

Dalí, Magritte, and Surrealism's Legacy, New York c. 1965

Sandra Zalman
University of Houston

In the winter of 1965, two Manhattan museums held simultaneous exhibitions of Surrealist painters, Rene Magritte at the Museum of Modern Art, and Salvador Dalí at the Gallery of Modern Art. The occasion facilitated—even made explicit—a comparison between the two representatives of figurative Surrealism. The New York art world took the opportunity to re-assess the legacy of the careers of the two painters, one quite familiar in the U.S., and the other either ignored or dismissed. On a broader scale, the presence of two major surrealist shows demonstrated the relevance of Surrealism to the contemporary New York art world, and begged the question of how Surrealism as a movement would be understood, not only for contemporary art, but for art history.

It had been nearly thirty years since MoMA's major Surrealism show of 1936, but in that time Surrealism's place within modern art had not been significantly reinterpreted. The attention generated by two major exhibitions of surrealist artists demonstrated the need for reevaluation of the formalist narrative that, since Clement Greenberg had denounced Surrealism in 1944,¹ refused to account for the movement in the history of modern art. Despite Surrealism's place on the sidelines of the art world throughout the 1950s, by the 1960s, what Dalí and Magritte seemed to offer was an alternative genealogy of art history as it had been presented up to the 1960s, and thus, a way to account for the growing plurality of contemporary artistic practice.

Many reviewers made the connection between Magritte, Dalí, and contemporary art. Emily Genauer, in her review of the two exhibitions, suggested that Dalí and Magritte were clearly "Pop's papas."² She continued:

Sandra Zalman: sandra.zalman@gmail.com

Copyright © 2012 (Sandra Zalman). Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported License. Available at <http://jsa.asu.edu/>

The question, then, is why so many usages of the original surrealists, surviving in the decades since only as components of individual artists' idioms (Dalí's and Magritte's particularly), have suddenly become the common currency of a whole style again. The answer is, of course, that pop is also a non-esthetic, sociological expression. It, too, is a catch-all movement for many diverse talents united principally by their opposition to current cultural values, and by their need to make themselves heard... Well, other times, other protests.³

Genauer attributes the resurgence of influence of Dalí and Magritte to the social dimension of Surrealism and its engagement with everyday life. Wrote another reviewer: "When the history of content in modern art comes to be written—a document to be set beside the form-oriented discussions that now prevail—Dalí and Magritte (and the Surrealists in general) should form a consequential chapter in that picaresque account."⁴ The recognition that there was a parallel tradition that could be just as persuasive as a formalist account of modern art signaled a major shift in the critical reception not only of Surrealism, but of contemporary art as well.⁵

While press was nothing new for Dalí, such praise indicated for both Dalí and Magritte that critics were becoming more receptive to works that seemed to speak to contemporary mores rather than formalist values. Dalí had been a fixture in the New York social scene for decades, and his reputation as an artist was much more tied to his personality than to his aesthetic output. The initial reporting of the Dalí exhibition's opening was no different. While the Magritte exhibition opened on December 13 to little fanfare, the opening of Dalí's exhibition, which occurred a few days later on December 17, garnered headlines. *The New York Times* reported that nearly 1,000 people attended the reception, which was a black-tie affair.⁶ Senator Robert Kennedy was later photographed at the exhibition.⁷ More than one review mentioned that Dalí brought his pet ocelot to the museum. In a parenthetical aside in his article on Magritte, literary scholar Roger Shattuck mentioned that "Dalí tried to steal the show at [Magritte's] opening,"⁸ but no other articles mention Magritte's opening at MoMA or whatever purported disturbance Dalí attempted.

Meanwhile, outside the Salvador Dalí exhibition, protesters presented a five-foot dummy meant to represent the artist, labeled "I'm all hung up with myself—Dalí."⁹ The protest was organized by a young artist, Louis Abolafia, in response to what he believed was the museum's lack of support to American artists. While the terms of the protest were hardly new (similar protests had taken place since the early days of MoMA's history), the museum's founder, Huntington Hartford's response to

the protest was unusual: “why do you have to do this to me?” he reportedly pleaded to Abolafia.¹⁰ The protest was also remarkable because Hartford’s museum was only a little over a year old, and thus did not have an extensive track record, nor had the Gallery of Modern Art built the type of cachet that MoMA could by then lay claim to. Hartford’s response is telling, however, for his personal identification with the critique of his institution.

Like the surrealist painters they were exhibiting, the two institutions hosting the exhibitions—though less than a mile apart geographically—had vastly different reputations and missions. One reviewer compared them to the department stores “Macy’s and Gimbels confronting each other across New York’s West Side in a Surrealist event. . . .”¹¹ The reference is apt, given that “Gimbels was beloved by many in its day but never mustered the sophistication and charm of its slightly more upscale neighbor on the other side of 34th Street.”¹² The Gallery of Modern Art was built, at great personal expense to A&P Grocery heir Huntington Hartford, in order to offer an alternative to what Hartford perceived as the elitist (abstract) version of modern art on display at other New York institutions. In *The New York Times*, John Canaday called Hartford’s institution “the anti-modern Museum of Modern Art” because it was rooted in the nineteenth-century and included only figurative works.¹³ By hosting a Dalí exhibition, Hartford was, in effect, capitalizing on the fame of the artist, while differentiating his institution’s populist attitude toward art from MoMA’s supposed exclusivity.

The architecture of the Gallery of Modern Art was also intended to set it apart from MoMA, despite Hartford’s selection of Edward Durell Stone, the architect who had co-designed MoMA in 1939. The galleries on the 4th and 5th floors were walnut-paneled, and drawings of the museum in the Edward Durell Stone archives reveal that there were not only walnut finishes, but bronze handrails, plush red carpet in some places, parquet floors in others; dropped plaster ceilings in some galleries, marble window panels, and some walls with vinyl wall covering. As architecture critic Ada Louise Huxtable described, “What will be remembered by the public. . . are the building’s cosmetics—many running feet of rich macassar ebony, walnut, bronze, grasscloth, thick red and gold carpets, parquet floors, the celebrated Stone grilles—all applied with lavish generosity and occasionally smothering overtones of domestic luxury.”¹⁴ Upon the opening of the museum, curator Margaret Potter praised the galleries and the interior designer John Rainey: “The elegance and quiet luxury of the furnishings have provided such a magnificent setting and atmosphere for the works of art. . . .”¹⁵ Such decadent architectural details describe a very different setting for modern art than the international-style aesthetic cultivated by MoMA.

MoMA had given Dalí a solo exhibition in 1941, but even then had felt the need to address Dalí's ambivalent, even fallen, status in the art world. James Thrall Soby, the show's curator, described Dalí's hold on the popular consciousness: "In America, where Dalí's fame has been the greatest, large sections of the public have acquired a taste for vicariously experiencing all manner of violent sensations. The tabloids, radio and moving pictures have fed the taste with a cunning hand..."¹⁶ Soby not only acknowledges Dalí's notoriety, but attributes the public's taste for Dalí, at least in part, as being cultivated by mass media.

Despite Hartford's well-known disdain for the Museum of Modern Art, curator Carl J. Weinhardt's introduction to the catalogue that accompanied the exhibition at the Gallery of Modern Art reminded the public of the solo show that Dalí had received at MoMA: "It is hard to believe that twenty-five years have elapsed since the Museum of Modern Art presented the first major Dalí exhibition in this country... Thus it is high time for another survey..."¹⁷ The foreword to the catalogue repeated the strategy that MoMA had employed by openly acknowledging Dalí's popularity: "Today a painting by Dalí immediately recalls the personality of the artist and his eccentric behavior."¹⁸ Arguing for the primacy of the paintings over the personality of the artist, Theodore Rousseau, curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art recalled that Dalí's works "have been violently attacked, but they have also been passionately admired, and they have fascinated the general public. They... are often more popular than works of artists long recognized as the greatest."¹⁹ Here the popularity of the works is almost conflated with their quality.

Indeed, Hartford was banking on Dalí's popularity. Only a year and a half old, Hartford's Gallery of Modern Art was already suffering financially. The Dalí collector A. Reynolds Morse felt that a Dalí exhibition would rejuvenate the struggling institution and moreover even transform it. Recounting a conversation with Dalí's wife Gala, Morse wrote that "It was useless to try to explain to her that he [Carl Weinhardt, the Gallery's director] understood perfectly what I meant when I said he needed a hit show just now. I told Gala we must all work toward making the Gallery of Modern Art into the definitive Dalí Museum."²⁰

In spite of the exhibition curator's stated desire to foreground the nearly 300 works in the exhibition, programming around the exhibition centered on the artist himself. In addition to the public opening, "Two Evenings with Salvador Dalí" were scheduled to take place on December 18 and 19 in the auditorium of the Gallery.²¹ A transcript of the December 19th event reveals that not only was Edward Durell Stone, the building's well-known architect, on hand as the master of ceremonies, but after a screening of *Un Chien Andalou*, Dalí drew at an easel while a Spanish guitarist played music and Dalí interacted with the audience.²² This was followed by an

illustrated lecture by A. Reynolds Morse, whose Dalí collection formed the backbone of the exhibition. A. Reynolds Morse had been instrumental in making the Dalí exhibition happen—paying the cost of transporting the bulk of his collection, 186 Dalí works—to New York for the occasion, facilitating the publication of the catalogue, and helping to hang the show with Dalí and the curators.²³

The evening was advertised in the paper as a black tie champagne buffet, and tickets were sold at \$50 each, though prospective attendees were reminded that “Contributions to the Foundation for Modern Art Are Tax Deductable.”²⁴ A critic for *Time* magazine incorporated Dalí’s appearance and performance into his review, commenting that, “it was Dalí himself who won best-of-show at a gala black-tie lecture attended by critics, socialites and an ocelot on a leash. Sporting his silver-handled cane, Dalí held the audience in breathless amusement as he dashed off a sketch of a horseman to the tempo of [flamenco guitar]...Not that Dalí had skimped on art for the occasion...It covers quite a bit of art history in a style that describes Dalí himself—a pastiche.”²⁵ Another reviewer wrote, “The Gallery of Modern Art has made this a smash performance.”²⁶

Many reviewers were unable, or unwilling, to discuss the work without addressing the persona of the artist. In some ways the exhibition—and the programming that surrounded it—provoked such a comparison, since it was framed as a major retrospective spanning the artist’s career from the time he was six years old until the present.²⁷ The exhibition also included not only Dalí’s paintings, but drawings, prints and jewelry designs, taking over every floor available to exhibit in Hartford’s museum.²⁸ Morse felt that the show was not marketed effectively—not only were many of the works being shown in the U.S. for the first time, but many from the Dalí’s collection had not been shown in 30 years.²⁹ Nonetheless, initial attendance reports indicate a strong interest in the Dalí show, with between 2,000-3,000 visitors per day in the early weeks of the exhibition.³⁰

Like the variety of work on display, the reviews were, perhaps predictably, mixed. John Canaday of the *New York Times* described the show as “unutterably vulgar,”³¹ noting that though there were:

small, beautiful spots, like the portrait of Harpo Marx...if you can separate them from the grotesque and pretentious clamor that surrounds them on every side, there are some (not all) of Dalí’s best paintings, such as the Philadelphia Museum of Art’s *Premonitions of Civil War*. But the fine spots are swamped under the dozens of polished absurdities that have for so long been Dalí’s substitute for the talent that he killed by abuse. Even the best work suffers by

magnification of its weaknesses since it cannot be dissociated from the Freudian clown that Dalí has chosen to project as his public image over the decades.³²

Oddly, a shorter notice published a week later in *The New York Times* and signed by J.C. (presumably John Canaday again), gave a more moderate assessment of the show, and focused on the audience's indiscriminate appetite for Dalí. The author writes, "...it is a lot of Dalí and time has shown that there is a large public that cannot get too much of him, with a loyal indifference as to whether he is at his best or at his worst."³³ Another reviewer asserted that the exhibition would be "a revelation and a chastening blow to anyone who has ever sealed off Dalí as a spent talent whose limited contribution to modern art came to an end in the late 1930s"³⁴; yet also conceded that "Dalí is a great artist by twentieth-century standards, betrayed by frequent and apparently unavoidable lapses of taste."³⁵ Critic Emily Genauer, who praised the show, tempered her enthusiasm by acknowledging the general ambivalence of critics: "It is almost an embarrassment to say it. Salvador Dalí is a great painter."³⁶ Even Huntington Hartford, interviewed in 1970 following the 1969 closure of the Gallery of Modern Art, also picked up on the conflict between the artist's fine art and commercial ventures:

I keep going back to Dalí as an example of a great painter. Although I do have reservations about Dalí. I mean I don't think Dalí is probably a Monet or a Constable, certainly not a Turner, I don't think he's a Winslow Homer. But at the same time I still think he is one of the great painters of history. I think he will go down as a great painter. I think he has done a tremendous amount of second-rate stuff. And so did Dickens. Nobody wrote more second-rate stuff than Charles Dickens. And I mean I think there's an analogy there in that sense. We live in a much more commercial age even than the one that Dickens lived in, you know, where it pays off to do second-rate stuff...But as far as Dalí goes I think the last ten years he's devoted himself assiduously to doing great paintings and I think he's accomplished that.³⁷

Though Hartford considered himself an arbiter of taste, he offers a more nuanced understanding of the market concerns with which Dalí contended.

While critics—and the public—were familiar with Dalí as a fixture in the American press for decades, the attention that the Museum of Modern Art

exhibition brought to Magritte was entirely new. In the United States, Magritte had fairly frequent gallery shows throughout the 1950s and 1960s at his dealer Alexander Iolas's gallery, but none had received serious attention. Perhaps his most important show, prior to the 1960s, was "Word vs. Image" at the Sidney Janis Gallery in 1954, where, almost a quarter-century after it was made, Magritte's *Treachery of Images* was first exhibited, and reproduced, in the U.S.³⁸ Though it was a commercial failure, "Word vs. Image" was an important show—it was the first American exhibition that grouped Magritte's works thematically. It was at this show that Jasper Johns first encountered Magritte's work.³⁹ Yet for the most part, Magritte was barely discussed in the New York art press. Only one work sold from the Sidney Janis exhibition,⁴⁰ and many critics expressed the opinion of Thomas Hess in *Art News*, that the works were "droll but peripheral."⁴¹ Eventually, Johns, Robert Rauschenberg and Andy Warhol all came to own works by Magritte.

Nonetheless, growing interest in Magritte was surely the beginning of a larger anti-expressionist trend in contemporary art that William Rubin described as "pseudo-Dada activity on the part of the younger artists, a response related in part to the atmosphere of indecision—even crisis—which has followed in the wake of massive advances wrought by Pollock, Still, Rothko and others."⁴² When Walter Hopps curated a major Duchamp retrospective at the Pasadena Museum in 1963, Duchamp's work was reintroduced to a new generation of artists—Warhol, Ed Ruscha, Billy Al Bengston and Dennis Hopper attended the opening. Though the exhibition did not travel and was reviewed primarily by regional publications, Duchamp's oeuvre offered a model for contemporary conceptual works. Rubin argued, in his assessment of Duchamp, that the artist's early painting could be compared with the style of Dali and Magritte, and offered a strategy for dry academic painting to act as a form of anti-art.⁴³ Duchamp's oeuvre offered a model for contemporary conceptual works. However, his alleged retirement from painting in the 1920s did not present an explicit precedent for the type of deadpan imagery that Magritte's works conjured.

Thanks to the exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, Magritte was hailed as a "hip, on-the-scene artist" despite the fact that he had been painting consistently, with little stylistic change, for over 40 years.⁴⁴ The Magritte exhibition at MoMA opened to the public on December 15, 1965. Curated by William Seitz (who selected the paintings) and James Thrall Soby (who wrote the catalogue), the exhibition was Magritte's first and only solo show at the Museum of Modern Art.⁴⁵ While Magritte, like Dalí, worked in multiple mediums, the exhibition displayed 81 works, all of which seem to have been paintings. In addition to the paintings on display in the galleries, MoMA also showed a film about Magritte in its auditorium for the first

month of the exhibition, which was viewed by some 2,000 visitors.⁴⁶

American museums held exhibitions of Magritte's work in 1961, 1962 and 1964—the earliest at the Dallas Museum for Contemporary Art, followed by a retrospective at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, and an exhibition presented at the University of St. Thomas, Houston and the Arkansas Art Center in Little Rock—yet none of these shows traveled outside of the regions in which they originated. Dickran Tashjian credits MoMA's ability to create cultural buzz for the active solicitation of its 1965 Magritte show,⁴⁷ which traveled to the Rose Art Museum at Brandeis University, the Art Institute of Chicago, the Pasadena Art Museum (where the Duchamp retrospective had been held three years earlier) and the University Art Museum at Berkeley. Indeed, MoMA had to turn away museums that wanted to host the exhibition; by contrast, the Gallery of Modern Art was the only venue for the Dalí exhibition.

Earlier museum exhibitions of Magritte's work in the U.S.—particularly “Rene Magritte in America” in 1960-61 at the Dallas Museum and Museum of Fine Arts, Houston—displayed Magritte in a whimsical format. In both exhibitions, works were hung at odd intervals and at varying heights, and Magrittean props were scattered amongst the paintings. Installation photographs reveal light posts topped with bowler hats in Dallas, and boulders (perhaps paper maché) in troughs of small pebbles in Houston. By contrast, MoMA's exhibition treated Magritte's work more formally, not only in its installation, but also in the scholarly text provided by James Thrall Soby (Fig. 1).⁴⁸ The paintings were displayed in a straightforward, almost spare, manner, on light colored walls with occasional dark colored walls setting off larger works.

With Magritte and his works featured in spreads in *Esquire* and *Life* magazines,⁴⁹ as Dalí had once been, MoMA's 1965 Magritte exhibition succeeded in driving both popular and critical attention toward figurative Surrealism in a way that Dalí's exhibition at Hartford's Gallery was not able to do. At least one critic commented on the perhaps unexpected popularity of the show: “Rene Magritte is packing them in at the Museum of Modern Art, with nothing moving or making sounds...His work has pulled in the housewife and the teen-ager with a casual interest in art as well as the more sophisticated college crowd and the denizens of our art culture.”⁵⁰ Noted William Berkson in *Arts Magazine*, “The Modern has a canny way of picking the right times for such exhibitions. Magritte, although his alliance with the fantastic firmly separates him from Pop, criticizes the contemporary scene with his extreme calm.”⁵¹ In fact, almost every review mentioned Magritte's work as an integral antecedent for Pop art.⁵² A characteristic example was critic Henry J. Seldis' review, written when the exhibition traveled to the Pasadena Art



Fig. 1. Installation view of the exhibition, “René Magritte.” December 15, 1965 through February 27, 1966. The Museum of Modern Art, New York. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. Photo: Rolf Petersen © The Museum of Modern Art/Licensed by SCALA / Art Resource, NY

Museum; Seldis observed that “the overt irrationality as found in the scale and repetition of everyday banalities that marks the best of Pop, can be seen, in a sense, as a further extension of the somnambulant irrationality found in many of Magritte’s scenes.”⁵³ Though not habitually referencing popular culture, Magritte’s steadfast figuration and his foregrounding of the impersonal icon in an age still dominated critically by artistic iconoclasm may have been enough to warrant his significance for contemporary artists.⁵⁴ But more significantly, Magritte, like the Pop artists, fixated on a world in which objects did not operate through their expected networks, wherein they were invested with an interior life remarked upon through deadpan and irony.

Dalí, who in recent years had explicitly experimented with Op and Pop themes (for example in the painting *Fifty Abstract Pictures as Seen from Two Yards Change into Three Lenins Masquerading as Chinese and as seen from Six Yards appear as the Head of a Royal Tiger* (1963) on display in his retrospective), was not quite able to convince critics of his relevance to the contemporary art scene. Indeed, Dalí’s frenetic

personality may have been part of the problem:

Dalí said the secret of the success of the show would be to keep injecting it with new ideas. Every week some new aspect of himself and his art should be promoted to keep crowds coming. He then launched into a detailed explanation of the ingredients planned for his first injection of new vitality into the show...Dalí said he planned to show how Pop Art was a necessary prelude to a revival of beauty...of meaning in art.⁵⁵

Dalí may have also been hindered in this by the publicity given to his large-scale academic history paintings of the 1950s, including *The Discovery of America by Christopher Columbus*, which was owned by Hartford and given pride of place in the museum. Max Kozloff assessed the situation in *The Nation*: “Instead of rapidly adjusting to slick plastic surgery—the sort of thing so tasteless in Dalí—the spectator here oscillates between the sensation of looking through, and of being observed by, an aperture...”⁵⁶ Beyond his showmanship, Dalí’s adaptability seemed to signal to critics that he was not committed to any particular form of aesthetic expression. Comparing the two artists, the reviewer for *Newsweek* wrote:

The Belgian-born painter is no idle dreamer, no Dalí-esque trickster or exhibitionistic display of his sublimations and repressions. Magritte is much more difficult to understand than Dalí, who is also currently having a retrospective (at Huntington Hartford’s Gallery of Modern Art), and he is certainly a more genuine, original and profound artist.⁵⁷

While literary scholar Roger Shattuck felt that the “national weeklies and the New York art critics appear to want to treat [Magritte] favorably but do not have means of doing so: too enigmatic, too personal, a shock too subtle to reproduce easily on coated paper, no flamboyance in an interview...”⁵⁸ it was precisely Magritte’s unobtrusiveness as an art world figure that complemented (and contrasted with) the literalness of his work.⁵⁹ Other reviews noted this as well. One wrote, “Next to Magritte’s granite integrity, how shallow, meaningless, and theatrical appear most of the conceits of the ‘showman’ Dalí. If one is a jester, the other is a seer of apocalyptic visions.”⁶⁰ And comparing Magritte and Dalí once again, Canaday wrote in *The New York Times*, “As a fantasist [Magritte] is the least exhibitionistic of artists. He never brings off his effects with a flourish; it is his very

commonplaceness that does the trick.”⁶¹ In combination Dalí and Magritte were able to embody the versatility of figurative Surrealism that, ever since the 1960s, had come to factor more and more prominently in the contemporary art scene. Magritte demonstrates the prosaic absurdity of the world of objects through his marriage of conceptualism and illusionism. And while Theodore Rousseau’s foreword to the Dalí catalogue predicted that “with the passage of time, the details of an artist’s life and his opinions are forgotten, and his fame comes to depend entirely on his paintings,”⁶² Dalí’s greatest legacy for art history seems to lie precisely in his ability to cultivate lasting publicity as an artist. Not coincidentally, he sat for a screen test with Andy Warhol in 1966. He offered a precedent for the crafting of the artist into a celebrity—an artistic strategy that continues to reverberate today.



- 1 Clement Greenberg, “Surrealist Painting,” *The Nation* (August 12 and 19, 1944).
- 2 Emily Genauer, “Dali and Magritte: Pop’s Papas,” *New York World Telegram and Sun* (December 18, 1965), n.p.
- 3 Genauer, “Dali and Magritte: Pop’s Papas,” n.p.
- 4 James R. Mellow, “Birds of a Feather,” *New Leader* (February 14, 1966): 29.
- 5 The following year, the art critic Gene Swenson curated the exhibition *The Other Tradition* at the Philadelphia Institute for Contemporary Art, which “proposed nothing less than an alternative, ‘non-formal’ history of twentieth-century art, tracing a lineage that went not from Cubism’s flattened picture plane to Color Field painting but from Dada and Surrealism to Pop. ... Swenson instead proposed a sophisticated reappraisal of Surrealism through the cool lens of Pop...emphasizing their fascination with the rich emotional and psychological responses triggered by everyday objects...” (Scott Rothkopf, “Banned and Determined: Scott Rothkopf on Gene Swenson,” *Artforum*, v. 40, n. 10 (Summer 2002): 194.
- 6 See Ruth Robinson, “Dali and His Art Attract Throng to Preview,” *The New York Times*, December 18, 1965.
- 7 See Maureen Sullivan, “Rage of Columbus Circle,” *Catholic News* (February 17, 1966).
- 8 Roger Shattuck, “This is Not Rene Magritte,” *Artforum* (September 1966): 32.

- Dickran Tashjian notes that this is the only reference to any antics at Magritte's MoMA exhibition, and I too have not found another article that mentions it. (Dickran Tashjian, "Magritte's Last Laugh: A Surrealist's Reception in America," *Magritte and Contemporary Art* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2006), 59. Sculptor Ruth Vollmer, who attended the opening did not mention Dali's presence, describing it as "a festive occasion, people seemed to be particularly spirited—and such a nice unstuffy crowd" (Ruth Vollmer, letter to Associate Curator Alicia Legg, December 13, 1965, Museum of Modern Art Archives).
- 9 "Nemesis Pickets Dali Show," *New York Herald Tribune* (December 19, 1965): 37.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 James R. Mellow, "Birds of a Feather," *New Leader* (February 14, 1966): 28.
- 12 David K. Randall, "Only the Store is Gone," *New York Times* (February 19, 2006). Randall continues, "Rarely was the store mentioned without reference to its rival, and many New Yorkers always had trouble distinguishing between the two." Additionally, Hartford's decision to name his museum The Gallery of Modern Art also facilitated confusion between his institution and the Museum of Modern Art.
- 13 John Canaday, "Doing Just Fine Lately, Thanks," *The New York Times* (April 2, 1967).
- 14 Ada Louise Huxtable, "Columbus Circle Gallery Will Open in Mid-March," *The New York Times* (February 25, 1964): 33.
- 15 Margaret Potter, letter to John Rainey, March 27, 1964, Edward Durell Stone archives, University of Arkansas.
- 16 James Thrall Soby, *Salvador Dalí* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1941), 27.
- 17 Carl J. Weinhardt, Jr., "Introduction," *Salvador Dalí 1910-1965* (New York: Gallery of Modern Art, 1965), 7. Listed as Director in the exhibition catalogue, Weinhardt had apparently resigned by the time the exhibition opened and is referred to as "former Director" in the exhibition's press release.
- 18 The foreword was reprinted from the foreword that Theodore Rousseau, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, had written for the 1962 book *The World of Salvador Dalí*. See Robert Descharnes, *The World of Salvador Dalí* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962). The majority of the new text in the catalogue was a two-and-a-half page artist statement written by Dalí himself.
- 19 Theodore Rousseau, "Foreword," *Salvador Dalí 1910-1965* (New York: Gallery of Modern Art, 1965), 9.
- 20 A. Reynolds Morse, A. Reynolds Morse journals, frame 1247, Smithsonian Archives of American Art. Morse at one point hoped to "salvage the Hartford Museum [by] donat[ing] our collection gradually to our own Foundation and try to get it displayed on a Dalí floor at the Gallery of Modern Art" (A. Reynolds Morse

journals, frame 1273, Smithsonian Archives of American Art).

21 Due to lack of initial ticket sales, these were eventually combined into one event, which took place on December 19, 1965 to an audience of about 100 (A. Reynolds Morse journals, frame 1260, Smithsonian Archives of American Art).

22 "An Evening with Salvador Dali at the Gallery of Modern Art," published by the Reynolds Morse Foundation, Cleveland, OH, 1966 (archives of the Salvador Dali Foundation, Figueres, Spain).

23 A. Reynolds Morse had a vested interest in a successful exhibition of Dali's works, but was also able to take on a larger role because of administrative upheaval at the Gallery of Modern Art, which included the departure of Director Carl Weinhardt.

24 Advertisement, "An Evening with Salvador Dali," newspaper unknown, 1965, Huntington Hartford archives.

25 "The Comedian and the Straight Man," *Time* (December 31, 1965).

26 "Portrait of the Artist as a Young Eyeball," *Patriot Ledger* (January 7, 1966).

27 The choice to begin the exhibition with works by the six-year-old Dali prompted art critic John Canaday to dub the retrospective postnatal, and also to ask how Dali could account for his lack of productivity between 1904 and 1910.

28 Hartford removed his own collection from display in order to clear more space for the Dali show. At this juncture, I have not been able to locate any installation photographs of Dali's retrospective at the Gallery of Modern Art.

29 A. Reynolds Morse, A. Reynolds Morse journals, frame 1269, Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

30 A. Reynolds Morse, A. Reynolds Morse journals, frame 1280, Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

31 John Canaday, "Art: Dali's Postnatal Retrospective," *The New York Times* (December 18, 1965).

32 Canaday, "Art: Dali's Postnatal Retrospective."

33 J.C., "Dali and More Dali in the Daliest Show Ever," *The New York Times* (December 26, 1965).

34 Bryan Robertson, "Hello Dali," *Spectator* (January 7, 1966).

35 Robertson, "Hello Dali."

36 Emily Genauer, "400 Works by Dali Prove It: He's Great," *New York Herald Tribune* (December 18, 1965).

37 Huntington Hartford, interviewed by Paul Cummings, May 19, 1970, Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

38 The reproduction was published in *Arts Digest* to accompany Robert Rosenblum's review of Janis's exhibition. This is also one of the first reviews to

describe Magritte's paintings as detached and matter-of-fact, as opposed to the previous characterization of his paintings as personal dream fantasies. See Robert Rosenblum, "Magritte's Surrealist Grammar," *Art Digest* (March 15, 1954): 16.

39 See Roberta Bernstein, "René Magritte and Jasper Johns: Making Thoughts Visible," in *Magritte and Contemporary Art: The Treachery of Images*, ed. Stephanie Barron and Michel Draguet (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2006), 109-123.

40 In an interview in 1967, Sidney Janis described the show: "Well, the exhibition that we did on "Word vs. Image" was a dismal failure; I think we sold one picture, and that picture was bought by Saul Steinberg" (Sidney Janis, Interview, conducted by Helen M. Franc, MoMA archives (June 15, 1967)).

41 Thomas B. Hess, "Rene Magritte [Janis]," *Art News*, v. 53, n. 2 (April 1954): 43.

42 William Rubin, "Reflexions on Marcel Duchamp," *Art International* (December 1960): 49.

43 William Rubin, "Reflexions on Marcel Duchamp," *Art International* (December 1960): 52. There are a few reviews of the exhibition in national publications: in *Artforum*, which was published on the west coast but circulated nationally, and articles in *The New York Times*. See Paul Wescher, "Marcel Duchamp," *Artforum*, v. 2, n. 6 (December 1963): 19-22, and Murray Schumach, "Pasadena to See Art of Duchamp," *The New York Times* (August 13, 1963).

44 Walter Barker, "Magritte's Dislocations of Reality," *Sunday Post Dispatch* (January 9, 1966). Magritte is generally acknowledged to have had two departures from his signature style—during World War II, he painted what he called "Sunlit Surrealism" and for six weeks in 1948, he embarked on his "vache" period.

45 MoMA initially contacted James Thrall Soby, who had authored several books on the Surrealists, including Dalí's 1941 MoMA exhibition catalogue, to curate the show but he declined, citing medical difficulties, and instead wrote the catalogue text. The responsibility for selecting and hanging the works was given to William Seitz, who was at the time the curator of the Department of Painting and Sculpture Exhibitions. Seitz left the museum before the show opened to become a director of the Rose Art Museum and Professor of Fine Arts at Brandeis. The Belgian Government also gave its official sponsorship to the exhibition.

46 Margareta Akermark, letter to Frans Maes (Director of the Belgian Government Information Center), January 26, 1966 (Magritte exhibition files, MoMA archives). MoMA also looked into acquiring this film for its collection.

47 Dickran Tashjian, "Magritte's Last Laugh: A Surrealist's Reception in America," *Magritte and Contemporary Art: The Treachery of Images* (Los Angeles: LACMA, 2006), 57. It was also in 1965, that Patrick Waldberg, who associated with the Surrealists,

published his study of Magritte, which, in addition to James Thrall Soby's catalogue, became the large-scale English-language publication on the artist (see Patrick Waldberg, *René Magritte* (Brussels: André de Rache, 1965).

48 Soby felt strongly that the catalogue should be a resource for future Magritte scholars and urged that the bibliography included with his text list at least 100 items, even if that meant cutting out plate pages (James Thrall Soby, letter to Monroe Wheeler, August 24, 1965, Magritte exhibition files, MoMA Archives). A text by the young scholar Suzi Gablik, who knew the artist, was rejected for inclusion in the MoMA catalogue, following Lucy Lippard's report that it presented Magritte in a historical vacuum (Magritte exhibition files, September 21, 1964, MoMA Archives).

49 "This is Not Magritte," *Esquire* (February 1966); "The Enigmatic Visions of René Magritte," *Life* (April 22, 1966): 113-119.

50 Walter Barker, "Magritte's Dislocations of Reality."

51 William Berkson, "René Magritte," *Arts Magazine*, v. 40, n. 4 (February 1966): 52.

52 See Grace Glueck, "A Bottle is a Bottle," *The New York Times* (December 19, 1965); Max Kozloff, "Epiphanies of Artifice," *The Nation* (January 10, 1966): 56; Earl W. Foell, "Is Dada Daddy to Pop?" *Christian Science Monitor* (June 2, 1966).

53 Henry J. Seldis, *Los Angeles Times* (August 14, 1966).

54 His working method too resembled that of the Pop artists. When Sarah Whitfield writes of Magritte's practice, she says, "in an age that prizes originality, Magritte's resolve to pursue a technique which courted anonymity, which set out to be workmanlike rather than experimental, has been widely interpreted as a refusal to be a part of the modernist tradition." Sarah Whitfield, *Magritte* (London: The South Bank Centre, 1992), 13.

55 A. Reynolds Morse, A, Reynolds Morse journal, frame 1284, Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

56 Max Kozloff, "Epiphanies of Artifice," *The Nation* (January 10, 1966).

57 "The Square Surrealist," *Newsweek* (January 3, 1966).

58 Roger Shattuck, "This is Not Rene Magritte," *Artforum* (September 1966): 32.

59 I address Magritte's consistent characterization as a secret agent in the New York press in my article, "Secret Agency: Magritte at MoMA in the 1960s," *Art Journal*, v. 71, n. 2 (Summer 2012): 100-113.

60 M-L. D'Otrange Mastai, "The Connoisseur in America: Rene Magritte," *The Connoisseur* (May, 1966).

61 John Canaday, "The Quiet Necromancer," *The New York Times* (December 19, 1965): X17.

62 "Foreword," *Salvador Dali 1910-1965* (New York: Gallery of Modern Art, 1965), 9.