



ALAN RUIZ MATRIX 195 RISK MANAGEMENT

OCTOBER 4, 2024 - JANUARY 19, 2025



WADSWORTH ATHENEUM MUSEUM OF ART

WITH DREAMS, WE WILL HAVE REALITIES

Founded in 1842 and opened in 1844, the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art initially focused on contemporary American art of its time, although this was not its sole focus. Despite this commitment to the present, the institution came to being in an age still dominated by the aspiration of the encyclopedic museum. A. J. Davis, one of the architects of the museum's first building, described his and Ithiel Town's design as giving the "arts of civilization a characteristic and permanent home."¹ The task of the encyclopedic museum—itsself a product of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment—is to offer a comprehensive representation of entire fields of knowledge through its collection. Its underlying assumption is that everything we know can be contained and condensed in such a way that visitors to the museum can traverse the globe through a single point of connection. As an institutional model, it establishes distinctions; its collecting practices are driven by explicit and covert decisions about what is significant and worth knowing. Its capacity to contain the world of knowledge is delimited by a classification system it operates by and enforces. All of this happens under one roof, an ongoing process of parsing objects into a taxonomy so they can be reassembled within the institution's notion of order.

These classificatory processes manifest physically in an institution's containers—buildings, galleries, vitrines, armatures—which form through parallel operations, ideologies, and concentrations of power. The interiors of encyclopedic museums reaffirm sequential and spatialized historical narratives through an unfolding array of rooms, lighting, and displays. A building's external envelope broadcasts a set of values and fantasies, reflecting an organization's ideal and unified self-image—its primary boundary. Like all social institutions, buildings contain and are nested within larger systems, suspended within increasingly complex environments. Yet often these structures exceed an institution's aspirations and fall out of sync with their existing embodiment and changing contexts.

What happens when an institution outgrows its container? In 2000, the Wadsworth Atheneum announced an expansion project that would consolidate its five existing buildings. By 2003, the plan had been abandoned due to its financial reach. The legacy of this unrealized expansion endures as an under-explored and valuable case study, illuminating the complex intersection of social systems, organizational change, leadership, global architecture, urban development, and shifting understandings of the role of art institutions at the dawn of the new millennium.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The oldest continuously operating museum in the United States, the Wadsworth Atheneum was constructed in phases between 1844 and 1969 as a complex of five connected buildings: the original Wadsworth building (1844), the Colt Memorial (1910), the Morgan Memorial (1915), the Avery Memorial (1934), and the Goodwin building (1969). Each building represents a distinct period in architectural history, spanning Gothic Revival, Tudor Revival, Beaux-Arts, International Style, and Neo-Brutalism. The cumulative effect is a Frankensteinian collage of architectural styles that were popular over the eras of the museum's incremental growth and reflect the evolving vision, authority, and wealth of its benefactors and leadership.

In the early 1930s, Atheneum director Arthur Everett "Chick" Austin Jr. observed, "It is quite sufficient to build in the best taste of one's own time. In ten years ideas will have changed but these changes cannot now be anticipated."² The young director's ambition would result in the Avery Memorial, the first International Style museum interior in the United States. Designed almost entirely to Austin's specifications by Robert B. O'Connor of the New York firm Morris & O'Connor, the Avery's Bauhaus-inspired central court, with its geometric lines and open design, astonished museum audiences of the time. Ever attuned to the present, Austin's legacy is remembered as one of innovation, bringing the work of Picasso, Dalí, George Balanchine, Le Corbusier, and others to the Wadsworth. Such contemporary programming defined Austin's tenure and underscored his restless ambition to position Hartford as a hub of modernist cultural innovation.

CONTINUING INNOVATION

On July 17, 2000, the Wadsworth Atheneum announced plans for yet another building project, this time foregrounding a desire to improve its facilities, bring the museum into the twenty-first century, and, most importantly, unify its fragmented five-building complex.³ George David, then president of the Wadsworth Atheneum's board of trustees and chairman of United Technologies Corporation (UTC), a multinational conglomerate headquartered in Farmington, CT, articulated the ambitions of the institution's planned expansion: "Great architecture foreshadows and raises the excitement of what's inside. Hartford deserves architectural and other goals as lofty as Washington and London and Bilbao. With dreams, we will have realities."⁴ David's statement reconnects the Wadsworth with its Austin-led legacy of innovation through infrastructure and addresses, perhaps contradictorily, a local Hartford community and an international art audience.

A design task is seldom the purview of one individual, and more often a series of group processes and intra-organizational dialogues. To realize a built project of this scale, an organization often solicits proposals from a number of architects for review by a team of institutional and community stakeholders. These "architectural competitions" generate renderings, diagrams, models, capital campaigns, and PowerPoint presentations, media that carry the promise of an organization's growth, prosperity, and mission. In this sense, this suite of materials may also convey the aspirations and fantasies of a group and may unleash powerful irrational and covert forces, as members negotiate their collective and conflicting individual investments in a design's outcome.



SIMON ALEXANDER, DSC_0528.JPG, 2001. (L-R): GEORGE DAVID, BEN VAN BERKEL, SYLVIA SMITH, AND KATE M. SELLERS, WITH UNSTUDIO MODEL FOR EXPANDED WADSWORTH ATHENEUM MUSEUM OF ART. WADSWORTH ATHENEUM MUSEUM OF ART ARCHIVES.

At the Wadsworth, an Architecture and Project Planning committee was assembled including board president David; curator of contemporary art Nicholas Baume; trustee Mickey Cartin; vice president of the board David Dangremond; Gabriella De Ferrari; acting director Elizabeth Mankin Kornhauser; and chair and former secretary of the board of trustees Carol LeWitt. Together, they developed a list of fifty international architects “poised to be the next Frank Gehry.”⁵ The New York firm Fox & Fowle Architects was hired as the executive architectural team to work alongside the winning designer, and the artist Maya Lin was selected to design an outdoor work for the museum on Main Street.

On October 6, 2000, four finalists—Brad Coepfil, Zaha Hadid, Morphosis, and UNStudio—spoke publicly about their work during “Architecture and the New Museum: A Forum for the Future,” a symposium organized by the Wadsworth Atheneum and moderated by Terence Riley, former chief curator of architecture and design at the Museum of Modern Art, New York. The forum provided a platform for architects to showcase contemporary approaches to form and for the public to engage in discussions about contemporary architecture’s societal role, including the future function of museums and their relationship to their contexts. Held in the Hilton Hartford’s Grand Ballroom, the forum hosted 500 attendees and boasted a 300 person waitlist, drawing comparison to the competitiveness of attending college basketball’s Final Four tournament.⁶ However, in this particular arena, the press located the conflict not among the rival architects, but rather within the public, members of which reportedly debated the relative benefits of “provocative” designs and traditional approaches to building.⁷

The forum had institutional precedents. The previous year, the Atheneum hosted a panel discussion which warmed the waters for introducing new architecture to the Wadsworth and new urban schemas to the city of Hartford.⁸ Over sixty years earlier, as part of the 1932 exhibition *Modern Architecture*, Austin organized a forum with a similar objective including architects Philip Johnson, William Lescaze, and historian Henry-Russell Hitchcock. Like the Architecture and Project Planning committee, Austin likely intended this event and exhibition to subtly prepare the Atheneum's audience and trustees for what would later become the Avery Memorial.

DIGITAL TURN

Upon the recommendation of the Architecture and Project Planning committee, museum leadership selected the Netherlands-based firm UNStudio. Architect Sylvia Smith from Fox & Fowle collaborated closely with Caroline Bos and Ben van Berkel of UNStudio, comprehensively overseeing the design plan to help create a "strong catalytic element that would create a new whole."⁹ The Dutch architects were keenly aware of the changing social role of the architect. If, in the twentieth century, designers were tasked with top-down planning, in the context of twenty-first century urban centers, architects confronted spatial practice as developing nodal points within a larger network. Aligning their practice closely with existing infrastructure, the firm engaged in a situationally specific strategy they called "deep planning" that responded to the economic and public conditions of a site.¹⁰ UNStudio's topological and material approach continued the existing collage-like configuration of buildings that constituted the Wadsworth Atheneum's campus. Van Berkel likened their spatial method to that of curators "working with the collection of the buildings."¹¹ Introducing cohesion to this architectural network of buildings, UNStudio's proposal intended to enhance circulation pathways, optimize sight lines, and add 60,000 square feet of improved storage capacity and expanded gallery space for contemporary art.

However, their recommendation was grounded in substantial organizational transformation. Responding to public aversion towards the museum's crenelated Gothic Revival Wadsworth building, as evidenced by focus group research, the renovation aimed to communicate differently to Hartford's public, dissolving its perceived exclusionary boundaries. To achieve this and to rationalize the new circulation plan, UNStudio proposed to demolish the Goodwin building, replacing the fortress-like Brutalist threshold with a more open and welcoming entrance and linking it to a bus station on Main Street.¹² This surgical operation would close the interior open-air Gengras Court but connect the four remaining buildings with two spiraling ramps in a double-helix configuration, introducing new arteries to previously obstructed parts of the museum. At the apex of an expanded entrance hall, a central oculus would naturally illuminate a new and much-needed public gathering space in Hartford. "This is not simply about making architecture," said van Berkel. "It's about creating a new kind of experience."¹³

UNStudio's proposal was formally striking and characterized by sinuous curves, folds, and complex geometry that intervened in the museum's existing fabric. Aesthetically, the design exemplified architecture's "digital turn," which, since the 1990s, was marked by the widespread adoption of computer-aided design, and bolstered by postmodern critical theory, most notably the writing of Gilles Deleuze and his book on

the fold. Architectural theorist Mario Carpo noted that this era heralded a “trend so conspicuous and novel” wherein intricate forms and blobs, previously unimaginable for human designers to realize alone, came to symbolize the essence of digital innovation in architecture.¹⁴

This period witnessed some of the most iconic and contested additions to the built environment and became synonymous with contemporary museum architecture. Perhaps the most cited example, Frank Gehry’s 1997 design for the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, Spain, was one of the earliest architectural projects to employ CATIA, a software originally used for aircraft design and capable of modeling the exact contours of over forty-thousand titanium panels. Despite Gehry’s signature curvilinear approach, Carpo and other scholars argue that the digital turn minimized the modernist authorial role of the architect. Working with CATIA necessitated submitting to the possibilities and limitations of the software, a tension that has remained one of the main criticisms of the trend.

URBAN MAGNETS

From Austin’s revolutionary vision to David’s aspiration of competing with world centers, leadership at the Wadsworth has often wanted more not just for the museum but also for Hartford. The belief that civic transformation begins with an architecturally significant contemporary museum is often pegged to an urban dynamic known as the “Bilbao Effect.” When Gehry’s Guggenheim Bilbao opened in 1997, the city became a magnet for urban investment, expanding its commercial districts and tourism industry. Celebrated as a model for how culture could radiate value and incentivize development, the Guggenheim has become a neoliberal formula in which art lubricates the experience-driven economy of place-making.

Unsurprisingly, the Wadsworth Atheneum expansion was envisioned as one ingredient in a larger urban renewal effort. As reported in the *Hartford Courant*, the new Wadsworth would create “a classy, enticing ‘gate-way’ to Adriaen’s Landing,” a \$500 million mixed-use economic development project intended to reinvigorate the city after decades of decline.¹⁵ Named after Adriaen Bloch, a Dutch colonist who sailed the Connecticut River in the 1600s, Adriaen’s Landing would host a retail-entertainment-apartment complex, hotel, convention center, and 500,000 square feet of shopping space.

Adriaen’s Landing is only one chapter in the state capital’s tumultuous history of prosperity and recession. Once witness to the Gilded Age of industrial capitalism, the city’s prosperity in more quotidian industries led to its nicknames as the “Insurance Capital of the World” and “America’s File Cabinet” due to its thriving service sector in the later part of the twentieth century. Yet the city’s prosperity to a concentrated few also deepened its profound racial and socioeconomic divides. Like much of the so-called city planning that took place throughout the United States in the twentieth century, these disparities were exacerbated by the development of highways, ill-fated housing projects, and 1950s redlining practices that heightened segregation.

Concurrent with the accumulation of wealth generated by Hartford’s industries, the city was plagued by police violence, riots, arson, and record levels of unemployment through the next decade, marking the onset of economic deregulation and financial austerity



CHARLES J. VENDETTI, *CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAY IN FRONT OF AETNA, NOVEMBER 29, 1962.*
HARTFORD HISTORY CENTER, HARTFORD PUBLIC LIBRARY.

nationwide. The 1960s witnessed further intensification of these divisions, notably during the period of white flight, as affluent residents relocated to Connecticut's suburbs. This class-based city-country divergence has contributed to Connecticut having one of the highest levels of income inequality in the nation to this day.

Following the boom-and-bust cycle of the 1980s real estate bubble, Hartford endured another period of significant unemployment and population decline that continued through the 1990s, reducing its residential tax base. After years of urban neglect, in 2000, Adriaen's Landing emerged as one of several public investment projects in the United States—such as Baltimore's Inner Harbor and Boston's Seaport—intended to revitalize urban industrial waterfronts by attracting a young workforce, encouraging private investment, and providing thousands of square feet of retail and residential space. Adriaen's Landing, however, ultimately did not achieve its promise. The project's reliance on major corporations, such as ESPN, proved catastrophic when business investment was subsequently withdrawn.

The parallels between these development initiatives in Hartford and Bilbao are worth considering. Both projects emerged early during the process of economic globalization and following a period of deindustrialization in traditionally wealthy countries. These transformations to an international division of labor moved industry to parts of the world where blue-collar work was cheaper, leaving many once-thriving cities to atrophy. Hartford's industrial decline and outdated infrastructure hampered its ability to compete on a global scale during the 2000s. Lack of strategic vision and leadership further hindered the city's efforts to capitalize on globalization opportunities.¹⁶ While the city's leaders actively sought to attract culture, sports, and entertainment, the state's focus on suburban development led to a decline in urban population and tax revenue. With greater success, Bilbao harnessed the power of art and culture to revitalize the city by catering to an imagined global elite. Such proposals often benefit from tax exemption and yield homogenizing results that exacerbate racial and economic disparity. The Guggenheim Bilbao, situated on the site of a former shipyard, exemplifies this transformation, making way for new forms of urban development

while remaining a caricature of its working-class past. Artist Allan Sekula aptly described the Bilbao as a “fish that never rots, a ship that never rusts, a lighthouse that only shines when the sun’s out.”¹⁷

GROUP DYNAMICS

The early 2000s were marked by significant economic and political instability. The dot-com bubble, September 11 terrorist attacks, and the Iraq War fostered an environment of nationalist propaganda, paranoia, xenophobia, consumer patriotism, and economic uncertainty. International affairs became increasingly interwoven with the local, presenting new risks and anxieties. This convergence fostered a climate of mistrust and insecurity toward and within institutions.

British psychoanalyst Wilfred Bion’s notion of basic assumptions—the hidden and unconscious motivations of a group’s behavior that influence its task—offers insight into how collective dynamics operate under such pressures. Bion first observed these irrational forces while working with shell-shocked soldiers after the Second World War, pioneering an emerging understanding of the link between the psychic and the social fields. Bion identified dependency, fight-flight behavior, and pairing as the fundamental subliminal forms of interaction that interfere with a group’s objective.¹⁸ Members of dependency groups seek security by relying on an idealized leader to solve problems, disregarding their own capabilities. Flight-flight groups prioritize preservation through aggression or conflict avoidance, while pairing groups rely on the interaction of two leaders, allowing other group members to lapse into inaction. While basic assumptions are pervasive in all areas of group life, they are difficult to study and often only recognizable in retrospect. Understanding these effects in relation to the built environment, psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Arthur D. Colman has observed that “after-the-fact analysis of a poorly advised group decision, an ugly, inadequate building, or an unworkable social program, all despite the best overt intentions of the participants, sometimes brings the Basic Assumptions into focus and may make the faulty design processes more understandable.”¹⁹

The exact dynamic at play in early 2000s Hartford is hard to pin-point—perhaps because the contours of the group in question were not well-enough defined. Who was the building for? While the Wadsworth Atheneum’s planning committee professed to represent the interests of the museum and the community writ-large, public feedback was only invited after plans for the building were completed. The museum unveiled its expansion plans as part of a public ceremony on June 21, 2002, during which guests were invited to view and interact with the architectural model made of wood and aluminum. In the following weeks, the plans were subjected to overwhelmingly unfavorable criticism. Visitors voiced their disagreement in a guestbook located near the model, describing the “inappropriate” expansion as resembling a Dustbuster, a “junky piece of metal fallen from the sky,” and even Darth Vader’s home.²⁰ An exaggerated cartoon in the *Hartford Courant* depicted the Wadsworth surrounded by airplanes and included the caption, “They have to change the design. Everybody thinks it’s the airport.” Equally anxiety-inducing was the proposed two-year closure required for construction and demolition. During this period, highlights from the Wadsworth’s collection were to be deinstalled and on view at other museums, which caused significant public distress.

CONTAINING ANXIETY

How could the Wadsworth's planning committee and architectural team fail to perceive the renovation as an act of excision rather than integration, particularly given the absence of community representation within their ranks? As Colman has written, "Irrational process among the groups of people for whom [buildings] are designed may be projected directly into the physical structure, symbolically represented through its shape or size, or negatively represented through omission or over-evaluation of one user group's needs relative to another's."²¹ In part, the public's associations to aerial transit, science fiction, and space junk—things that float in the air—reflected a public anxiety antagonistic to the museum's lofty global ambitions. Yet at the same time, these comments suggested a wider resistance to change in the "land of steady habits," in a city where risk had long been measured by actuarial science. Indeed, as Colman observes, "Groups and institutions have a way of sapping personal responsibility and risk-taking. They can be 'man-eaters'; homogenizing individual skills and holding up consensus rather than creativity as their highest value."²² The Wadsworth architectural model became a "bad object", a receptacle for projections that came to represent architectural extravagance, unwanted change and, perhaps on a deeper level, an unconscious threat. In what ways did the post-9/11 climate foster a distrust of foreign architects and the extraterrestrial architectural body they wished to create, potentially leading to concerns that their work would compromise the Wadsworth's American history?

As psychodynamic organizational consultant James Krantz has observed, "Periods of change in organizations put great strain on the ability of their members to contain their anxieties. The course of change both evokes and is shaped by heightened anxiety."²³ Public opposition to the Atheneum's expansion suggests that the project lacked sufficient means to manage fears stimulated by the anticipated changes. Institutions may enact structures—or *social defenses*—to ward off anxiety.²⁴ These defenses appear as policies, protocols, and decision-making processes designed to safeguard members from direct accountability.

The project emerged during a period of organizational transition. Initially introduced under museum director Peter C. Sutton, the expansion was then led by acting director Elizabeth Mankin Kornhauser following her predecessor's departure. Later still, it was inherited by director Kate Sellers. Tensions among museum leadership were well-documented by the press, most notably between Sellers and board president David; their dynamic, in a classic rehearsal of Bion's flight-fight and pairing basic assumptions, ultimately lead to Sellers's early departure. Shortly thereafter, a wave of resignations swept across the board—five trustees left, including Agnes Gund and David—casting doubt on pledged donations for the expansion's capital campaign. The project languished without formal leadership for several months before Willard Holmes, former deputy director of the Whitney Museum of American Art, assumed the role as museum director. Ultimately, citing economic concerns, Holmes scrapped the plans; he doubted whether a physical expansion was worth the museum's efforts and instead invested energy and resources in the museum's endowment.²⁵ Dismissing accusations of overreach, he declared, "It's certainly not being reconsidered because it is too ambitious. I didn't come to Hartford to be second rate."²⁶

ARCHITECTURAL UNCONSCIOUS

The success or failure of a planned building may be less compelling than the fantasies and dreams it conjures. For Sigmund Freud, dreams were manifestations of suppressed wishes, representing unconscious fulfillments of desires that the conscious mind had actively repressed. The original architectural model of the expansion—perhaps the only remaining three-dimensional trace of the project—endures as such a dream. Although the model was never formally accessioned by the Atheneum, it is currently housed in its basement. Stored deep within the museum's bowels, an eerie, architectural unconscious, it exists in an ontologically precarious state. Despite a renovation to the Morgan Building in 2015, in recent years, the permanent fate of the UNStudio model has been debated due to its sheer size and demands on the museum's limited storage capacity.²⁷ Such a dilemma underscores Achille Mbembe's meditation on the archive as a "product of judgement, the result of the exercise of a specific power and authority" that, through its spatial limits and rituals, legitimizes some objects over others.²⁸

Even before institutions become built forms, they live internally within the individuals that comprise and engage with them. The mental images any institution conjures differ depending on a given person's place and role within it—from director to gallery attendant, preparator to artist, architect to audience member.²⁹ These perceptual differences have also played out in relation to UNStudio's unrealized model. For some, the model should be split off, representing an unmemorable chapter. For others, it is a lost object, a painful reminder of what might have been. Existing between artifact of the past and fragment of an unrealized future, neither realized at full scale nor formally acquired as a work of art into the museum's corpus, it remains within the Atheneum's halls illegitimately. What would it mean for an institution to disavow its own once-ideal self-image—or, conversely, to integrate its unrealized dream and tolerate the ambivalence this act evokes?

An institution may search for new identities and pursue various operations to resuscitate, extend, and renew its existence. Indeed, an institution is a body with appendages, drives, desires, defenses, and dreams for survival. Like any organism, it is subject to internal conflicts, external pressures, and, despite its claims to permanence, the inevitable atrophy of time. Such dynamics are part of the life of a social system and its capacity for both creation and destruction. Yet, ultimately, an institution is made up of the groups and individuals whose investment, agonistic passion, and enduring love serve as its lifeblood. Without this support and vitality, it remains a series of hollow containers with old dreams waiting to be realized.

Alan Ruiz

ALAN RUIZ

Ruiz was born in Mexico City and lives and works in New York. He received an MFA from Yale University and was a fellow in the Whitney Museum Independent Study Program.

He has held recent solo exhibitions at CCS Hessel Museum of Art, Annadale-on-Hudson, NY (2022) and The Kitchen, New York (2021). He has participated in group exhibitions at venues including the Architekturmuseum der Technischen Universität Berlin (2022); Galerie Max Mayer, Düsseldorf (2021); F, Houston (2020); Galerie Maria Bernheim,

Zürich (2020); Callicoon Fine Arts, New York (2019); and TG, Nottingham (2018). He has presented talks and participated in public programs at The Chinati Foundation, Dia: Beacon, Kunstverein München, The Artist's Institute, and SculptureCenter. His writing has been published in *Artforum*, *Transatlantique*, *BOMB Magazine*, and *Movement Research Performance Journal*. He is a recipient of a 2019 Creative Capital Award and a 2021 NYSCA/NYFA Fellowship in Architecture.

WORKS IN THE EXHIBITION

Split Object, 2024

Aluminum, wood, hardware

Variable dimensions

Group Portrait, 2024

Inkjet print

9.5 x 12 in.

Return, 2024

Partial removal of east-facing interior gallery wall

Complexes, 2024

Etched stainless steel, oil paint

8 parts, 6 x 6 in. each

All works courtesy of the artist

¹ Linda Ayres, ed., *"The Spirit of Genius": Art at the Wadsworth Atheneum* (Hartford, CT: Wadsworth Atheneum, 1992), 11.

² Eugene R. Gaddis, *Magician of the Modern: Chick Austin and the Transformation of the Arts in America* (New York: Knopf, 2000), 191.

³ Wadsworth Atheneum press release. June 21, 2002. Auerbach Library and Archives.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ "Wadsworth Planning to Free Itself," *Hartford Courant*, July 16, 2000.

⁶ "A Contemporary Consensus," *Hartford Courant*, October 7, 2001.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Panelists included architects Ann Beha, Daniel Libeskind, director of the Museum of Modern Art Glenn Lowry, architectural historian Helen Searing, and urban planner Kenneth Greenberg.

⁹ Sylvia Smith, in conversation with the author, April 30, 2024, New York City.

¹⁰ Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos, *Move* (Amsterdam: UNStudio, 2008).

¹¹ "Van Berkel & Bos," *Hartford Courant*, March 11, 2001.

¹² "Arts Institutions Suffer Growing Pains," *New York Times*, August 17, 2003.

¹³ Wadsworth Atheneum. Undated invitation.

¹⁴ Mario Carp, "Digital Style," *Log 23* (2011): 41-52.

¹⁵ "Wadsworth Planning to Free Itself," *Hartford Courant*, July 16, 2000.

¹⁶ "As Deadline Closes in, Patriots Reject Lucrative Hartford Offer," *New York Times*, May 1, 1999.

¹⁷ *The Forgotten Space*, directed by Allan Sekula and Noël Burch, (Wildart Film, 2010).

¹⁸ Wilfred R. Bion, *Experiences in Groups, and Other Papers* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961).

¹⁹ Arthur D. Colman, "Irrational Aspects of Design," in *Group Relations Reader*, eds. Arthur D. Colman and W. Harold Bexton (San Rafael: Grex, 1975), 315-316.

²⁰ "Art Museum Dumps Design," *Hartford Courant*, July 25, 2003.

²¹ Colman, 22.

²² Ibid.

²³ James Krantz "Dilemmas of Organizational Change: A Systems Psychodynamic Perspective" in *The Systems Psychodynamics of Organizations*. (Routledge, 2006).

²⁴ James Krantz. "Social Defenses and Twenty-First Century Organizations." *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 26, no. 2 (2010): 192-201.

²⁵ "Arts Institutions Suffer Growing Pains," *New York Times*, August 17, 2003.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ironically, the fact that the expansion would have improved the institution's storage is a kind of return of a repressed past.

²⁸ Achille Mbembe. "The Power of the Archive and its Limits" in *Refiguring the Archive*. (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002)

²⁹ David Armstrong. *Organization in the Mind: Psychoanalysis, Group Relations and Organizational Consultancy*. (Routledge, 2005).

Born 1984 in Mexico City
Lives and works in New York

ARTIST TALK

Alan Ruiz in conversation with Soyoung Yoon
and Jared Quinton

Thursday, October 3, 5pm gallery viewing;
6pm conversation



WADSWORTH ATHENEUM
MUSEUM OF ART

600 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103
(860) 278-2670

thewadsworth.org

MATRIX 195 is supported by the Wadsworth Atheneum's Contemporary Coalition and the Wadsworth Exhibition Fund, supported by the Estates of James Lyon, Karen Kelleher, and Susannah Schickman. Additional support provided by the Howard Fromson Fund and Creative Capital Foundation.

The artist wishes to thank: Amy Kilkenny,
Arthur Colman, Ben van Berkel, Caleb Stone,
Carol LeWitt, Cecil Adams, Chloe Collins,
Gabiella De Ferrari, Jared Quinton, James Krantz,
Mark Giuliano, Mena Henry, Nicholas Baume,
Nicole Kaack, Sylvia Smith, Trevor Herman Hilker.