personal holdings and the work conserved by the Chinati Foundation. I feel it is imperative that these works are given adequate consideration and analysis because the concrete and mill aluminum works comprise the two largest series, in scale and in quantity, respectively, executed by Judd. The works reflect an era of patronage that had been unseen in America before or since and raise issues as to the necessity for institutions such as the Dia. The ensuing litigation, after the Dia's financial setbacks, led to the creation of the new not-for-profit institution, the Chinati Foundation, established by Judd to house and care for the work and property for its existence; I feel that the establishment of such an institution and works under its care warrant examination.

For this paper, I felt that I could only concentrate sufficiently on one aspect of Judd in Marfa, therefore I chose to examine the holdings of the Chinati Foundation in depth while covering Judd's personal holdings in Marfa superficially. Unfortunately, the personal holdings listed in this thesis only represent those held by Judd at the time of his death; they, and the rest of Judd's properties and assets elsewhere, are currently in settlement and their future is uncertain. I consider this paper to be important in that it provides a critical examination of significant works by Judd in Marfa and it provides a view of the way the Chinati was while under Judd's supervision.
Introduction

"I like simple forms. The forms I use are for me very different. I have one main philosophy which concerns all my work. My work has absolutely nothing to do with purity, pure forms or perfection, as is often stated. Most of the articles written about me are only good for the dustbin. Critics think that I implicitly believe in Plato's ideal form of an object, the idea of a chair for example. I am not all that impressed by Plato. It is a misconception to think that there are things which do not exist now. There is no other world but this one. Plato's teaching is based on laughable religious nonsense: as if forms float somewhere in space.

I avoid illusion, things are what they are. But all forms are spiritual. It is tedious that spirituality has become a contaminated word. I see it as an awareness which stems from reality—a kind of 'being.' Things and us are part of the same world, factually speaking we are one. Art must therefore be general, but at the same time out of the ordinary, different from different things."

-Donald Judd

In this thesis, I discuss the work of Donald Judd in Marfa, Texas. The approach used to trace its development begins with a partial biography followed by an examination of early work and the formulation Judd's philosophy on the exhibition of art which ultimately manifested itself as the Chinati Foundation. Judd's early career and business associations with Heiner Friedrich and the Dia Art Foundation are also examined as they constitute a significant portion of the economic force behind the evolution of the works at Marfa.

Judd first purchased property in Marfa in 1973 and began work on a permanent installation site called "La Mansana" or "The Block." The Block was comprised of a house, which became Judd's secondary residence to his home on 101 Spring Street in New York, and two airplane hangars which had been moved in the 1930's from Marfa's Fort D. A. Russell to their present location in town. At this time, Judd was searching for an alternative living environment for himself and his children as well as a place for ideation and experiments of permanent installation. It took Judd six years to renovate the house and hangars into livable and exhibitable spaces, spending approximately two years on each building.

---

In 1978, when most of the installations at the Block had been completed, Judd was visited by Heiner Friedrich, an international art dealer for American and European clients specializing in American artists of the 1960's and 1970's. Friedrich, his wife Philippa de Menil, and an associate, Helen Winkler, at that time comprised the board of the Dia Art Foundation and were interested in funding an expanded version of Judd’s work in Marfa. Beginning in 1979, the Dia Art Foundation assumed financial responsibility of the “Marfa Project” and invested over $5 million into it during the following five years. In 1986, after the Dia had been forced to declare bankruptcy due to a drastic drop in stock values in the oil market and negligent overspending on their projects, Judd sued for control of the works and was allowed to establish a new, not-for-profit entity entitled the Chinati Foundation.

Chapter III of this thesis concentrates on two principal installations in Marfa executed by Judd, one hundred mill aluminum boxes installed in the renovated artillery sheds and fifteen groups of concrete structures placed on a one kilometer stretch of land along Texas State Highway 67. These works comprise the most extensive installations in both number and size, respectively, ever produced by Judd. The installation site of these series and the majority of the other work now covered by the Chinati Foundation is located at Fort D.A. Russell, a defunct military installation which once had been used as a German P.O.W. camp during World War II.

Following the legal settlement in 1986 with the Dia, Judd created the Chinati Foundation, a separate, not-for-profit institution with himself and five others, William Agee, Annalee Newman, Carl Ryan, Jane Shurley, and Brydon Smith, as the Board of Trustees. Twenty-two crushed car sculptures by John Chamberlain, initially funded by the Dia now covered by the Chinati, were permanently installed in a renovated warehouse in town. A large series by Dan Flavin was intended for installation in six of the barracks at Fort Russell, but to date they have not been completed. Other permanent installations at Fort Russell include Claes Oldenburg’s “Monument to the Last Horse” (1991) and Ilya Kabakov’s “School House Number Six” (1993) while numerous artists were invited to mount temporary exhibitions in buildings at the fort and around town from 1987 to 1994.
Judd also began an artist-in-residence program allowing artists selected, by him, to live in
Marfa for three to twelve months in order to develop their work.

Currently, the Chinati Foundation is experiencing fundamental changes because of
Judd’s death this past February. Dr. Marianne Stockebrand was named Director of the
foundation and assumed her office in Marfa in July 1994. Much of Chinati’s development
and curatorial work was handled by Judd and it is believed that Stockebrand will continue
the foundation in the same manner. Judd had also provided a portion of the operating costs
which are presently unmet. Alternative sources of funding for the foundation are currently
being sought.

Judd’s work at Marfa warrants extensive examination for many reasons. First,
Judd is a major American artist who currently suffers from a lack of in-depth study on
these installations which, as previously mentioned, includes two of the largest series ever
executed by Judd and are a large part of, as Judd said, “...the biggest thing I’ve ever done
in my life.[]” Second, these installations in Marfa physically represent Judd’s
philosophies regarding permanent installations and how art should be experienced. Third,
the historical phenomenon of artists moving out of the galleries and into the American West
and Southwest in the late 1960’s and 1970’s, evidenced by the installations at Marfa,
deserves consideration as does the Dia Art Foundation which financially supported many
artists in this endeavor. Finally, my personal opinion is that the Chinati Foundation will
not be able to continue in the way which Judd intended it; the lack of funds necessary to
sustain the foundation will require a search for monies entirely outside of the operation and
which will, undoubtedly, elicit gradual concessions and compromises that will alter the face
of the Chinati. Interpretations of Judd’s plan by others involved with the foundation will
also assist this change. I feel it is imperative to record Chinati as it was, under Judd’s
supervision as chief curator, collector, critic, and creator, rather than how it may become
under others. For these reasons, an examination of Judd’s work in Marfa is appropriate,
warranted, and urgent.

York, November 25, 1985), pg. 58.}
Chapter I

"Back then, being an architect was much like being a dentist or a doctor. And being an artist was hopeless. So, I picked hopeless."

-Donald Judd

Biographical Information

Donald Clarence Judd was born June 3, 1928, in his grandparent's farmhouse in Excelsior Springs, Missouri, to Effie and Roy Judd. Roy Judd was an executive for Western Union which required the family to move frequently, to which Donald later attributed his shyness. Donald Judd showed an early aptitude for art and noted one of his first works to be a watercolor painting produced at age eleven while living in Omaha, Nebraska.

In 1946, Judd enlisted in the United States Army and was sent to Korea to help establish army bases abroad. Aside from living in Dallas for a few years as a child, the first time Judd saw the Southwest was when he and four other soldiers were sent by bus from Fort McClellan, Alabama to Los Angeles to be shipped out to Korea. Judd sent a telegram to his mother recounting his impression of West Texas: DEAR MOM VAN HORN TEXAS. 1260 POPULATION. NICE TOWN BEAUTIFUL COUNTRY MOUNTAINS. LOVE DON 1946 DEC 17 PM 545. Once in Korea, Judd was assigned to an engineering unit which designed and constructed base facilities. By the time Judd left Korea in 1947, he had earned the position of chief engineer.

When Judd returned to the United States, he spent six months commuting from his parent's house in New Jersey to New York City to classes at the Art Students League. In

---

1948, he began his university career at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia. The following year, Judd transferred to Columbia University in New York, graduating cum laude in 1953 with a B.S. in Philosophy. Upon his return to New York in 1949, Judd resumed his education at the Art Students League, studying figurative painting, which he attended until his graduation from Columbia.

Judd returned to Columbia in 1957 to attempt a graduate degree in Art History, taking classes from Meyer Shapiro and Rudolf Wittkower, but eventually abandoned this pursuit in 1962.\footnote{Judd, “A Long Discussion Not About Masterpieces But Why There Are So Few Of Them, part II,” reprinted in Complete Writings 1975-1986, pg. 76. Regarding his decision to abandon the pursuit of a graduate degree at Columbia, Judd wrote: “[T]here is a strong philistine bias against contemporary art among art historians. If a historian, of art or otherwise, doesn’t know how the present works, how can the historian understand the past? I remember some very philistine remarks by Rudolf Wittkower, the best being an objection to my writing a thesis on Ingres: ‘Why do you want to write on a contemporary artist?’”}

Judd earned his first job as an art critic for Art News in September 1959 while in graduate school. Three months later, Judd left Art News and was hired by Hilton Kramer to write reviews for Arts (later renamed Arts Magazine). By 1964, Judd was also writing occasional reviews for Art International and Art in America. The following year, after being fired by James Fitzsimmons of Art International, Judd began writing fewer reviews and concentrated instead on developing his personal artistic style.

**Defining An Artistic Expression**

Judd’s reviews reflected a progressive uneasiness with what he saw as a lack of quality art produced in America or abroad; the work of Frank Stella, Ad Reinhardt, Josef Albers, Barnett Newman, and John Chamberlain were considered, by Judd, to be exceptions to this view. At this time, Judd himself was attempting to find a satisfactory mode of employing paint on canvas, an endeavor he ultimately discontinued in 1962.\footnote{This date is of some debate; Barbara Haskell, *Donald Judd* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, exhibition catalogue, 1988), pgs. 29-31 depicts figures of paintings dating to 1962, whereas Judd claims the end of his painting career to be 1961 in “Some Aspects of Color in General and Red and Black in Particular,” *Artforum*, vol. 32, no. 10, (New York, Summer 1994), pg. 110.}

Four years later, Judd concluded that because of the myriad of problems inherent to
painting on a two-dimensional surface, the medium should be abandoned altogether. In his essay, "Specific Objects," Judd explicitly outlined painting's shortcomings:

The main thing wrong with painting is that it is a rectangular plane placed flat against a wall. A rectangle is a shape itself; it is obviously the whole shape; it determines and limits the arrangement of whatever is on or inside of it.
...Almost all paintings are spatial in one way or another.
...Anything on a surface has space behind it. Two colors on the same surface almost always lie at different depths.
...Except for a complete and unvaried field of color or marks, anything spaced in a rectangle and on a plane suggests something in and on something else...

According to this essay, Judd's primary problem with painting is that it is inescapably illusionistic; it is always attempting to represent something it is not. Later in the essay, Judd clarifies his preference for three-dimensional work over painting:

Three dimensions are real space. That gets rid of the problem of illusionism and of literal space, space in and around marks and colors—which is riddance of one of the salient and most objectionable relics of European art. The several limits of painting are no longer present. A work can be as powerful as it can be thought to be. Actual space is intrinsically more powerful and specific than paint on a flat surface.

Judd's first three-dimensional "Minimalist" work was initially intended to be a wall

---

4 Bruce Glaser, "Questions to Stella and Judd," ArtNews, vol. 65, no. 7, (New York, September 1966), pg. 58. Almost thirty years later, in "Some Aspects of Color in General and Red and Black in Particular," pg. 113, Judd reflected upon this remark and stated, "I didn't think when I said thirty years ago that painting was finished that it would be so thoroughly finished. The achievement of Pollock and the others meant that the century's development of color could continue no farther on a flat surface."


10 Ibid., pg. 184.
piece, painted cadmium red light with a black asphalt pipe placed vertically along the center, but was soon discovered to be equally suited to the floor (fig. 1). The work was kept on the floor of Judd’s studio for some time because its generous size and weight made it difficult to hang. Judd found that he liked the work as a floor installation, and from this studio accident he realized the potential for further experimentation with free-standing three-dimensional works. In the years to follow, Judd abandoned painted wooden constructions in favor of anodized metal, and colored plexiglass. Judd remarked that the translucence and inherent color dyed into the plexiglass was more “natural” and “true to the medium” than a painted surface could provide. Soon thereafter, Judd abandoned color in his floor pieces, temporarily, opting instead for constructions comprised of unadorned materials.

The reason Judd temporarily abandoned applied color seems related to his quest to design works which disallowed emotional readings or references beyond the objects themselves. The intended result was clarity of form and immediate cognition of the work at hand. Judd described this pursuit as such:

11 I chose to place the word Minimalist in quotes for several reasons, primarily because it is a term applied to a group of artists working in a similar aesthetic style rather than as a cohesive group such as the COBRA, the Blaue Reiter, Cubo-Futurists, etc. “Minimalism” had first been used in print in the 1920’s by John Graham to describe Russian art, then again in the early 1960’s to classify artists such as Ad Reinhardt and Marcel Duchamp. Judd had also used the term “minimal” in some of his reviews for Arts Magazine, but not in the sense of an impending or existing movement. What was ultimately labeled Minimalism, Minimal Art, or described as Minimalist in the 1960’s was also termed “ABC Art” by Barbara Rose, “Imageless Pop” by Peter Plagens, “Primary Structures” by Kynaston McShine, “Specific Objects” by Judd, “Structurist Art” by Lucy Lippard, “Literalist Art” by Michael Fried, and several other variances denoting its lack of aesthetic decoration.

Judd, who disliked all-encompassing labels or attempts to pigeonhole his work, reluctantly chose to be called an “Empiricist,” referring to the English philosopher David Hume’s revelations in A Treatise of Human Nature, 1738, that only an object that could be touched, felt, and experienced through concrete examinations was “real,” versus something existing only in theory; “objects do not have “essences” (Judd, Complete Writings 1959-1975, pg. 72). Judd’s exposure to Hume undoubtedly occurred during his studies in Philosophy at Columbia University. For further discussion of Empiricism and its relation to Judd’s work, see Haskell, Donald Judd, pgs. 17-18, 22; Yve-Alain Bois, “The Inflection,” Donald Judd: New Sculpture (exhibition catalogue, The Pace Gallery, New York, September 13-October 19, 1991), n.p.; Galerie Maeght Lelong, Paris, text by Judd, Donald Judd (exhibition catalogue, 1987), pgs. 9-10. Judd discusses Hume’s writings in his review of Walter Murch, Complete Writings 1959-1975, pg. 72.

12 Haskell, Donald Judd, pg. 28.

13 Ibid., pg. 47.
In the three-dimensional work the whole thing is made according to complex purposes, and these are not scattered but asserted by one form. It isn't necessary for a work to have a lot of things to look at, to compare, to analyze one by one, to contemplate. The thing as a whole, its quality as a whole, is what is interesting. The main things are alone and are more intense, clear and powerful. They are not diluted by an inherited format, variations of a form, mild contrasts and connecting parts and areas.\textsuperscript{14}

Judd sought to secure control over his objects as well as the viewer. Judd's objects were carefully designed and constructed of industrial, commercial materials with precise joints and fittings, intended to be without surface decoration or interior components thereby limiting the viewer's ability to read emotions or outside references into the work. The construction of the works eventually was relegated to factories or foundries where evidences of a human touch could be effectively removed from an object thereby and eliminating "the hand of the artist" which had been crucial to Abstract Expressionism. Also, the materials used in construction were most easily manipulatable at a foundry versus a studio environment.

This move out of the studio and into the foundry raises questions about attribution and authorship of the works.\textsuperscript{15} Judd always retained control over the production of his works, albeit indirectly as he did not construct them himself, and sought to authenticate

\textsuperscript{14} Judd, "Specific Objects," \textit{Complete Writings 1959-1975}, pgs. 184-187. These concepts were expanded by Robert Morris in 1966 and known popularly as "Gestalt theory," a term borrowed from the psychological studies of Kurt Koffka, Wolfgang Kohler and Max Wertheimer. Although Judd did not directly rely upon Morris's writings \textit{per se}, he was aware of them and wrote positively about Morris's work, commenting upon their intention, in his reviews. For more information, see Judd, \textit{Complete Writings 1959-1975}, pgs. 117-119, 165. Morris wrote: "In the simpler regular polyhedrons, such as cubes and pyramids, one need not move around the object for the sense of the whole, the gestalt, to occur. One sees and immediately 'believes' that the pattern within one's mind corresponds to the existential fact of the object. (...) Characteristic of a gestalt is that once it is established all the information about it, \textit{qua} gestalt, is exhausted. (One does not, for example, seek the gestalt of a gestalt.) Furthermore, once it is established it does not disintegrate. One is then both free of the shape and bound to it. Free or released because of the exhaustion of information about it, as shape, and bound to it because it remains constant and indivisible." Morris, "Notes on Sculpture, part one," \textit{Artforum}, vol. 4, no. 6 (New York, February 1966), pgs. 43-44.

\textsuperscript{15} For more information see "Specific Objects," \textit{Complete Writings 1959-1975}, pg. 187.
them through traditional avenues of gallery and museum exhibitions. In this instance, Judd can be seen as exerting power over the viewers by forcing them to accept that these works—although Judd himself had no direct hand in their physical realization—must be considered “a Judd piece” because of their placement within a legitimizing context. The viewer is neither invited nor expected to question the authorship of the works due to their location. Whereas Judd was willing and, in fact, seeking to depersonalize his works as much as possible, he was not willing to relinquish authorship and the benefits of such, namely financial gain and recognition. Judd had also written positively about the possibilities of mass-production, yet this was never implemented in his art.

Judd also sought to establish control over the viewer by producing a proliferation of writings and criticisms about his art. In many instances, these writings would appear in print alongside contemporary critical discourse and would thus have a nullifying effect on any comments made in opposition to the artists’ declarations. Judd, as author of the artworks and, presumably, the primary source of information about them, placed himself in the role of interpreter/critic and dictated to the viewing public what it should think, feel and know about his work. Through this advantageous placement and through a general societal acceptance of the primacy of the word of the artist, Judd was able to relegate all other opinions about his art secondary to his own.

---

16 Judd’s role as author is, however, certainly visible in his concept of the works and specific instructions regarding the fabrication of the pieces.
18 Judd’s writings were also successful because of his previous employment as an art critic and his familiarity with the style and language used in writing about art. Other critics have addressed the phenomenon of the large number of American artists in the 1960’s, specifically Minimalists, writing about their art and providing extensive theories to support its existence. For example, Frances Colpitt notes in Minimal Art: The Critical Perspective (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1990), pgs. 4-5 that the Minimalists were the first group of artists to be university-educated and therefore able to deal with concepts and ideas, that members of the group (such as Judd and Mel Bochner) worked as art critics themselves and could therefore, presumably, write effectively to defend their work, and that the works required written explanations to be fully comprehended.
Fig. 1. Judd, "Untitled," 1962.
Cadmium red light oil paint, wax, and sand on canvas and wood, and black enamel on wood with asphalt pipe. 50 1/2 x 45 x 9 5/8 in. Collection of the artist.

Travels In The Southwest

As well as being an art critic, Judd held a variety of teaching positions: he worked as an instructor at the Police Athletic League of New York; at the Christadora House (a settlement house) as an art educator; as a part-time teacher at the Allen-Stevenson Elementary School from 1957-1961, and as an instructor at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, an affiliate of the Brooklyn Museum of Art, between 1962-1964. In 1965,
he was awarded a grant from the Swedish Institute in Stockholm for travel throughout Sweden. After returning from Sweden, Judd accepted a Visiting Professorship at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire for the 1966-67 school year, which effectively ended his career as an art critic. The following school year, Judd taught a sculpture seminar at Yale University through a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. It was around this time that Judd met and married a dancer named Julie Finch. The couple had two children, a son, Flavin Starbuck (b. 1968), and a daughter, Rainer Yingling (b. 1970); they divorced in the mid-1970's.

In November of 1968, Judd purchased a seven-story building in New York City, 101 Spring Street, which became his primary residence. He also experimented with installations here: permanent on the residential floors and temporary on the street level. Works by Claes Oldenburg, John Chamberlain, Dan Flavin, Robert Irwin, and others were installed on the residential floors while younger, emerging artists were given space at street level. Ideology concerning permanent installation sites was developed and later realized here and in Marfa. Judd retained this property in New York throughout his lifetime.²⁹

In the summer of 1968, prior to the purchase of the New York building, Judd drove with his family from Colorado to Arizona, Utah and New Mexico in search of a small

²⁹ Judd wrote a particularly scathing article entitled “Una Stanza Per Panza” Kunst Intern Magazin (Bonn, Germany, parts 1-4: May, July, September, and November 1990) in which he provides an argument for his prior invention of permanent installation sites, an idea he considered stolen and then exploited by two of his patrons, Count Giuseppe Panza di Biumo and Heiner Friedrich. Judd later “corrected” the essay in May 1992; it is currently unpublished. The essay traces his difficulties and legal battles with Panza, and mentions, in passing, those with Friedrich, the de Menils, and others as well as injustices and revelations concerning permanent installations. Judd and Panza were involved in several lawsuits concerning work made without Judd’s supervision or permission for an installation site owned by Panza in Varese, Italy and, later, a sale of Minimalist works by Panza to the Guggenheim Museum. Judd writes, “Panza and Friedrich also have in common the misuse and debasement of the idea of permanent installation, which I think is my idea, which Panza took from me and the existing installations of ’70, and which Friedrich took from both myself and Panza. First Panza and then Friedrich realized that the promise of permanent installation could be used to acquire art cheaply, and then that a little apparent permanence could hide a great deal of shiftiness.” (pg. 10, unpublished essay.)” ...[In 1970.] I was sick in bed and Panza and his wife were brought up in the elevator to visit. ...They didn’t say much. But of course Panza saw the work and the space and I undoubtedly stated my intention for the building. This is the source for the idea of permanent installation followed by Panza, exploited by Panza, exploited to death by Heiner Friedrich through the Lone Star and Dia Foundations...” (pg. 16, unpublished essay.)
place, "not much more than a campsite." Their search was unsuccessful, and the next summer they set out, again by car, down the coast of Baja, California, which Judd noted "is excessively perfect in its lack of vegetation," ultimately ending up on the Pacific at El Rosario. For the next three summers, Judd and his family stayed a month at El Rosario and later, 1970-1971, an additional month at Rancho El Metate, fifty miles inland from El Rosario. Judd considered purchasing property in Arroyo Grande, located a few miles from Rancho El Metate, but rejected the idea on two grounds: first, transporting the works to and from Mexico would have been extremely difficult because of existing customs regulations; second, Judd had gotten into an argument with border officials about his appearance which dampened his enthusiasm about the site. A few months later, in November of 1971, Judd flew to El Paso, drove to Marfa, and rented a small house in town. That house, along with two neighboring World War I airplane hangars, was later purchased by Judd in 1973 and became part of The Block, Judd's residence in Texas and an additional permanent installation site for his works.

**Judd's Writings And The Dia**

Related to his establishment of The Block in Marfa, Judd wrote a timely, and thought-provoking essay in 1973 entitled "Complaints, part two," in which he calls for action through a series of observations, primarily negative, which ultimately led to reform in art management through private patrons and art organizations such as the Dia Art Foundation. Throughout this writing, one of Judd's most frequent and seemingly implacable complaints was the perceived mistreatment and abuse of his works by galleries, museums, and collectors. These abuses generally occurred during transportation to or from exhibition sites, at museums where works would be reassembled poorly or damaged by the viewing public. Specifically, Judd writes:

---

21 Ibid., pg. 97.
22 Ibid., pg. 97. Judd was involved in an argument about the length of his hair: he perceived the border official to be harassing him for having long hair, which Judd attributed to Richard Nixon and his attempts to "keep the hippies home," with Mexico's help.

---
The various shippers are careless and usually the museum staff that handles art is careless. The public is awful and the guards don’t mind. The handling is even worse when a show is over and the museum wants it out of there fast. Insurance is a farce. It’s always up to the artist or the dealer to spend two years collecting it, if they can. Insurance is not based on the destruction of a work of art, but on partial damage or the cost of replacement. The surface of a large expensive stainless steel piece of mine was damaged in Europe two years ago by being packed with the corrugated side of the cardboard next to the steel. The insurance company decided the piece was damaged 10%. But you can no longer sell the piece and get your money back. And also the 10% has never arrived.

A couple of lacquered pieces of mine have come back with Santini stickers stuck on the lacquer. Hague slid a painted wooden piece on its side along their concrete floor. They’re the worst. Budworth has never damaged anything. Auer, which the Whitney uses, has no idea of what they’re moving; they slid another wooden piece on its side across the bed of their truck. One company, whose name I can’t remember, possibly connected to Auer, tied two large metal boxes on the tailgate of their truck, between the open doors, which pounded in a side of each box.  

As the essay progresses, Judd chronicled multiple abuses from the viewing public, museum guards, and other institutions to his work and that of other artists, leading Judd to conclude:

The fast and constant exhibitions enforce the idea of performance, show business, rather than the idea of making art, either movable or for a particular situation. It’s serious to make something that will be visible for a long time; it’s

23 Judd, Complete Writings 1959-1975, pg. 209.
It was because of incidents such as these that Judd began insisting upon supervising the installation of his work at any temporary site, museum or gallery. He would usually bring one of his assistants and whoever constructed the works along with him, all at the expense of the host institution, as well as other preparators whose expense was sometimes absorbed by Judd. For example, at a retrospective of Judd’s work at the Dallas Museum of Art in February 1989, curatorial notes were circulated among the staff outlining aspects of the installation to be controlled by Judd: first, that he, not the curator, would determine the placement of his works in the designated galleries; second, multiple demands were necessary for Judd to agree to the exhibition of his work such as prior approval, by Judd, of the museum’s blueprints and elevation, hundreds of pairs of white, cotton gloves provided by the museum to be worn and changed every couple of hours by everyone working in the area, two additional crews, as well as his usual traveling assistants, to install one piece each at the museum’s cost, and the hiring of additional museum guards to work during the exhibition; third, the shipping of some of the larger works was to be overseen by members of Judd’s staff, from venue to venue, again at the museum’s expense. In all the DMA spent over $30,000 to bring Judd, his staff, and crews to Dallas and over another $30,000 to ship and install the works, totaling almost 50% of the budgeted cost for the exhibition.

Throughout the remainder of “Complaints, part two,” Judd argued against current museum practices for installation and indirectly called for an alternative viewing space without the hindrances of an institutional setting. He observed:

The conditions for looking at art are miserable. Shows are often full of people, a few of whom are idiots. You can only stand and look, usually past someone else. No space, no privacy, no sitting or lying down, no drinking or eating, no thinking, no living. It’s all a show. It’s just information. Art is kept isolated and half visible. You can seldom see

---

34 Ibid., pg. 209.
much of what is being done in New York or of what has been done. Art isn't visible in ordinary circumstances. New York City doesn't want it around. Since art historians and trustees have so much to say about what happens to artists' work, contemporary art is treated as possible rare artifacts, but mostly bound to fail. The culture of the Kimbell Museum, the Metropolitan, and Lincoln Center controls the exhibition of contemporary art—makes sure it is only exhibited.  

Judd was also concerned with the lack of funding artists receive through various state and federal programs, relative to other government programs. He made a convincing argument that "museums are charities that are monuments to the rich," noting the inherent irony in paying more for the building itself than the sum total (in 1973 art market values) of the art it exists to house. In one of the earlier observations in the essay, Judd remarked, "[t]he museums patronize, isolate, and neutralize artists." In closing, Judd described his perception of the relationship between artist and museums:

It's an old point that no artists are involved in running museums. In no way do artists control their own activities. It's all done for them by the less educated for other purposes. Anyway, the main effort should be to produce works of art and that's not a very visible purpose in museums and in the National Endowment.  

It seems apparent from these complaints that Judd was no longer willing to subject his work to the multitude of abuses he perceived as existing within the gallery and museum environments. One year prior to these writings, Judd had purchased land in Marfa, Texas with the intention of establishing both a personal retreat from New York City for himself

---

26 Ibid., pg. 208.
27 Ibid., pg. 208.
28 Ibid., pg. 211
and his children and a permanent installation site for his works. As will be discussed later, Judd, like Michael Heizer, Walter de Maria, Robert Smithson, Mary Miss, and other sculptors in the 1960's and 1970's, was part of a collective movement out of these traditional viewing spaces and into alternative installations in the American West and Southwest. This desire to abandon traditional exhibition space and move into one completely created and controlled by Judd occurs at a time when Minimalism, including Judd's work, had already been accepted in an academic sense and was actually on the decline, therefore the legitimizing context of the museum or gallery space was no longer necessary to him as a means of validation.

Although Judd had been financially successful, it seems that by 1973 the enormous costs involved with the creation and maintenance of a permanent installation site was apparent to him. Thus, Judd was in need of a patron to support him in these financial matters. And, through his writings and complaints, Judd elucidated the urgency for an establishment of permanent installation sites for his and other artists' work outside of a traditional setting, was fulfilled, albeit temporarily, by the Dia Art Foundation.
Chapter II

“Sculpture is what you bump into when you back up to see a painting.”

-Barnett Newman

Judd Moves To Texas

During the late 1960’s, artists began to liberate their work from the confines of both the studio and museum/gallery environments to locations out-of-doors, into the American West and Southwest. Examples of such include: Robert Smithson’s “Spiral Jetty” (1970) located in Great Salt Lake, Utah and “Amarillo Ramp” (1973) constructed posthumously in Texas; Michael Heizer’s “Double Negative” (1969-70) located near Overton, Nevada, “Depressions,” “Displacements,” and numerous other projects built on desertlands; Walter de Maria’s “Las Vegas Piece” (1969) in Nevada and “Lightning Field” (1974-77) installed near Quemado, New Mexico; Robert Morris’s “Mirror Displacements in the Yucatan” (1969) and “Observatory” (1970) built at Ijmuiden, The Netherlands (now destroyed); multiple works by Richard Serra; outdoor installations by Alice Aycock, Dennis Oppenheim, Robert Irwin, Nancy Holt, Christo, and others. Generally speaking, in the majority of

---


30 Sculptors of the 1960’s and ’70’s forced an expansion of the definition of sculpture to encompass works that had not traditionally been considered as such. They introduced boxes, cubes, various polyhedrons, and other geometric, three-dimensional constructions made of industrial materials as well as series of tiles, bricks, and metal plates as “art”; then, soil covering gallery floors, excavated land sites, man-made rock formations, and various other outdoor installations were submitted in response to the previous works. The definition of sculpture grew to such an extent that Krauss proposed a litmus test for identification: if it was neither landscape nor architecture, it could be considered sculpture. (Sculpture in the Expanded Field,” pg. 292.) Later, Krauss mentions artists contemporary to Judd (but not Judd himself) as progressing beyond modernism into postmodernism: “It seems fairly clear that this permission (or pressure) to think in the expanded field was felt by a number of artists at about the same time, roughly between the years 1968 and 1970. For, one after another Robert Morris, Robert Smithson, Michael Heizer, Richard Serra, Walter de Maria, Robert Irwin, Sol LeWitt, Bruce Naumann...had entered a situation the logical conditions of which can no longer be described as modernist.” Ibid., pg. 287.
these instances, artists were searching for an alternative means of installation than could be offered by the traditional gallery or museum environments. This new art necessitated this type of housing because it was directly and inextricably tied to the earth and its expression contrary to the self-referential content of Minimalism. For example, Smithson wrote compellingly on the need for art to break free of the cultural confines of traditional exhibition spaces:

Cultural confinement takes place when a curator imposes his own limits on an art exhibition, rather than asking an artist to set his limits. Artists are expected to fit into fraudulent categories. Some artists imagine that they've got a hold on this apparatus, which in fact has got a hold of them. As a result, they end up supporting a cultural prison that is out of their control. Artists themselves are not confined, but their output is. Museums, like asylums and jails, have wards and cells—in other words, neutral rooms called ‘galleries.’ [...] Works of art seen in such spaces seem to be going through a kind of esthetic convalescence. They are looked upon as so many inanimate invalids, waiting for critics to pronounce them curable or incurable. The function of the warden-curator is to separate art from the rest of society.

Whereas Smithson and other Earthwork artists were inspired to search for an alternative to traditional interior spaces for their work due to cultural and artistic concerns, Judd was motivated to move into the American Southwest by three dominating factors: his desire to escape New York City and gallery/museum spaces, to create a truly permanent

---


installation site ("I wanted to install my own works for eternity"), and to maintain complete control over such. Judd considered galleries and museums to be limited institutions because they were controlled by status and commerce rather than art and/or artists. And, as previously cited, Judd wrote at length about the abuses he and his art incurred through temporary exhibitions. In Marfa, Judd was able to have complete control over every aspect of his installations, being limited only by financial constraints. Thus, when the Dia approached Judd in 1979 with a contract to pay for an expansion of these installations and perpetual maintenance of the site, it would have appeared that the external constraints on the works were to be indefinitely eliminated.

**History Of The Dia Art Foundation**

In June of 1974, the Dia Art Foundation was incorporated in New York City and awarded not-for-profit status. The foundation’s mission was to support artists whose work necessitated permanent housing due to size or scale and who were otherwise unable to secure funding. Some art produced in the late 1960’s and 70’s was not necessarily appropriate for traditional exhibition spaces, such as a museum or gallery, due to the materials used or artist’s intention. Thus, the Dia could be seen as forming in response to the needs of artists seeking alternative modes of expression.

The members of Dia Art Foundation’s board of directors were no strangers to the art world. The president and economic force behind the foundation was Philippa de Menil Pellizzi Friedrich, daughter of Dominique and the late John de Menil of Houston and

---
33 Judd, “Dutch Interview,” unpublished, pg. 3.
34 Ibid., pg. 3. Judd formulated his opinions regarding the need for galleries and museums to be run in part by artists around 1969. He helped to develop the Art Workers’ Coalition list of “13 Demands” which were issued to the Museum of Modern Art, New York; the first demand stated that “The Board of Trustees of all museums should be made up of one-third museum staff, one-third patrons and one-third artists...” reprinted in Art In Theory, Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, eds., (Blackwell Publishers: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1992), pgs. 901-902. Judd commented on his involvement with Art Workers’ Coalition the following year in an Artforum article entitled “The Artist and Politics: A Symposium,” September 1970, pgs. 35-39.
35 Hoban, “Medicis For A Moment: The Collapse of the Dia Dream,” pg. 54. Philippa and Heiner Friedrich were married in a Sufi ceremony in 1979; they filed civil papers for the wedding in New York City in 1982.
heiress to a percentage of her family's fortune, based largely on Schlumberger Oil stocks. Philippa's philanthropy clearly arose from her parents' involvement in the arts. The de Menils amassed one of the world's finest private collection of art with a particular emphasis on Surrealism and African art. They also commissioned Mark Rothko and Barnett Newman to execute works for the Rothko Chapel in Houston, to be perpetually cared for by the Menil Foundation. Philippa's wealth at the time of the Dia's inception was estimated to be "in the tens of millions;" by 1984, the Dia had reportedly spent over $30 million dollars funding their projects, relying almost entirely on Philippa's private fortune.

Heiner Friedrich was listed as a vice president of the Dia Art Foundation along with a longtime de Menil associate, Helen Winkler. Born in Germany during World War II, Friedrich was financially supported by his father's equipment engineering firm which endowed him with a comfortable yearly income before he was in college. Friedrich left school before graduating to set up an art gallery in Munich with a partner, Franz Dahlem. Friedrich's reputation as an important dealer in American art of the 1960's and '70's was solidified with the sale of American Pop Art to a major collector in Germany, and he soon became known as a notable representative of American artists and European collectors. In 1973, Friedrich moved to New York City where he opened Heiner Friedrich Gallery in SoHo and soon established himself as a prominent dealer in America.

The name "Dia" has several meanings: in Greek dia means "conduit"; in Spanish it means day, daylight, or date; in French and German it is an abbreviation for a photographic slide or transparency; as a prefix in English, it means through or across. Friedrich commented that the name "Dia" was chosen because of its changing, transitory quality and sometimes used this characteristic to his advantage when describing the foundation. In January of 1985, Friedrich explained the name as such, "It is a humble term, a transitory term. It means the transitory ability that each person has in life." Several months later, he remarked that dia meant "conduit. Dia was chosen as a transitory term for an institution that would not be eternal but would make possible the presence of

---

37 Ibid., pg. 7.
artworks on an extended, long-term basis.\textsuperscript{38}

The seeds for the Dia Art Foundation can be seen in Friedrich’s art dealing of the early 1970’s. He frequently represented Minimalist and Earthwork artists but as their work grew too large or too ambitious, patrons would decline support. Persuading a perspective patron to commit to a project that was usually neither saleable nor houseable proved an impossibility. Thus, the Dia Art Foundation was committed to fund certain artists liberally and to bring about conditions where the artists could create works without pressure from financial concerns.

The works in particular that the Dia sought to sponsor were stated in their charter: “those projects which cannot obtain sponsorship or support from other public or private sources because of their nature or scale.” At this time, many of the Minimalist and Earthwork artists had planned projects that required permanent placement because of their large scale, particular materials, or site-specific installation. With the establishment of the Dia, these artists were provided the opportunity for both funding of their projects and the expressed promise of perpetual care for the work’s existence.

The scope of the Dia Art Foundation was well-known throughout the art world. Many historical museums, such as the Getty in Malibu, had vast private fortunes supporting them which allowed them to buy virtually any available artwork. The Dia went a step further by actually commissioning the works, then intended to house them perpetually in an environment which, today, overwhelmingly reflects the patronage attitude of a past generation. The Dia provided a level of private patronage that could be compared with that of the Medicis or Pope Julius II during the Italian Renaissance; few private patrons in modern history would be able to compare with the Dia’s unsparing largesse. It was the first American foundation dedicated to the creation and preservation of artworks in a permanent, non-travelling environment, funded entirely by private money.

While the Dia was undeniably generous with its monies, a serious problem developed which ultimately contributed to its downfall; the Dia appeared to suffer from a lack of restraint and, as one Dia staffer characterized it, an “anything goes” attitude towards

\textsuperscript{38} Hoban, “Medicis for a Moment: The Collapse of the Dia Dream,” pg. 55.
funding. This can be seen in some of the Dia’s purchases of property, such as a castle in Garrison, New York bought in 1979 for $1 million for the purpose of creating a one-man museum for Dan Flavin. The castle, after the Dia had acquired it, was found to be too costly for them to renovate and even more difficult to resell. Another example of the Dia’s somewhat reckless spending is LaMonte Young and Marian Zazeela’s project entitled “Dream House” on Harrison Street in New York City, which was intended to be an ongoing project, never to be completed. The Dia spent over $4 million between 1979 and early 1985 making esoteric renovations such as the addition of a “beard sink” for Young to wash his lengthy beard. Dream House required a staff of twenty-two to operate; Young and Zazeela lived there and catalogued their work. The extent of the extravagance with which the Dia treated this particular project caused one of Dream House’s technicians, David Cremin, to characterize the Dia’s funding attitude as “Ask and ye shall receive.”

While this type of attitude may have prevailed in their projects, the Dia’s administrative staff allegedly suffered from a multitude of internal difficulties due to a lack of professional office workers. Many of the Dia’s administrative staffers were artists themselves rather than trained office staff. It is reported that the Dia would require three bids on office supplies as innocuous as paper clips, yet would commit comparatively gross oversights in money management such as paying taxes for properties which were classified as tax-exempt. The administrative problems suffered by the Dia were only partially to blame for its collapse; in a statement by Philippa de Menil regarding the Dia’s success, the underlying problem is clear, “The reason we accomplished so much in terms of projects is that we just forged ahead and didn’t worry about overspending.”

Artists and their work were not the only activities to be funded by the Dia. Religion, specifically a Sufi sect in New York, was also patronized. Philippa and Heiner both converted to the Muslim faith in 1979, and were married in a Sufi ceremony that same year. Philippa’s conversion occurred after meeting Sheikh Muzaffer Ozak, the leader of a

---

39 Ibid., pg. 57.
40 Ibid., pg. 54.
41 Ibid., pg. 54.
group of whirling dervishes. Religion was covered under the Dia Art Foundation's guidelines and they began donating regularly to the establishment of a Sufi mosque on Mercer Street. The Dia was also supporting Sheikh Muzaffar's personal expenditures and a variety of Islamic education projects. These outside activities were not well received by some of the Dia's artists as some sensed a declining interest in art projects. Philippa and Heiner deny that their support of religious activities adversely affected any of their art endeavors.\footnote{Ibid., pg. 56.}

Primarily the Dia supported artists who were already well-known in the artworld. Among the artists Dia routinely sponsored from its beginning in 1974 to its decline in 1983 were such established artists as Andy Warhol, Cy Twombly, Walter de Maria, Joseph Beuys, Dan Flavin, John Chamberlain, and Donald Judd as well as comparatively obscure artists such as Imi Knoebel and Blinky Palermo. Artists who were approved for funding by the Dia gained much celebrity and were soon labeled "Dia Artists," placing them in a separate caste from other contemporary artists uninterested in the foundation or unable to receive Dia's financial backing. The Dia Art Foundation was nicknamed the "Art Mafia" because of its characteristic secretive operation and its apparent ability to make an artist's career successful merely by selecting to support his work.\footnote{"His" work is appropriate--almost all of the Dia's support went to male artists.}

**Early Commissions Of The Dia**

The first completed project undertaken by the Dia was a permanent installation of fluorescent lights by Dan Flavin in the courtyard of the Basel Kunstmuseum in 1975. Flavin's work was regularly supported by the Dia, including a project in which three of New York City's Grand Central Station platforms were illuminated, measuring one thousand feet each. Flavin was also commissioned to create a large series of fluorescent lights to be permanently displayed at the "Marfa project" in Marfa, Texas, although it was
never installed. Flavin was to fill six renovated army barracks at Fort D. A. Russell with light sculptures to complement the permanent installations of Judd and Chamberlain.

Many of Walter de Maria's most celebrated works were also funded by the Dia. In 1977, he approached Dia with a project entitled "The Vertical Kilometer" in which a brass rod measuring two inches in width and one kilometer in length was to be sunk (vertically) into the earth, the visible end flush with the ground surface. The project was approved and installed in the park facing Kassel's Museum Fridericianum for the opening of Documenta VI. Two years later Dia approved de Maria for a companion piece to "Vertical Kilometer" entitled "Broken Kilometer," in which de Maria permanently installed five hundred brass rods in a Dia-owned New York City building, each measuring two inches in width and two meters in length arranged in five parallel rows of one hundred rods. De Maria produced many other projects with the financial backing of the Dia, but the most ambitious and infamous one is certainly "Lightning Field," located thirty miles north of Quemado, New Mexico. Begun in 1974 and completed in 1977, it consists of four hundred stainless steel poles arranged in a grid measuring 1.6 kilometers by one kilometer, twenty-five rows by sixteen rows. The precision with which de Maria installed these poles is such that if a giant sheet of glass were laid atop of them every pole would touch its surface. This project cost the Dia over $900,000 to install, with yearly maintenance costing up to $200,000. Fortunately, "Lightning Field" managed to survive the bankruptcy of the Dia in the mid-1980's and is still owned and operated by the new Dia. The site is open June through November to visitors who are required to spend no less than twenty-four hours there to fully experience the effect of sunlight and moonlight upon the poles.

---

44 Jeff Kopie (former assistant to Donald Judd), conversation with the author January 25, 1994. Mr. Kopie added that Flavin was paid in full by Chinati (with Dia funds) to create these six works, yet to date he believed that none have been made. The Chinati Foundation is currently involved in negotiations with Flavin to have them realized.

45 Ibid. Mr. Kopie said that the Chinati Foundation does own the designs which exist only on paper, but Judd and Flavin "are not getting along right now," and it seemed unlikely that Chinati would be able to install them. The Chinati Foundation has renovated one of the six barracks which was to house the Flavin works.

46 "Broken Kilometer" and other projects are still owned by Dia and have been reinstalled in New York City by the "new" Dia Art Foundation, the Dia Center for the Arts.
Fig. 2. Map of Marfa, drawn by Judd, c. 1987.
Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.
Fig. 3. Map of Texas, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. 
Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Dia Takes Over The Marfa Project

The most ambitious and expensive project undertaken by the Dia was the “Marfa project,” ideated by Judd and partially installed in southwest Texas. As noted, Judd had been working on the Block since 1973 and intended it to be a permanent exhibition space, housing works by himself and other artists, scaled to fit their interior or exterior settings. When the Dia expressed interest in Judd’s work at Marfa, the scope of the project changed
considerably. During a visit with Judd in Marfa in 1978, Friedrich was impressed by the ambition and scope of Judd’s project, and by how much had been completed between 1973-1978. Friedrich had been handling Judd’s work in Europe and New York for about ten years before approaching him with the prospect of Dia funding, but by 1979, the Dia had committed not only to funding the Marfa project but to making it their largest and most expensive endeavor. The Marfa project was to serve as the Dia’s flagship; it was intended to be the prototype for all one-man projects to come. Between 1979-1984, the Dia invested over $5 million dollars into the Marfa project.

Marfa is located in roughly two hundred miles southeast of El Paso and sixty miles north of the Texas/Mexico border and serves as the seat of Presidio county (figs. 2 & 3). It lies northwest of Big Bend State Park amidst mountainous desertland along an otherwise empty stretch of Texas State Highway 90. Marfa was settled in the 1880’s by cattle ranchers and workers on the Southern Pacific Railroad whose line passed through the town. Its name comes from Marfa Ignatievna Kutuzov, a maid in Fyodor Dostoevsky’s *The Brothers Karamazov*, whose character deeply impressed the wife of one of the town’s settling ranchers. Marfa is also home of the “Marfa lights,” mysterious lights east of the Chinati Mountains with an unexplainable source whose earliest reports date before the town.

---

47 This exact number of years Judd was handled by Friedrich prior to the Dia is uncertain. Friedrich had represented many Minimalist artists, including Judd, starting in the late 1960’s in his galleries in Munich, Cologne, and New York, yet Judd was represented primarily in New York by Leo Castelli. Friedrich later began showing Judd more prominently in his galleries in group shows and solo exhibitions: *18 Skulpturen 1972-1973*, Galerie Heiner Friedrich, Munich (1973) and Cologne (1974); *An Exhibition For the War Resisters League*, Heiner Friedrich Gallery, New York (1975); *Donald Judd*, Heiner Friedrich Gallery, New York and Cologne (1977); *Donald Judd*, Heiner Friedrich Gallery, New York and Munich (1978); *Donald Judd*, Galerie Heiner Friedrich, Cologne (1979).

Count Giuseppe Panza di Biumo was one of Friedrich’s major collectors who heavily patronized his galleries and began taking an interest in Judd’s work around 1970. The majority of Panza’s collection of Judd’s work was sold to him by Leo Castelli, although it can be assumed that some of Judd’s work during 1970-1976 was probably sold to him by Friedrich and certainly works from 1977-1979 when Friedrich held solo shows of Judd’s work. Following the decentralization of the Dia Art Foundation in 1985, a sale was made by Friedrich to Panza of several drawings and plans of work to be executed by Judd. Judd had donated these works to the Dia (they had initially commissioned the drawings and Judd had recovered them in negotiations) in order for them to be sold and the profits used to benefit another Dia artist, Robert Whitman, who had not been able to secure a financial settlement from the Dia. Later, these works were created without Judd’s permission by Panza and became part of an enormous controversy surrounding Panza, Judd and a $32 million purchase of works by the Guggenheim Museum. For more information regarding the relationship of Panza and Friedrich, see Judd, “Una Stanza Per Panza,” parts 1-4.
was settled. For over one hundred years people have searched for the source of the lights (there are at least two) which appear every night and glow with the intensity of a star. Some witnesses report that the lights move, split, and blink on and off, and some viewers claim to have been chased by the lights while on foot or horseback. The Marfa lights were a topic on the television series Unsolved Mysteries (1989) and have recently been the subject of an investigation by a scientific team from Japan. The movie Giant (1956) was also filmed in Marfa, and the dilapidated facade of the movie’s fictional mansion stands today as a monument to Hollywood’s vision of West Texas. Recently, Marfa has been unfavorably portrayed on a television news magazine, 60 Minutes (1991), and in a 1992 PBS documentary for its role as a significant transportation hub in Mexico-United States drug trafficking.

As previously mentioned, Judd first visited the area in 1946 while traveling from Alabama to California where he was to be shipped out for the Korean War. Twenty-five years later, while living in New York City, Judd returned to Texas looking for a summer vacation house for his family and to place permanent installations of his work in a space outside of the traditional museum environment. After rejecting sites in California, New Mexico, and Arizona, Judd rediscovered the severe landscapes and wide-open spaces of Texas, and chose Marfa over other nearby towns. Alpine, Presidio, and Marathon, Texas, were also strong contenders, but ultimately were not chosen for various reasons. In Marfa, Judd found a small Texas town with a colorful past and an abundance of affordable, available real estate.

In 1979 the Dia purchased buildings in Marfa intended to house Judd’s and other artist’s work: the Wool and Mohair Building and a portion of Fort D. A. Russell. Over the next two years the Dia bought the remainder of the fort, 340 acres of its adjoining property, and 640 acres fifty miles south of Marfa overlooking the Rio Grande River and the

---

48 “Welcome to Marfa,” Holiday Capri Inn guide to the town.

49 David Dillon, “A Sculptor Driven by a Powerful Vision...,” The Dallas Morning News, February 12, 1989, late edition, pg. 1C. He writes, “Judd first saw Marfa in 1946... [H]e returned to the Pecos region of southwest Texas only to find Alpine too big, Marathon too impoverished, and Presidio too seedy. He ended up in Marfa.”
mountains of Mexico. The Dia spent well over $2 million dollars between 1979-1981 on the Marfa project, primarily on real estate and Judd's compensation.

The original contract between the Dia and Judd centered around an expansion of Judd's current work with the eventual inclusion of other artists, all to be permanently housed and maintained in Marfa. Specifically, Judd was commissioned to produce twenty-five mill aluminum boxes with the same exterior dimensions but different interior configurations, two fifteen-foot stainless steel floor pieces, thirteen twenty-foot horizontal aluminum wall pieces, three vertical metal wall pieces, and a series of fifteen concrete structures of unspecified size to be completed at a later date. Of these commissioned works all were produced yet only the mill aluminum boxes and the concrete groups were installed; the remaining works are stored in warehouses in Marfa.

Problems Between Judd And The Dia

Judd designed the fifteen concrete works to be located along a half-mile stretch in the southwest corner of Fort D. A. Russell, where they are placed today. He had intended to install some of his works at the Wool and Mohair Building and on the tract of land fifty miles outside of Marfa, yet it was never done. Judd had designed a massive adobe structure to be constructed at the location outside of Marfa, but the Dia refused funding for this aspect of the project primarily due to its location. Friedrich ultimately decided that Judd's mill aluminum pieces would be housed at Fort D. A. Russell, citing that the location out of town was "in some place that no one could get to." Judd disagreed with this decision but felt that the location might work if new buildings were constructed specifically to house the works. This, too, was refused by the Dia and Judd was asked to redesign and rebuild the artillery sheds and the equestrian Arena (formerly the gymnasium of the fort) to house the mill aluminum boxes and some of his wall pieces, respectively. Judd agreed, yet only the mill aluminum boxes were installed. Friedrich later used the Wool and Mohair Building to house a large number of works by John Chamberlain, and six of the barracks at Fort D. A. Russell were designated for Dan Flavin's series of fluorescent lights. Judd

---

commented on the condition of the fort before the renovations:

... Most of Fort Russell was a ruin. Other than the two artillery sheds and later the Arena, I was against buying it. It had been an army base, which is not so good. Most of the buildings were without roofs, there was trash everywhere and the land was damaged. Some of the barracks had been turned into kitsch apartments with compatible landscaping. Military landscape overlain with a landscape of consumer kitsch is hard to defeat. At any rate, the artillery sheds were concrete and solid, although they leaked.\(^{51}\)

The relationship between Friedrich and Judd and, consequently, the Dia and Judd was strained due to progressive dissimilarities in their visions of the Marfa project. In the beginning, their common bond was a dissatisfaction with the gallery-museum options for an artist, and their desire to escape that system. This made them adequate business partners in the beginning yet, as their project progressed, it became clear the Judd and Friedrich embraced different ideologies and visions for the Marfa project and the means by which it would be realized.

In 1980, one year into Judd and the Dia’s working relationship, Judd was compelled to take extreme action to ensure his position of control over the Marfa project. He proposed that his monthly salary be increased and that the Dia pay for an expansion of the mill aluminum series and threatened abandonment of the project if the Dia refused. The request for increased compensation was caused by his extensive redesigning of parts of Fort D. A. Russell, something Judd considered beyond the scope of the original contract. The Dia conceded to these demands and granted Judd nearly $400,000 for increased pay and the commission of an additional seventy-five mill aluminum boxes.\(^{52}\)

In 1981, Judd had contracts drawn up by his law firm in New York which specified

---


\(^{52}\) Ennis, “A Tale Of Men And Monuments,” January 26, 1985, pg. 12. The mill aluminum boxes were billed at $5000 each; Judd’s salary was raised to $16,000 a month through 1982, $17,500 a month through 1984.
in great detail what he agreed to do for the project and restated the 1980 requests; all terms were agreed upon by the Dia. His role as artist, architect and supervisor of the Marfa project as well as additional works to be installed were established. The specifics for the concrete works were established as well: fifteen groups of concrete structures measuring 2.5 x 2.5 x 5 meters with no less than two structures per group, all to be realized under the supervision of Robert Kirk. Other works specified for installation were twenty-two of Chamberlain’s crushed car sculptures at the Wool and Mohair Building, redesign and renovation of the Wool and Mohair building by Judd, Flavin’s fluorescent light works in six barracks at Fort D. A. Russell, and redesign and renovation of the barracks to house the Flavin works by Judd. All of these works were to be perpetually exhibited, owned, and maintained by the Dia.
Chapter III

“Everything is in motion, art must be motionless.”

-Ad Reinhardt

Art Commissioned By The Dia: One Hundred Mill Aluminum Boxes

Prior to the Marfa project Judd had been experimenting with the concept of serial imagery in plywood boxes with identical exterior dimensions but differing interior configurations. It is clear that these experimentations were precursors to Judd’s expanded series of one-hundred mill aluminum boxes at Marfa and are likely to be a direct result of his desire for site-specificity and permanent installation of his work (figs. 4-6). Judd’s use of plywood may have been more practical than aesthetic as it was readily available and inexpensive which allowed for greater experimentation than other industrial materials. The extent of this experimentation was a series of fifteen plywood boxes exhibited in 1977 at Heiner Friedrich Gallery, which he had been working on since 1973. This 1977 series was compared to the varying impressions of human beings, “the condition of being at once as similar and as different as possible.” This seems equally applicable to the one hundred mill aluminum boxes at Marfa.

The easiest way to comprehensively describe the boxes is to categorize them into “families,” as in boxes with one open side, two open sides, and so forth. In this way, design patterns will emerge and placement guides may be seen (apps. A & B; figs. 7-14).

---

53 Judd cited this comment as being influential to him: “In Marfa, the sober, functional architecture, the art and the furniture are a whole that cannot be separated, a kind of gesamtkunstwerk. First of all, I wanted to install my own works for eternity. I quote my colleague Ad Reinhardt: ‘Everything is in motion, art must be motionless.’” Judd, “Dutch Interview,” unpublished, pg. 3.

54 Haskell, Donald Judd, pg. 104.

Fig. 4. Judd, "Untitled," 1974. Plywood. 36 x 60 x 60 in. Collection of the Art Museum of South Texas, Corpus Christi.

Fig. 5. Judd, "Untitled," 1974. Plywood. 36 x 60 x 60 in. Collection of the artist.
Fig. 6. Judd, "Untitled," 1978. Plywood. 19 1/2 x 45 x 30 1/2 in. Collection of the artist.

Fig. 7. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #75) 1980-1984. Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.
Fig. 8. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #34) 1980-1984. Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 9. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #12) 1980-1984. Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.
Fig. 10. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #88) 1980-1984. Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 11. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #9) 1980-1984. Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.
Fig. 12. Judd, "Untitled," (Box #6) 1980-1984. Mill aluminum. 41 x 51 x 72 in.

Fig. 13. Interior of the south artillery shed, facing north.
Figure 14. Description of the One Hundred Mill Aluminum Boxes

**Constants:**
1. External measurements of all boxes are 41 x 51 x 72 inches.
2. The thickness of all interior and exterior planes is approximately .5 inches (1 cm).
3. When two sides are open, they are always facing one another (E and W may be open on one box, but never E and N).
4. When two planes are used in the interior, they are always 4.25 inches apart and always parallel to each other.

**Description of the Boxes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Box Numbers (see Appendix A):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no open sides, one recessed\textsuperscript{A} side</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no open sides, two recessed\textsuperscript{A} sides</td>
<td>7, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no open sides, four recessed\textsuperscript{A} sides</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 side open</td>
<td>97, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 side open, additional\textsuperscript{B} recessed\textsuperscript{A} 1/2 plane</td>
<td>5, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side</td>
<td>17, 69, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, one bisecting\textsuperscript{C} plane</td>
<td>13, 22, 85, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, two bisecting\textsuperscript{C} planes</td>
<td>36, 59, 86, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, one short\textsuperscript{D} diagonal plane</td>
<td>40, 49, 58, 63, 76, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, two short\textsuperscript{D} diagonal planes</td>
<td>41, 43, 54, 55, 84, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, one long\textsuperscript{E} diagonal plane</td>
<td>8, 25, 35, 44, 61, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, two long\textsuperscript{E} diagonal planes</td>
<td>11, 16, 28, 31, 65, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, one covering\textsuperscript{F} diagonal plane</td>
<td>62, 71, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, one bent\textsuperscript{G} diagonal plane</td>
<td>1, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one + 1/2 sides open</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one + 1/2 sides open, additional\textsuperscript{B} recessed\textsuperscript{A} 1/2 plane</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one + 1/2 sides open, one bisecting\textsuperscript{C} plane</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides</td>
<td>67, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, one bisecting(^{C}) plane</td>
<td>15, 23, 27, 48, 56, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, two bisecting(^{C}) planes</td>
<td>12, 46, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, one short(^{D}) diagonal plane</td>
<td>24, 29, 33, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, two short(^{D}) diagonal planes</td>
<td>19, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, one long(^{E}) diagonal plane</td>
<td>21, 45, 50, 57, 64, 79, 80, 83, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, two long(^{E}) diagonal planes</td>
<td>10, 14, 18, 20, 26, 32, 47, 51, 52, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two open sides, one covering(^{F}) diagonal plane</td>
<td>30, 42, 60, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no open sides, elevated(^{H}) lid</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, elevated(^{H}) lid</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one open side, floating(^{I}) lid</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box within a box, two open outer sides, no open inner box sides</td>
<td>34, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box within a box, two open outer sides, two open inner box sides</td>
<td>9, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box within a box, one open outer side, no open inner box sides</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box within a box, one open outer side, one open inner box side</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

A=4.25 inches (10 cm).
B=plane is 4.25 inches (10 cm) from the exterior, directly parallel with facing plane.
C=horizontal or vertical.
D=half-size planes; they only cover 1/2 the length or width of the interior.
E=covers interior less approximately 4 inches (10 cm).
F=covers interior completely.
G=covers interior completely by bending corners up and down; the plane in the interior would not be the same size as the open top, rather it would be an asymmetrical shape.
H=lid rests on a pedestal 4.25 inches (10 cm) from the subsequent plane.
I=there is a 4.25 inch (10 cm) gap around the entire lid.
Figure 15. Detail of Screws in the Construction of the Mill Aluminum Boxes.

Original 25 Boxes

Eleven screws along length, zero, two, or four times per box

Nine screws along width, zero or two times per box

(No screws along height)

Later 75 Boxes

Four screws along height, zero, two, or four times per box

Five screws along width, zero or two times per box

Six screws along length, zero or two times per box

Notes:
1. Drawings not to scale.
2. Screws visible from external sides only.
3. Screw heads measure approximately .25 inch (1 cm) in diameter.
4. Other construction methods of boxes (not visible from exterior) include pins, welding, and brackets.
Each of the one hundred boxes were manufactured at the Lippincott Foundry in Connecticut and shipped to Marfa where they were assembled. The edges and the finish of each box are identical, yet their fastenings are different. In the first series of twenty-five boxes, Judd designed the sides to be affixed with nine screws along the width, only on the top (zero or two times per box); eleven screws along the length, both on the top and the bottom of each side (zero, two, or four times per box); no visible screws along the height. In the later seventy-five boxes, Judd used five screws along the width, only on the top (zero or two times per box); six along the length, only on the top (zero or two times per box); and four for the height (zero, two, or four times per box) (fig. 15). The reason for this change appears to be aesthetic rather than structural because of his shift from more to fewer supports. This decision appears to have been unfortunate for today, ten years after the completion of the series, some of the boxes with fewer screws are beginning to bow slightly from the unsupported weight, some of their planes noticeably separate, generally not aging as well as those with more supports.

Regardless of the number of screws used, the edges of each of the boxes are sharp, fitting precisely against each other, giving the appearance of being manufactured totally without human involvement. This is in accordance with Judd’s belief that he is an Empiricist, rather than a Minimalist, distilling his specific objects down to their most elementary level using only the most necessary exterior embellishments, such as the fastening screws. The fact that they do not seem man-made, though common sense dictates otherwise, may explain why many art critics try to infuse these works with humanistic characteristics in order to make sense of their appearance. Barbara Haskell describes them as “evoking the majesterial presence of hushed sentinels,” while to

---

56 The Lippincott Foundry was opened in 1966 by Donald Lippincott and Roxanne Everett, devoted entirely to the manufacture of sculpture. The fabricators there were not artists themselves, but were encouraged to be sensitive to the artists’ needs and work closely with the sculptors and engineers of large-scale works fabricated in industrial materials. “Lippincott was felt to be ‘more a communal studio than a factory,’ since it resembled the traditional studio workshop. It was the answer to many sculptors’ practical and economic problems.” Colpitt, *Minimal Art: The Critical Perspective*, pgs. 17-18.

57 Haskell, *Donald Judd*, pg. 123.
Michael Ennis they appear "like some enormously complex futuristic calendar."\textsuperscript{58}

Each box varies distinctively from the others in its interior design. Yve-Alain Bois noted in a 1991 catalogue for an exhibition of Judd's work at the Pace Gallery in New York that when:

Confronted with 100 parallelepipeds at Marfa, each of them occupying the same amount of space, the first thing that inevitably strikes you is what differentiates them, namely their negative volumes. ...what is being sculpted here, is, first and foremost, negative space...\textsuperscript{59}

Judd's extensive variety of negative spaces in his boxes at Marfa ranges from the simple, such as a box with one open side, to the complex, such as a box with two open sides appearing to float without visible support within the exterior. Judd sought to maintain the perception of each individual work as a whole, versus one work comprised of one hundred units. This is contrary to some of his early sculpture, such as stacks and progressions, in which several unconnected parts were intended to be seen as a singular unit. However, the impact of viewing these boxes, forty-eight and fifty-two at a time, seems to charge their presence with a strength that would be comparatively reduced if viewed separately, one at a time.

To assist the reading of each box as an individual work in itself, Judd desired the spectator to view the boxes from several different angles, walk completely around them, and experience their individuality through shifts in perception. Judd's intended reading of the boxes is related to phenomenological studies conducted by the French philosopher, Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Generally, phenomenology is the study of the difference between what something is known to be and the way in which it appears to the viewer. As proof, Merleau-Ponty offers a discussion about varying perspectives of a house where one can view the house from countless angles, all appearing differently and all being equally valid, yet its true identity is the compilation of all these views: the house seen from

\textsuperscript{58} Ennis, "A Tale Of Men And Monuments," January 12, 1985, pg. 2.

\textsuperscript{59} The Pace Gallery, text by Bois, "The Inflection," n.p.
everywhere. Thus, comprehending the physicality of the object comes both from previous encounters with the object and understanding the nature of shifting perspective.

Robert Morris, while formulating the concepts of Gestalt theory, stated, "...in the simpler polyhedrons such as cubes and pyramids one need not move around the object for the sense of the whole, the gestalt, to occur," that the form is completely given at once from any particular vantage point. While some of Judd's earlier three-dimensional works may have gestalt, this is not applicable to the mill aluminum boxes because the entire configuration of the work is not immediately recognized from any given perspective. Morris also added, "[I]here are two distinct terms: the known constant and the experienced variable," which relates to Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology studies. This is relevant to the boxes as the form, a rectangle, is immediately readable upon encounter with the object; again, the work that may be contained within is not necessarily obvious to the viewer from all angles.

The surface treatment of each of the mill aluminum boxes reflects the mechanical smoothness and precision of an industrially manufactured work of art. Consequently, this may cause a hindrance to the viewer's reading of the object by confusing the eye when the surface appears reflective or unfavorably lit, thereby disallowing the object to clearly reveal itself. Critics' impressions of these works echo this and tend to ascribe transcendental qualities to the boxes: "Surfaces seem to expand with light and the works seem almost to hover above the floor;" "At certain times, seen from certain angles, the material in some of these solids is visually transposed, suddenly seeming as if it were made of transparent plexiglass." Judd's decision to use a reflective surface which would respond to the natural, changing light of the day, such as that afforded by the mill aluminum, also reveals

---

61 Morris, "Notes on Sculpture, part one," pg. 44.
62 Morris, "Notes on Sculpture, part two," *Artsforum*, vol. 5, no. 2 (Los Angeles, October 1966), pg. 21.
64 The Pace Gallery, text by Bois, "The Inflection," n.p.
his desire to infuse his work with a "spirituality" by giving light and, thus, life to his boxes.65

Fig. 16. Detail of "mill marks" on exterior plane of mill aluminum box.

The term "finish fetish" was popular in the 1960's for art critics to describe what they considered to be an exaggerated concentration on the surface of the object, usually applied to works employing high-gloss, "modern," industrial finishes, such as car paint or plastic, and was generally reserved for works coming from the West Coast.66 Judd could be accused of "fetishizing" the finish of his works, with an apparent concentration on the effect of such a premeditated surface. In fact, the surfaces of these works are so delicate that even when exposed to body oils such as those found in a fingertip, they begin to

65 Judd, "Dutch Interview," unpublished, pg. 2. See frontispiece for the entire quote.
66 Krauss indirectly accuses Judd of "finish fetish" in "Sculpture in the Expanded Field," pg. 278: "Never mind that Gabo's celluloid was the sign of lucidity and intellection, while Judd's plastic-tinged-with-dayglo spoke the hip patois of California."
deteriorate. One fingerprint on a box can be seen from several feet away, and Judd keeps a sample square of fingerprint-laden mill aluminum for those who absolutely must touch. The distracting appearance of “mill marks,” or long scratches and blemishes caused by the milling process and which are both unavoidable and unremovable (figs. 16 & 17) cast doubt on an accusation of “finish fetish”. These mill marks are whitish in color and span the length or width of every plane used in the construction of the boxes. Although it is apparent that for Judd the finish of the works is crucial to their reception, he is not obsessed with perfectly reflective or smoothly finished surfaces.

![Fig. 17. Detail of “mill marks” on interior plane of mill aluminum box.](image)

Aesthetic factors notwithstanding, Judd’s choice of material for the boxes may come from the fact that mill aluminum does not bulge or warp when heated or manipulated and therefore would allow him to pin and fasten the planes in any fashion without being evidenced on the surface.⁶⁷ In this way, Judd could pin planes to make them appear as if

---

⁶⁷ S. J. Gaido III, engineer extraordinaire.
they were floating or suspended within the box. By doing this, Judd pushed the metal farther than gravity would allow for today pins are visible where the planes of some of the boxes are separating. Judd’s choice of mill aluminum for the construction of works in a permanent installation is both somewhat puzzling and inappropriate due to the instability of the material. The reasons behind the use of mill aluminum versus an aesthetically similar and more stable material, such as stainless steel, are unknown.\footnote{The use of mill aluminum seems highly inappropriate because it is an instable material that must be handled cautiously, if at all, and does not age well. And, it does not appear from any of Judd’s work or writings that he was ever interested in depicting the way an object deteriorates as it ages, rather he seemed quite preoccupied with precision and permanence. With this in mind, it is very difficult to understand why Judd chose mill aluminum as the material of choice for what should be a permanent monument to himself and his philosophies. One theory regarding this was mentioned in a conversation with Bob Tiemann around October 1989: Tiemann considered Judd’s choice of an instable material for a permanent monument as attempting control over life and, conversely, death. His opinion was that Judd had a fear of death; by controlling an instable material, Judd would feel enabled to control and thereby deter death.}

As previously mentioned, Judd’s experimentation with serial imagery started around 1973 with a series of fifteen plywood boxes containing differing interior configurations. Judd possibly began using plywood for experiments in serial imagery for economic reasons: plywood was inexpensive and readily available and the material was also easy to manipulate, meaning that the boxes could be assembled in the studio and did not necessitate the use of a foundry. Yet, the question arises as to why Judd shifted from the single, anonymous box, frequently unencumbered by interior design, to multiple boxes with changing, independent interiors creating a specific identity or “personality” for each. On this topic, Judd’s writings prove to be more confounding and even contradictory than elucidating as to why he made the change.\footnote{Specifically, see Judd’s previously cited comments from “Specific Objects,” Complete Writings 1959-1975, pg. 187: “It isn’t necessary for a work to have a lot of things to look at, to compare, to analyze one by one, to contemplate. The thing as a whole, its quality as whole, is what is interesting. The main things are alone and are more intense, clear and powerful. They are not diluted by an inherited format, variations of form, mild contrasts and connecting parts and areas.”} One possible explanation for this shift from less to more personalization is that Judd, from 1973 to his death in 1994, was ferreting out ideas for a permanent installation, or monument, to stand as a marker to his existence. Morris’s demand that the “new sculpture” be devoid of separate parts or detail was to avoid entanglement in internal relationships which would allow for an emotional reading of the
works; this was required of sculpture as a means of "avoiding intimacy" at all costs.\textsuperscript{36} Judd had already begun work in Marfa at this time and it is likely that he wanted to express himself in a more personal, intimate manner, albeit somewhat veiled, through the one hundred mill aluminum boxes with changing interiors versus, for example, one hundred identical, impersonal, and unchanging boxes with no humanistic references whatsoever. The plywood experiments can be seen as Judd's quest for a more personal expression of himself through a shift in style than an anonymous, impersonal box could provide him.

\textbf{Fifteen Concrete Groups}

The fifteen concrete groups in Marfa are somewhat easier to decipher than the mill aluminum boxes because of their similarity to Judd's earlier works, although not immune to the colorful imagination of art critics. They have been rather contradictorily described as "information-age megaliths intentionally designed to give no information"\textsuperscript{71} and as "exud[ing] an unpretentious grandeur and monumentality that recalled the heroic markers of archaic civilizations."\textsuperscript{72} Made and assembled in Marfa at the old Marfa Ice Plant and installed along a one-kilometer span of Fort D. A. Russell, the works progress north to south from less to more complex configurations (app. C; figs. 18-27). The first five groups were made under the supervision of Robert Kirk whom Judd eventually fired for producing unsatisfactory works. The difference in construction between the first five and the later ten can be seen by the improved surface treatment, edges, and aging of the latter. The first five groups are suffering from multiple stress fractures in the concrete and noticeable bowing in the upper planes. As the bowing in the upper planes increase, the sides are unable to meet with the top panel, and the edges are subsequently gaping. The construction of the first five groups is also apparent in many of the individual structures: composite stone used as a base faced with more refined and, assumedly, more expensive concrete (fig. 28), molded in place by pressing large slabs of plywood against the surface.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{36} Anna Chave, "Minimalism and the Rhetoric of Power," \textit{Arts} magazine vol. 64, no. 4 (New York, January 1990), pg. 57.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{71} Michael Ennis, "A Tale Of Men And Monuments," January 12, 1985, pg. 2.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{72} Haskell, \textit{Donald Judd}, pg. 124.}
(fig. 29) and then pinned together. In the later works no such construction marks are visible.

Fig. 18. Judd, "Untitled," (detail of Group #14) 1982-1984. Concrete. Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).
Fig. 19. Judd, "Untitled," (Group #14) 1982-1984. Concrete.
Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 20. Judd, "Untitled," (Group #9) 1982-1984. Concrete.
Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).
Fig. 21. Judd, "Untitled," (Group #10) 1982-1984. Concrete.
Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 22. Judd, "Untitled," (detail of Group #3) 1982-1984. Concrete.
Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).
Fig. 23. Judd, "Untitled," (Group #3) 1982-1984. Concrete.
Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).

Fig. 24. Judd, "Untitled," (detail of Group #12) 1982-1984. Concrete.
Each structure 98 1/2 x 98 1/2 x 197 in. (2.5 x 2.5 x 5 m).
Fig. 25. Concrete groups with indigenous Texas pronghorn antelope, facing northeast.

Fig. 26. Concrete groups, facing southwest.
Figure 27. Description of the Fifteen Concrete Groups

Constants:
1. All concrete structures measure 98.5 x 98.5 x 197 inches, or 2.5 x 2.5 x 5 meters.
2. The thickness of each slab measures approximately 10 inches (25 cm).
3. All structures have at least one side open but no more than two open sides.
4. When two sides are open, they are always facing each other (E and W may be open in the same structure, but never E and N).

Description of the Concrete Groups, North to South:
1. Two structures aligned widthwise E-W; widths open on each except E on W structure.
2. Three structures arranged in triangle with base to S; widths open on all.
3. Three structures arranged in triangle with base to S; lengths open on all.
4. Five structures arranged at 90° angle, three E-W and three N-S; widths open on all except pivotal structure where only W width is open.
5. Three structures arranged in triangle with base to S; outer lengths open on all.
6. Four structures arranged with three touching lengthwise and one touching along two closed widths; all widths open except two touched by fourth structure.
7. Three structures aligned lengthwise E-W; all lengths open except E on middle structure.
8. Three structures arranged in triangle with base to S; inner lengths open on all.
9. Three structures arranged 120° from each other; outer widths open on all.
10. Four structures aligned in two rows lengthwise, N-S, as though a row is missing from the center; lengths open on all.
11. Three structures arranged 120° from each other; inner widths open on all.
12. Six structures aligned lengthwise N-S; E widths open on all.
13. Six structures aligned in two rows of three widthwise, N-S, with first box of W row begun at midpoint of first box of E row (versus parallel to each other); lengths open on all of E row, E lengths open on all of W row.
14. Six structures aligned in two rows of three widthwise, lengths open on all of E row, widths open on all of W row.
15. Six structures arranged touching into one large rectangle; lengths open on all.

Notes:
A=unless otherwise noted, none of the structures touch each other; the space between each structure varies with configuration.
Fig. 28. Detail of surface of early concrete structure.

Fig. 29. Detail of surface of early concrete structure with visible plywood patternning.
The configuration of the concrete groups changes with the viewer's perspective. The composition of each group is frequently legible by viewing an open side of a structure at an angle through to its rear members. The majority of open sides face Fort D. A. Russell while the closed sides face Texas State Highway 67, running between Marfa and Presidio. While there is no singular viewing point to comprehend the configuration of all of the works at once, the Fort Russell side seems to be preferable.

The construction of the concrete structures pales in comparison to the precision of the mill aluminum boxes; the difference in materials is primarily responsible although execution and design also play a role. Many of the concrete structures suffer today from poor engineering in which unsupported weight damages the work because of improper mass distribution. The upright short ends of a structure, each one-half the length of the long sides, are incapable of properly supporting or distributing the weight of the suspended side which has caused bowing and stress fractures. The mill aluminum boxes are on a much tighter ratio of length to height, 1:1.4, and are therefore better able to withstand the tendency to bow. Year-round exposure to the elements, with temperatures over 100°F in the summer and below freezing in the winter, has also contributed to the aging process.

The concrete groups in Marfa represent the largest sculptures ever created by Judd. Judd's previous works were generally smaller than human scale and were usually able to fit comfortably within a gallery space. Judd expanded the size of these works in order to scale them to fit their outdoor placement which, in turn, increased their visibility for several miles. By enlarging the size of these objects, Judd infused the concrete works with an element of power that had been present but not dominant in smaller sculptures. The power of the concrete structures is expressed through Judd's choice of material and size of the works as well as the austerity of their appearance and the obvious control necessary for their construction. Considering their generous size and mass, these works have the power to injure or kill the viewer if a structure were to collapse. This further expression of power, specifically physical power, works in conjunction with previously mentioned elements of psychological power expressed throughout the installation.
Fig. 30. Judd, "Untitled," (Stack) date unknown.
Installed at The Block, Marfa, Texas. Collection of the artist.

The concrete groups in Marfa share much in common with Judd’s stacks and progressions of the 1960’s and ’70’s. In the stacks and progressions and, later, the concrete groups, Judd presented the viewer with several components usually installed physically apart from each other but intended to be viewed as a single, complete work (fig. 30). The stacks and progressions were frequently composed of four to twelve units placed in a specific mathematical relationship to the floor, ceiling, and each other. This same trend
is seen in the placement of the two to six concrete structures to make one group, as in his early usage of multiple units to create a singular whole.

Judd also appropriated a visual lexicon similar to the stacks and progressions for the concrete groups. For example, Judd can be seen as translating a vertical stack directly into concrete group number twelve with a shift from wall to ground placement, the inclusion of open sides, and a reduced number of components. Group seven is a stack translated similarly, also shifting from wall to ground placement, using fewer components, and having minor aesthetic adjustments. Groups thirteen and fourteen can be read as four rows (two rows each) of translated progressions with fewer components, wall to ground placement, and alternating open sides. Group four can be seen as an attempt to combine both a stack and progression. Whereas the similarities in configuration are apparent upon critical examination, it is likely that it was not Judd's intention to design the concrete groups with such an overt reference to his early works. Rather, Judd was concerned with spatial relationships between the works and their environment:

I found that if I placed a work on a wall or on the ground, I wondered where it was. I found that if I placed a work on a wall in relation to a corner or to both corners, or similarly on the floor, or outdoors near a change in the surface of the ground, that by adjusting the distance the space in between became much more clear than before, definite, like the work. If the space in one or two directions can become clear, it's logical to desire the space in all directions to become clear. This usually requires more than a unit or it requires a space built around a unit or it requires the amplification of a unit to an enclosure containing a great deal of space. This is so of some large indoor works and of most large outdoor ones. Works outdoors, then, are either free-standing on a level surface, containing space within, or incorporate a level or a sloped surface or relate to an existing wall or demarcation. Some of the free-standing works outdoors are: [...] [...and] the fifteen works in concrete at the Chinati Foundation in Texas. These are on level land, but
specifically, so as to avoid one protruding knoll and to end before another, extending one kilometer, aligned north to south. They were built on damaged land.\(^7\)

Also related to the stacks and progressions and evidenced in the concrete works is Judd’s usage of mathematics to determine the layout of the units. Usually, a stack or progression would be composed of numerous units, with identical measurements, placed equal distances from the ceiling, floor, and each other, but occasionally Judd would produce a work which either increased or diminished incrementally in either proportionately or using the Fibonacci series. In both of these placements, equidistant and variable, a continuation of the series can be imagined *ad infinitum* due to both their reliance upon mathematics for organization and because there is no logical reason why the series should not continue if space allowed. In regards to the latter claim, Judd disagreed and stated,

Geometry and mathematics are human inventions. I use a small, simple portion in my work for my purposes. Four units in a row are only that. They are not part of infinity, either endless or above or within. They are a small, finite order that I am interested in. They are not the turtle that supports the world.\(^4\)

While this may have been Judd’s intention for these works, it is possible to observe a different result.

As noted, the concrete groups progress from less to more complex configurations, with equal spacing between the separate groups, thus allowing the viewer to contemplate how further—or prior—groupings would occur. In this respect, the concrete works differ greatly from the one hundred mill aluminum boxes for two reasons: first, the concrete groups are composed of multiple, not singular, units intended to be seen as a unified whole which both clearly relates them (and not the mill aluminum boxes) to the stacks and

progressions and allows for the possibility of an expanded series by an increase in groups or structures; second, Judd established specific parameters for the construction of the mill aluminum boxes which determined that only a finite number could be constructed, thereby limiting continuation of the series.

The concrete groups and the mill aluminum boxes are also contrasted by their intended housing which is expressed clearly through their respective sizes and construction materials. The concrete groups, with each structure measuring 2.5 x 2.5 x 5 meters, are relatively too large to be housed inside and therefore necessitate an outdoor location. And, while the use of concrete as the construction material does not determine the works' location, it does serve to assist the necessity for the works to be located out-of-doors. Conversely, the use of mill aluminum in the construction of the one hundred boxes forced their interior setting, as the material is too instable to survive without considerable protection. While the size of the mill aluminum boxes do not require them to be housed indoors, they are benefited by a determined, closed environment.75

As with the mill aluminum boxes, the individual concrete structures and collective groups are not always immediately legible from a singular perspective. Although the preferred viewing point to see all fifteen works at once appears to be from Fort Russell, these works demand that the viewer walk through them to discover structures or open sides that are obscured at certain angles. For example, it would be difficult to determine the exact configuration of concrete groups one, four, eight, ten, eleven, or fourteen because of the closed sides facing the fort, and the arrangement of group six would be hidden altogether.

75 Three works in particular designed by Judd can be seen as falling between the two extremes of the concrete groups and the mill aluminum boxes, and their determining features, in varying degrees. First, an untitled work from 1971 and permanently installed out-of-doors in St. Louis, Missouri at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pulitzer, Jr. superficially resembles the mill aluminum boxes but is larger (inner box: 54 x 81 x 129 in.) and is constructed of stainless steel. This work necessitates a specific, outdoor setting because it is built according to the slope of the land. Second, an untitled work comprised of three concrete structures from 1984 installed out-of-doors at Laumeier Sculpture Park, also in St. Louis, is similar to concrete group number seven in Marfa but smaller (8'3" x 8'2" x 41 in). As with the concrete groups in Marfa, the use of concrete did not determine the interior or exterior location of the work but rather served to assist its exterior placement, and this work is small enough to be housed indoors if necessary. Third, an untitled work of 1984 at the Kröller-Müller Museum in Otterlo, comprised of six cubes made of chipboard, each measuring 259 x 259 x 259 cm, is located indoors due to construction material although its size would probably have dictated an outdoors setting.
The viewer must walk through the entire one kilometer installation to determine the components of the individual groups as well as to comprehend the entire installation. In the field the groups are usually only able to be seen two at a time, when a viewer is standing between two of them, because almost all are positioned to prevent further viewing or contain closed sides between the groups. This choice of positioning and obscured viewing enables the concrete groups to retain an individual identity and be seen as singular works rather than an enormous collective whole.
Chapter IV

"...museum architecture [is] the Antichrist of art."

-Donald Judd

Architecture Commissioned By The Dia: The Artillery Sheds

Judd's role as architect of the Marfa project arose from a childhood interest in it as a career, and was aided by his brief assignment as an engineer in the Army. Although Judd had no formal training in architecture he was commissioned by the Dia to redesign and rebuild many buildings at Fort D. A. Russell and the Wool and Mohair Building in town. Judd's designs were typically spare, with an emphasis on clarity and space, which allowed the works to be uninhibited by their environment. The parsimony and economy of Judd's designs mask an underlying complexity which exists in his architecture as well as his art, and the similarities between the two are readily apparent upon observation. All of the architecture in Marfa was designed towards Judd's personal utopian vision of installing, creating, and living with art--begun with the renovations of the Block in 1973 and, earlier, at 101 Spring Street in New York City--which he worked on throughout his life. The Marfa project, now the Chinati Foundation, comprises the greatest extent of Judd's realized architecture and is invaluable as a visible source of the marriage of his art and his architecture.

Before Judd was able to place any of the one hundred mill aluminum boxes, the artillery sheds had to be redesigned and rebuilt for both aesthetic and practical reasons. The sheds had originally been built in the 1930's, about twenty years after the establishment of the site as an outpost for the Texas Rangers called Camp Marfa. In 1929, Camp Marfa was expanded and named Fort D. A. Russell to house the U. S. Cavalrymen that gave

76 Judd, "Una Stanza Per Panza," unpublished essay, pg. 28.
77 For more information regarding Judd's architecture career, see Judd, "Art and Architecture, 1987," Architektur, pgs. 194-199.
protection along the Texas/Mexico border. During World War II, the fort was manned by mechanized cavalry units and briefly served as a German P.O.W. camp. Judd left one of the original brick walls in the east barrack bearing the ominous inscription "DEN KOPF BENUTZEN IST BESSER ALS IHN VERLIEREN," as a reminder of the fort's final function. In October 1946, the fort was abandoned and left undisturbed for thirty-four years until the Dia and Judd began their work there.\textsuperscript{8}

---

\textsuperscript{74} The Texas Historical Commission installed a commemorative plaque at the entrance to Fort D. A. Russell reading, "Fort D. A. Russell. Originally named Camp Marfa, this installation began as a supply post for U.S. Army Border Patrol stations in 1911. It was a cavalry camp during the years of the Mexican Revolution. Renamed for Civil War General David Allen Russell, it became a permanent army post in 1929. Deactivated at the end of 1933, it was reopened in 1935 with artillery units. During World War II Fort Russell became an army training camp and was home to a chemical warfare battalion as well as German POWs. The fort was officially closed in October 1946."
Fig. 32. Plan for the installations at Fort D. A. Russell, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

The artillery sheds are located along a southern stretch of developed land on the property (figs. 31 & 32). To the north of the artillery sheds are the barracks, the Arena, and other buildings while the fifteen concrete groups are placed amidst sparsely vegetated land to the east. The sheds were originally constructed of brick and concrete with a flat roof and garage doors along the west wall. Judd gutted both buildings and added two
rows of freestanding concrete piers in each structure to define the placement of the boxes and serve as structural supports for the roof (fig. 33). Along the ceiling, Judd affixed concrete crossbeams with projecting ribs extending the length and width of the building; at alternating intersections of the crossbeams running lengthwise a pier projects downwards. He removed the east and west walls and replaced them with windows which extend almost floor to ceiling and run the length of the buildings. These windows are bisected with mullions into four parts with one sliding section in each building which can be opened for ventilation (figs. 34 & 35). The windows are held in place by four-inch aluminum strips, mirroring the material housed within. In 1986, the flat roof was replaced with a Quonset-hut-style corrugated metal roof, equal in height to the bricked exterior below (figs. 36-38).
Judd described the renovations as such:

The buildings, purchased in 79, and the works of art that they contain were planned together as much as possible. The size and nature of the buildings were given. This determined the size and scale of the works. This then determined that there be continuous windows and the size of their divisions. The windows replaced the derelict garage
doors closing the long sides. A sub-division of nine parts, for example, would be too complicated in itself and as bars in front of the works of art, smaller to larger inside, rather than larger outside as part of the facade to smaller inside as part of the sub-division of the interior. The windows are quartered and are made of clear anodized extruded aluminum channel and reinforced glass. One window of each building slides open, which isn’t enough, but the sliding windows were much more expensive. The long parallel planes of the glass facade enclose a long flat space containing the long rows of pieces. The given axis of a building is through its length, but the main axis is through the wide glass facade, through the wide shallow space inside and through the other glass facade. Instead of being long buildings, they become wide and shallow buildings, facing at right angles to their length.

As I mentioned, the flat roofs leaked. In 84 the one hundred mill aluminum pieces in the two buildings were nearly complete and needed greater protection. Since patching the flat roof had been futile, and since insulation was needed, and for architecture, I planned a second roof. In Valentine nearby, thirty miles, there was a large metal storage building, one curve from the ground to the ground, with very deep and broad corrugations, obviously structure itself. Similar vaults were built as the roofs of the two artillery sheds. The height of the curve of the vault is the same as the height of the building. Each building became twice as high, with one long rectangular space below, and one long circular space above. The ends of the vaults were meant to be glass, but were temporarily covered with corrugated iron. With the ends open, the enclosed lengthwise volume is tremendous. This dark and voluminous lengthwise axis is above and congruent with the flat, broad, glass, crosswise axis. The buildings need some furniture and some use for the small enclosed space that is within each one.”

78 Judd, Architektur, pgs. 72-74.
Fig. 35. Exterior of the north artillery shed with four-part windows.

Fig. 36. Exterior of the south artillery shed with roof elevation.
Fig. 37. Exterior of the north artillery shed.

Fig. 38. Exterior of an artillery shed with roof elevation and four-part windows.
The size of the artillery sheds prevented Judd from housing all one hundred of the mill aluminum boxes together. They were split into two groups of fifty-two in the north shed and forty-eight in the south, all placed equidistant from each other and the walls, and occupy the same amount of physical space. In the north shed, Judd placed four boxes in the vestibule created by the outer north wall of the building and the original brick wall bearing the inscriptions ZUTRITT FUER UNBEFUGTE VERBOTEN and DEN KOPF BENUTZEN IST BESSER ALS IHN VERLIEREN (fig. 39). The remaining forty-eight boxes were installed between the two rows of freestanding concrete piers. The view of the whole is obstructed by two brick walls projecting from the midpoint of the east and west walls; they do not meet in the center but halt the visual progression of the two outer aisles.

Fig. 39. Inscription on an original wall in the north artillery shed.

---

69 The inscriptions read, "Access by unauthorized persons forbidden" and "it is better to use your head than to lose it," respectively. The only published mention of these inscriptions by Judd is of the latter, in passing, in "Marfa, Texas" Complete Writings 1973-1986, pg. 99.
Judd's decision to include the German inscriptions within the installation appears to serve two purposes: first, Judd is concerned with retaining the historicity of the site; second, and more importantly, Judd seeks to instill in the viewer allusions to World War II and Nazi Germany. Other Minimalists, namely Walter de Maria and Frank Stella, had referred to Nazism in their work in order to evoke images of power and control. Judd appears to desire the same result, yet his message is the opposite of Stella and de Maria's. Whereas they used imagery and wording which historically had been used to glorify and empower the Third Reich, Judd chose messages inscribed by Nazi captors. The power in Judd's allusions is transferred to the captors who succeed in controlling and disempowering the Nazis. Thus, themes of power and control are still evident in Judd's inscriptions albeit reversed from other artists' usages.

The south artillery shed is constructed similarly to the north, also with a vestibule containing four works. The remaining forty-four boxes are placed between two rows of concrete piers with articulation of the aisles mirroring the pierless north-to-south crossbeams as in the north building. The visual continuity of the three aisles is interrupted by Judd's inclusion of a brick wall projecting floor to ceiling at the midpoint of the building, obscuring the center aisle. Without taking into consideration the vestibules and their boxes, it can be observed that by placing the two sheds end to end without their north and south terminal walls, each of the three aisles would have the same number of boxes visible or obscured, depending on the viewer's positioning. It is conceivable that Judd's

---

81 Chave, "Minimalism and the Rhetoric of Power," pgs. 46-48, 50. Walter de Maria's "Museum Piece" (1966-67), swastika-shaped 3' x 3' aluminum floor piece; some of Frank Stella's "Black Series" paintings: "Reichstag" (1958), referring to the burned Parliament Building used in Hitler's propaganda campaign which helped him become Fuhrer; "Arbeit Macht Frei ("Work Makes You Free")" (1958), the motto inscribed over the gates of Auschwitz; and "Die Fahne Hoch ("The Flag On High")" (1959), the first line of the official marching song of the Nazi party. Chave, attempting to explain possible reasons for usage of Nazi imagery, comments, "A flirtation with extremes of violence can be seen...as appealing most deeply to some of those most insulated from violence by virtue of their race, nationality, and gender." For a more thorough discussion on themes of power and control in Minimalist art, see entire article.

82 Heiner Friedrich's mother was reportedly a member of the National Socialist party (Judd, "Una Stanza Per Panna," unpublished essay, pg. 29) which raises the question as to whether or not Friedrich knew of the inscriptions and what his feelings were about them. It also leads one to consider if these inscriptions were left passive-aggressively by Judd, as his relationship with Friedrich had generally been tenuous from the beginning.
plan for a new structure to house the mill aluminum boxes might have been designed this way.

The Arena

The Arena, originally the gymnasium and later an enclosed equestrian center for the fort, was redesigned in accordance with Judd's new contract with the Dia. Judd envisioned the structure's use as housing for two large horizontal works of his and for large parties and gatherings. In October 1987, Judd initiated what became an annual weekend event and fund raiser for the Chinati Foundation, hosting up to seven hundred people at times.

Fig. 40. Interior of the Arena.
Fig. 41. Interior of the Arena.

Judd removed the original floor of the Arena down to the concrete supports underneath and decided to leave half of it exposed, filled with alternating bands of dirt and concrete (figs. 40 & 41). The other half of the floor was paved with cement to hold tables and chairs and facilitate kitchen usage. The Arena also contains domestic elements such as pantries, washrooms, sinks, a loft built over the kitchen, and a double-sided bed built for
Judd's children. One of Judd's signature revolving door/window constructions was installed at the center of each of the four walls (figs. 42 & 43). Judd also restored the clerestory, an architectural element Judd considered important for the Arena because he saw it as something attempted by the architects during the original construction, but not completed.

Fig. 42. Door/window construction by Judd in the Arena.
In the Arena, as with all his restorations in Marfa, Judd worked to keep the architecture as true to its original plan as the buildings would allow. He did not attempt to recreate the past by renovating his buildings in Marfa, but rather to improve what remained and change the function of the sites. Aside from being a dining hall, the Arena

---

was designated to house traveling and permanent works of art, by Judd and others, and is currently home to an untitled work by David Rabinowitch. Judd described the renovation of the Arena:

As I've said all of Ft. Russell was a wreck, including the building called the Arena. ...The building is called the Arena because when the fort was closed after World War II the gym floor was removed for the scarce wood and sand laid so as to have an indoor area in which to ride horses. When the sand was removed long strips of concrete which had supported the wooden floors became visible, which were fine in themselves. Some concrete was necessary for a floor so a large area was poured toward the kitchen and the bathroom at the south end and a smaller area poured at the north end for working. The two areas comprise half of the total area. The remaining half in between is filled with gravel; the strips remain in both halves. It would have been oppressive to cover the whole floor with concrete. It's a large and beautiful space, due mostly to the ceiling of trusses and the clerestory and to the new floor, with the old lines of concrete. The doors are aligned, are quartered, and rotate. Two are free-standing outside, opposite the axes of the building. *44

As noted, outside of the Arena Judd placed two freestanding revolving doors, approximately forty feet from the west and north entrances, marking the start of a paved path to the Arena (fig. 44). On a cement slab to the south of the Arena, Judd installed a work by Richard Long entitled "Sea Lava Circles" (1992), in which three concentric circles of pumice stones are placed side-by-side creating rings measuring from about eight feet to about four feet in diameter. Adjacent to the south end of the Arena, Judd constructed a small adobe labyrinth with walls measuring ten feet in height (fig. 45). The effect of direct sunlight on the adobe labyrinth creates sharp contrasts in light and shadow which add to the

*44 Judd, Architektur, pgs. 82-83.
linearity and intricacy of the space. This area was also as additional seating during the feasts, holding two sets of long tables and chairs, and an outdoor bath and shower.

Fig. 44. Exterior of the Arena with freestanding door/window construction.
Fig. 45. Detail of adobe labyrinth adjacent to the south side of the Arena.

The Wool And Mohair Building and John Chamberlain’s Work In Marfa

The only works not by Judd that were completed for the Marfa project under the Dia Art Foundation were John Chamberlain’s twenty-two crushed car sculptures housed in the renovated Wool and Mohair Building within the town of Marfa. The building was redesigned by Judd to incorporate three separate structures which originally served as a center for buying and selling raw textile products. Judd connected the structures to form one large building with an open-style skeletal pitched roof with natural lighting from four-part windows along the length of the building and revolving door/windows at either end (fig. 46). Outside, Judd surrounded the building with a wall made of adobe mud brick set into mortar, a building technique he considered indigenous and typical of South Texas and Mexico (fig. 47).
Fig. 46. Interior of the Wool and Mohair Building with Chamberlain installation.

Fig. 47. Detail of mud brick wall around exterior of Wool and Mohair Building.
Fig. 48. Oversized couch and video inside Wool and Mohair Building.

Fig. 49. Detail of a Chamberlain sculpture.
The three buildings which originally constituted the Wool and Mohair Building are still apparent and used in the installation of Chamberlain’s work. The first section experienced upon entering the building has two halves: one half contains three wall pieces, a floor piece, and a giant couch and video screen that plays a tape of Chamberlain explaining his work (fig. 48); the other contains two rooms, one with three wall pieces and the other a wall piece, bedroom, bathroom, and closet. These two rooms and the first and second sections are separated by three revolving door/windows that rotate on a central axis. The second section consists of a large, open space with eight floor pieces and a large, shallow box containing very fine sand for visitors’ drawings. The third section of the building is slightly smaller than the second, housing five floor pieces and one wall piece. Judd commented on the architectural renovations of the Wool and Mohair building:

The buildings of the [Dia Art Foundation in Marfa] are primarily those of Fort D. A. Russell. The important building not at Fort Russell is made of three buildings together, half a city block, which were an office and warehouses for the sale of wool and mohair. This is in the center of Marfa, across from the Post Office. It contains the work of John Chamberlain. As usual with the buildings of the Foundation, the three were in bad shape and in this case were not well-built. The restoration alone took a long time. The buildings vary in width, height, and construction, but are on the same level, the platform necessary to load bales onto railroad cars. I moved the various openings some to make an axis from one end of the three to the other. I replaced the broken sliding doors for loading with quartered windows, one quarter of which rotates. The metal parts were painted grey. The walls, which are plastered adobe or tile, were painted a tan the color of adobe. A new roof of corrugated aluminum with skylights of corrugated plastic was put on the large central building. The west end of the more narrow building was enclosed with an adobe wall the height of the crossbars of the new windows. All buildings
should have enclosed spaces outdoors. Half of the space outside of the east end, opposite the Post Office, was covered with gravel for parking, which is much better than asphalt. The same gravel covers the other half which turns right along the building parallel to the railroad tracks. This large right angle was planted in a corresponding grid of sotol plants, an agave of the area...

Within the east building of the three, on either side of the axis, I designed an office and apartment. Large spaces are difficult and expensive to heat so that small spaces become necessary in the winter. Also almost all spaces, especially if they contain art, should be livable. Both of the small spaces are lit by a skylight closing a shaft. The apartment is in two parts, the further, the bedroom, lit and ventilated by a window, which illuminates the translucent door to the bedroom that's between two dark doors.\textsuperscript{85}

Chamberlain’s work was part of the Judd’s original plan for the installations at Marfa, and was later supported by the Dia (fig. 49).\textsuperscript{86} Chamberlain’s work is varied throughout the structure showing his experimentation with color--such as painting or not painting the works after their creation--and with placement by creating works for the floor, the wall, or to be leaned up against a wall. In this regard, Chamberlain can be viewed as willfully blurring the lines between painting and sculpture by presenting a three-dimensional work as a two-dimensional object. Chamberlain’s work retains the basic three-dimensionality of sculpture, albeit with industrial, unconventional materials, infused with volume, motion, and an element of power and violence via scale and construction

\textsuperscript{85} Judd, Architektur, pgs. 78-79.

\textsuperscript{86} "In 1979, in accordance with my idea of permanent installations, I agreed to have the Dia Foundation come to Marfa and purchase the land and main buildings of Fort Russell, on the edge of town, to make permanently maintained public installations of contemporary art. My idea was to have large, careful installations of my own work, pieces made for the place, and smaller, but still large, installations of the work of Dan Flavin, also to be made for the site, and the work of John Chamberlain.” Judd, “Marfa, Texas,” Complete Writings 1975-1986, pg. 100.
Termination Of The Marfa Project

Included in the 1981 contracts with the Dia was a section detailing the joint control Judd shared with the Dia over the administration of the Marfa project. Judd felt that he was not able to make pertinent decisions regarding the project and wanted to establish more authority for himself in such matters. Also, the Dia had been employing artists as administrative staff rather than professional office workers, and Judd wanted to reserve the right to reject any Dia staffers he found unsuitable for the work in Marfa.

Perhaps the most crucial clause inserted into the 1981 contract was one which forcefully established the Dia’s commitment to perpetual ownership and maintenance of the Marfa project contingent upon Judd’s approval of their management. Judd added this clause because he questioned the Dia’s commitment to the Marfa project and feared their withdrawal before completion or worse, that they may sell the project and his works. The sale of the Marfa project at that time would have been devastating to its development for a number of reasons: the sale of such a great number of Judd’s work would have been devastating by effectively saturating the market; the Marfa project was intended to be site specific and therefore would have necessitated a buyer of considerable financial means who was able to work closely with Judd and would be willing to continue the project as it was intended; the sale of the Marfa project en masse to an outside buyer could have meant Judd’s decreased control over the direction of his works and no guarantee of perpetual conservation or exhibition or, worse, a deinstallation of the existing works. Judd

Aspects of violence in imagery was promoted by Judd in one of Chamberlain’s early works entitled “Mr. Press” (1961). In reviewing this work, Judd described it as, “A large relief, high to the extent of four or five feet, is in part a diagonal mass across a vertical one and in whole a radiating, swastika structure.” Complete Writings 1959-1975, pg. 46. Judd recalls the work again on pg. 110, again characterizing it as a “radiating, swastika structure,” and goes into great detail about the composition of work which determines the swastika. And, it is not known if this was Chamberlain’s intended reading of “Mr. Press” or if this is only Judd’s interpretation. From the review, it appears that Judd values this piece more for its ability to convey motion through color and happenstance construction methods rather than for what could be implied by its shape, yet Judd’s choice of words to describe “Mr. Press” seem to connote power, control, and violence considerably more than similar descriptives such as triskel, windmill, propeller, etc. could.
recognized that without the financial backing of the Dia, the Marfa project could not be realized and wanted insurance that it would not be neglected either before or after its completion. Judd’s foresight in including this clause proved fortuitous because it turned out to be the deciding factor for the legal separation of Judd and the Marfa project from the Dia Art Foundation.

Relations between Judd and the Dia declined rapidly over the next few years. By 1982, Judd and Friedrich were no longer on amiable terms.\textsuperscript{58} In early 1983, Friedrich informed Judd that the Dia was experiencing serious financial problems and that the Flavin installations would have to be postponed even longer. A few weeks later, Judd received a letter from the Dia stating his compensation—currently $17,500 a month—was to be reduced. The next week, Judd received the final blow: a letter from the Dia informing him of a proposed transfer of the Marfa project to a new, tax-exempt foundation. According to this proposal, the Dia’s responsibility for perpetual maintenance of the site would be lessened yet they would still ultimately retain ownership of it. Because of these actions, Judd defended himself and his interests by taking steps to form his own not-for-profit foundation for the Marfa project.

March 1983 marked the beginning of the decentralization of the Dia Art Foundation. The Marfa project was one of many the Dia wished to withdraw from. Fortunately, Judd had the foresight to recognize the possibility of the Dia’s abandonment and took the necessary steps to obtain control of the project if they did not perform satisfactorily; the clause stipulating this in the 1981 contracts allowed Judd to form the Chinati Foundation, named for a neighboring mountain range, to cover the Marfa project. The Dia agreed to transfer “most of the assets which it now holds in connection with the Marfa project” to the Chinati Foundation after it had “proved its competence in all areas and shown its ability to maintain the assets.”\textsuperscript{59} Thus, in 1984, the Chinati Foundation was loaned the Marfa

\textsuperscript{58} Ennis, "A Tale of Men and Monuments," January 26, 1985, pg. 12. Mr. Ennis reports that Judd “denounced Friedrich as wasteful and incompetent” in the spring of 1982 at a dinner between the two at Judd’s New York studio; Mr. Ennis also notes that Judd returned his 1982 Christmas bonus of $2000 to Friedrich.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., pg. 12.
project for three years to demonstrate its capacity to support the site and works, with the Dia ultimately retaining ownership.

The temporary transfer of the Marfa project to the Chinati Foundation was by no means the end of the war between Judd and the Dia. The fact that the Dia retained ownership of the works and the site was undoubtedly unsettling for Judd. He brought suit against the Dia to permanently transfer ownership of pertinent assets in Marfa to the Chinati Foundation rather than reapply every three years for temporary acquisition. In 1984, the Dia owned all of Fort D. A. Russell and 340 adjacent acres, the Wool and Mohair Building, a large tract of land outside of Marfa, and all works by Judd, Chamberlain, and Flavin housed or to be housed in Marfa. Judd sued for all of these assets and for breach of contract concerning the Flavin barracks, hoping to force the Dia to provide funds necessary for their completion. After several years of litigation, the suit was settled out-of-court: Judd was awarded all demands and the title transfers were made accordingly. By 1984, the Dia had already spent well over $5 million on the Marfa project, excluding legal fees, and "a lot of money" for settlement fees in the breach of contract suit.³⁰ Today, the Chinati Foundation operates wholly without involvement of the Dia Art Foundation and all ties between them are severed.³¹

Whereas other not-for-profit art organizations promoted artists by funding new works, the Dia declared itself to be committed to perpetually funding, housing, and conserving the work of selected artists. It appears that their attempt to create seemingly immortal works of art to stand as a tribute to themselves and the artists who created them was based on what was believed to be limitless funds; unfortunately, their ample money supply proved exhaustible. A sale of the Dia's artworks in November 1985 of works by Dan Flavin, Cy Twombly, Andy Warhol, and Judd raised $1.3 million, $700,000 less than

³⁰ Jeff Kopie, conversation with the author, January 25, 1994. It has been reported in Texas magazine (Patricia C. Johnson, "Space For Art," Texas magazine (Houston Chronicle Sunday insert), January 3, 1993, pg. 8) that the amount was $750,000, paid over five years from 1987 to 1992.
³¹ Ibid. Mr. Kopie mentioned that he thought it might be possible for the Dia to bring suit against Judd for ownership of the Marfa project if the Chinati Foundation were forced into bankruptcy for the sole reason that they financed the project at one time, but he thought it unlikely that they would do so and difficult for them to prove.
needed to remain solvent. By 1987, the Dia Art Foundation was no longer in existence and the publicly funded Dia Center for the Arts was created without one of the original founders, Heiner Friedrich. Although sources differ as to why Friedrich was not included in the new Dia organization, he claimed that, “my resignation was based on [Donald Judd’s] ongoing malfunctioning mind and misplaced information.”

---

92 Ibid., pg. 57. Friedrich’s resignation may have been a condition of receiving administrative and financial help from Philippa’s mother, Dominique de Menil. Friedrich stated that, “It is possible that Mrs. de Menil didn’t want to see a lawsuit and advised us to seek strong counsel. She was able to help us with board members. There was some dialogue, and there might have been some problems. That’s private. They are not strong enough to hurt me on their own.”
Chapter V

“What do you say when people buy a million dollars worth of your work and don’t want any more? You just say thanks.”

-John Chamberlain

Work Produced Under The Chinati Foundation: Permanent Installations

When the Chinati Foundation was given temporary lease of the works in Marfa in 1984, Judd was charged with the responsibility to prove financial ability to maintain the works of art and property. The Chinati Foundation was to be reviewed every three years by the Dia in order to determine whether Judd had successfully accomplished this task, and to decide if another three years were warranted. For the first three years the Chinati was primarily supported by Judd and a few private investors, but with mounting legal fees and approximately $200,000 a year in operating expenses there was not sufficient money to expand the collection. When an out-of-court settlement was reached in 1987, a permanent title transfer of all Dia assets in Marfa was secured as well as a cash settlement of $750,000 to be paid out over five years. The increased income for the Chinati Foundation enabled Chinati’s Board of Trustees, William C. Agee, Annalee Newman, Carl Ryan, Jane Shurley, Brydon Smith and Judd, to shift from merely sustaining the existing works to implementing new programs and installing new works by Judd and other artists.

Some of the earliest expansions of the Chinati Foundation were the renovation of one of the six Flavin barracks and the construction of two large concrete structures in the southwest corner of Fort D. A. Russell, in 1987 and 1989, respectively. The renovation of the Flavin barrack cost about $15,000 and would have housed an installation planned by Judd (figs. 50 & 51). Judd described the renovation of the barrack as follows:

---

83 Larry Bell quoting John Chamberlain’s comment to Judd regarding the Dia’s decision to withdraw from the Marfa project in Judd, “Some Aspects of Color in General and Red and Black in Particular,” *Artforum*, pgs. 73, 114.

84 Johnson, “Space For Art,” pg. 8.
There are several instances of impromptu architecture without sketches and plans. In the fall of 87 there was a chance because of money and a willing construction company to renovate the southernmost barracks of Ft. Russell, previously privately retained and then deaccessioned, as an exhibition space, in contrast to the permanent spaces everywhere in the Foundation. The barracks is U-shaped, with an inner porch enclosing a yard open to the east. The light is very bright. Both sides of both arms of the building were lined with windows. The outer windows were closed to reduce the light and to gain wall space. The inner windows under the porch remain for moderate light. The pairs of windows at either end of the long arms remain as the light of the long axes. The space and the light around and turned inward is very fine.59

Fig. 50. One of the six barracks intended for renovation and installation of Flavin works.

59 Judd, Architektur, pg. 91.
Fig. 51. Plan for installation of Flavin works, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

The two concrete structures that are currently unfinished were designed by Judd and constructed under the guidance of Robert Kirk in 1989. They were intended to be part of a larger complex, totaling ten structures in all, to be built according to a grid formation (figs. 52-54). They were intended to house the remainder of Judd’s works commissioned
by the Dia: three vertical stacks, two large stainless steel floor pieces, and thirteen horizontal works. The height of the vertical works necessitated a new installation space be built for them as the barracks, the artillery sheds, and the Arena were all considered inadequate for spatial reasons. After constructing the majority of one concrete structure and half of another, engineer Claude Armstrong surveyed the site and found the structures to be defective and in danger of collapsing. Thus, the project was abandoned. It is scheduled to be attempted at a later date using improved materials and building techniques. The thirteen horizontal works will probably be installed in a renovated barrack if another attempt is unsuccessful while the others will remain in storage until a suitable location is selected for their installation.  

Judd’s plans for the complex, before they were declared unsafe, were as such:  

Thirteen horizontal pieces and three vertical pieces for the wall and two large stainless steel pieces for the floor were built for permanent installation at the first foundation. These were made around 80, early in the short life of the original arrangement and, after a while, it became evident that there were no plans for their installation. All of the work was still in storage when the Chinati Foundation took over. The existing buildings were not suitable. Also, just reworking old buildings becomes tiresome. For the work in storage I planned new concrete buildings placed on a grid. The site is high and as usual the view is long. The land is apparently open rangeland but in the grass there are the foundations and walks--even a couple of little rock gardens--of a complex which housed prisoners of war from Germany during World War II. The land was already used and damaged, and will be cleaner when the new complex is finished than when it began. The buildings are placed directly on the rangeland without any border or transition and the drainage of the roofs is conserved so that the buildings are not bordered by weeds. The ten buildings are centered on ten squares of

---

Jeff Kopie, conversation with the author, February 8, 1994.
twelve, the two in the middle remaining empty. Narrow walks on a grid determined by the doors of the buildings connect them all, making two grids, one major but not linear, and one minor but linear. There is no reason to enclose the complex since it is away from town. Two buildings will each contain a large steel work on the floor, two will each contain three vertical pieces, four will each contain three horizontal pieces, and two will have two stories containing offices and living spaces. These are completely new buildings under construction. 7

Fig. 52. Plan for the construction of concrete buildings, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

7 Judd, Architektur, pgs. 88-89.
Fig. 53. Plan for the construction of concrete buildings, drawn by Judd, c. 1987. Reprinted by permission of the Chinati Foundation.

Fig. 54. Concrete buildings, after abandonment, 1994.
Judd also intended to construct a large, four-walled adobe court on undeveloped property near the Rio Grande river, about sixty miles south of the installations in Marfa. The court was initially planned under the Marfa project and 640 acres of land were purchased for its installation, yet the work was never realized because of objections to the inaccessibility of the site. After the Chinati's separation from the Dia, the location of the installation was changed to a site along the Rio Grande river yet again the work was not realized due to a lack of sufficient funds for construction. The specifications for this work were described, somewhat vaguely, in an unpublished writing by Judd:

A large work, eighty feet long, which was shown in '81, now destroyed, or a related one, could be made for outdoors. A distantly related work has long been sketched for the ground floor of my building in New York, a cast-iron building, a type which James Bogardus thought should have cast-iron beams, which cannot support, and iron floors. Appropriately the work is to be iron, and is to be against the long wall, divided into two parts because of the stairway. Russian churches are often paved with iron plates and these could be cast for the floor, which is not original. Such a work could also be on two walls or four, forming a court, as will a very large work, about one hundred meters to a side, made of adobe bricks, that I want to build on the Rio Grande. Not much gets made of the possibilities, yet it's a lot considering that it's against the grain.**

On October 12, 1991, Claes Oldenburg presented the Chinati Foundation with a permanent installation of an oversized horseshoe entitled "Monument to the Last Horse: Amino et Fide" (fig. 54). The title refers to Louie, a legendary United States Cavalry horse, who is said to have lived for ninety-nine years and buried at the site of Oldenburg's

---

** Judd, "21 February 93," unpublished essay, pg. 5.
monument. The idea for the work came after Oldenburg's 1987 visit to Marfa where he heard the story of Louie and found an old horseshoe and nail at the fort. According to Judd, Oldenburg remarked that at the time he was "looking for a way to respond to the landscape, history of the place, both past and present." The horseshoe also serves as a companion piece to Dallas Museum of Art's "Stakehitch" commissioned in 1983 and installed in 1985 for the opening of their new building designed by Edward Larabee Barnes. On this relationship, Judd notes, "If the stake to which the horse is hitched is in Dallas and the rear left horseshoe is in the Big Bend, the horse shades half of Texas." The monument was planned, designed, and manufactured by Lippincott Foundry between 1990-1991 and was temporarily installed from June to August 1992 in front of Mies Van Der Rohe's Seagram Building in New York City, courtesy of the Pace Gallery. The work was financed through the sale of eight maquettes, one-sixth the size of the final product, donated by Oldenburg and his wife, Coosje van Bruggen.

The following year, October 1992, the Chinati Foundation opened their newest permanent installation by Icelandic artist Ingólfur Arnarsson. In a small, renovated barrack Arnarsson installed "Untitled: Series One" composed of thirty-six 21.3 x 15.3 cm (9 x 6 in.) sheets of paper, approximately eighty pound in weight, lightly shaded in pencil. The sheets are placed vertically and positioned horizontally, about nine inches apart, along the south wall of the barrack with the total installation measuring over forty-four feet in length. The opposite wall (north) has one door and eleven windows which provide the light for the installation. Each of the sheets are evenly shaded which gives the appearance of being painted with a faint, grey watercolor wash. Two unitled paintings by Arnarsson flank the short sides of the barrack, executed in white concrete with two triangular forms painted on

---

99 This legend varies somewhat from person to person in Marfa. Judd notes a political significance to the horse i.e. "Monument to the Last Horse: Amino et Fide," unpublished essay, pg. 4, that "Louie was designated the last horse of the United States Cavalry at Fort D. A. Russell on the 14th of December, 1932 and was buried, presumably shot. This sentimental gesture inaugurated the use of tanks in preparation for World War II."

100 Ibid., pg. 3.

101 Ibid., pg. 1. Although Judd praised "Stakehitch," he is clearly disappointed by the DMA's architecture: "perhaps the stake is through the heart of Ed Barnes' indifferent building."
each in light grey watercolor in alternating corners of the 60 x 50 x 4 cm vertical works. The paintings were owned by Judd and on long-term loan to the Chinati Foundation.

In 1992, Judd also placed his privately-owned “Sea Lava Circles” by British artist Richard Long and “Untitled” by David Rabinowitch, American, on long-term loan to the Chinati Foundation. As noted, the Long is installed out-of-doors on the south side of the Arena on a concrete slab. The work consists of three concentric circles formed by pumice stones or sea lava rocks. The Rabinowitch is installed inside the Arena in the northwest corner of the structure. It is a single ovoid form cut from .75 inch black steel measuring approximately six feet in diameter, placed flat, directly on the floor. The relationship established between Judd and the Chinati from placing his personal property on long-term loan allowed him tax benefits and insurance of the works’ maintenance and visibility. In turn, Chinati-owned property was leased to Judd for his private use: the Old Marfa Ice Plant, originally purchased by the Dia to create the concrete groups and the two abandoned concrete structures, is covered by the Chinati Foundation but is rented to Judd as a workshop which now fabricates metal works.

Installation of Ilya Kabakov’s “School Number Six” in one of the barracks at Fort D. A. Russell was completed for October weekend 1993 (fig. *). The viewer is invited to experience the space by voyage through the dilapidated barrack and discover evidences of fictional schoolchildren. Outside, Kabakov installed two signs in Cyrillic, one over the north entrance reading “Welcome,” and a quote from Lenin on the west side, “Study, Study, Study” further denote the space’s fictional function. Littered throughout the interior are various elementary school items in antiquated museum cases with printed narration, as though written from one student’s perspective, describing the significance of the objects: a case of sheet music and instruments with a description of music classes, drawings and art supplies with comments about art class, relics discovered during class field trips and stories recanting the excursions, pages of exercises from grammar, spelling, and arithmetic classes. Throughout the installation, there is a sense that the spirits of these fictional children are present and trapped in this lost environment; it is made up of, “...memories,
faded memories, like children were there and all of a sudden they left. Kabakov intended to leave the structure as he had found it, without doors or windows, but the high wind gusts in Marfa were rapidly destroying the installation, therefore makeshift doors and windows were created to block the currents from the outer walls.

Fig. 55. Claes Oldenburg dedicating “Monument to Last Horse: Amino et Fide,” 1991.

Temporary Exhibitions

By 1988, Judd had stabilized the Chinati Foundation’s finances and introduced two new programs of temporary exhibitions to compliment the permanently installed works: the artist-in-residence program and temporary exhibitions of traveling shows from private or public collections. The artist-in-residence program was inaugurated in 1990, offering artists interested in living in Marfa the chance to do so by providing them with an apartment at Fort D. A. Russell and exhibition space at the Marfa Locker Plant. Under this program, artists are unpaid but are invited to stay in Marfa from two to six months. The artists were chosen by Judd but are now selected by Chinati’s new director, Marianne Stockebrand.101

Many of the artists featured in traveling shows at the Chinati Foundation can be read as art that assisted the development of Judd’s work, such as Josef Albers and Barnett Newman.104 Other exhibited works followed abstract, geometricized trends in art which, formally, correlate with the permanent installations of the Chinati Foundation. The works were chosen by Judd and the Board of Trustees of the Chinati Foundation and would open during the October weekend in Marfa, usually staying on view for two months.

The first temporary installation of a traveling show was mounted in 1988 and consisted of a series of twenty-one geometric paintings dating from the 1950’s to 1980’s by Swiss artist Richard Paul Lohse. The paintings were executed on various proportioned grids, generally painted in varying hues of primary and secondary colors. The show at the

101 The artists who have participated in the artist-in-residence program and their home countries are as follows: Ragna Hermansdottir, Iceland; Brian Wendelmann, Sweden; Stefan Baumkotter, Germany; Sonny Thorbjørnsdottir, Iceland; Ingólfr Arnarsson, Iceland (the Chinati Foundation purchased his work for permanent installation after his stay in Marfa); Nadia Nanopoulos, Greece; Joost Van Oss, Holland; Andreas Karl Schulze, Germany; Daniel Göttin, Switzerland; Regina Stralka, Germany; Chris Garron, United States (Texas); Rupert Deese, United States (New York).

Chinati was Lohse’s first one-man show in the United States, having previously exhibited in only a few group shows. The paintings were lent by the Lohse Foundation in Switzerland and exhibited in the renovated Flavin barracks. After the show’s completion four of the paintings were placed on long-term loan to the Chinati Foundation and moved to a smaller barracks on the west side of Fort D. A. Russell.

The following year, 1989, the Chinati Foundation installed two temporary exhibitions, the drawings of Jan Schoonhoven 1962-1987, and drawings from sketchbooks by Piet Mondrian 1909-1914, all lent by the Hague Museum in Amsterdam. In 1990, temporary exhibitions featuring paintings by Gunther Forg and prints by El Lissitzky were installed. By 1991, Judd was able to mount three temporary exhibitions at Chinati: eighteenth-century Giovanni Battista Piranesi prints, a series of studies and preparatory drawings for Albers’s “Homage to the Square,” and untitled brass sculptures by Roni Horn. In 1992 three more temporary exhibitions were installed: seventeenth-century Dutch engravings by Hendrick Goltzius, prints, collages, and drawings entitled “Working Materials” by John Baldessari, and contemporary photography by Lynne Cohen.

In 1993, Judd limited the guests to his October weekend to close friends and major contributors to the Chinati Foundation, citing that donations from the previous two celebrations had amounted to less than expected and that weekend costs were barely covered. That year Judd arranged for the temporary installation of a series that had been intended for permanent housing at the Chinati Foundation, the complete prints of Barnett Newman. These prints are one of three complete series by Newman which encompass his entire print repertoire. The fate of the prints is currently being decided; they were initially to be exhibited under the Dia’s Marfa project, then to be donated to the Chinati Foundation, but ultimately were given to Judd’s now defunct Austin Street Foundation by Annalee Newman, Barnett’s widow, before their exhibition in 1993.105 The fate of the prints is currently being decided: with Judd’s recent death and the lack of a firmly established not-

105 The Austin Street Foundation was set up by Judd to cover some of his personal property in Marfa and elsewhere, but, unfortunately, was never firmly established before Judd’s death and only existed on paper. The assets intended for coverage by the Austin Street Foundation will probably be shuttled to the pending Judd Foundation, but currently all of his assets are in settlement.
for-profit entity to cover Judd’s assets, the prints have been stored in New York until legalities surrounding their expressed and intended ownership and housing can be determined.

**Judd’s Private Assets In Marfa**

Judd’s private property in Marfa constitutes a significant amount of the real estate in the town. There are now attempts to establish a “Judd Foundation” to cover these assets and convert them into permanent installations intended to be open to the public at a much later date. Currently, the Judd Foundation is only in the working stages and much of these assets are involved in settlement negotiations. The only radical change in the holdings, barring any sale of properties, will probably occur with the Ayala de Chinati; the land, not the houses, is being considered for a nature conservatory.

As noted, the scope of this thesis focuses on the holdings of the Chinati Foundation with only cursory coverage of Judd’s private assets in Marfa. Therefore, this section will only partially list the properties and works held privately by Judd without providing any detailed analysis.
Figure 56. Partial List of Judd’s Private Assets In Marfa

Buildings in Marfa:

The Block—Judd’s first purchase in Marfa and his primary residence in town. The Block is comprised of two structures: one, an extensive library and permanent installation space for a Flavin piece and some of Judd’s early sculptures, the other, another installation site and living areas with domestic additions.

Old Marfa Hotel—used for administrative purposes; called the “Business Office”.
Old Marfa Bank Building—was used by Judd; called the “Architecture Studio”.
Glascock Building—used for administrative purposes; called “Architecture Office”.
Old Safeway Supermarket—now used for storage of artworks; called “Art Studio”.
Whyte Building—named for architect; contains furniture by Rudolf Schindler and early paintings by Judd.
Ranch Office—used to manage administrative details for the Ayala de Chinati.

Houses in Marfa:

Porter House—named for architect, as are others; also used as residence by Judd.
Cobb House—contains some of Judd’s early paintings.
Walker House—contains paintings by Jack Wesley.
Bruns House—formerly the house of Marfa’s town physician.
Collie House—believed to be the oldest house in Marfa.

Properties outside of Marfa:

Ayala de Chinati—was Judd’s primary residence in Texas. Ayala de Chinati stretches across 45,000 acres of land near the Rio Grande River with three houses at different locations: Casa Perez, Casa Morales, and Las Casas. At Las Casas, Judd constructed a large outdoor sculpture made of local stone in which multiple arcs spiral inwards to create a water reservoir.
Chapter VI

"Pollock and Judd are, I feel, the beginning and the end of American dominance in art."

-Joseph Kosuth 106

The Current Status Of The Chinati Foundation

Dr. Marianne Stockebrand took her post as the new Director of the Chinati Foundation in July of 1994. Rob Weiner and Jeffrey Kopie are, respectively, the Associate Director and Administrator of the foundation. In addition to a few other employees who are directly involved with the day-to-day maintenance and general upkeep of the sites, Stockebrand, Kopie and Weiner comprise the entire staff of the Chinati Foundation.

As of this writing, approximately six months after Donald Judd’s death, the Chinati Foundation is searching for alternative means of financing the maintenance of the works and daily operating costs of the works through public and private sources. About $150,000 is needed to meet all required operative expenses, but between $250,000 and $300,000 is needed to meet salaries and fund temporary exhibitions. The Chinati Foundation has applied for two grants from the National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) as well as grants from the Texas Commission on the Arts. Other sources of revenue are expected to come from a sale of prints, made by Judd, through commercial galleries including Texas Gallery in Houston, the extension of board positions to wealthy Chinati supporters, an aggressive membership drive, and the establishment of a Texas Board of Trustees. As a last resort, affiliation with an established institution in Texas, such as the University of Texas system, or outside of Texas, such as the Getty Foundation in California or the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam, is being considered.

Perhaps the most surprising source of funds that the Chinati Foundation is

exploring is from the new Dia Art Foundation, the Dia Center for the Arts in New York City. Although no specific requests or offers have been made yet, the new director of the Dia, Michael Govan, and members of the Chinati Foundation’s staff and board are “on friendly terms.” Yet another surprising twist in this story is the new Dia’s source of funding: some public monies, including NEA grants, which places the new Dia in the polar opposite position from its prior incarnation. Considering both the past history between the Dia and the Chinati Foundations and the possibility, albeit remote, of a claim to ownership of the works in Marfa by the Dia, financial support from the new Dia seems to be the least attractive option for the Chinati to consider.

Conclusions

There is more work that needs to be done regarding the study of the Chinati Foundation: first, a thorough evaluation of Judd’s architecture at the Chinati Foundation in and around Marfa needs to be done; second, a more thorough study of the other artists represented by the Chinati Foundation is needed; third, an examination of Judd’s private holdings in Marfa would be a welcome accompaniment to this text but may no longer be possible with the assets in litigation. Broader work could be undertaken in other areas of the thesis as well: an examination of the move from gallery/museum environments into the American West and Southwest is needed; more studies considering attribution of artworks created by a foundry or other industrial methods that do not require the artist to come in physical contact with the work during production are needed; a study of Judd’s installations at 101 Spring Street in New York City is needed, and so on. Currently, this text represents the most extensive examination of the work and issues relating to the Chinati Foundation.

The most prevalent aspect of the installations in Marfa is the amount of control exerted by Judd over the objects, the environment, and the viewer. The issue of control is

107 Jeffrey Kopie, conversation with the author, July 15, 1994. This point was reiterated by Rob Weiner in a separate conversation with the author, August 24, 1994.

108 For more information, see footnote 91.
relevant to and can be seen in almost every facet of the installations and within the works themselves. These elements of control are directly related to Judd’s initial desire to escape the museum/gallery settings and move to Texas to establish a personal exhibition space controlled entirely by him. In Marfa, Judd expanded his role as artist in many ways, such as providing extensive written analysis of the works, establishing himself as curator, conservator, and critic of the Chinati Foundation, and donating much of the capital needed to sustain it. These elements of control, Judd’s control-versus-culturally-motivated move to Marfa, and Judd’s expanded role of the artist have layers of issues tied to them which have been discussed in previous chapters. The concept of permanent installation necessitates a considerable amount of control be taken over otherwise natural or “chance” occurrences in order to insure proper functioning of the site. But, the belief that a permanent installation could actually become “permanent” is at the very least misleading, and the term itself is somewhat of an oxymoron. Permanent installations can only be measured in human terms, not in consideration of the duration of the planet as modern technology has yet to create a material that cannot ultimately be decomposed. A better term would perhaps be “lifetime installations” or “stable exhibitions.”

After the scope of the Chinati Foundation shifted to include temporary installations as well as permanent, it evolved into a “mini-museum” in essence. This shift occurred after litigation with the Dia, from which the Chinati Foundation emerged, and a Board of Directors was established. There were museum people on the original board who may have wanted traveling shows to be exhibited by the foundation, but Judd appears to have maintained considerable control over its development. The reason for the shift is unknown; the result of the shift is the establishment of a small-scale museum with less bureaucracy but the same problems of a larger institution.

This year, 1994, the Chinati Foundation was able to mount one traveling exhibition of paintings by Korean artist Hyong-Keun Yun and hosted two artists-in-residence. Whether or not this will become the trend for the future is uncertain; until a stable source of funding to support the Chinati Foundation is found, concessions will undoubtedly occur.
In a worst-case scenario, it is possible that without proper funding the foundation will experience a gradual deinstallation of the works. Part of the problem lies with the fact that the Chinati Foundation was Judd's dream, fueled by his vision and philosophies, which motivated him to be very passionate, protective, and supportive of it. Since Judd has died, much of the energy that went into developing and maintaining the site has died, too. Fortunately for Judd, he died seeing the foundation at its fullest extent, completely under his control, and believing that it would continue to survive after him. The current staff are extremely committed to maintaining the integrity of the site and continuing the dream as Judd envisioned it; hopefully there will soon be willing contributors who believe in them and their ability to do so.
Appendix A
Placement of the mill aluminum boxes

North Artillery Shed

Legend:
\[\text{brick} = 71 \times 81 \times 51 \text{ in.}\]

South Artillery Shed
Appendix B
Layout of mill aluminum "families"

- □ = no open sides
- □ = one + 1/2 open sides
- □ = box in a box
- □ = elevated/ floating lid
- □ = 1/2 side open
- □ = bent diagonal plane
- □ = one open side
- □ = two open sides

North Artillery Shed

South Artillery Shed
Appendix C

Layout of the Concrete Groups

Legend:

= 2.5 x 2.5 x 5 meters (2w = 1)

= open side
APPENDIX D

Statement for the Chinati Foundation

In November 1971 I came to Marfa, Texas to make a home for the summers in the southwest of the United States and the northwest of Mexico, which before the Conquest was called Chichimeca. In '73 and '74 I bought three buildings and the land surrounding them, comprising a city block, which is now a large complex containing a great deal of my work and some other artists. In '75 I became a resident of Texas. In '79 I began work on what is now the Chinati Foundation, a name given in '86, the name of a nearby mountain.

The Chinati Foundation is the successor in Marfa to the Dia Foundation, which in '79 purchased most of Fort D. A. Russell, where the Chinati Foundation is primarily located, as well as a very large building in the center of town which became the installation of John Chamberlain's work. Later, as I suggested, Dia purchased two sections on the Rio Grande, sixty miles away, as a site for a very large work of mine to be made of adobe, which was never begun. Also, Dia paid for the construction and purchase of five groups of my work, two of which are installed and three which are not: fifteen pieces made of concrete and one hundred pieces made of mill aluminum, three vertical pieces, thirteen horizontal pieces and two large works in stainless steel. Dia provided the work by Chamberlain.

The Chinati Foundation, La Fundacion Chinati, which is independent, is now one of the largest visible installations of contemporary art in the world, visible, not in storage. When it nears completion or even now, if my own complex is added, it is the largest, as befits Texas.

The enterprise in Marfa was meant to be constructive. The art was meant to be, and now will be, permanently installed and maintained in a space suitable to it. Most of the art was made for the existing buildings, which were dilapidated. The buildings were adjusted to the art as much as possible. New ones would have been better. Nevertheless, in reworking the old buildings, I've turned them into architecture. It takes a great deal of time
and thought to install work carefully. This should not always be thrown away. Most art is fragile and some should be placed and never moved again. Some work is too large, complex and expensive to move. Somewhere a portion of contemporary art has to exist as an example of what the art and its context were meant to be. Somewhere, just as the platinum-iridium meter guarantees the tape measure, a strict measure must exist for the art of this time and place. Otherwise art is only show and monkey business.

The art and architecture of the past that we know is that which remains. The best is that which remains where it was painted, placed or built. Most of the art of the past that could be moved was taken by conquerors. Almost all recent art is conquered as soon as it's made, since it's first shown for sale and once sold is exhibited as foreign in the alien museums. The public has no idea of art other than that it is something portable that can be bought. There is no constructive effort; there is no cooperative effort. This situation is primitive in relation to a few earlier and better times.

Art and architecture—all the arts—do not have to exist in isolation, as they do now. This fault is very much a key to the present society. Architecture is nearly gone, but it, art, all of the arts, in fact all parts of the society, have to be rejoined, and joined more than they have ever been. This would be democratic in a good sense, unlike the present increasing fragmentation into separate but equal categories, equal within the arts, but inferior to the powerful bureaucracies.

José Ortega y Gasset wrote: 'But the most dangerous aspect of the intellectual aberration that this 'bigotry of culture' signifies is not this; it consists in presenting culture, withdrawal into one's self, thought, as a grace or jewel that man is to add to his life, hence as something that provisionally lies outside of his life and as if there were life without culture and thought—as if it were possible to live without withdrawing into one's self. Men were set, as it were, before a jeweler's window—were given the choice of acquiring culture or doing without it. And it is clear that, faced with such a dilemma, during the years we are now living through men have not hesitated, but have resolved to explore the second alternative to its limits and are seeking to flee from all taking a stand within the self and to
give themselves up to the opposite extreme!'  

Most of the activities which should support art, which claim to support art, which justify themselves so, are nearly irrelevant to it. These are the museums, the art bureaucrats, the critics and the educators. Only the galleries--commerce--are not irrelevant, and they furnish an ambiguous situation, providing money necessary to live and work, but also a mercenary attitude, beyond the necessary business, which younger artists and the public are now quick to assume as part of the nature of art. Most older artists know very well that they are prior and separate from the galleries and certainly from the museums, but many younger artists accept the scheme which has grown since World War II as the nature of things. This new social structure is not part of the reality of art, and is killing it. This has to be resisted. I've always defended my work. I've installed every public exhibition and have kept and installed work in my own spaces, most of which are in my place in Marfa.

The Chinati Foundation is an attempt to continue this on a greater scale and also to extend the consideration to Flavin's and Chamberlain's work. This is nearly the only attempt I know of to show completely and naturally the present reality of art. Art must be the only activity which its practitioners don't control. We, after all, the 'experts,' and not so many, are told what to do by many upstart self-appointed experts.

It was my intention to have a comprehensive amount of work by Dan Flavin, John Chamberlain and myself. I did not want to make another museum anthology. And three seemed all that could be done well. But I did want a more natural situation than became possible, which would mean having some work by other artists, mostly outdoors, for example that of Carl Andre, Claes Oldenburg, Richard Long, Richard Serra and Larry Bell. Later the possibility arose, thanks to Anna Lee Newman, of installing the complete prints of Barnett Newman, which will eventually be accomplished by my foundation, which also has paintings by John Wesley. I have work in Marfa yet to be installed by Carl Andre, David Rabinowitch, Larry Bell, Richard Serra, Robert Irwin, Yayoi Kusama, Roy Lichtenstein, John Chamberlain, Richard Long, Dan Flavin and others. There are prints
and drawings by Josef Albers, Agnes Martin, Yves Klein, Lauretta Vinciarelli and others. There is considerable new and old art from the Northwest Coast and from Chichimeca.

There is much to be done. No work was done on the six barracks for which Flavin designed large installations of fluorescent light. There is money, perhaps, to complete one. Several buildings are required for the installation of the three groups of work of mine that are in storage. There is money for one. There is a projected work of adobe on the Rio Grande. The Arena, originally the gymnasium of Fort Russell, was to have had a large work of mine along both walls, colored, possibly made of concrete, possibly made of metal by a factory in Switzerland. More concrete pieces of mine were planned for the large areas of Fort Russell now empty. The building for Barnett Newman’s prints has become a problem for my foundation.

There are two extra barracks: the northern one should be restored and used as a print studio, an idea of Flavin’s. The southern one should be a temporary exhibition space, unlike the rest of the spaces. Among the faults of the museums is a great simplicity as to what should be shown, which almost prohibits the exhibition of work by artists not from New York and especially prohibits that by artists from Europe and elsewhere.

There are several short buildings. One will be a museum for Fort Russell, which was originally Camp Marfa - MAPOA. One will have some of Flavin’s drawings for the six works. One should have the library of art and architecture that was planned. One building could contain the two dark rooms which Larry Bell first constructed in his studio and then at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, a great work which he is willing to make again. I would like one building to contain several paintings be Josef Albers, who is highly regarded, but not highly enough. A lost chance was to restore the adobe church in Ruidosa, near Sierra Chinati, and ask Ken Price to make a work for the interior. Presidio County is poor, economically and politically, but it is, nevertheless, Raintree County.

Don Judd
Board of Directors
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