Architecture, Design and Conservation
Danish Portal for Artistic and Scientific Research

Aarhus School of Architecture // Design School Kolding // Royal Danish Academy

A Qualified Utopia

Sheridan, Michael

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.60558/f790-c269

Publication date:
2023

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication

Citation for pulished version (APA):
Sheridan, M. (2023). *A Qualified Utopia: The Work of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art*. Royal Danish Academy - Architecture, Design, Conservation. https://doi.org/10.60558/f790-c269

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 02. May. 2024

ARKITEKTSKOLEN AARHUS

Designskolen Kolding

Det Kongelige Akademi

A Qualified Utopia:

The Work of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert

at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art

A dissertation presented

by

Michael Sheridan

to

The Royal Danish Academy

School of Architecture, Design and Conservation

Copenhagen, Denmark

in application for the degree

Doctor of Architecture

May 2021

This dissertation has been accepted by the Royal Academy - Architecture, Design, Conservation for public defense for the doctorate in architecture:
doctor architecturae (dr.arch) in Copenhagen on 02.06.2023.

Evaluation Committee:
Professor Peter Thule Kristensen, Royal Danish Academy, Copenhagen
Professor Charlotte Klonk, Humboldt University, Berlin
Professor Helena Mattsson, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm

As required by Danish law, this document has been assigned an ISBN number for archiving and retrieval purposes, with five copies deposited at the Library of the Royal Academy and two copies deposited at the Royal Danish Library.

A Qualified Utopia: The Work of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art

Abstract

This dissertation examines the work of the Danish architects Jørgen Bo (1919–99) and Vilhelm Wohlert (1920–2007) at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, located on an old estate, in Humlebæk, Denmark. During 1956–1991, the two architects completed six buildings that extend a nineteenth-century villa and create a continuous circuit around the museum park. The formal variations between those buildings have inhibited investigation and resulted in a major gap in the knowledge of modern Danish architecture. The missing link is the role of Knud W. Jensen (1916–2000), Louisiana's founder and director until 1991, whose instructions to the architects led to the variations between the buildings.

The research supporting this study was conducted in two stages: documentation and analysis. In the first stage, primary source-material, most of it previously unexamined, was assembled to create a comprehensive record of Louisiana's design and construction. In the second stage, the museum's origins and expansion were examined within a series of historical contexts that shed light on Bo and Wohlert's work, as well as Jensen's evolving vision for Louisiana. By combining these stages of research, it is evident that Bo and Wohlert employed a handful of fundamental principles throughout their work, even as Jensen's requirements varied from building to building. As such, we can regard the totality of Bo and Wohlert's work as a single building that was designed in a contingent manner and constructed over a period of thirty-five years.

Examining that unitary building through Jensen's concept of a "qualified utopia," it is evident that Bo and Wohlert's architecture embodied and preserved Jensen's program of unifying art and everyday experience, by adapting modernist models of exhibition space to Louisiana's landscape. More broadly, the theorem of a Qualified Utopia identifies an essential characteristic of modern Nordic architecture and locates Louisiana within that subculture. As a result, it is possible to recognize a regional tradition that transcended stylistic distinctions and provides the foundation for future scholarship.

ISBN 979-8218190828

Volume 1: Introduction–Chapter 3

Volume 2: Chapter 4–Appendices

Volume 3: Illustrations

This educational and non-commercial document has been produced under the doctrine of fair use and contains visual material that is under copyright, including drawings, paintings, photographs and depictions of artworks within photographs. All visual material remains the exclusive property of the various rights holders and may not be reproduced without their consent. Primary copyright holders are identified in the List of Illustrations on pages 338–351. In addition to the primary copyright holders, the rights of individual artists and their representatives remain in force, including but not limited to:

Jean Arp, Alberto Giacometti, Richard Serra, Henry Moore, Henri Laurens, Richard Mortensen, Erik Hoppe, Aksel Jørgensen, Carl Kylberg, Karl Isakson, Niels Larsen Stevns, Astrid Noack, William Scharff, Adam Fischer, Jeppe Vontillius, Gunnar Westman, Knud Agger, Robert Jacobsen, Søren Georg Jensen, Mogens Andersen, Mogens Jørgensen, Vilhelm Lundstrøm, Harald Leth, Aage Vogel-Jørgensen, Asger Jorn, Harald Giersing, Henry Heerup, Mirko Basadella, Reg Butler, Alberto Viani, Lynn Chadwick, Alicia Penalba, Max Bill, Naum Gabo, Francis Bacon, James Rosenquist, Jackson Pollock, Kenneth Noland, Frank Stella, Ellsworth Kelly, Morris Louis, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Piet Mondrian, Robert Morris, George Segal, Claes Oldenburg, Andy Warhol, Tom Wesselman, Roy Lichtenstein, Robert Indiana, Donald Judd, Richard Long, Kenneth Noland, Sam Francis, Alexander Calder, Frei Otto, Gunnar Aagaard Andersen, Susanne Ussing, Mette Aarre, Niels Lergaard, Carl Henning Pedersen, Yves Klein, Gerhard Richter, Lucio Fontana, Jean Tinguely, Richard Hamilton, César, Martial Raysse, Robert Rauschenberg, Jim Dine, George Rickey, Dieter Roth, George Trakas, Jasper Johns, Jan Groth, Mario Merz, Cindy Sherman, Sean Scully, Michael Singer, Tony Cragg, Jenny Holzer, Alfio Bonanno, Olafur Eliasson, Per Kirkeby, Candice Breitz, David Hockney, Edward Kienholz and Nancy Reddin Kienholz, Andreas Gursky, Sophie Calle, Pamela Rosenkranz, Wolfgang Tillmans, Marianna Uutinen, Theo van Doesburg, Cornelius van Eesteren, and Franz West. Works by Pablo Picasso © 2023 Succession Picasso.

Text and line drawings not otherwise credited © 2023 Michael A. Sheridan. The excerpts of source texts are copyrighted by their respective authors and publishers.

Produced and printed by Sheridan Academic Projects, Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A.

A Qualified Utopia: The Work of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert

At the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art

Resumé

Denne afhandling undersøger de danske arkitekter Jørgen Bo (1919–99) og Vilhelm Wohlerts (1920–2007) arbejde på Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, beliggende på en gammel landejendom i Humlebæk i Danmark. I årene 1956–1991 fuldførte de to arkitekter seks bygninger i forlængelse af en villa fra det nittende århundrede og skaber dermed et kontinuerligt forløb rundt om Museumsparken. De formelle variationer mellem disse bygninger har hæmmet udforskningen og har efterladt et betydeligt hul i kendskabet til moderne dansk arkitektur. Det manglende led er rollen som Knud W. Jensen (1916–2000), Louisianas grundlægger og direktør indtil 1991, hvis anvisninger til arkitekterne førte til variationerne mellem bygningerne.

Forskningen, der understøtter denne undersøgelse, er gennemført i to faser; dokumentation og analyse. I første fase blev primært kildemateriale, det meste ikke tidligere undersøgt, samlet for at skabe en omfattende registrering af Louisianas design og konstruktion. I anden fase er museets oprindelse og udvidelse undersøgt i en række historiske sammenhænge, som kaster lys over Bo og Wohlerts arbejde samt Knud W. Jensens vision for Louisiana efterhånden som den udviklede sig. Ved at kombinere disse forskningsstadier er det tydeligt, at Bo og Wohlert anvendte en række grundlæggende principper gennem hele deres arbejde, selvom Jensens krav varierede fra bygning til bygning. Vi kan således betragte helheden af Bo og Wohlerts arbejde som én enkelt bygning, designet på en betinget måde og opført over en periode på femogtredive år.

Ved at undersøge denne enhedsbygning gennem Jensens koncept om en ”kvalificeret utopi,” er det tydeligt, at Bo og Wohlerts arkitektur udtrykker og bevarer Jensens program om at forene kunst og hverdagsoplevelse ved at tilpasse modernistiske modeller af udstillingsrum til Louisianas landskab. Mere generelt identificerer en ”kvalificeret utopi” et væsentligt kendetegn ved moderne nordisk arkitektur og placerer Louisiana i denne subkultur. Som resultat heraf genkendes en regional tradition, der overstiger stilistiske distinktioner og danner grundlag for fremtidig forskning.

This page intentionally blank.

A Qualified Utopia:
The Work of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art

Volume 1 of 3

Introduction–Chapter 3

Contents - Volumes 1 & 2

Acknowledgements viii

Introduction ix

Chapter 1 Origins: 1657–1956 1

Documentation 1

1.1 An Unnatural History 1
1.2 Alexander Brun 5
1.3 Knud W. Jensen 10
1.4 Vilhelm Wohlert 17
1.5 Jørgen Bo 21
1.6 California 26
1.7 After Los Angeles 31

Analysis 36

1.8 Out of the Ruins 37
1.9 Points of Reference 45
1.10 The House as Model 48
1.11 A Modern Vernacular 51

Observations 61

Chapter 2 A Home for Art: 1956–58 63

Documentation 63

2.1 The Collection 63
2.2 A Change of Fortune 65
2.3 Passages and Pavilions 69
2.4 Space 75
2.5 Construction 81

Analysis 89

2.6 The Italian School 89
2.7 Universal Space 92
2.8 Flexible Order 102
2.9 Exhibiting the Landscape 104

Observations 111

Chapter 3 Organic Growth: 1959–71 113

Documentation 113

3.1 A Union of the Arts 113
3.2 Plan B 113
3.3 The Louisiana Project 116
3.4 The Sculpture Garden 119
3.5 Bo and Wohlert after 1958 129
3.6 The 66-Building 135
3.7 The 71-Building 139

Analysis 144

3.8 A New Agenda 145
3.9 Constructed Landscapes 152
3.10 The Dynamic Museum 159
3.11 Dynamic Additions 165

Observations 169

Chapter 4 A New Museum: 1972–82 171

Documentation 171

4.1 Temple or Forum? 172
4.2 The 76-Building 173
4.3 Centers of Gravity 179
4.4 An Alternative Era 183
4.5 The Lake Garden 189
4.6 A New Collection 192
4.7 The Master Plan 194
4.8 The South Wing 200

Analysis 207

4.9 A Concrete Utopia 207
4.10 An Eclectic Era 211
4.11 Bo and Wohlert in West Germany 220
4.12 "Wanted: Qualified Utopias" 229

Observations 240

Chapter 5 Earthwork: 1983–94 243

Documentation 243

5.1 Site-specific 243
5.2 The East Wing 247
5.3 Transitions 254
5.4 Epilogue 256

Analysis 260

5.5 Movement in Space 261
5.6 Below the Surface 267
5.7 A Complete Museum 273

Observations 278

Conclusions 281

1. Knud W. Jensen's Architectural Agendas 281
2. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's Unitary Building 288
3. A Qualified Utopia 296
4. The Regional Tradition 304

Appendices 315

1. Sources 315
2. Bibliography 319
3. List of Illustrations 338

Acknowledgements

Assembling this material has been a mammoth and complicated undertaking, which would not have been possible without the help of many persons. First and foremost, I would like to thank the group of people who contributed to the creation of Louisiana and generously shared their memories with me: Vilhelm Wohlert, Kirsten Strømstad, Mogens Prip-Buus, Stig Løcke, Claus Wohlert, Lea Nørgaard, Vibeke Holscher, Alfio Bonanno, Carsten Hoff, George Trakas, Annelise Bjørner, Alfred Homann, Niels Halby, and Elisabeth Munck. At Louisiana, I am grateful to a large number of people whom I encountered during my research at the museum. I am particularly indebted to Michael Juul Holm and Lærke Rydal Jørgensen of the publications department, and to Sidse Buck and Kim Hansen in the museum's archival department.

I received crucial research assistance from Simon K. Bering Papousek, Danish Defence Library; Torsten Bløndal, Edition Bløndal; Morten Bo and Marie Bo; Bjørn Westerbeek Dahl; Elisabeth Durafour, Fredensborg Kommune; Michael H. Gelting, Danish National Archives; Antonio Godoli, Galleria degli Uffizi; Gorm Harkær; Krestine Kjærholm; Thomas Koch; Bent Skov Larsen; Trine McKeever, Richard Serra Studio; Peter Poulsen; Ida Præstegaard; Annette Rasmussen; and the staff of both the Danish National Archives and the Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Division of the New York Public Library. Moreover, I am deeply grateful to Erik Brahl, Brahl Fotografi; Franca Candrian, Kunsthaus Zürich; Ciara Crowley and Jennie Hinchcliff, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; Jens Frederiksen; Architetto Jacopo Gardella; Kees Huibregtse, Stichting Viktor IV; Caspar Koch; Peter Korsgaard, Danish National Agency for Data Supply and Efficiency; Peter Leth-Larsen; Mette Kia Krabbe Meyer, Mette Colding Dahl and Inger Ellekilde Bonde, the Royal Danish Library; Johanna Poltermann, Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart; Jakob Seerup, National Museum of Denmark; Petra Smits, Stiftung Sonsbeek; Jørgen Strüwing; Professor Carsten Thau; Marina Verhoeven, Middelheim Museum Library; Julie Arendse Voss, Bruun Rasmussen Auctioneers; Hetty Wessels, Stedelijk Museum; Antonio Wohlert; and Claus Wohlert. Special thanks are due to Rune Rosenborg Rasmussen and his colleagues at the Collection of Architectural Drawings, the Royal Danish Library, which is a unique resource of extraordinary cultural importance.

Introduction

This page intentionally blank.

1. Research Statement

A. Prologue

At the most basic level, the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is the engine of research. If we are fortunate, it occasionally leads to the feeling of elation that scientists describe as “the joy of discovery.” The pleasures of that pursuit – searching for evidence; struggling with puzzles; recognizing correlations – sustain us through the trials that attend any serious investigation. But however rewarding it might be, individual research is only the foundation for the shared enterprise of scholarship. That is to say, the joy of discovery is paralleled by the obligation to establish a link connection between new knowledge and established knowledge, in order to advance the general field of study and inspire other investigators. And so, it is my belief that the most meaningful scholarship not only sheds new light on the subject of inquiry, but also illuminates a collective project.

This dissertation examines the architectural history of the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, in Humlebæk, Denmark, during the period 1956–1994. Located on the grounds of a nineteenth-century estate; *Louisiana*, the museum was established by Knud W. Jensen (1916–2000), the businessman and art collector who named his museum after the estate, served as the director until 1991 and worked to expand Louisiana until his death. In 1956, Jensen hired the architects Jørgen Bo (1919–99) and Vilhelm Wohlert (1920–2007) to design an exhibition building for his collection of modernist Danish art, which would be an extension of the existing villa; the museum opened in 1958. Over the next thirty-three years, the two architects expanded Louisiana with five additions, creating a ring of buildings that begins and ends at the villa. Taken as a whole, Bo and Wohlert’s six buildings at Louisiana constitute the defining achievement of each architect’s career.

The starting point for this project was an inquiry from Louisiana’s director of publications, Michael Juul Holm, in April 2015, asking if I would be able to write a book about the museum’s buildings. The question was based on my earlier research into Bo and Wohlert’s work, in preparation for a book on Danish single-family houses

that featured two examples by those architects and described several others.[1] During 2004–05, that research involved a series of field trips with Wohlert and a series of conversations regarding his work with Bo. Moreover, I was extremely familiar with Louisiana, through decades of visits and my work as the curator and exhibition architect for the 2006 exhibition *Poul Kjærholm – Møbelarkitekt*. Considering my existing knowledge of Bo and Wohlert's work and the insights into Louisiana's development that Wohlert had provided a decade earlier, I felt a profound sense of obligation to accept the invitation and document the museum's architectural history.

In 2015, my intention was to create a scholarly account of the museum's construction that would appeal to a general readership. The foundation for my research was a comment that Wohlert made to me, explaining that it was "impossible to understand Louisiana's architecture without considering the landscape." As a result, the book would not only include a detailed study of the buildings, but also the history of the property and the major installations of outdoor sculpture that represented further stages in the development of the landscape. Given Knud W. Jensen's influence on both buildings and landscape; as outlined in his autobiography *Mit Louisiana-liv*; the scope of inquiry would also include the museum's institutional history. The result was *Louisiana – Arkitektur og landskab*, which was published by the museum in August 2017 and chronicles the museum's development through the renovation work of 2006.

In fact, *Louisiana – Arkitektur og landskab* only included a portion of my research. During the writing, I explored a number of ideas and lines of study that exceeded my original outline. Some of those ideas were fairly abstract and perhaps less engaging to the general reader. As a result, I put aside a broad section of inquiry that examined Louisiana's development in the context of modernist exhibition practices, with the intention of developing that material at a later time. In 2018, I returned to the material and took up the threads of a broad contextual analysis, using the initial phase of research as the foundation. That work led me in a variety of new directions, and yielded insights and conclusions that I could not have predicted. Having completed this second phase of study, I am proud to share the totality of my research into Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at Louisiana, in the form of this dissertation.

---

[1] *Mesterværker – Enfamiliehuset i dansk arkitekturs guldalder* (København: Strandberg Publishing, 2011).

B. Research Problem

Since Louisiana opened in 1958, it has been described as a union of art, architecture and landscape, to the point of cliché. And yet, the relationships between those factors have never been examined in detail or depth. As a result, the state of knowledge regarding Louisiana's architecture has hardly advanced since 1958, even as the museum expanded by a factor of 10 and underwent a radical shift in artistic focus. (Shortly after the museum opened, Knud W. Jensen embarked on a project of transformation; insisting on another type of exhibition space and re-directing the programming from figurative Danish art to international abstract art.) This arrested state of knowledge has been furthered by an accumulation of unsupported assertions and folklore, which has obscured a complex saga of architectural invention and transformation. The paradox of Louisiana's architectural history is that Bo and Wohlert's buildings are instantly recognizable and hardly understood.

We can attribute the lack of scholarly attention to at least three factors. One obvious factor is the complexity of Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana, which includes exhibition buildings completed in 1958, 1966, 1971, 1982 and 1991, as well as a building that was completed in 1976 and includes a concert hall. Following Knud W. Jensen's practice, I will refer to the earlier buildings by their year of completion; the 58-Building, the 66-Building, the 71-Building, the 76-Building; and the large-scale additions of the South Wing (1982) and the East Wing (1991) by their common names. The study of these buildings is complicated by the architects' unusual working process, which confounds the typical model of individual authority. While all of the buildings have been credited to both architects, only the 58-Building was a joint work. As Wohlert informed me, he and Bo took turns designing the later buildings.

Any examination of Louisiana's buildings is further complicated by the differences in character. The 58-Building and the 76-Building were constructed of overlapping elements and large expanses of glass; the 66-Building, 71-Building and South Wing provide enclosed galleries that are illuminated by skylights; and the underground East Wing is invisible, aside from the glazed entry structures. The varied characters of these buildings, particularly the different degrees of enclosure and the glass roofs, have confused observers and can be considered the primary obstacle to in-depth study. As a result of this confusion, previous discussions of Louisiana's buildings

have typically focused on the 58-Building at the expense of the later buildings, as described in my review of the literature.

Another obstacle to research has been a general hesitation to revise or expand the official history of Louisiana; as promoted by the museum, supported by the two architects and codified in Knud W. Jensen's autobiography, *Mit Louisiana-liv*. That "history" consists almost entirely of tales and legends that shed little or no light on the buildings: the estate was established by Hofjagtmester Alexander Brun, who married three women named Louise (but not at the same time); Knud W. Jensen discovered the estate while walking his dog (Trofast); Jensen contacted Wohlert and they drove to Louisiana in the architect's CV2 (on icy roads); Bo and Wohlert laid out the first building with sticks and rope; some artists complained that the views of the landscape distracted visitors from the art; later buildings were constructed with solid walls as a result of the growing collection (or perhaps the artists' complaints); the variations between the buildings were the result of the architects' creative tendencies.

In place of research, critics and authors have relied on a mixture of fact, fiction and anecdote that has gained credibility through repetition. We can trace the origin of this unfortunate mélange to Professor Kay Fisker's review of the 58-Building, which simultaneously canonized the building and introduced a series of myths that would be recycled for decades. As Fisker famously declared,

> "Louisiana is one of the most important works in modern Danish architecture. It will stand as a monument in the history of Danish architecture and create admiration for our architecture around the world. For me personally, it has been the greatest architectural experience for many years."[2]

Fisker's review contains a number of useful observations, including an insightful comparison between Louisiana and Ordrupgaard, and a reference to Wohlert's training with Kaare Klint. However, the review also established the practice of emphasizing Wohlert's role, while avoiding any discussion of Bo's contribution.[3]

---

[2] Kay Fisker, "Louisiana," *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8: 148.

[3] Fisker's oversight was peculiar, in that Bo was both a former employee and a current teaching assistant at the School of Architecture. Fisker neglected to mention that Bo's house for his own family (1953–54) provided a partial model for the 58-Building. Moreover, Bo's house was largely inspired by the work of Richard Neutra, which Fisker admired and had described in the pages of *Arkitekten*, as documented in Chapter 1.

This omission would become as commonplace to later discussions of Louisiana as the obligatory reference to Wohlert/Klint. Moreover, Fisker made a series of statements that were either exaggerated or simply incorrect: describing the entire building as an product of "the influence of delicate oriental architecture," attributing the gallery lighting to American examples and imagining that Louisiana was modeled on the Museum of Modern Art, in New York.[4] While those statements are contradicted by evidence, they nonetheless became parts of the standard tale, to be repeated without question until they were accepted as historical fact.[5]

In retrospect, it is possible to recognize a historical pattern to the discussion of Louisiana's architecture. The 58-Building was greeted with a combination of praise and speculation. As the museum expanded with buildings that were more anonymous and less easily understood, an absence of knowledge led to an accumulation of ignorance. Struggling to explain the differences between the 58-Building and the later buildings, observers relied on accepted interpretations. Given the potential discomfort of challenging the narrative advanced by Knud W. Jensen – one of the most respected figures in Danish cultural life – critics either ignored the later buildings or imagined them as examples of architectural eclecticism. The result of this pattern has been a profound lacuna regarding a major work of modern architecture.

C. Research Objectives

My initial goal, born of frustration, was to assemble a base of new knowledge that would profoundly alter the conception of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at Louisiana. Considering the poverty of existing scholarship and the resulting fog of myth and misinformation, I was determined to start from zero and accumulate as much documentation as possible; working from primary sources and regarding the existing accounts with critical detachment. Beyond my own project, I hoped this research could provide a foundation for future studies of Louisiana; as well as Bo and Wohlert's other joint works; and thus advance the knowledge of Danish architecture.

---

[4] See Note 2.

[5] For example, see Lisbet Balslev Jørgensen, "Louisiana, Humlebæk, 1958–82," *Arkitektur DK* 1989, no. 4: 185. The author repeated sections of Fisker's review, *verbatim*, and embellished them with familiar, apocryphal stories. For further examples, see the bibliography that Thomas Kappel compiled for his 1992 Master's Thesis; referenced in my review of literature.

My second goal was to reasonably explain the differences in character between Louisiana's buildings. The absence of that explanation has been the fundamental obstacle to a scholarly assessment of Bo and Wohlert's work at the museum. Based on my research into their other joint buildings and projects, which were remarkably consistent, I found the standard trope of architectural eclecticism to be implausible. Simple logic suggested a direct relationship between the evolution of the institution and the diverse characters of the buildings, but that premise had never been explored. In search of a reasoned explanation, I would identify both the common and peculiar features of each building, hoping to isolate the sources of variation. I resolved to investigate each of the buildings with the same degree of intensity.

My third goal, which is an extension of the second goal, was to illuminate the relationship between the buildings and the institution that they served. That is to say, I hoped to discover the degree(s) to which the architecture embodied or contradicted the museum programming. To that end, I would exchange a magnifying glass for a telescope and study the buildings within the larger history of the museum, looking for correlations that might reveal the significance of Bo and Wohlert's buildings to Jensen's evolving vision for Louisiana. Making sense of a thirty-five-year-long process of design and construction was complicated by the fact that the planning for Louisiana's expansion did not follow a clear line, but was largely improvised.

Beyond the goals specific to Louisiana, I hoped to locate Bo and Wohlert's buildings within the context of modern Nordic architecture, circa 1925–75. In doing so, I might contribute to the understanding of Nordic modernism, which was an alternative to the orthodoxy developed in central Europe during the 1920s. Unfortunately, the orthodox model predicated on technological rationalism began the dominant paradigm. In terms of human experience, it was largely a failure. In contrast, a group of Nordic architects synthesized foreign concepts and local culture, to produce buildings that still serve and inspire people after nearly a century. By locating Bo and Wohlert's work within this alternative vein of modernist architecture, we might find lessons from Louisiana that can illuminate other places.

Based on these goals, this dissertation presents an accumulation of evidence that supports four conclusions, which are presented below in the form of theses:

1. Knud W. Jensen's Architectural Agendas

During Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana, Knud W. Jensen pursued three distinct architectural agendas, which he enforced through his instructions to the architects. As a result, Jensen was directly responsible for the primary differences in character between Louisiana's buildings. Initially, he required a building with natural lighting and an intimate relationship with the setting. After the museum opened, he insisted that any future exhibition spaces follow a conventional model of enclosed galleries with skylights. In the mid 1970s, Jensen pursued a neo-Dadaist building program that led to a temporary estrangement from Bo and Wohlert. Following their reunion, Jensen's conception of Louisiana as an autobiographical project resulted in new types of construction, reaching a denouement in the glazed structures of the East Wing.

2. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's Unitary Building

Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert were fundamentally consistent in their work at Louisiana, employing a handful of strategies to create a chain of buildings that are ultimately experienced as a contingent whole. Bo and Wohlert arrived at Louisiana with different principles, but overlapping interests. Designing the 58–Building, they fused their individual talents and created a union of space and place that neither could have imagined in isolation. Following the opening of the museum, their collaboration resulted in an exchange of creative traits. As a result, they were able to extend the underlying strategies of the 58–Building to new types of exhibition spaces, even as they worked alone. In this way, the two architects accommodated Jensen's multiple agendas, while constructing a unitary building over a period of thirty-five years.

3. A Qualified Utopia

Knud W. Jensen's concept of a "qualified utopia" provides a tool for identifying the character of Bo and Wohlert's unitary building; locating it within the history of museum architecture; and revealing its role in Louisiana's institutional development. After 1958, Jensen's demand for isolated exhibition spaces contradicted his original agenda of popularizing art through contact with the landscape, but he was unable to recognize it as such. In fact, he criticized museum buildings that were dislocated from their settings and arrived at his concept of a **"qualified utopia"**, based on the negative meaning of utopia as the non-place. Over the decades, Bo and Wohlert adapted two

different models of modernist exhibition space to Louisiana's landscape: qualifying placeless-utopian concepts in order to create, and then preserve, a unity of building and setting. In the process, they also preserved Jensen's institutional agenda, despite his contradictory architectural agendas.

4. The Regional Tradition

Bo and Wohlert's qualification of utopian architectural paradigms allows us to locate their work within the context of modern Nordic architecture. While the exemplary buildings are typically described in terms of their distinctive physical attributes and experiential qualities, Bo and Wohlert's counter-utopian process provides a method of defining these buildings by what they rejected: the belief in technology as a substitute for the natural world; the attempt to standardize human behavior; the belief that it is desirable to reconstruct the world. Among the counter-utopian attributes that define modern Nordic architecture after 1930, the most common was the rejection of a universal vision, in favor of a dialogue with the reality of the place. This model of definition by antithesis provides a framework for comparing buildings of very different scales, programs and formal characters. As such, the theorem of a **"qualified utopia"** can be regarded as another tool for the investigation of Nordic architecture.

2. Literature Review

There is very little published material on Louisiana that could be regarded as literature in the academic sense of the term. Since the museum opened in 1958, it has been described and illustrated in countless newspapers, journals and books, in many different languages. The majority of these published accounts contain little of interest to the researcher; primary exceptions to this rule are listed in the bibliography. In general, published material on Louisiana follows a pattern, with the early accounts based on facts and interviews, and the later accounts tending to personal opinion and regurgitated commentary. The most extensive source of printed material on Louisiana has been the museum itself, which has produced a series of illustrated books and special issues of *Louisiana Revy* that describe the collection and the buildings.[6] The

[6] The first booklet was an offprint of *Mobilia* no. 38, a special issue devoted to the new museum. During 1960–74, Mobilia Press produced a series of booklets that were updated every few years, to record the growth of the collection and the expansion of the museum. Beginning in 1978, Louisiana produced a series of larger, more substantial volumes of billed-reportage that included introductory text

early examples contain useful documentation of a museum that no longer exists, while the post-1978 examples are primarily vehicles for Louisiana's official history.

Reviewing academic databases, including World Cat, ProQuest, JSTOR, and REX, I located one previous academic study that examines Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at Louisiana.

In December 1992, Thomas Kappel submitted the thesis "Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlerts Museumsarkitektur 1958–91" to the Department of Art History, University of Copenhagen, in application for the degree of Mag. Candidate.[7] His advisor was Professor Øystein Hjort, the art historian and a board member of the Louisiana Foundation. Kappel did not develop a consistent line of reasoning, but relied heavily on his very extensive bibliography. To his credit, he devoted considerable attention to Museum Bochum (1983–89), in Germany; his chapter on that building is a useful addition to the literature. Kappel's study of Louisiana was crippled by his decision not to investigate the architects' drawing archives, in the belief that the actual buildings were sufficient to understand their central work.[8] He interviewed Bo, Wohlert and Knud W. Jensen, but they seem to have provided him with little new information. Avoiding difficult questions, Kappel dedicated great effort to rationalizing what he was told or had read. Ultimately, he regarded Bo and Wohlert's buildings as products of different architectural styles. In fact, conducting a meaningful survey of Bo and Wohlert's museum work within the span of two years is not a practical project for a student, or even an experienced scholar.

A review of the major surveys of architecture and landscape architecture reveals brief mentions of Louisiana in the works of William J. R. Curtis and Geoffrey Jellicoe.[9] However, the other major surveys (Benevolo, Zevi, Frampton, Cohen) omit Louisiana from their brief discussions of Nordic architecture, presumably hobbled by the language barriers and a lack of adequate source material.

---

by Knud W. Jensen, describing the museum's history, mission and development. Special issues of *Louisiana Revy* published in 1983 and 1998 celebrated the twenty-fifth (vol. 24, no.1) and fortieth (vol. 38, no. 3) anniversaries of the museum's opening.

[7] A copy was deposited at the Royal Danish Library; item no. 130003673287.

[8] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 4.

[9] William J. R. Curtis, *Modern Architecture since 1900*, third edition (London: Phaidon, 1996), 465. Geoffrey Jellicoe, *The Landscape of Man*, third edition (London: Thames & Hudson, 1995), 366–367.

The most frequently cited source regarding Louisiana's history is Knud W. Jensen's autobiography, *Mit Louisiana-liv*, which has provided the basis for every discussion of the museum's architecture since the first edition was published, in 1985.[10] While Jensen's description of Louisiana's origins and development is an indispensable resource for facts, dates and events that feature the author, it must be treated with care. Unfortunately, previous authors have used the book as a substitute for actual research, likely due to the complexities and sensitivities described in the Research Statement. Jensen's book is most useful as a source of information to be cross-referenced with other sources and examined for references that suggest new lines of investigation. The most useful references include the open-air sculpture exhibitions of the post-war era, Bo and Wohlert's study trip to Italy and Switzerland, and Jensen's fascination with glass buildings, all of which were fundamental to this dissertation.

Three, large-format illustrated books describe Louisiana's origins and architecture, following the outline established in Jensen's autobiography. Published to mark Louisiana's 50th anniversary, Pernille Stensgaard's *When Louisiana Stole the Picture* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2008) is a social history of the museum. Stensgaard emphasized the museum's effect on Danish cultural life, based on a large number of interviews and a thorough study of the museum's newspaper clippings. To this end, she devoted considerable attention to Knud W. Jensen's personal life, his circle of associates and internal politics at the museum. Stensgaard had little to say regarding the architects or their buildings, beyond the standard tropes, but her references to Louisiana's exhibition policies are useful in considering the museum's evolution.

John Pardey's *Louisiana and Beyond – The Work of Vilhelm Wohlert* (Hellerup: Edition Bløndal, 2007) – also published as *Louisianas arkitekt: Vilhelm Wohlert* – is most useful as a visual reference. Pardey conceived the book as a personal tribute to Wohlert and based his text on interviews with the subject; there is very little new information. Following historical precedent, the chapter on Louisiana focuses on the 58-Building; all of the later buildings are summarized in four paragraphs. While Bo and Wohlert's joint works provide 50% of the content, Pardey carefully avoided any discussion of Bo's background or contributions. The most useful lesson of this book is the folly of examining either Bo or Wohlert in isolation.

---

[10] Knud W. Jensen, *Mit Louisiana-liv* (København: Gyldendal, 1985). Expanded, revised edition, 1993.

Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert: Louisiana Museum, Humlebæk (Berlin: Wasmuth, 1993) combines Jens Frederiksen's photographs with an essay by Michael Brawne. The essay summarizes the history of the museum up to 1991 – largely based on Jensen's autobiography and Fisker's 1958 review. Brawne included two quotes from Jensen's 1979 address "The Ideal Museum" and mentioned his ideal of the "third possibility." However, he misunderstood the concept and declared that Louisiana was an attempt to realize that ideal, without evidence or elaboration. Unfortunately, Brawne did not discuss Bo and Wohlert's work in the context of post-war, European museum architecture, which was his area of expertise, as seen in his extremely useful survey *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*.

3. Methodology

The research that supports this dissertation was conducted in two parts: an initial stage of discovery and documentation during 2015–17, and a second stage of contextual study and analysis during 2018–20. The initial stage produced a detailed chronicle of Louisiana's design and construction that I have labeled **Documentation**, parts of which were published in *Louisiana – Arkitektur og landskab*, in 2017. During the second stage of research, key points of the Documentation were examined in relation to people, events and ideas that were known to the three principals, resulting in an interpretative body of knowledge that I have labeled the **Analysis**.

A. Documentation

The basic research was guided by three principles. The first was the necessity of examining Louisiana's institutional history, which has been *terra incognita* in previous discussions of the museum's architecture. Considering Knud W. Jensen's roles as founder and director of the museum, it was reasonable to assume that he played a major role in the development of the buildings. Consequently, the research would encompass any instructions that Jensen provided to his architects, a review of the museum's exhibition history and a comparison between the museum's original collection and the revised collection of the 1970s.

The second principle was to examine each of Bo and Wohlert's buildings at Louisiana with the same degree of curiosity; countering the historical tendency to focus on the 58-Building, at the expense of the later buildings. The fact that the later buildings

have resisted simple interpretations only made their study more urgent. While those buildings might appear to be less compelling, it was logical to assume they embody a mixture of architectural and institutional factors equal in complexity, or perhaps greater, to the 58-Building. Following Wohlert's previously mentioned instruction, the study of the buildings would be preceded by a historical study of the landscape.

The third principle was the importance of studying unrealized architectural schemes and documenting parts of the museum that no longer exist. Firstly, I was determined to collect Bo and Wohlert's unrealized projects, which could support an overall understanding of the museum's growth and might provide clues to understanding the completed buildings. The study of Louisiana's landscape would include major projects that were eventually dismantled or altered beyond recognition, particularly the 1964 sculpture garden that was erased by the construction of the South Wing. In time, I discovered several developments around the lakeshore that were eventually abandoned, but were crucial to recognizing Jensen's multiple architectural agendas.

B. Analysis

I began the applied research without a set of objectives, apart from the conclusion that Knud W. Jensen was responsible for the primary variations between the buildings, as revealed by the basic research. Rather than working towards additional conclusions, I pursued an open-ended project of studying unresolved questions, by examining them in a series of historical contexts, using secondary sources. The most relevant contexts were the development of modernist exhibition space during the 1920s; the post-1945 movement to popularize art; the constructivist tendency in Danish residential design after 1948; and Jensen's choice of institutional role models after 1958. Each of these analytical directions can be traced to Jensen's autobiography, directly or indirectly. For example, his reference to Bo and Wohlert's 1956 study trip led to a close study of their destinations, which revealed an overlooked aspect of the 58-Building, which led me to consider the evolution of modernist exhibition space. That historical research finally provided a framework for assessing all of Louisiana's buildings. However, realizing that assessment required an additional tool.

The applied research allowed me to consider several of Jensen's written statements that do not appear in the Narrative, due to their convoluted structure and/or obscure meaning. By subjecting Jensen's 1957 mission statement for Louisiana; his 1975

manifesto advocating a “concrete utopia”; and his 1979 address “The Ideal Museum” to textual analysis, it was possible to gain new insight into his thinking over the decades. Jensen’s 1979 address introduced the concept of a **“qualified utopia”**, which initially puzzled me. After considering that concept in relation to the evolution of modernist exhibition space, I was able to recognize the fundamental character of Bo and Wohlert’s work at Louisiana. However, that recognition would not have been possible without the knowledge established in the Documentation, demonstrating – at least in my work – the necessity of empirical research for theoretical insight.

In addition to historical studies and textual analysis, I considered Bo and Wohlert’s work at Louisiana in relation to a number of other museum buildings. For example, I was curious whether Jensen’s pivot to enclosed galleries, circa 1959, was inspired by the institutions that supported Louisiana’s shift toward temporary exhibitions. I also wondered about possible relationships between Louisiana and a pair of contemporary museums that also feature sculpture in the landscape: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller and the Maeght Foundation. In addition, I examined two post-modernist museums in West Germany, which were designed by Hans Hollein, in Mönchengladbach; and James Stirling, in Stuttgart. While the study of Stirling’s building was prompted by Bo and Wohlert’s second-place entry in the competition that produced the building, the study of Hollein’s building was an intuitive choice that proved fortunate.

C. Definition of Key Terms

Throughout this dissertation, I employ three, potentially difficult terms that are found in Knud W. Jensen’s written statements and are fundamental to describing Bo and Wohlert’s work at Louisiana. I employ the terms according to Jensen’s meanings, but each is subject to multiple interpretations. For the sake of clarity, I have compiled the following definitions.

Genius Loci – Knud W. Jensen often employed the term *genius loci* when referring to Louisiana or other place that exhibit a distinctive character. As is commonly known, the term originated among the Romans, who believed that each person, institution or place had a protective deity: a *genius*. The modern usage of the term refers to the so-called “spirit” or character of a place and is credited to the eighteenth-century English poet Alexander Pope. In 1731, Pope declared that buildings and gardens should be constructed in accordance with the existing character of the setting,

"To build, to plant, whatever you intend, / To rear the Column or the Arch to bend, To swell the Terras, or to sink the Grot; / In all, let *Nature* never be forgot. / Consult the *Genius* of the *Place* in all, / That tells the waters to rise, or fall."[11]

In the early 1960s, the term *genius loci* found renewed currency among activists, planners and landscape architects, due to the growing resistance to the effects of post-war development. In the 1980s, the term entered popular architectural discourse through the writings of Christian Norberg-Schulz, who argued that, "Architecture means to visualize the *genius loci* and the task of the architect is to create meaningful places, whereby he helps man to dwell."[12] Drawing on the philosophy of Martin Heidegger, Norberg-Schulz advanced a theory of "existential space" that can satisfy both functional and psychological requirements, through the cultivation of Place. In contrast, Jensen's use of the term followed Alexander Pope's epistle and was limited to the distinctive physical features of a particular location: buildings, topography, trees, solar orientation, views, etc. The use of *genius loci* in this dissertation reflects Jensen's use and is an abbreviated reference to the physical character of a location.

Utopia – Knud W. Jensen often wrote and spoke of utopias and utopian concepts. In 1955, he published a collection of essays on cultural policy titled *Slareffanland eller Utopia?* (Wonderland or Utopia?).[13] As Jensen reminded the reader in the titular essay, *utopia* has two meanings. Thomas More's 1516 description of an ideal society was not an instruction manual, but a commentary on the impossibility of that ideal. To reinforce that point, More located his impossible society on the imaginary island of Utopia, which – following the Greek words *eu/ou* (good/not) and *topos* (place) – can be read as "good-place" or "non-place."[14] The positive reading of utopia became the commonly used metaphor for fantastic or unrealizable projects, typically of a social character. Jensen employed that usage, but he also used utopia in the negative reading of the term: as a metaphor for ideas and buildings that are detached from any place.

---

[11] Alexander Pope, *An Epistle to the Right Honourable Richard Earl of Burlington: Occasion'd by his publishing Palladio's designs of the baths, arches, theatres, &c. of ancient Rome*, lines 31–36.

[12] Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli, 1979), 5.

[13] Knud W. Jensen, *Slaraffenland eller Utopia. Artikler om Velfærdsstatens Kulturpolitik* (København: Gyldendal, 1966).

[14] Valerie J. Fletcher, *Dreams and Nightmares, Utopian Visions in Modern Art*, (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1983), 18.

Jensen's dual use of *utopia* provides a theoretical basis for assessing his agendas and Bo and Wohlert's buildings. Neither of the architects could be considered utopians in either meaning of the term. However, Jensen pursued utopian agendas of several types and both meanings, all of which exercised a profound influence on Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana. To avoid confusion, I will employ the terms ***social-utopian*** and ***placeless-utopian*** in my discussions of Jensen's varied agendas, Bo and Wohlert's exhibition spaces and the larger cultural developments that impacted all three men's efforts at Louisiana.

Qualified Utopia – Knud W. Jensen introduced this term in an address that he delivered to a meeting of museum professionals, entitled "The Ideal Museum," in 1979. The first section of the address concerned museum architecture, which he began with the statement **"Wanted: Qualified Utopias."** The final section of the address concerned museum programming, as he advocated the union of art and daily life in pursuit of "a utopian museum." A contextual reading of Jensen's text indicates that he was employing the term *utopia* in both the positive and negative meanings.

In the first section of the address, Jensen's criticized recent museum buildings for rejecting *genius loci* and compromising the experience of the art, even as he admired their distinctive characters and acknowledged their public appeal. As documented and detailed in Chapter 4, he regarded those buildings as placeless-utopian architectural statements, due to the architects' disregard for location. As an alternative, he imagined a hypothetical state, in which an architect's creative vision was moderated by a concern for the setting; we can infer that he was describing the **"Qualified Utopia"** of his opening statement. In the final section of his address, Jensen's reference to a utopian museum employed the positive meaning of the term, as he promoted the ideal of a social-utopian institution that will have "a profound effect on the surrounding society."

There is no indication that Jensen regarded Louisiana as an ideal museum, or that his hypothetical model was a reference to Bo and Wohlert's work. Nonetheless, by identifying the opposition between genius loci and modernist museum buildings; employing the dual meanings of *utopia*; and introducing the concept of a **Qualified Utopia**, Jensen provided the intellectual apparatus for assessing the relationship between his institution and Bo and Wohlert's unitary building.

4. Document Structure

A. Chapter Divisions

The body of this dissertation is divided into five chronological chapters that record Louisiana's pre-history during 1657–1956 and the four stages of Jørgen Bo's and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at the museum; 1956–58, 1959–71, 1972–82, 1983–94. The four stages of Bo and Wohlert's work correspond to the evolution of Louisiana's exhibition spaces: from open frameworks with windows, to enclosed galleries with skylights, to larger and more neutral galleries with skylights, to underground rooms illuminated by artificial light. Those four stages also correspond to phases in Knud W. Jensen's vision of Louisiana: from an unconventional exhibition of Danish art, to a showcase for temporary exhibitions, to a major institution devoted to international art, to a continuous chain of buildings that would complete his autobiographical museum. This alignment of architectural and institutional histories supports the search for links between Bo and Wohlert's buildings and Jensen's vision for Louisiana.

Each chapter is divided into two sections. The first section presents **Documentation** for that period, while the second section presents the corresponding **Analysis**. The sections of Documentation and Analysis are divided into numbered sub-sections that focus on a particular topic or building. The sub-sections allows for cross-referencing between chapters, as the text proceeds and refers to previous chapters. For example, a reference to the ninth sub-section of Chapter 2 is followed by [2.9]. Due to the density of information, each section of Documentation and Analysis includes a summary. At the end of each chapter, the **Observations** distill the main points derived from the Documentation and Analysis. The final section of the text contains the **Conclusions**, which validate the theses presented in my Research Statement.

B. Chapter Summaries

Chapter 1 – Origins: 1657–1956 provides a pre-history of the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art. During the nineteenth century, the setting was transformed into a picturesque landscape that provided the point of departure for Bo and Wohlert's work. A summary of Jensen's early life describes a series of events that preceded his decision to establish Louisiana. The biographical summaries for Bo and Wohlert describe their early professional experiences and the individual works that would

inform their collaboration at the museum. Moreover, Jensen's founding of the museum is examined in relation to the post-1945, European practice of open-air exhibitions. An exploration of American influences on post-war Danish architects identifies the architectural language that Bo and Wohlert would employ for their first building at Louisiana, and reveals their complementary talents.

Chapter 2 – A Home for Art: 1956–58 examines Bo and Wohert's first building at Louisiana, which was completed in 1958. An introduction to Louisiana's collection establishes the character and scale of the artworks, which informed the design of the building. A chronicle of the architects' design process includes an account of their 1956 study trip to Italy and Switzerland, which proved decisive for their work at the museum. The 58-Building is considered at length, providing the reader with a pair of virtual tours; alternately focused on space and construction. A review of the 1956 study trip examines the two, opposing tendencies in museum design they encountered during their journey. Further study of the 58-Building reveals a synthesis of those tendencies, relying on influences that have previously been overlooked or ignored.

Chapter 3 – Organic Growth: 1959–71 chronicles the initial additions to Louisiana and Jensen's determination to radically transform the museum, as documented in Bo and Wohlert's expansion schemes. The photographic reconstruction of Louisiana's sculpture garden documents a crucial step in the museum's growth and leads to a comparison with José Luis Sert's work at the Maeght Foundation. A summary of Bo and Wohlert's collaboration after 1958 is followed by detailed studies of the first two additions to the museum, which they designed individually. Examining the foreign institutions that supported Jensen's transformative project illuminates his rejection of the 58-Building. Analysis of the two additions reveals the architects' principled responses to Jensen's new architectural agenda.

Chapter 4 – A New Museum: 1972–82 documents the turbulent decade in which Jensen finally succeeded in transforming Louisiana, by constructing two major additions and reforming the permanent collection. The process was complicated by his pursuit of an anti-aesthetic building program, during his "Alternative Era." A primary source of Jensen's "Alternative Era" can be found at Centre Pompidou; a summary of that museum's genesis introduces a pair of post-modernist museum buildings in Germany, designed by Hans Hollein, and James Stirling. The two post-

modernist buildings provide useful points of comparison for Bo and Wohlert's German projects of the 1970s, as well as their work at Louisiana. An analysis of Jensen's 1979 address "The Ideal Museum" introduces his concepts of a "qualified utopia" and a "third possibility," which will ultimately locate Bo's and Wohlert's work at Louisiana in both institutional and historical contexts.

Chapter 5 – Earthwork: 1983–94 covers the final phase of Bo's and Wohlert's work at Louisiana. Jensen's reliance on Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller as a model for Louisiana's sculpture collection invites a comparison between the two museums. A detailed study of the underground East Wing reveals the consistency of Wohlert's efforts and Jensen's decisive role in the development of that building. Following the two architects' departure from Louisiana, Jensen continued to pursue new building and landscape projects, which are summarized in an epilogue. Finally, an assessment of Bo and Wohlert's cumulative work at Louisiana reveals a characteristic state that transcends the variations between buildings and serves to introduce the conclusions.

C. Illustrations and Footnotes

Given the empirical character of the research, this dissertation relies heavily on visual evidence and is supported by a larger number of illustrations than is typical for a dissertation. Initially, I thought to combine the text and illustrations in a single volume, but I have reverted to the historical model of separate volumes, for two reasons. Firstly, it is far easier to follow a text when it is not disrupted by images. Secondly, separate volumes allow the reader to study the images at will, rather than by coercion, in parallel to their reading. A two-volume format also allows the reader to study illustrations in other chapters without losing their place in the text.

This dissertation is written in American English, with corresponding spelling and punctuation. Following Anglo-American convention, I employ a person's full name at the first reference within a section of text and their family name in the following references. In the footnotes, the most commonly cited sources are Knud W. Jensen's autobiography, *Mit Louisiana-liv*, and the six unpublished memoranda, "*Målsætning Redegørelse*" (Goal-setting Statements), that Jensen addressed to the board members of the Louisiana Foundation between 1973 and 1985. To avoid unnecessary repetition, the footnotes refer to these sources with the following abbreviations:

MLL: Knud W. Jensen, *Mit Louisiana-liv* (København: Gyldendal, 1985).

M1: —. “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 1.” (August 1973).

M2: —. “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 2.” (September 1975).

M3: —. “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 3.” (July 1976).

M4: —. “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 4.” (November 1978).

M5: —. “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 5.” (August 1980).

M6: —. “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 6.” (December 1985).

In the footnotes and bibliography, a handful of sources were published in both Danish and English. In those cases, the titles are given in English. Where the source was only published in Danish, the title is given in its original form.

This page intentionally blank.

Chapter 1
Origins: 1657–1956

This page intentionally blank.

Origins: 1657-1956

Documentation

The origins of the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art can be found in the history of the landscape and the formative experiences of the three people who led the creation of the museum: the art collector Knud W. Jensen and the architects Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert. As a young man, Jensen developed dual passions for literature and the fine arts, and briefly considered a career as an art historian. Family obligations led Jensen to a career in business, but wealth allowed him to acquire a publishing house and collect art. In time, his desire to create an alternative to the traditional model of an art museum led him to purchase a derelict estate named *Louisiana*. Bo and Wohlert were friends prior to joining forces at Louisiana, but had very different approaches to architecture that were based on principles instilled during their education. The union of those principles would guide their work at Louisiana for almost forty years.

The history of Louisiana's landscape is inseparable from Danish military history between the mid 1600s and early 1800s. During that period, a series of wars led to changes in the ownership of the land and an engineering project that transformed much of the place from a natural setting into artificial landscape. After the violence subsided, the land was transformed once again, by the forester and former soldier – Alexander Brun – who established the estate known as Louisiana and devoted much of his energy to horticulture. Brun's work on the property completed the setting that would eventually capture Jensen's imagination, give his new museum its identity and determine the forms of Bo and Wohlert's buildings. Reviewing the history of the landscape and following Jensen's, Bo's and Wohlert's paths prior to their work at Louisiana allows us to understand the decisions they made while creating a unique museum of extraordinary richness and subtlety.

1.1 An Unnatural History

Three hundred years ago, the land now occupied by the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art was part of *Kraagerup* (later Krogerup), an estate that once stretched to the northern coast of Zealand and included several islands and a number of villages. The most important of Kraagerup's villages was also the nearest; a fishing settlement

that lay at the end of the road leading down to the Øresund, the strait that separates Denmark from Sweden and leads to the Baltic Sea. The first settlers, who were there as early as 2000 BC, had been attracted by the brook that flowed into the sea and gave the village its name: *Humlebæk* (Hops Brook).[1]

The small farm that formed the nucleus of Kraagerup existed by the early 1500s and passed through the hands of several families until 1657, when the enterprising bailiff of Kronborg County, Hans Rostgaard, became the owner by marriage. The same year, Denmark declared war on Sweden, igniting the Dano-Swedish Wars of 1657–60. After Swedish troops occupied most of Denmark and encircled Copenhagen; intending to raze it, Rostgaard distinguished himself as a spy and a leader of the guerilla resistance. The Swedes were eventually expelled and a grateful King Frederik III rewarded Rostgaard for his service: granting him an appointment as Royal Fishing Master; an expanse of land that transformed Kraagerup into a vast domain; and an annual stipend for his and his wife's lifetimes. In 1672, the annual stipend was replaced with still more property, including scattered farms and fields, and two of the five houses in the village of Humlebæk. By the time that Rostgaard died in 1684, Kraagerup's holdings included *Heire Mark*, a large tract south of the manor house that included a marshy area bisected by the brook.[2] **[Fig. 1.1]**

Upon Rostgaard's death, ownership of Kraagerup passed to his son Frederik, who would become a noted scholar and archivist. In 1700, during the Great Northern War, Karl XII Gustav of Sweden invaded Denmark and landed his troops on the shore just north of Humlebæk, where they quickly overwhelmed the farmhand militia. Over the next weeks, the Swedes and their British allies rampaged across the countryside, looting and destroying farms and inflicting particularly heavy damage on Kraagerup, which had been a center of resistance. As compensation, King Frederik IV awarded Frederik Rostgaard various lands and properties, including the remaining houses in Humlebæk, so that Kraagerup owned the entire village and all of the surrounding land. After Frederik Rostgaard died in 1745, Kraagerup passed to his son-in-law,

[1] Asger Schmelling, *Humlebæk Fiskerleie* (Frederiksborg: Frederiksborg Amts Historiske Samfund, 1971), 8. I am indebted to Schmelling's precise and exhaustive scholarship, which provided the basis for my accounts of Krogerup, the excavation of the lake and the history of Alexander Brun's estate.

[2] Schmelling, 105–110.

Frederick Masius von der Masse, whose own son, Frederick Anthon Adam von der Maase, sold the estate to Pauline Sehested in 1804.[3] By that point, the Napoleonic Wars were raging across Europe, and Denmark had been drawn into a geopolitical struggle that would lead to a radical reshaping of the land around Humlebæk. During the 1950s, the resulting landscape would guide the design of the first exhibition building at the Louisiana Museum.

In the aftermath of the French Revolution, France ignited a cycle of wars that lasted from 1792 until Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, in 1815. In the early years, Denmark joined Russia, Sweden and Prussia in the League of Armed Neutrality; largely to preserve its lucrative trade with all sides; and incurred the wrath of Great Britain. The First Battle of Copenhagen was fought on 2 April 1801, under the command of Vice Admiral Horatio Nelson. After an exchange of cannon fire that lasted much of the day, Nelson's offer of a cease-fire was accepted, and Denmark agreed to quit the League, while remaining neutral. The Second Battle of Copenhagen, in September 1807, involved a British bombardment that was vastly more destructive than the first battle and would be decisive for the landscape around Humlebæk. After three nights of attack that burned much of the city, the Danish government petitioned for a cease-fire, agreed to terms and surrendered the fleet. The British sailed off with their prizes and Denmark ended its neutrality by allying itself with France.[4]

Almost immediately, the Danish government initiated a program of state-sponsored piracy, using small craft that were armed with a cannon, and engaged Britain in a conflict known as the Gunboat War, 1807-14. Seven days after the loss of the fleet, King Frederik VI issued an edict known as the Privateer Ordinance, establishing a policy of interdiction aimed at British merchant ships sailing through the Øresund, on their way in and out of the Baltic.[5] In the winter of 1810, the Danish government decided that a port would be constructed at Humlebæk, under the command of an engineer from the General Staff: Lieutenant Colonel Diedrich Adolph von der Recke. Recke's plan included a commercial harbor with a narrow channel leading to an inner

[3] Ibid. As well: Jørgen Jespersen, "Asminderød sogn, Krogerup 1660-1801," www.olischer.dk/Byskirv/stat.html. Accessed 15 August 2015.

[4] N.A.M. Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649-1815* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2004), 468-471, 459.

[5] Schmelling, 136.

basin, which would be excavated from the marshland on either side of the ancient brook. While the harbor was intended for fishing boats, the basin was for privateers and dimensioned to accommodate up to one hundred gunboats, which could lie in wait and then slip out into the Øresund to attack British ships. **[Fig. 1.2]**

A short time before the government decided to construct the port at Humlebæk, Constantin Brun – a merchant who had grown extraordinarily wealthy from Denmark's policy of neutrality – purchased Kraagerup for his first-born son Carl Friedrich Balthazar Brun, who would become the owner three years later. Constantin Brun immediately offered to give the King all of the land necessary for realizing Recke's plan, including the village of Humlebæk and a large parcel around the brook. Work began that spring, with the laying out of a new road (now Gammel Strandvej) around the edges of the parcel and the construction of new houses for the villagers, a hundred meters to the north.[6] **[Fig. 1.3]**

Carrying out Recke's plan was a complicated and extremely expensive enterprise. In warm weather, up to 350 men worked on the site with hand tools, constructing the harbor and excavating the basin that would become Humlebæk Lake. As the excavation proceeded, most of the soil was deposited on the south side of the basin, creating a bulwark that would conceal the gunboats from approaching ships as they headed north. By 1814 and the near-completion of the harbor, the Gunboat War was over and Recke was "a tired and broken man," who died two years later at the age of sixty-one.[7] Recke's project was a strategic failure, but it endowed Humlebæk with a fishing harbor and an enchanting lake. One hundred and forty years later, the lake would be a focal point of a new museum building that was constructed on the bulwark created with the excavated soil. In the meantime, the land that Constantin Brun had donated to the Crown, in 1810, would be restored and cultivated by his grandson, Alexander Brun. It was Brun who, with great difficulty, would assemble the property where the museum is now located and name his estate *Louisiana*.

---

[6] Schmelling, 44–52.

[7] Ibid.

1.2 Alexander Brun

Alexander Brun (1814-93) was born and raised in the manor house at Kraagerup. By 1820, the house was surrounded by a picturesque park that his father, Carl Brun, had created in the English style, with meandering paths and rare, imported species of trees. The son apparently inherited his father's love of horticulture, and an early diary entry refers to flowers by their Latin names, as well as "cheerful" bees.[8] After studying forestry and surveying in Denmark and Germany, Brun took a position with the Danish Forestry Administration, but soon enrolled at the Royal Prussian Academy of Agriculture. By 1847, he had purchased Palstrup, an estate in Jutland, but his life as a gentleman farmer was interrupted by the outbreak of the First Schleswig War in 1848. Brun volunteered and joined a company of riflemen; was wounded at the Battle of Isted in 1850; and emerged from the war as a decorated officer. In peacetime, he rekindled his youthful fascination with bees and journeyed to Germany and Poland, where he studied the latest advances in beekeeping.[9]

Famously, Brun married three women whose names included *Louise* and named his estate at Humlebæk after one of them. However, it was not his first wife, born Sophie Louise Alice Tutein (1829-99). Their marriage, which took place in April 1849 and was doomed by a mismatch of affections, was annulled after only twenty-five days.[10] In 1852, Brun married Louise Penelope Webb (1830-55) and sold Palstrup. The newlyweds moved back to Kraagerup, where Brun and his father were already working to reclaim the land that Constantin Brun had donated for Recke's project. One year earlier, Alexander Brun had offered to buy the parcel that included the lake and the surrounding slopes (now designated 25a) for the listed price. **[Fig. 1.4]** But the county authorities evidently had second thoughts and replied: "on the other hand this stretch is one of the most beautiful points along the whole coast, and this circumstance might well mean that others would pay a higher purchase price for it."[11]

---

[8] Schmelling, 90.

[9] A summary of Alexander Brun's life can be found in Anton Christensen, "Brun, Alexander," in *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, ed. Povl Engelstoft and Svend Dahl (København: J. H. Schultz, 1932–44), 4:202–04.

[10] Histroical information regarding Brun's wives can be found in Bene Larsen, "Tre gange gift med Louise," *Berlingske Aftenavis*, 2 August 1958.

[11] Brun's efforts to purchase the property are detailed in Schmelling, 84–88.

Already, the authorities had sold the southern portion of the land that was formerly part of Kraagerup (designated 25b) to an engineer, I. C. Thygesen.[12] Thygesen intended to build a house for his family and industrialize much of the rest of the property. His plans included a kiln for firing stoneware in the deep cleft carved by an ancient offshoot of the brook, and a brick factory on the lower level of the parcel, near the beach. Thygesen had applied for permission to buy the land in 1844 and, after many years of negotiation with an ossified bureaucracy, he was finally able to acquire the parcel in 1851. He constructed a modest, one-story house with a tile roof and a pair of outbuildings, on either side of the entrance, which provided a stable and a kitchen with maid's quarters.[13] **[Fig. 1.5]** However, the rest of Thygesen's scheme apparently fell apart and he sold the property to Alexander Brun in 1854. Brun and his wife moved into the house and began planning their future at "one of the most beautiful points along the whole coast," but their idyll was brief. A few days after Christmas 1855, Louise died in childbirth, along with the daughter whom she had struggled to deliver.

In the wake of the tragedy, Brun devoted himself to his bees and the improvement of the estate; establishing his own colonies and became the leading Nordic authority on beekeeping. By 1858, he had combined lessons from Dzierzon with insights from his own experiments and published his authoritative book *Vejledning i Biavl* (Instructions in Beekeeping). In 1861, Brun founded "Foreningen for Nordens Bivenner" and he published *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Biavl* (Nordic Journal of Beekeeping), during 1862-64.[14] As an extension of his interest in horticulture and a complement to his beekeeping, he established an experimental orchard of apple and pear trees at the south end of the estate, where they would receive late-afternoon sun and shelter from sea winds, screened by the birch trees that still cover the steep slope to the beach. In 1858, amid this flurry of activity and experimentation, Brun married his third wife, born Louise Wolff (1835-1926), and named the estate after her.[15]

---

[12] The following account is based on Schmelling, 88–90.

[13] According to standard lore, Alexander Brun constructed the villa during 1854–55. However, Schmelling discovered that Brun did not receive the deed for parcel 25b until 12 May 1854. As a result, he concludes that Thygesen constructed the buildings soon after he took over the property in 1851.

[14] *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, see Note 9 for full citation.

[15] Schmelling, 90.

By 1861, the Interior Ministry had finally decided to dispose of the parcel that included the lake and the surrounding slopes (25a), and a very small parcel (25g) that included an old half-timbered house (believed to date to the 1780s) that had lately been occupied by the Harbormaster. **[Fig. 1.6]** Ten years after his initial offer had been rebuffed, Alexander Brun petitioned the ministry to set a fixed price and sell the land to his family, explaining that he required more land for his fruit trees. After that request was rejected, the two parcels were put up for auction, and Carl Brun was the high bidder for both of them.[16] While 25g was incorporated into Alexander's estate and the former harbormaster's house was given over to his gardener, father and son subdivided the land around the lake: designating the southern portion as 25k, which became part of Louisiana. Carl Brun donated the remainder labeled 25a to the Danish Lutheran Church, which completed a small church and a cemetery in 1868. The timing was fortunate, as Carl Brun expired the next year and was one of the first to be interred in the cemetery.

In 1871, Alexander Brun transformed the modest house at Louisiana into a villa, by adding a second story, a hipped slate roof and a balcony that faces the sea.[17] By 1875, he had transformed the area around the villa into an English-style park. **[Fig. 1.7]** Prior to expanding the house, Brun had already made substantial improvements to the property. A new stable was constructed next to the service wing that included the kitchen, and the original stable converted to a coach house. A glazed shed was added to the coach house and used for nurturing young plants, and a honey magazine was installed in the service wing to store the results of the bees' labor. In addition, Brun probably erected the six-sided gazebo, at the highest point on the property, that would eventually inspire an observation deck, constructed in 1964; and the Panorama Room that replaced that deck, in 1982.

Brun's most important additions to the estate were the rare and extraordinary trees that he planted in the upper level of the park, many of which still survive. One obvious source of inspiration for Brun's collection of specimen trees was the park at Krogerup, where his father planted a number of foreign specimens and established an

[16] Schmelling, 87.

[17] Schmelling, 89.

extraordinary collection of rhododendron. Another likely source of inspiration was the enormous beech with nine trunks that lies north of the villa and is believed to be more than 200 years old. The origin of the tree is mysterious, but it is believed that mice buried a cache of beechnuts on the spot, which eventually germinated and grew together to produce what is generally known as a "mouse-beech."

Brun was particularly interested in evergreens, and he imported species from around the world; Japan, Morocco, Tibetan, Serbia, and North America; that included a towering Sitka spruce from Alaska. He planted most of the evergreens in a belt on the north side of the lawn, where they blocked north winds (as well as the view of the cemetery) and framed the view of the sea. **[Fig. 1.8]** In several places around the grounds, he planted varieties of oak, beech, and willow from the *pendula* group, which he valued for their drooping forms, including the weeping willow still survives at the end of the fern-filled cleft.[18] The trees that Brun planted during the nineteenth century became as important to the experience of Louisiana as the beech with nine trunks, the lake, and the bulwark; capturing the imaginations of Jensen, Bo, and Wohlert when they arrived there nearly 100 years later and playing a primary role in the design of the museum.

Brun served on the Danish Council of State during 1864-65, dabbled in politics and held many of the ceremonial positions that his father had held, including *Jagtmester* (Master of the Hunt) and *Hofjagtmester* (Royal Master of the Hunt), but his primary interests were his bees and his fruit trees. He remained active in beekeeping circles until 1884, when he finally stepped down as president of the association of Nordic beekeepers. An expanded, second edition of his treatise on beekeeping was published that same year.[19] As far as we know, Brun spent his last years continuing his experiments in breeding pears, which he hoped might be useful to Danish agriculture. When his will was read in 1893, it contained an unusual stipulation:

"Future owners of the property Louisiana, or of the terrain where the parent trees of the pear varieties mentioned below grow, shall be obliged to distribute free of charge

[18] Chr. H. Bertelsen, "Louisianas træer," in *Louisiana 1958 Årbog*, ed. Knud W. Jensen and Ole Wivel (København: Gyldendal, 1958), 35–36. As well: Povl Bruun-Møller, "Haven ved Louisiana," *Politiken*, 25 April 1959.

[19] *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*, see Note 9.

scions of the excellent new pear varieties produced from seeds sown by the Master of the Royal Hunt Alexander Brun: to wit 'Master of the Royal Hunt A. Brun's' pear, 'Danish Nelis' pear, 'Danish Dechant' pear and 'Dagmar pear'."[20]

Louise Brun lived until 1926, but she sold Louisiana to Wilhelm Smith Dahl, a wholesaler of plumbing equipment, in 1909. Dahl intended to use the villa as a summer residence, but apparently required updated plumbing and more space. Upon taking over the estate, he hired Holger Jacobsen to design an extension to the north end of the villa, which included a second stair to the ground floor and a direct connection to the kitchen in the service wing. Already, the balcony facing the park had been converted into a porch that was covered by a pergola and supported on columns. Jacobsen returned in 1913, adding a pair of bay windows at the south end of the villa, and again in 1916, designing an addition to the stable that would accommodate Dahl's new automobile and a chauffeur who slept in the attic. Dahl died in 1917. Two years later, his widow, Julie Andrea Dahl (born Wegener), married Peter Johannes Busky-Neergaard. After she passed away in 1927, her widower remained at Louisiana for the rest of his life. In 1939, he hired E. Hartvig Rasmussen to design a one-story extension to the south end of the villa, creating a sunroom that also provided a balcony for the bedrooms on the upper level.[21] **[Fig. 1.9]**

Following Busky-Neergaard's death in 1954, his heirs arranged to sell Louisiana to the local government, which had been developing plans for the property for several years. The neighboring cemetery would be expanded to cover much of Brun's park (which would require the felling of numerous trees), a sewage treatment plant would be constructed in the fern-filled cleft leading to the lower level of the park, and the villa would be converted to a home for the elderly. For the sake of convenience, the gravedigger would live in the house once occupied by Brun's gardener, located within sight of his workplace and his future clients in the villa.[22] All of these plans would have been realized, except for the interference of a trespassing art collector named Knud W. Jensen.

---

[20] Schmelling, 91.

[21] The architectural drawings that record the extensions and renovations to the villa can be found in the archives of Asminderød-Grønholt municipality, and include the names of the various architects.

[22] The municipality's plans for the property are described in MLL, 14–15.

1.3 Knud W. Jensen

Knud John Peter Wadum Jensen (1916–2000) was a complex, charismatic cosmopolitan who found his life's work sharing his cultural interests with as many people as possible. In the process, he established the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art and revolutionized the Danish museum world by his example. Jensen was born into a wealthy Copenhagen family and spent his summers at Strandholm; a villa on the Øresund coast near Vedbæk that his parents had built in 1918. **[Fig. 1.10]** The youngest of three children, he enjoyed a carefree upbringing in a cultivated household that valued paintings, music and books. All of this was made possible by his father's position as the owner of Denmark's largest cheese wholesaler, *Ost en Gros A/S*. Both of his parents, Christiane and Peter, had an affinity for literature, and his father was a passionate bibliophile who collected first editions and other rarities. As a teenager, Jensen became his father's assistant, visiting auction houses and antiquarian dealers, and helped build a collection that overflowed into the his bedroom.[23] Sleeping among the books, he developed a love of literature that would later lead him into publishing.

During his high school years, Jensen attended Schneekloth's Gymnasium, where the walls were hung with changing exhibitions of paintings and drawings created by contemporary Danish artists. The exhibitions featured works by artists who would eventually become pillars of Jensen's collection, such as Vilhelm Lundstrøm, Niels Larsen Stevns and William Scharff, and were accompanied by annual lectures given by Professor Axel Jørgensen; another painter whose works would be included in the original collection at Louisiana. As Jensen explained,

"My schooldays were of huge importance for the development of my own interests. The schoolmasters Rue and Jacobæus, who had organized the institution 'Art in the School,' [*Kunst i Skolen*] made sure that we worked throughout the year among works of art of high quality. The demand for art at that time was minimal, and the initiative of the two teachers was so unique that it was met with good will from all the important artists, who gladly lent their works to the society for years. Sitting through a long winter

[23] MLL, 46–47. As well: Lawrence Weschler, "Profiles: Louisiana in Denmark," *The New Yorker*, August 30 1982: 38.

and looking at a Giersing portrait or a Søndergaard landscape became important to many of us."[24]

By the time that Jensen finished high school, he was imagining a career in the humanities, possibly as an art historian or a literary scholar. While his parents hoped that he would take over the family business, they indulged his interests and he spent 1936-38 traveling across Europe, where he became proficient in several languages, studied art history at the University of Lausanne, and wrote a thesis regarding the influence of non-Western, "primitive" art on the development of modern art.[25] It was in Lausanne, browsing in a second-hand bookshop, that he encountered the book that would ignite his fascination with Greek art, and classical culture in general.

"Suddenly a shock went through me. I had gotten hold of Christian Zervos' *L'art en Grèce*. One splendid image followed another: Cycladic idols, Archaic *korai*, small bronze sculptures, vase paintings that could have inspired Picasso and Matisse, horses in painted, fired clay, dancers, washerwomen and strange animals; rich, imaginative, bold design. My dusty prejudices against Greek art were blown away, the whole envelope of cultivated snobbery and school-learning burst. Here, a man had truly looked at Greek art with fresh eyes."[26]

By his own admission, Jensen lacked the self-confidence to devote himself to a career in scholarship and he joined the family business as a trainee, in 1939.[27] Following his father's death in 1944, Jensen became director of *Ost en Gros* and began leading a "double life": operating the company by day and spending his nights with a circle of artists and writers for whom he served as the indulgent host and budding patron.[28] In 1945, Jensen provided the financing for a small publishing house – *Wivels forlag* – that was directed by the poet Ole Wivel and produced works of contemporary Danish literature; an avant-garde literary magazine, *Heretica*; and illustrated books on art. By mid 1952, Denmark's oldest and most important publisher, Gyldendal, was nearly

---

[24] Knud W. Jensen, "Samfundet og Kunsten," in *Kulturelle strømninger i Danmark, nu og snart*, ed. Mogens Pihl (København: Forlaget Fremad, 1962), 23.

[25] MLL, 47–48.

[26] Knud W. Jensen, "Om Louisianas græske samling," in *Louisiana 1958 Årbog*, 11. See Note 18.

[27] MLL, 48.

[28] Weschler, "Profiles: Louisiana in Denmark," 39.

bankrupt and its stock had become the object of speculation on the stock market, endangering its future. To preserve the publishing house, Jensen purchased a majority stake and folded Wivel's imprint into Gyldendal.[29]

The purchase of Gyldendal elevated Jensen to a prominent position in Danish cultural life. Not long after, he was interviewed for a radio program about the future of *Statens Museum for Kunst*, where Jørn Rubow had recently been appointed director. In 1952, the museum – which had been founded as *Den Kongelige Malerisamling* – was the epitome of a traditional institution, with an ornate 1896 building that was modeled on a palace and designed by Vilhelm Dahlerup and Georg E. W. Møller. The host Pierre Lübecker, the art critic at the newspaper *Politiken*; simply asked his guests, "What do you think about the Museum of Art?" As Jensen recalled,

"I hadn't particularly thought about the Royal Museum in some time, I guess I just took it for granted. But prior to the interview I went over to take a look with fresh spectacles. And I was dumbfounded. It was a true horror cabinet, very much the nineteenth-century bourgeoisie's exaggerated view of its own importance, manifested in the transcendent value of the art it prized. It was a real art temple – huge, fat columns, a broad forbidding marble staircase, rows and rows of plaster busts, dark alcoves."[30]

As an alternative, in both architecture and atmosphere, Jensen suggested that the museum erect a new building in the large park behind the museum [Østre Anlæg], and create a welcoming place with a sunny garden and a sculpture courtyard,

"I suggested that they ought to move into the museum's park, get a good architect, build a low pavilion, with not too high ceilings and good lighting, and move all the modern stuff out there. The main thing was to make it inviting, so that all the people who walked through the park – the young mothers, the maids with perambulators, the old pensioners – would have an oasis in the park. […] People told me I was crazy: 'How can you violate the green areas of our town?' It was nuts. But I became fascinated by the idea. I thought, damn it, maybe I could do it myself."[31]

---

[29] Ole Wivel, *Lyset og market: Mit venskab med Knud W. Jensen* (Herning: Poul Kristensens Forlag, 1994), 18–20. As well: MLL, 48–49.

[30] Weschler, 40.

[31] Ibid.

Already, Jensen had started to purchase contemporary Danish art and was installing works from his collection in the warehouse and offices of his cheese company. The installations, which were intended for a segment of the public who might not otherwise encounter art, led him to seriously consider the role of culture in modern society and he established a program that would replicate his efforts on a larger scale.

In 1954, Jensen was one of the founders of Kunst på Arbejdspladsen (Art in the Workplace), an association of companies that installed temporary art exhibitions for the benefit of their employees. The association was inspired by a similar organization in Norway that emphasized traditional folk art, but Jensen and his colleagues pooled their resources to buy works by contemporary Nordic artists.[32] Member-companies could order thematic exhibitions supported by lectures and films. The menu of options included original works by Danish, Swedish and Norwegian artists, reproductions of works by foreign artists (such as Breughel, Cezanne, and Picasso), and large photographs and plaster casts of Greek statues.[33] The venues included factories, slaughterhouses, sawmills and steelworks, a variety of warehouses and the main packing facility for Irma, the supermarket chain. Most often, the exhibitions were installed in the lunchrooms, where they would enjoy a captive audience. **[Fig. 1.11]** Jensen explained his idealistic approach in the association's 1955 annual report:

"There is an increasing need for art in our time. The reasons are many, and can only be hinted at here; the mechanization of work, the expansion of leisure time, create in many people an urge towards individual activity, study and intellectual pursuits. It is our view that our exhibitions stimulate this, at the same time helping to create a friendly, congenial atmosphere in our canteens and lunchrooms. One must realize that for many of the people who spend time here, our exhibitions are their first real contact with the art of today. Neither at school nor in the home have they encountered art, and out in society only sporadically a statue in a park, a wall sign or a decoration in a public building. It is not least these people; the strangers to art, that it is the mission of the society to bring into

[32] Jensen described the Norwegian program in his essay "Kunsten i Hverdagsmiljøet," which appears in a collection of his writings on cultural policy, *Slaraffenland eller Utopia* (København: Gyldendal, 1966), 54–58.

[33] See *Kunst på Arbejdspladsen Katalog Nr. 1* (København: Foreningen Kunst på Arbejdspladsen, 1960), which contains a list of the packaged exhibitions and illustrations of many of the artworks.

contact with modern art. We think we detect that our work brings about a slow change in their attitudes to art; a recognition that it has a place in their existence."[34]

"Art in the Workplace" marked Jensen's shift from collector to curator, and appears to have served as a training ground for his work at Louisiana. He solicited the support of other business owners; served as the first president of the association; and – as can be inferred from the menu of options – played a role in planning the exhibitions. In all likelihood, the development of Art in the Workplace encouraged Jensen to convert his fantasy of establishing a museum into reality. Founding the association also catalyzed Jensen's social conscience and he became a vocal spokesman on cultural policy. Most importantly, it established Jensen's approach to exhibiting art: unapologetically ambitious, but free of pretension; guided by his own interests, but arranged in a spirit of generosity; in the hope that at least a few people would find the art engaging and a cause for reflection. In addition to all that, beer and sandwiches would be available.

Simultaneous with the creation of Art in the Workplace, Jensen became determined to establish his own museum. His first challenge was to find the right setting:

"In Copenhagen it seemed to me from the beginning out of the question to create a museum; it was both too costly and pretentious, and anyway there were already fifteen of them. It would have to be by the Øresund, where I had spent all my summers, perhaps at my parents' home Strandholm, on Egtoftevej between Vedbæk and Rungsted. But I really could not drive the family from its summer home, and the property was in any case subject to legal encumbrances that would probably prevent any such use. I often sat in my sailboat and looked in at the large, old properties on the coast: H. Konow's, which was a neighbor to the Strandmølle Inn and was later cleared by the State; Fredheim, a neighbor to the houses on Egtoftevej; and Rungstedlund, which quickly had to be rejected."[35]

In what has become an enduring episode in Louisiana's creation story, Jensen found the setting for his new museum while walking his dog on an autumn afternoon in 1954. Setting off from his house in Sletten, an old fishing village just south of

---

[34] Ibid., 55. See also: Knud W. Jensen, "Jo vist skal vi have kunst til arbejdet" (Of Course We Shall Have Art at Work), *Politiken*, 5 December 1954.

[35] MLL, 13.

Humlebæk, he followed the Gammel Strandvej until he arrived at the gates of Louisiana. **[Fig. 1.12]** Peter Busky-Neergard had died in February and in preparation for the sale to the municipality, the place had been abandoned. Climbing over the fence, Jensen discovered that the villa was locked, the outbuildings were in disrepair and the landscape was completely overgrown. The ruins on the property included a walled rose garden on a plateau overlooking the sea, the remnant of a tennis court down by the beach, a neglected orchard of fruit trees, several sheds and a dilapidated, six-sided gazebo at the highest point on the property, overlooking the sea.[36]

After Jensen learned of the municipality's plans for the property – the sewage treatment plant, more graves and a way station for the elderly – he began to imagine alternate locations for the sewage plant and the old-age home. Fortunately, the owner of Nyholm, an old brick villa along the beach, was willing to sell his property, which included a large garden that could accommodate the sewage plant. Jensen promptly bought Nyholm and offered it to the municipality at his cost. Eventually, the planning officials agreed that the home for the elderly could be moved into Humlebæk, closer to other social services. The final obstacle was the expansion of the cemetery; a new bridge had already been constructed over the lake, to provide access to the anticipated gravesites. Jensen offered to donate part of the property to accommodate the expansion, but the offer was rejected until the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, Bodil Koch, intervened and declared the donation sufficiently large.[37] As Jensen struggled to purchase the estate, he settled on a name for his new museum: Louisiana.

"It was obvious I had to keep this lovely name. I could hardly call the place the Humlebæk Museum of Modern Art or Jensen's Museum – people would die laughing."[38]

While the negotiations for purchasing Louisiana dragged on, Jensen began imagining the outlines of his museum; making sketches and working with the landscape architect Agnete Petersen. In 1955, Jensen intended to preserve the villa for his own use and construct an exhibition building at the end of the bulwark created by the excavation of the lake. One of Petersen's site plans depicts the public entrance to

---

[36] MLL, 9–11.

[37] MLL, 14–18.

[38] MLL, 20.

Louisiana along Gammel Strandvej, where the nineteenth-century gazebo would be used as a gatehouse, with a long path leading to the exhibition building. **[Fig. 1.13]** Jensen's sketch for the exhibition building included two galleries with columned porches that would frame a courtyard facing the sea. **[Fig. 1.14]** His scheme was quite conventional – even neoclassical – in approach, except for an appendage at one end of the building that was labeled "library." Despite the traditional conception of the building, Jensen was already beginning to imagine a museum with an unusual combination of features that would take advantage of the natural setting.

Jensen was finally able to take possession of Louisiana, in fact as well as affection, in May 1955. He immediately transferred ownership of the estate and much of his art collection to the Louisiana Foundation, the non-profit entity that owns the museum, as well as Gyldendal, the publishing house.[39] Over the next six months, he began the process of restoring the grounds; cutting back the overgrowth and dismantling the various ruins; and transformed the villa into a private retreat. After much painting and patching, he filled the old house with modern Danish furniture and artworks from his collection, and installed a grand piano for the musical evenings and house parties that he was planning for his friends. While Jensen was restoring the estate and stocking the wine cellar, he was also searching for an architect to help him realize his vision for Louisiana. By this point, he had postponed his plan for a new exhibition building. Instead, he planned to renovate the former coach house and the garage in front of the villa, and use them as galleries.

Jensen wanted to work with an architect who was roughly his own age, and he visited a number of recently completed, single-family houses that had been designed by young architects.[40] Eventually, he contacted Jørn Utzon. At the time, Utzon was best known for the house he had completed for his own family in 1952, which fused principles from the Danish brickwork tradition with ideas from the United States, particularly the single-family houses designed by Frank Lloyd Wright and his followers.[41] Jensen contacted Utzon and suggested that they meet at Louisiana, but

[39] MLL, 21.

[40] MLL, 23–24.

[41] See the chapter "Utzon House" in Michael Sheridan, *Mesterværker – Enfamiliehuset i dansk arkitekturs guldalder*, trans. Knud Michelsen (København: Strandberg Publishing, 2011), 76–95. The

Utzon replied that he was devoting all of 1956 to an architectural competition for a new opera house in Sydney, Australia (which he won). After Jensen was rebuffed, he mentioned his search to Mogens Gjødesen, an old friend and curator of antiquities at the New Carlsberg Glyptotek. Gjødesen suggested that he meet the young architect who had recently renovated the museum's galleries for French art, Vilhelm Wohlert.[42]

1.4 Vilhelm Wohlert

Povl Vilhelm Wohlert (1920–2007) was raised in a middle-class household that enjoyed foreign travel and encouraged his artistic tendencies. At gymnasium, one of his teachers suggested an architectural study trip to northern Italy that would include visits to Florence and Venice, and proved to be a decisive experience.[43] Wohlert entered the School of Architecture at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts in 1938, and conducted his preliminary studies under Kay Fisker and Steen Eiler Rasmussen. In 1941, Wohlert selected Kaare Klint (1888–1954) as his teacher for advanced studies. From that point, Klint became the dominant figure in Wohlert's professional development; his mentor, employer and role model; and it is impossible to understand Wohlert's work at Louisiana without a summary of Klint's lessons.

Klint's lessons were based on a unique set of principles that he had distilled from two radically different mentors. His first mentor was his father, P. V. Jensen-Klint, a leading figure in the Danish Arts and Crafts movement around the turn of the twentieth century and the architect of the Grundtvig Church, where a standard brick provided the module that governed the design and construction of the entire building.[44] Klint's second mentor was Carl Petersen, who had rejected Jensen-Klint's quasi-medieval manner and embraced Neoclassicism, with its rational system of

---

book examines fourteen single-family houses that were completed during 1950–62, including works by Erik Christian Sørensen, Bo and Wohlert, and Halldor Gunnløgsson. An English edition was published as *Landmarks: The Modern House in Denmark* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2014).

[42] MLL, 24.

[43] Thomas Kappel, "Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlerts Museumsarkitektur 1958–91" (Master's thesis, University of Copenhagen, 1992), 16.

[44] See Thomas Bo Jensen, *P. V. Jensen-Klint: The Headstrong Master Builder* (Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, 2009). Jensen's book also discusses Petersen's relationship with Jensen-Klint. As well: Kay Fisker, "Den Klintske skole, P.V. Jensen-Klint, Ivar Bentsen, Kaare Klint," *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 2: 37–80.

elements and proportions.[45] In his maturity, Klint fused the sensitivity to materials and devotion to craft that he had learned from his father with the use of geometry and concern for the human scale that he had absorbed from Petersen, while abandoning both of their preoccupations with historical styles. **[Figs. 1.15-1.17]**

In place of a pre-conceived style, Klint worked with three fundamental tools that were intended to produce rational forms and organic relationships. His essential tool was the module: a simple dimension taken from an element of the construction (the height of a door, the length of a brick, the width of a board) that would allow him to integrate all the parts into a whole. The second tool was geometry, which provided Klint with a timeless and universal language of forms and proportions: a square is a square, everywhere and always. The third tool was a deep knowledge of construction, including the properties of materials and how they can be joined together in an apparently artless way.[46]

In 1924, Klint accepted a position as a lecturer at the Academy's School of Architecture and established the Department of Furniture Design and Interior Space (*Afdeling for Møbelkunst og Rumudstyr*). His curriculum provided the foundation for the modern tradition of Danish furniture, and many of his students and followers; including Orla Mølgaard-Nielsen, Rigmor Andersen, Ole Wanscher, Mogens Koch, Børge Mogensen, Poul Kjærholm and Arne Karlsen; produced works of international and historical importance. In 1941, Klint's teaching position was expanded to include students of architecture, and Wohlert fell into his orbit. At the school and in Klint's office, where Wohlert began working in 1942, Klint taught his student how to draw; but more importantly, he taught him how to think and how to employ the fundamental tools: modules, geometry, and craftsmanship; which includes the effects of materials.

[45] For an introduction to Petersen, see Hakon Stephensen, *Arkitekten Carl Petersen: det tegnede Faaborg museum og skabte en epoke i dansk bygningkunst* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1979).

[46] The most useful summary of Klint's principles and major works can be found in Arne Karlsen, *Møbelkunst i det 20. århundrede* (København: Christian Ejlers forlag, 1990), 1:11–86. Reprinted as *Danish Furniture Design in the 20th Century*, trans. Martha Gaber Abrahamsen (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers Forlag/Dansk Møbelkunst, 2007). For complete documentation, see Gorm Harkær's two-volume *Kaare Klint* (Copenhagen: Klintiana, 2010).

As Wohlert explained,

"It is a classic methodology that Kaare Klint taught me and his other students, at a time when the word module was almost naughty. This schooling lies in the blood, and I have always endeavored to use it as the wonderful aid it is; at the same time, I have tried to avoid what Jensen-Klint called the geometric cat's cradle."

"Architecture is primarily about creating space. Materials and lighting serve to visualize space, while measurement systems should be used as the structural and coordinating principle of architecture. Just as in music, the key to harmony lies in the architecture of the simple numbers."[47]

In 1944, Wohlert created a school project that encapsulated all of Klint's lessons and can be considered a partial model for the first exhibition building at Louisiana, which became known as the 58-Building.[48] The project was an exhibition building for applied art, located on a triangular portion of the park around Kastellet, the old fortification in the center of Copenhagen. **[Figs. 1.18–1.21]** To insure adequate daylight in the galleries, Wohlert divided the building into a series of narrow wings and arranged them to fit the shape of the site, with the main entrance facing the park. The galleries consisted of two types: wide, double-height rooms that would receive light from two sides; and narrow rooms with split-level ceilings, which would only receive light from one side. He placed the wide galleries at a right angle to the park, and joined them with pavilions that project above the vestibules at either end. The entire building would be constructed of a half-timbered framework filled with brick panels or wooden windows. Despite the traditional building technique and sloping roofs, the project contains a number of ideas that would later appear at Louisiana.

The most obvious similarity to the 58-Building is the zig-zag arrangement of the wings, which allowed Wohlert to utilize the entire site and create a series of courtyards that would unify the building with the setting. In Humlebæk, he and Jørgen

---

[47] See Eric Messerschmidt, "En samtale med Vilhelm Wohlert: Man skal være ydmyg i sit udgangspunkt," *Arkitektur DK* 1991, no. 7: 337.

[48] I am indebted to Arne Karlsen for identifying this project and noting the connection to Louisiana in his essay "En linie i dansk arkitektur og brugskunst," reprinted in *Krydsklip i en arkitekts dagbog 1960–2000* (København, Christian Ejlers forlag, 2002), 68. I am also indebted to Gorm Harkær's extraordinary knowledge of Kaare Klint's archive, which allowed me to locate Wohlert's drawings.

Bo would turn this strategy inside out, and use a meandering arrangement of passages and pavilions to divide the journey through the landscape into a series of discrete episodes. Wohlert's entire project was governed by a square module; 80 by 80 centimeters, that was used to establish the floor plans and then developed into a series of larger modules, which determined the dimensions of the timber framework, the heights of the rooms, the divisions of the walls and the sizes of the windows. The result was a three-dimensional network of elements that shared an underlying dimension and would create a harmonious experience at every scale. Twelve years later, Wohlert would establish a smaller module; 60 by 60 centimeters, that was based on the width of a brick and governed all the new construction in Humlebæk.

Designing the exhibition building was a formative experience for Wohlert, especially in the development of narrow galleries with split-level ceilings and clerestory windows. That part of Wohlert's project was clearly inspired by Klint's 1942 project for a memorial to the polar explorer Vitus Bering, which took the form of a library with a lofty reading room. **[Fig. 1.17]** However, the original source for both projects was a building by one of Klint's mentors. As Wohlert later explained,

"He [Klint] didn't like skylights, not even for looking at art, and with great pleasure showed us the beautiful painted drawings for Carl Petersen's "Indian Hut", where the sidelight came down into the room through the high-placed lantern."[49]

"The Indian Hut" was the popular nickname for the exhibition building that Petersen designed for the artists' association *Grønningen*, in 1915. **[Fig. 1.22]** Constructed of timber framing and covered in wood, the building featured a peaked roof with clerestory windows on all four sides, and was named after the painted decorations (which apparently reminded some people of Aboriginal art) that Petersen revised each year that the building existed, 1915–17. At Louisiana, Wohlert would combine Petersen's model of a raised roof monitor with lessons from modern houses in Los Angeles and San Francisco, and create the distinctive "lantern" galleries that formed the core of Louisiana's first exhibition building.

[49] Vilhelm Wohlert, untitled lecture to celebrate Kaare Klint's 100th birthday, delivered at Kunstindustrimuseet (a.k.a. Design Museum Denmark) in November 1988. The lecture was reprinted in *De gamle mestre – Carl Petersen, Ivar Bentsen, Kaj Gottlob, Kaare Klint, Kay Fisker,* ed. Karen Zahle, Jørgen Hegner Christiansen and Finn Monies (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2000), 82–101. This citation, page 83.

In 1944, Wohlert graduated from the Academy and took a job in the office of Palle Suenson, where he met another new employee, Jørgen Bo. A few months later, Klint convinced Wohlert to return to his office, where he would be employed for much of the next decade. During these years, Wohlert also pursued independent projects, winning a 1949 competition to extend the town hall in Maribo with Rolf Graae, a colleague from Klint's office; the extension opened in 1951. Wohlert's relationship with his mentor was extremely intense and he required periodic sabbaticals, so that he could escape the gravitational field of Klint's dominant personality and cultivate his own interests.[50] The most important of these absences was a guest-teaching position at the University of California, Berkeley. In the summer of 1951, Wohlert and his wife packed up their four children and moved to Berkeley; the first leg of a journey that would provide Wohlert with first-hand exposure to recent American architecture and establish a friendship with his former and future colleague.

1.5 Jørgen Bo

Jørgen Bo (1919–1999) was raised in an academic household; both of his parents were teachers; and his creative abilities were evident at an early age. By early adolescence, he had taken up painting landscapes, while also mastering the violin – to the point where his parents debated whether he would be an artist or a concert violinist.[51] Instead, he redirected his artistic energies and enrolled in the School of Architecture at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in 1936, where he fell under the tutelage of Professor Kay Fisker. Fisker was a commanding presence at the school, where he lectured on architectural history and had his own department for studio courses. In addition to his work at the school, Fisker operated a busy office with Christian Frederik (C. F.) Møller; where Bo was employed during his studies.[52] Bo would follow Fisker's example, becoming a housing architect and continuing his preference for large-scale, nearly abstract forms, no matter the type of building.

---

[50] *De gamle mestre*, 100. See Note 49.

[51] Morten Bo (Jørgen Bo's son), conversation with the author on 14 June 2015.

[52] Ibid.

During the 1930s, Fisker was instrumental in developing a national approach to modern architecture, by emphasizing traditional materials and cultural continuity.[53] While Fisker was well aware of developments at the Bauhaus and other centers of mainstream Modernist architecture, he worried that the new industrial approach was largely a matter of style and overlooked fundamental human concerns.[54] Like Kaare Klint, Fisker believed that tradition was a source of knowledge to be developed to serve the present, and that history contained many examples – particularly pre-modern, vernacular buildings – that were at least as functional as recent buildings influenced by avant-garde art. Rather than construct buildings of reinforced concrete, Fisker believed that it was better to work with a familiar, local material that would allow for solid craftsmanship and blend into the larger environment. In his mind, the building material best suited for Denmark's culture and climate was brick.[55]

Fisker's primary interest was housing; his special area of expertise was designing large blocks of flats, which led to a very particular approach to architectural form. As he pointed out, dwellings comprise 80% of the built environment and most works of architecture do not require artistic expression.[56] At the Academy and in his practice, Fisker promoted functional plans, carefully placed windows that would admit as much light as possible and the correct use of materials. He taught his students to use a few unadorned volumes, but to arrange them in an informal way, so that the buildings would be experienced as part of the setting. He summarized this approach in a description of Nordic architecture that included a critique of mainstream Modernism,

"It isn't pretentious and flamboyant as in the Latin countries, Monumentality is not a goal in itself. We strive after an architecture that serves people, which conforms to nature and isn't intrusive, on the contrary; tries to be anonymous."[57]

---

[53] Nils Ole-Lund, "Den funktionelle tradition" in *Kay Fisker,* ed. Steffan Fisker, Johan Fisker and Kim Dirckinck-Holmfeld (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1995), 173–185.

[54] Kay Fisker, "The History of Domestic Architecture in Denmark" *The Architectural Review*, vol. 104, (November 1948): 226. The special, all-Danish issue was reprinted as *The Architecture of Denmark* (London: The Architectural Press, 1949).

[55] See Lawrence B. Anderson, "Fornyelse af en tradition," trans. Inge Hagen, in *Kay Fisker,* ed. Steffan Fisker, et al., 199–207. As well: Hans Erling Langkilde, *Arkitekten Kay Fisker* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1960), 45–76.

[56] Kay Fisker, "Funktionalismens Moral," 1947; Andersen reprint, 36. See Note 115 for full citation.

[57] Kay Fisker, "Svensk Bygningskunst," *Arkitekten* (U) 1945, no. 7: 31

During Bo's studies, the clearest example of Fisker's anonymous approach was the new campus of Aarhus University. In 1931, Fisker and his partner C. F. Møller joined forces with the architect Poul Stegmann and the landscape architect Carl Theodor (C. Th.) Sørensen, and won the competition for the master plan of the university, as well as the first phase of construction. The site was a large park in the center of Aarhus that included a shallow valley with a stream. **[Figs. 1.23–1.24]** Aware that the campus would be constructed over many decades, the architects developed an elementary form that could be adapted to various functions and used for all of the buildings. The uniformity of the buildings would allow for harmony as the university expanded, based on a consistent palette of yellow brickwork and yellow roof tiles. To preserve the natural character of the setting, the architects arranged the buildings on either side of the valley and divided the largest buildings into segments that were nestled into the terrain. Fisker and Møller would remain partners until 1943, when Møller assumed responsibility for the later buildings. During Bo's time in their office, in the late 1930s, he was aware of the work at the university and may have participated in it.

Bo graduated from the Royal Academy in 1941, while Denmark was under German occupation. Unable to find full-time employment, he moved to Gothenburg and worked for Melchior Wernstedt during 1942–43.[58] Returning to Denmark in 1944, Bo took a part-time job as a technical consultant to *Danmarks Naturfredningsforening* (The Danish Association for the Preservation of Nature), a position that he would hold until 1952. His prospects improved in late 1944, when he found a job with Palle Suenson and met three new colleagues who would be instrumental to his future. One of them was C. Th. Sørensen, the landscape architect for Aarhus University, whose office was located in the same building as Suenson's office. Sørensen became a mentor to Bo, traveling with him in Italy and teaching him about the placement of buildings in the landscape.[59] At Suenson's office, Bo also met Vilhelm Wohlert, who soon returned to Kaare Klint's office; and Knud Hallberg, who had close contacts in the Social Democratic party. Shortly after the end of the Second World War, the

---

[58] Vilhem Wohlert, "Jørgen Bo 1919–1999," *Arkitekten* 1999, no. 20: 28–30.

[59] Bo's relationship with C. Th. Sørensen is noted in a book by Professor Malene Hauxner; Bo's daughter, who was a landscape architect and professor at the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (KVL). See Malene Hauxner, *Open to the Sky*, trans. Marion Frandsen and Margot Blanchard (Copenhagen: The Danish Architectural Press, 2003), 49.

Social Democrats launched a large-scale building program to address the severe housing shortage. While Hallberg's connections could bring him commissions, he needed someone to design the buildings and turned to Bo. In 1947, Hallberg and Bo left Suenson's office and established a partnership that would continue until 1957.[60]

Almost all of Hallberg and Bo's commissions were low-rise housing estates located on the outskirts of Copenhagen and constructed with very low budgets. Fisker's influence is especially apparent in the first phase of Stengaardsparken, in Gladsaxe, completed in 1948. Bo arranged the houses for families in L-shaped rows of 4-5 dwellings that frame sheltered backyards. The budget limited Bo's opportunities for architectural expression to the outlines of the brick walls and the shapes of the tile roofs. Nonetheless, he was able to provide each house with a sense of identity, by creating vestibules that project out towards the street and covering them with individual roofs. **[Fig. 1.25]** It was a typically Fiskeresque solution that relied on the roof as the primary means of expression, and the result was both anonymous and humane. While he was working on Stengaardsparken, Bo designed a house for his parents that embodied his approach to architecture in the 1940s and remains one of his most refined works.

At first sight, the Alf and Anne Bo House would appear to be an anonymous dwelling typical of the period. **[Figs. 1.26–1.27]** However, the careful placement of the house in the terrain and the massive volume of the roof; which seems to weight the building to the slope; reveal the sensitivity to topography that would distinguish Bo's work at Louisiana. Bo oriented the house to the southwest, so that both sides would receive direct sun, and created a simple floor plan that minimized circulation space. The house was only 90 square meters, but Bo took the layout of the furniture into account as he dimensioned the rooms and placed the window openings. The only departures from the sober scheme of right angles and simple forms occur where the house emerges from the slope, but even there, the eccentric walls were the result of functional concerns. Studying the plan, we can observe that Bo rotated the stair to the basement, so that it would be easier to maneuver bicycles around the corner, and skewed the full-height wall at the terrace to allow more daylight in the living room.

[60] Morten Bo (Jørgen Bo's son) described the origin of his father's partnership with Knud Hallberg during a conversation with the author on 14 June 2015.

The high wall around the terrace would reappear and play an even more prominent role in Bo's next design for a single-family house, as his formal approach shifted from closed volumes to overlapping elements that extend out into the surroundings.

The first phase of Stengaardsparken only included 29 dwellings and had been the exception to Hallberg and Bo's work. Typically, they were dealing with hundreds of dwellings; 296 units at Kærparken in Hjortekær, where they were forced to use prefabricated elements, but were able to rely on C. Th. Sørensen for the landscaping; 153 units at Nordparken, in Rønne; 273 units at Skoleparken, in Bagsværd.[61] In Bagsværd, the site was nearly 100,000 square meters, and the design of Skoleparken was first and foremost an exercise in site planning. Bo's primary challenge was arranging the buildings in such a way that the residents would not feel overwhelmed by the vast scale of the development. His solution was to divide the row houses into chains that meander across the site and frame a series of courtyards, which provide an intermediate scale between the dwellings and the enormous estate. **[Figs. 1.28–1.30]**

By spring of 1952, the design of Skoleparken was essentially complete and the working drawings were in progress. Construction would not begin until the autumn and Bo was able to make a cross-country journey across the United States with his friend Børge Glahn, supported by a travel grant from Danmark-Amerika Fondet.[62] Like many Danish architects, Bo and Glahn were hungry for new impressions after years of wartime isolation and eager to encounter buildings that they had founds in books, magazines and exhibitions. After a series of stops that included Charlottesville, Virginia, where they visited buildings designed by Thomas Jefferson; Chicago, where they saw works of Frank Lloyd Wright and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe; and Arizona, where they toured Wright's Taliesin West; Bo arrived in Berkeley, California, on the

[61] "Projekteret boligbebyggelse i Bagsværd" [Skoleparken], *Arkitekten* (U) 1952, no. 20: 154–158. "Elementhusene i Hjortekær," *Arkitekten* (M) 1953, no. 11/12: 187–192. "Skoleparken i Gladsaxe," *Arkitekten* (M) 1956, no. 8/9: 126-133. Nordparken in Rønne has been documented by the housing association Bo 42, which manages the property now known as Afdeling 56; see www.bo42.dk., accessed 20 November 2018. As well: Esbjørn Hiort, *Housing in Denmark Since 1930,* trans. Eva M. Wendt, (København, Julius Gjellerups Forlag, 1952), 72, 94 [Hjortekær].

[62] Also known as *Danmarks Amerikanske Selskab*, the organization administered Fulbright travel grants to visit the United States, which were funded by the U.S. government, to promote cultural and educational exchange. As a condition of the grant, the two travelers produced a summary of Thomas Jefferson's work as an architect in-and-around Charlottesville, Virginia, which was published as Jørgen Bo and Børge Glahn, *En Amerikansk Arkitekt, Thomas Jefferson* (København: Det Schønbergske Forlag, 1953).

east side of San Francisco Bay.[63] It is uncertain where he and Glahn parted, but Bo stayed in Berkeley for some time, renewing his acquaintance with Vilhelm Wohlert.

1.6 California

While Jørgen Bo was in California, he and Vilhelm Wohlert encountered a number of buildings that would have a profound influence on their work at Louisiana.[64] Driving around San Francisco Bay, they visited works by Wohlert's recent acquaintances at the university, including William Wurster, Mario Corbett, Joseph Esherick, and Jack Hillmer. The senior member of the faculty was Bernard Maybeck (1862–1957), who had moved to Berkeley in 1892 and developed a very personal interpretation of Arts and Crafts ideals. Wohlert was particularly fascinated with Maybeck's timber-framed church for the Christian Science movement, completed in 1910, and undoubtedly took Bo to visit the building.[65] **[Fig. 1.31]** As importantly, they visited the house that Jack Hillmer had designed for Fred and Eva Ludekens, on Belvedere Island, along the north side of the bay. **[Figs. 1.32–1.33]** That house reflected a deep appreciation of Frank Lloyd Wright's principles of "organic architecture," which Hillmer adapted to his obsession with precise craftsmanship and passion for raw, natural materials. His favored material was California redwood, a native species that resists shrinkage, warping and decay, and can be exposed to the weather.

Hillmer designed the Ludekens House to take advantage of the views and to preserve the existing trees. Most of the living spaces are arranged in a rectangle parallel to the water, and a cantilevered deck runs the length of the house. Along the deck, 4" by 8" redwood posts support the various roofs and frame the windows that seem to disappear into the floor and ceilings. The focal point of the house is a fireplace constructed from massive slabs of granite, which were left unfinished to display the marks from the quarry. Aside from the steel frame that was cantilevered out from the slope and the heated concrete floor, the entire structure was constructed of untreated redwood; rough sawn on the exterior and planed inside. Wohlert admired the house

[63] This incomplete outline of Bo and Glahn's itinerary was assembled using Else Tholstrup's email to the author on 13 May 2016, and a review of Morten Bo's family photographs.

[64] Wohlert described his travels with Bo, in San Francisco and Los Angeles, during a conversation in September 2005.

[65] Wohlert's sketch of Maybeck's church, dated October 1952, appears in John Pardey, *Louisiana and Beyond: The Work of Vilhelm Wohlert* (Hellerup: Edition Bløndal, 2007), 106–107.

beyond words and often mentioned it as a crucial source of inspiration, to this author and others.[66] Hillmer's dedication to preserving the character of the setting, his use of natural materials, and his window-wall of closely spaced wooden posts would all be continued and reinterpreted in the 58-Building. But first, Bo and Wohlert would travel south and return to first sources, including several houses designed by Wright and his followers that had inspired Hillmer.[67]

Before Bo returned to Denmark, he and Wohlert drove south to Los Angeles, where they spent several visiting an eclectic range of buildings, mostly single-family houses that can be divided into two groups. **[Figs. 1.34–1.40]** At the top of their list were houses designed by Frank Lloyd Wright and two of Wright's former employees, Richard Neutra and Rudolph Schindler. The two Austrians had been educated in Vienna during the early years of the twentieth century and eventually immigrated to the United States, a decade apart, with the hope of working for Wright. By 1940, they had created a distinctive Southern Californian version of modern architecture, by combining Wright's lessons in the handling of space with the abstract forms and unadorned surfaces advocated by their teachers in Vienna, most notably Adolf Loos.[68]

The other focus of Bo and Wohlert's visit to Los Angeles was the Case Study Houses; a series of experimental, single-family houses that had been designed and constructed since 1945. The mastermind of the Case Study House program was John Entenza, editor of *Arts & Architecture*, the leading magazine of modernist culture in the United States. Entenza imagined the Case Study Houses as a series of inexpensive dwellings that would demonstrate the advantages of modern architecture to a mass audience and provide prototypes for the post-war building boom.[69] He selected the architects for the program from his circle of friends, who included William Wurster, Richard Neutra, Eero Saarinen and Charles Eames. By the time that Bo and Wohlert arrived in Los

[66] Pardey included two photos of the Ludekens House, but did not mention it in his text. See Alan Hess, "Jack Hillmer's Ludekens House," *Fine Homebuilding*, no. 30 (December 1985/January 1986): 18–23.

[67] According to Hess, Hillmer's primary influences were Wright, Schindler and Mies van der Rohe. He first encountered Schindler's work in 1942, when he saw the Pueblo Ribera apartment building (1923), in La Jolla. Hillmer became a tenant and made a close study of Schindler's other work. See Hess, 22. Visiting the Schindler-Chace House involved a meeting with the architect, who lived there until 1953.

[68] Thomas S. Hines, *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture*, second ed. (Oxford; New York: University of California Press, 1982), 21–23.

[69] See Esther McCoy, et al., *Blueprints for Modern Living: History and Legacy of the Case Study Houses* (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989).

Angeles, more than a dozen of the Case Study Houses had been completed, including Charles Eames's iconic CSH #8. **[Fig. 1.37]**

The visit to Los Angeles introduced Bo and Wohlert to a more complex type of construction than they had encountered in or around San Francisco, and a correspondingly more complex treatment of space. Different structural systems create different types of interior space, as can be seen by comparing the interiors of a brick house and a house constructed with post-and-beam framing. While the houses Bo and Wohlert visited in the Bay Area were typically constructed of wooden studs (Wurster, Mario Corbett, Joseph Escherick), or timber framing (Maybeck and Hillmer), several of the houses they visited in Los Angeles combined load-bearing walls with wooden framing, resulting in different types of space within a single building. Two of those houses would be particularly important to Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana.

The earlier house was Rudolph Schindler's Schindler-Chace House, also known as the Kings Road House and constructed during 1921–22.[70] **[Figs. 1.41–1.43]** Schindler and his wife Pauline were devoted advocates of natural living, who believed in the benefits of organic foods, sunbathing and sleeping outdoors. After finding a like-minded couple, Marian and Clyde Chace, and a suitable lot in West Hollywood, Schindler designed a "cooperative dwelling" for the two as-yet childless couples. Each couple occupied an L-shaped wing that included a private entrance, a bathroom, and two studios – one for each spouse – that were arranged at a right angle and framed a grassy courtyard. Next to each entrance, a stair leads to the roof and the timber-framed "sleeping baskets" that replaced conventional bedrooms.

The studios were enclosed on three sides, by rows of concrete slabs that were cast on the ground and then hoisted into place; the gaps between them were filled with narrow pieces of glass. The fourth side of each studio opens to a courtyard and is equipped with large, sliding panels of wood and glass (originally canvas) that recall the *shoji* in traditional Japanese buildings. To shelter the studios from sun and rain, Schindler extended the roofs beyond the sliding panels, and then crowned the roofs with bands of clerestory windows that allow daylight to reach the interiors. A third

[70] Wohlert's collection of slides documenting the visit to Los Angeles does not include images of the Schindler-Chace House. Given the importance of Schindler's work to Jack Hillmer, we can be certain that he directed Bo and Wohlert to the Schindler-Chace House. See Note 67.

wing included a shared kitchen, a garage and a guest room with its own patio. In Schindler's words, the house was "a simple weave of a few structural materials which retain their natural color and texture throughout."[71]

Alongside the Ludekens House, We can regard the Schindler-Chace House as a primary reference for the design of the first exhibition building at Louisiana. Schindler's house presented Bo and Wohlert with a radically simplified approach to construction, and provided them with a series of lessons that were both general and extremely specific. The stark contrast between the load-bearing walls and the sliding panels in the studios would reappear in the system of passages and pavilions that extend out from Louisiana's nineteenth-century villa. Schindler's treatment of the studios as four, nearly identical elements can be seen as a precedent for the four pavilions in the 58-Building, and his combination of cantilevered roofs and clerestory windows would be re-invented and inverted to light those galleries.

Bo and Wohlert's other decisive encounter in Los Angeles was a visit to Richard Neutra's Case Study House #20.[72] Also known as the Bailey House, CSH #20 is located on the same cul-de-sac as Case Study Houses #18, #9 and #8 – the Eames House. Completed in 1948, CSH #20 continued a number of the ideas that Schindler had pioneered a quarter-century earlier on Kings Road, but Neutra adapted those ideas to a more conventional (and more comfortable) way of living.[73] **[Figs. 1.44–1.47]** Working with a very limited budget, he divided the 1,350 square-foot house into a pair of narrow wings: one mostly constructed of cement blocks that were covered with plaster, the other constructed of wood framing and clad in redwood. The two wings were placed side-by-side, but offset in plan and covered by flat roofs that cantilevered in all directions, creating deep overhangs that joined the interior with the surroundings. The differences in materials and building techniques created a house with two distinct faces; mostly closed to the east and the driveway, and completely

[71] Rudolph M. Schindler, "A Cooperative Dwelling," *T-Square* no. 2 (February 1932): 20–23, reprinted in Kathryn Smith, *Schindler House* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001), 82. As well: Robert Sweeney, Judith Sheine, *Schindler, Kings Road, and Southern California Modernism* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 2012).

[72] The location of CSH #20 next door to CSH #8 (Eames House), which appears in Wohert's slides, and the many slides of other houses by Neutra, establishes Bo and Wohlert's visit to CSH #20.

[73] Neutra knew the house on Kings Road well, having lived there with his wife Dionne and their son during 1925–30, as he and Schindler attempted to sustain a professional partnership. See Smith, 26–28.

open to the west, where a continuous wall of glass with an enormous sliding door faced a garden filled with large trees.[74]

The offset in the plan allowed the living room to receive light from two sides, but it also created sheltered corners at either end of the house that were integral to Neutra's larger strategy. To compensate for the small interior, he developed the surrounding outdoor space as a series of courtyards and patios, including an entrance court, zones for socializing and children's play, and a sitting area next to the master bedroom. In front of the kitchen, a service area included a timber-framed pergola that provided a carport. Added together, the outdoor living areas nearly equaled the size of the interior, and were intended to accommodate the family until they could afford to construct an addition to the house. Neutra was dedicated to dissolving the boundaries between indoors and out, and the enormous windows and sliding glass door must have fascinated Bo and Wohlert. However, it seems that the most important lesson they learned at CSH #20 was the use of freestanding walls to subdivide outdoor space.

On the east side of the house, Neutra extended the end wall of the kitchen to screen the service area from the main entrance. At the other end of the house, a bedroom wall projected out to shelter the carport and support one side of the pergola. Together, the two walls created a courtyard and domesticated a portion of the surroundings. Projecting walls had been a feature of modernist structures since the 1920s, but they were typically constructed of exposed masonry or covered in exotic stone veneers, as in Ludwig Mies van der Rohe's German Pavilion (1928–29). By contrast, Neutra plastered the walls and presented them as abstract elements. Moreover, the white plaster created a strong contrast with the natural colors of the redwood cladding and red brick fireplace, undermining any sense of mass or experience of a self-contained building that was distinct from the surroundings. Returning to Denmark, Bo would develop Neutra's example into a historically important house for his own family and establish the strategy of white, freestanding walls that would characterize Louisiana.

---

[74] "Case Study House #20," *Arts & Architecture*, vol. 65 (December 1948): 32–41, 56–57.

1.7 After Los Angeles

Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's time together in California was a formative experience for both men; the effect on their individual work was both immediate and profound. While their basic principles remained unchanged, both embraced a more fluid treatment of space and adopted an elemental approach to construction. The building was now a set of parts, rather than a single mass; windows were openings between elements, rather than holes in a massive wall; roofs were treated as simple, geometric forms, typically as flat slabs. Working separately, they designed a number of projects during 1953–56, both completed and unrealized, that established the basis for their collaboration at Louisiana. These transitional projects allowed them to explore the ideas and examples they had encountered overseas, each according to his longstanding preoccupations. In Bo's case, it was a matter of following his training with Kay Fisker and simplifying a building to a few abstract forms, as seen in the first project he designed after returning home, in late 1952.

Within a few months of his return, Bo found a deep, narrow lot north of Copenhagen and began designing the small house that would provide the most important element of the 58-Building. Bo's goal was a complete integration of house and garden that would accommodate his young family.[75] His first decision was to set the house back from the street, so that it divided the lot into two sections: a large, front garden for the adults and a secluded garden for the children, at the back of the lot. He arranged the rooms to correspond to the two gardens, with the entrance and the living room to the west, and the kitchen, dining room, and the children's bedrooms to the east, where they would receive morning sun. Gerda Bo's bedroom was at the front of the house, next to a stair leading to the attic, which included her husband's sleeping quarters and his workroom with a large window overlooking the front garden. **[Figs. 1.48–1.51]**

Bo's leap of imagination was to reduce the structure of the house to a series of load-bearing walls and extend the walls out into the surroundings. Regardless of location, all of the walls were constructed of lightweight concrete block and plastered white, so that they were understood as abstract forms that subdivide space, both inside and out.

[75] Poul Erik Skriver, "Hus I Hjortekær," *Arkitektur* 1957, no. 3: 91-97.

These freestanding walls reinforce the division between front and back gardens, and frame a series of outdoor living spaces: a small terrace next to the living room that recalled Bo's house for his parents, an entry courtyard that included a carport and a sunny terrace next to the kitchen, where the children could entertain themselves within sight of the adults. To preserve the visual impact of the white walls, Bo treated the roofs as separate elements that were covered in wooden boards and stained black.

Bo's plastered walls and courtyard-carport were inspired by CSH #20, but he pursued Neutra's strategy of freestanding elements to its logical and radical conclusion. While the walls around Neutra's service court project out from the ends of the building, Bo's walls project out from the interior. As a result, the outdoor areas are experienced as extension of the rooms inside, creating a unity of interior, terraces and setting. Taking a lesson from the terrace at his parent's house, he made all of the walls the same height, so that the outdoor spaces provide a sense of enclosure. At the same time, the consistent height unites all of the walls into a set of elements that are partially covered by the elemental black roofs. Bo's intentions are clearest at the courtyard, where the walls are revealed as thin slabs and the roof of the carport is presented as another slab, barely supported by the ends of the walls.

Bo's house for his own family supplied the defining feature of the first exhibition building at Louisiana: the white masonry walls that are staggered across the site and join the interior with the surroundings. What is more, his treatment of the roofs as independent forms that are supported by the walls was an important step towards the language of overlapping elements that he and Wohlert would develop at Louisiana. In the meantime, Wohlert was also exploring ideas and forms encountered in California, and honing the abstract approach to traditional craft that would join all of Bo's overlapping elements into one of the most refined buildings of the twentieth century.

Wohlert finally returned to Denmark in 1953. By that time, Kaare Klint was suffering from the heart disease that ended his life in March 1954. Wohlert dutifully returned to his mentor's side; worked with him until his death; and then supervised the closing of the office. During that period, Wohlert was scarcely able to do independent work, but he entered the competition for a new Langelinie Pavilion, to replace the 1902 building designed by Fritz Koch that had been destroyed by Nazi sympathizers, in 1944.

Wohlert's proposal consisted of a long, low building that would preserve the open character of the setting and harmonize with the surface of the water. **[Fig. 1.52]** He arranged the parts of the program according to the number of patrons; with the public restaurant and a large terrace on the ground floor; rooms for weddings and receptions on the first floor; and facilities for the Royal Danish Yacht Club on the top floor, where a crown of clerestory windows would flood the meeting rooms with daylight. A reinforced concrete structure would allow wide, column-free spans and the floor slabs would project out into the surroundings, creating an array of cantilevered roofs and a balcony for the members of the yacht club. The edges of the roofs and the parapets for the balcony and terrace would be covered in untreated spruce boards, which would weather to a silver-gray patina and complement the exposed concrete.[76]

Despite Wohlert's practical planning and sensitive approach to the setting, the jury favored monumental schemes, such as Jørn Utzon's Wright-inspired tower, which received an honorable mention, and Eva and Nils Koppel's Mies van der Rohe-inspired block, which was awarded first prize and completed in 1958. Wohlert's entry did not receive official recognition, but it was a breakthrough in his work that allowed him to develop familiar practices in new forms. All of the dining rooms were planned using a simple module, the space required by a table for four people, so that the rooms could be subdivided or joined as needed. While the arrangement of volumes recalls Wright's 1910 Robie House, the cantilevered roofs, balcony and clerestory windows for the yacht club, and the unfinished spruce cladding were apparently inspired by Jack Hillmer's Ludekens House. What elevates the project above pastiche are the humane sense of scale and the organic relationship between the parts and the whole that would distinguish Wohlert's work at Louisiana.

Between 1955 and mid 1956, when he began working with Bo at Louisiana, Wohlert completed two masterworks of interior architecture that included the galleries at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek that brought him to Knud W. Jensen's attention. **[Figs. 1.53–54]** One of the museum's treasures is an extremely rare, complete set of Edgar Degas's bronze sculptures; seventy-two figures of animals, women and ballet dancers. Wohlert installed the bronzes between two galleries for paintings, joining them with a

[76] Wohlert's competition drawings include a project statement. Further: *Arkitekten* (U) 1954: 63–64.

low passage and a special gallery in the center. He designed the entire installation as a piece of fine cabinetry composed of individual elements; ash-veneer panels with solid wood edges, and black wood baseboards (possibly ebony) that would conceal wear.

Compared to Klint's work, the effect was shockingly direct. There were no moldings to cover the joints or elaborate details that would distract the visitor, simply the repetition of the elements and the natural properties of the wood. Drawing on his experience with the Copenhagen shop for Le Klint, which he had designed in Kaare Klint's office, Wohlert designed panels of basket-woven ash strips that were installed to form an abstract frieze in the central gallery. The length of the strips allowed Wohlert to create extremely wide panels without vertical joints: maintaining the sightline established in the passageways and focusing attention on the sculptures.

The second of Wohlert's interior masterworks was the shop for F. A. Thiele, the venerable manufacturer of eyeglasses and optical instruments, located in the center of Copenhagen. **[Figs. 1.55–1.57]** The client, Johan Frederik Axel Thiele, had originally commissioned the interior from Kaare Klint in 1944, and Wohlert had worked on the initial project. After numerous delays, the client was finally ready to proceed in 1954 and, in the aftermath of Klint's death, asked Wohlert to revisit the design.[77] He kept the underlying module and the basic layout, but reworked all of the surfaces, fixtures, and furnishings, and created one of the most extraordinary interiors in the history of Danish architecture. Aside from the teak tabletops and counters, the entire interior was made of fumed oak, in the workshops of Rudolf Rasmussen Cabinetmakers. The project architect, Johan Otto von Spreckelsen, visited the site every day for nearly a year, supervising the construction and the installation of the woodwork, which included custom-made fitting tables, detailed by Peter Hjorth and Mogens Prip-Buus. Unfortunately, the interior was never protected by historic preservation laws, and was destroyed by a renovation of the shop during the 1980s supervised by the client's son.

The focal point of the Thiele interior was an exquisite stair that conveyed customers to fitting tables on the mezzanine. To unify the two levels, Wohlert enclosed the

[77] Poul Erik Skriver, "Butik for optikerfirmæt F. A. Thiele," *Arkitektur* 1957, no. 3: 82–88. Wohlert described the destruction of the interior during a conversation in June 2005. Mogens Prip-Buus supplied additional insight during conversations with the author and Lærke Rydal Jørgensen on 27-28 October 2015.

mezzanine with a series of wooden screens and then repeated the strategy on the stair, by bringing the vertical pattern down to the floor. The screens appeared to float and allowed light to flow through them, giving the lowest and darkest areas in the shop a feeling of spaciousness. The installation was completed in 1957, while Wohlert was developing the details for the 58-Building, which includes a stair in the double-height gallery overlooking Humlebæk Lake. Looking back at the Thiele interior, Wohlert adapted the idea of floating screens to the setting; simplified the screens to rows of thin planks; and created one of the most memorable experiences in the museum.

Wohlert designed one other important project before the 58-Building was completed, a small guesthouse for Professor Niels Bohr, the visionary scientist and winner of the 1922 Nobel Prize in physics. In 1956, Professor Bohr hired Wohlert to renovate his summerhouse; an old cottage with a thatched roof previously renovated by Edvard Thomsen. Bohr also needed additional bedrooms and agreed to construct a separate building in a nearby clearing that is surrounded by pine trees.[78] **[Figs. 1.58–1.59]** Using the dimensions of a standard bed (1 x 2 meters) as a module, Wohlert designed a long wooden box that is fitted with an outer layer of solid doors and overhead shutters, and an inner layer of glass doors. The two layers allow the rooms to be opened to the surroundings, according to the season and the desires of the occupants. The overhead shutters can be fastened to a cantilevered frame, sheltering the deck in a way that recalls the Schindler-Chace House in Los Angeles.

Despite the modest size of the project and simple materials, Wohlert was determined that the guesthouse would have the same degree of precision as more luxurious projects. His assistant, Mogens Prip-Buus, dimensioned the entire building using the width of a single board, so that it could be clad in uncut pieces of material; 5/4” by 7”. As at the Ludekens House, the exterior of the guesthouse was covered in rough-sawn boards, while the interior paneling was planed to a smooth finish. After the woodwork was complete, the interior surfaces were painted with white enamel and the exterior coated with a tar-based preservative. This monochrome box was completed in the summer of 1957, just as construction began on the 58-Building. But fifteen months

[78] Vilhelm Wohlert described the origin of the commission during our visit to the house in June 2005. For more detail about this remarkable building, see Vilhelm Wohlert, “Annex til sommerbolig i Tibirke Lunde,” *Arkitektur* 1957, no. 4: 138–143. As well: “Bohr House” in Sheridan, *Mesterværker*.

earlier, when Knud W. Jensen asked Wohlert to work on Louisiana, he had yet to construct a single, freestanding building. Anxious about his lack of experience on the building site, Wohlert contacted Bo and invited him to collaborate on the project.[79] Decades later, Bo recalled the invitation,

"Listen Jørgen, don't get excited. This is going to be a small, humble job. We're just going to remodel a few stables."[80]

Analysis

The direct relationship between the history of the landscape and the creation of the museum has been described in the Documentation, and does not require elaboration. However, expanding the biographical material on Knud W. Jensen, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert allows us to locate their formative experiences within a series of historical contexts and gain additional insight into their later actions. As we have seen, Jensen's vision for Louisiana was the product of two impulses: a social agenda to make art more accessible to the general public and an aesthetic agenda to exhibit art in a natural setting. Both impulses can be traced to Jensen's exposure to Art in the School and his summers at Strandholm, but they were also guiding principles of a post-war European movement to popularize art that was known to Jensen. As well, the ideas and impulses that influenced Bo's and Wohlert's work following their return from California were well known to a number of their colleagues. By exploring these cultural and architectural developments, it is possible to understand Louisiana as a product of its time, but also as an extraordinary and apparently unique experiment.

---

[79] Wohlert explained his anxiety during a conversation with the author, in June 2005.

[80] See Weschler, "Profiles: Louisiana in Denmark," 42.

1.8 Out of the Ruins, Into the Landscape

For those not present, it is nearly impossible to imagine the despair that shadowed Europe following the Second World War, as the survivors confronted the barbarity of the Holocaust and the challenges of rebuilding entire nations; both physically and psychologically; as well as the new and existential threat of nuclear war. And yet, it was also a period of extraordinary idealism and of new initiatives that were intended to renew the bonds between nations; to prevent future catastrophe, but also to advance a new, more egalitarian era. One of the key strategies in this progressive effort was making culture accessible to a broad public. In the words of one historian,

"In the late 1940s and 1950s, Western Europe was crawling out of the dark crater the Second World War had blown in modern society. Art played an important role in those years of social and economic reconstruction and many expectations were pinned to it. The belief was that Modern art, which for a time had been suppressed in the West by political dictatorships – a situation that continued in Eastern Europe – was to free Western Europeans of the ballast of their (painful) past and educate them to become democratically-minded citizens of the world. Humanist beauty and freedom of expression were top priorities for Western democracies. Consequently, making old and new art accessible to the public was a priority in the 1950s and 1960s. The modern art book and the open air museum both originated in this Modernist context of enlightenment and utopia"[81]

Examining cultural programming in Europe in the early years of the post-war era, we find a series of exhibitions that were installed in unconventional locations and can be understood as a series of social-utopian experiments. The exhibitions were motivated by varied, often overlapping agendas: including social reconstruction, the revision of art history to include modern art, the revival of tourism, and – most relevant to this study – the popularization of art through the use of informal settings, particularly public parks. While the parks provided a substitute for traditional museums; many of which had been damaged during the war; they also provided common ground for people from different social backgrounds. As a result of the outdoor locations, these exhibitions focused on sculpture.

[81] Johan Pas, *The Middelheim Collection* (Brussels: Ludion, 2010), 13.

The first and most influential of these outdoor exhibitions was the 1948 *Open Air Exhibition of Sculpture*, arranged in Battersea Park, London; on the South Bank of the Thames and surrounded by neighborhoods of middle- and working-class families. The exhibition was arranged under the auspices of the London County Council (LCC), which was dominated by members of the Labour party, at the suggestion of Patricia Strauss, chair of the Parks Committee and a collector of modern art.[82] Strauss hoped to advance the acceptance of modern sculptors, such as Henry Moore, who served as her advisor and would be represented in the exhibition. **[Fig. 1.60]** But the underlying agenda was political, as Strauss and her colleagues pursued a policy of 'cultured leisure' that would serve as an alternative to purely commercial entertainments, and thereby promote Labour Socialism. As Robert Burstow explained,

"The LCC's commitment to 'high' culture was consistent with a belief among many Labour intellectuals, activists, councillors and MPs that the party should be concerned with people's material and cultural well-being. […] The spread of Socialism was seen to be inhibited by 'passive', 'escapist', and/or individualistic forms of leisure, such as drinking, gambling, Hollywood films, American comics and detective novels, and commercialized leisure at holiday camps and seaside resorts. Socialists argued that active, creative, communal, 'non-capitalist' forms of leisure, such as attendance at concerts, theatres, museums, art galleries, or educational evening-classes, would produce a thriving civic culture – 'the Third Programme approach', as one post-war Labour writer dubbed it."[83]

Following the opening in May 1948, which garnered national and international press coverage, more than 170,000 visitors streamed into the park, where they were offered guided tours and educational lectures, and allowed to touch the sculptures.[84] After this unexpected popular success, the LCC decided to continue the program as a triennial event, beginning in 1951 and continuing until 1966. The 1948 exhibition did not

---

[82] Melanie Veasey, "The Open Air Exhibition of Sculpture at Battersea Park, 1948: A Prelude to Sculpture Parks," *Garden History–Journal of the Garden Trust*, vol. 44, no. 1 (Summer 2016): 135–146.

[83] Robert Burstow, "Modern Sculpture in the Public Park: A Socialist Experiment in Open-Air 'Cultured Leisure' " in *Sculpture and the Garden*, ed. Patrick Eyres and Fiona Russell (London: Ashgate, 2006), 136. (The Third Programme was a BBC radio channel launched in 1946 and intended to promote cultural and intellectual life in Great Britain.)

[84] Dolores Mitchell, "Art Patronage by the London County Council (L.C.C.) 1948–1965," *Leonardo*, vol. 10, no. 3 (Summer 1977): 207.

include Danish artists – which would have drawn the attention of the Danish press – and there is no evidence that Knud W. Jensen was aware of the exhibition, although his autobiography refers to visiting one of the exhibitions in Battersea Park, perhaps in 1951, 1960 or 1963.[85] And so, it is entirely possible that the exhibition in 1948 escaped Jensen's notice. However, the open-air presentation of sculpture immediately spread to the Continent, where exhibitions in the Netherlands and Belgium included Danish artists and certainly attracted his attention.

On 1 July 1949, the town of Arnhem, the Netherlands, opened *Sonsbeek '49, Europese Beeldhouwkunst in de Open Lucht* (*European Sculpture in the Open Air*), located in Sonsbeek Park. **[Fig. 1.61]** The event was modeled on the exhibition in Battersea Park and initiated by officials of V.V.V (the Dutch Tourist Association) as a way of attracting visitors from Amsterdam and The Hague, to a town that had been largely destroyed during the Battle of Arnhem, in September 1944.[86] Beyond the commercial intentions, the exhibition was also an act of cultural recovery. The vast majority of the nearly 200 works on display were created by Dutch artists, including a handful who had died in combat or been executed by the Nazis for their resistance, and included proposals for memorials. In addition, there were roughly forty works by foreign artists, including four Danes: Adam Fischer, Jørgen Gudmundsen-Holmgreen, Gerhard Henning, and Henrik Starcke, whose works had been borrowed from an exhibition of Danish art at the Gemeentemuseum, The Hague.[87]

Knud W. Jensen was almost certainly aware of *Sonsbeek '49*. One of Jensen's closest artist-friends during the late 1940s was the sculptor Astrid Noack, and he was also her patron, eventually owning more than 20 of her works. As he recalled in his memoir,

"[…] my friendship with Astrid Noack in the first 7-8 years after the war revived a youthful love for Greek and medieval sculpture, from traveling to Greece or to German and French cathedrals, and the major museums in the capitals."[88]

---

[85] MLL, 106. According to Burstow, the exhibitions of 1954 and 1957 were staged in Holland Park, before returning to Battersea Park in 1960. After 1966, the Greater London Council shifted in a more conservative direction, and open-air exhibitions were held on an irregular basis until the mid 1970s.

[86] *Sonsbeek '49* (Arnhem: Comité Sonsbeek '49, 1949), 7.

[87] Ibid., 8, 13.

[88] MLL, 221.

Noack had been Adam Fischer's student in Paris, during the 1920s, and she would have known about the exhibitions featuring her mentor's work, both in The Hague and in Arnhem. As a result, we can reasonably assume that she would have informed Jensen about both exhibitions, if he were not already aware from other sources. Accompanied by extensive publicity, *Sonsbeek '49* attracted roughly 125,000 visitors.[89] As in London, the organizers decided to continue the program with triennial events, which would continue through 1958, before being revived on an irregular basis in 1966 and continuing to the present. **[Fig. 1.62]** Three years after the initial exhibition, *Sonsbeek '52* included works by Henry Heerup, Knud Nellemose, Mogens Boggild, and Noack. The inclusion of Noack's work, suggests that Jensen visited Arnhem that summer, although there is no documentation that he made the trip.

The success of the first exhibition in Sonsbeek Park led to the development of a new type of European museum. In 1949, the visitors to Arnhem included the mayor of Antwerp, Belgium, Lode Craeybeckx, and his Alderman for Finance, F. Vrints.[90] They were so impressed that they immediately began planning an exhibition of European sculpture in Antwerp's Middelheim Park, named after the historic estate. During the Second World War, the park was used as depot and parking lot, first by the German army and then by American forces, but it was largely restored by the end of 1949. On 1 July 1950, the city of Antwerp opened *Exposition Internationale en Plein Air de Sculpture 1900–50*. The exhibition totaled 167 works, including pieces by a number of Danish artists: Adam Fischer, Henry Heerup, Ulf Rasmussen, Henrik Starcke, Jørgen Thoms and Einar Utzon-Frank.[91] At the opening of the exhibition, Craeybeckx declared,

"Here all around us, the violence of the war came during the darkened years to ravage much that was beautiful. At present, it is a sunlit peace that reigns. Where folly and hatred did their destruction, the works of the spirit, conceived in numerous countries have to-day, here found their meeting place."[92]

---

[89] *Sonsbeek '52* (Arnhem: Stichting Sonsbeek '49, 1952), unpaginated.

[90] Pas, 14.

[91] *Exposition Internationale en Plein Air de Sculpture 1900–1950* (Anvers: Ville d'Anvers, 1950), 13–14.

[92] *2nd Biennale for Sculpture, Middelheim Park* (Antwerpen: Ontwikkeling, 1953), 3.

As in London and Arnhem, the exhibition in Middelheim Park attracted an enormous amount of international press coverage and it was extended by a month, due to the large number of visitors, which eventually totaled more than 125,000.[93] Shortly after that exhibition closed, the city council of Antwerp approved Craeybeckx's proposal to create an open-air museum within the park: the first public institution of its kind in Europe.[94] Opened in September 1951, the *Openluchtmuseum voor Beeldhouwkunst* (Open-Air Museum of Sculpture) would eventually be known as the Middelheim Museum. The inaugural exhibition was the first in a series of biennial events that were scheduled to alternate with the Venice Biennale and continued until 1989. **[Figs. 1.63–1.64]** While the 1950 exhibition had consisted of borrowed works, the city of Antwerp committed public funds for the new institution. Over the next decade, the Middelheim Museum would build an extensive collection of modern sculpture, and eventually loan many of the works to Louisiana, for the 1964 exhibition *Middelheim besøger Louisiana* (Middelheim Visits Louisiana) that is examined in Chapter 3.

Middelheim besøger Louisiana was paralleled by an exhibition of Danish sculpture in Antwerp: *Louisiana bezoekt Middleheim* (5 September – 18 October 1964). As Jensen explained in the catalogue for that exhibition,

"For me, it has been of great importance to visit the Open Air Museum for Sculpture Middelheim several times and it has always been my wish that one day our two institutions would work together."[95]

In fact, Noack probably informed Jensen of Lode Craeybeckx's 1950 exhibition, as a result of Adam Fischer's involvement. Jensen was certainly aware of the Middelheim Museum's opening in 1951. As he explained,

"I remember how much it impressed Danish sculptors, as a Belgian delegation [appeared] in the early 'fifties and bought works by Astrid Noack, Adam Fischer and Gottfred Eickhoff."[96]

---

[93] Pas, 15.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Knud W. Jensen, "Middelheim en Louisiana," in *Louisiana bezoekt Middleheim* (Antwerpen: Openluchtmuseum voor Beeldhouwkunst, 1964), 2.

[96] MLL, 109.

Jensen's reference to the early 1950s is vague, but a catalog of the Middelheim's collection includes detailed entries for the works of Noack, Fischer and Eickhoff, indicating that they were purchased directly from the artists in 1951.[97] **[Fig. 1.65]** The year of purchase is noteworthy because it indicates that Jensen knew about the Middelheim Museum some time before the 1952 radio interview with Pierre Lübecker that is described in the Documentation. Five years later, with Louisiana's first exhibition building under construction, Jensen composed a mission statement for his new museum, which was addressed to his circle of authors and artists. He began by asking the rhetorical question "What is the meaning of Louisiana?" and answered with nine points that summarized his motivations,

"1. The desire to create something beautiful, a delightful place that is immediately pleasing, a 'Thing of Beauty.'

2. The importance of moving art out into a piece of Nature: the receptive mode, the "cleansed" impression.

3. The attempt at an artistic synthesis, the visual arts – which as a rule are separate – assembled in one place, whereby their mutual interaction can be observed; Architecture, Painting, Sculpture, Applied Art, Garden Art; experienced together as one multifaceted expression of the same spirit of the time.

4. The desire for a place, an artistically shaped environment that can be the framework for a gathering; the place where we and other good people meet.

5. The idea of popularization (clever?). Increasing opportunities for contact between art and people. Through this attempt to convince people of arts' necessity, we may delight the many (perhaps only superficially) and crystallize the few who had previously been interested, but have not had the opportunity to experience art. Without a living need, art stagnates. Purpose of popularization: To increase and stimulate the need, as artist's feeling of being superfluous is eliminated, there is a need for a proper embrace.

---

[97] Marie-Rose Bentein-Stoelen, *Middelheim: Katalogus van de Verzamel* (Antwerpen: Openluchtmuseum voor Beeldhouwkunst, 1969), 43–44, 47–48, 108. The three sculptures were Gottfred Eickhoff's *Two Peasant Women* (1938–39); Adam Fischer's *Young Girl from Crete* (1942); and Astrid Noack's *Anna Ancher* (1938–39).

6. Establishment of a sort of norm or standard for our environment: so that one can adapt to contemporary art (TV and refrigerator are not the only salvation).

7. The museum itself: Louisiana is a corrective to the popular form for the museum: marble stairs, guards, felt slippers, the art on a pedestal, the nineteenth-century's self-importance, the whole contrast between the art of our time and the environment in which it is seen. Here: a living and humane place where artworks are given optimal conditions through lighting, "airy" hanging and beer in the living room [library], not forgetting Nature.

8. The desire to show our "foreign guests" that we have an art in Denmark. Art is not merely French art; Nordic art is not just Munch.

9. Louisiana Foundation (Peter Jensen Foundation), which also aims to support literature, is through Louisiana's presence not just a vague abstract concept (like the many 'State Councilor Hannibal Olsen and His Wife Dortheal's Grant for Young Artists'), but something more specific; a grant is not just a sum of money but – excuse the slight pretension – an accolade."[98]

Jensen's statement covers a wide range of topics and interests, in no particular order, but a number of his points establish a connection between his conception of Louisiana and the post-war ethos of popularizing art in the interest of social progress. This is explicit in Point 5, but is also evident in Point 6, in which he describes Louisiana as an environment that will unify daily life and contemporary art. Whether or not Jensen was familiar with the Labour Socialist concept of "cultured leisure," his belief that art can provide an alternative to passive consumption echoes, precisely, the Labour agenda of providing the population with healthy ways to spend their free time. While Jensen was realistic about the entertainment value of art: to "delight the many (perhaps only superficially)," he was also idealistic enough to believe that it could "crystallize the few who had previously been interested."

[98] Jensen referred to this statement in his autobiography (MLL, 36), but the contents remained a mystery until I unearthed the typewritten manuscript of "Louisiana: En Redgørelse." The four-page statement is undated, but includes the remark that "construction is underway, and the new Louisiana should be finished and put into use in August 1958"; suggesting it was written in mid or late 1957. The document is now in the Knud W. Jensen Archive, LMMA.

Moreover, Point 2 reveals that Jensen's social and aesthetic agendas were indivisible. As Jensen writes of "the receptive mode, the 'cleansed' impression," he is referring to the visitor's experience as they encounter the art and the psychological state that he believes necessary for the acceptance of modern art. According to his formulation, this "receptive" state of mind is made possible by "moving art out into a piece of Nature", into a neutral location that is "cleansed" of traditional symbols of authority (marble stairs, guards, etc.). By establishing a direct correlation between the natural setting and the popularization of art, Jensen echoed the ethos of the open-air exhibitions in London, Arnhem and Antwerp.

Given the parallels between Jensen's program for Louisiana and the social functions of the open-air sculpture exhibitions in London and Arnhem, his likely knowledge of those exhibitions and his certain knowledge of the Middelheim Museum; it is evident that Jensen did not conceive of Louisiana in isolation. Instead, we can deduce that a combination of biographical factors (his experience with Art in the School, idyllic summers at his family's villa on the Øresund coast and a fascination with sculpture rooted in his study of Greek art) made Jensen especially receptive to the open-air exhibitions and the social-utopian program they represented.

Considering Jensen's knowledge of the Middelheim Museum, we can gather that his vision for Louisiana began to take shape during 1951–52, and perhaps even earlier; and that his leading role in Art in the Workplace, beginning in 1954, provided him with the confidence to locate a setting and proceed with his plan. And yet, none of the open-air exhibitions included actual exhibition buildings, making Jensen's proposal for a complete museum-in-the-landscape something of a visionary proposal.[99] As a result, we can recognize Louisiana as both a product of the post-war movement to popularize art and a personal initiative to create a new type of museum.

---

[99] At *Sonsbeek '52*, the only structure for displaying art was a pavilion for small sculptures, constructed of tree trunks and woven reeds, and attached to the toilet building. The organizers of *Sonsbeek '55* constructed a pavilion designed by Gerrit Rietveld, which was open to the elements and dismantled at the end of the exhibition; it was reassembled at the nearby Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller in 1965. At the Middelheim Museum, in 1953, an existing orangery was hung with curtains that provided a background for drawings and small sculptures. Temporary structures of steel pipes and lightweight panels were erected from 1957, but the museum did not include a permanent exhibition structure until 1971. See Pas, 25–26.

1.9 Points of Reference

As Knud W. Jensen began to imagine the formation of his new museum, he had few examples to guide him. Point 7 of his mission statement – "a corrective to the popular form of the museum" – indicates a rejection of typical institutional models, in terms of both architecture and atmosphere. As such, the origins and historical development of traditional museum architecture are hardly relevant to Louisiana's history and will not be recounted here. However, I would draw the reader's attention to Helmut Seling's excellent summary "The Genesis of the Museum," which was excerpted from his dissertation and translated into English for *The Architectural Review*.[100] Seling examines the development of the museum as a building type, from the Italian *galleria* of the 1600s to the public monuments that emerged during the early 1800s, largely in Germany, following the neoclassical model of the temple. Along the way, he touches on the origins of the institutional ideology that repelled Jensen and many others, which was based on a deliberate separation of art from daily existence. As summarized in the words of the German scholar Wilhelm Wackroder (1773–98),

> "Picture Halls … ought to be temples, where in subdued and silent humility […] we may admire the great artists. […] Works of art in their essence fit as little in the common flow of life as the thought of God."[101]

A researcher might imagine that Jensen found inspiration in recent buildings constructed expressly for modern art, in New York and Amsterdam. But in the early 1950s, Jensen was not yet familiar with either the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), where the director Alfred H. Barr. Jr. presided over a modern building that opened in 1939; or the Stedelijk Musuem, where the director Willem Sandberg completed a two-story addition for temporary exhibitions in 1954. Decades later, describing the Stedelijk Museum's importance to Louisiana's development, Jensen explained,

> "The museum was the first of its kind in Europe, like the Museum of Modern Art: a new type of institution that was very different from the ancient art museums, which had not yet freed themselves from the Nineteenth Century's solemnity. Like the Bauhaus, which

[100] Helmut Seling, "The Genesis of the Museum," *The Architectural Review*, vol. 141 (February 1967): 103–114. Excepted from Helmut Seling, "Die Entstehung des Kunstmuseums als Aufgabe der Architektur" (Unpublished dissertation, University of Freiburg, 1954).

[101] Ibid., 114.

had become a myth and influenced this development, the ideas of Alfred Barr and Willem Sandberg were probably the most influential in the formation of this new museum type. Although I did not know these museums when I decided to create Louisiana, when I got to know them after the opening, due to the fact that I had to run a museum of this kind; I picked up a lot of confirmation and inspiration from them."[102]

Jensen's apparent ignorance of those two innovative institutions is not surprising. Prior to Louisiana's opening, his artistic interests were rather conservative, as seen in the exhibitions he assembled for Art in the Workplace and a profile of his own collection, written in 1956.[103] And yet, Jensen's conservative taste suggests that he was familiar with the Venice Biennale, located in the Giardini di Castello. Alongside the emergence of open-air sculpture exhibitions, the other major cultural event of the late 1940s was the revival of the Venice Biennale, in 1948, under the direction of the art historian Rodolfo Pallucchini.[104] The fact that the Biennale was staged in a tree-filled garden – more formal than the picturesque settings in London, Arnhem or Antwerp, but nonetheless a public park – was a historical coincidence, but absolutely suited to the Biennale's new direction. During the Fascist period in Italy, 1922–42, the Biennale had been used as a vehicle for propaganda, and then cancelled for 1944 and 1946. Pallucchini's revival reflected the post-war emphasis on making more art accessible to a broad segment of society, and promoting an international, pluralistic agenda. According to Henry Meyric Hughes,

"The 1948 Venice Biennale was the first pan-European exhibition of modern art since the War, and it had the ambition to inform and enlighten a broad public. Behind this lay an intention to exorcize the ghosts of the recent, fascist past—symbolized by their appropriation of the vacant German Pavilion for a major survey of French Impressionist painting—and to privilege all forms of abstraction and individual forms of expression, in preference to the figurative styles associated with totalitarian regimes."[105]

---

[102] MLL, 59–60.

[103] Gunnar Jespersen, "En samling bliver til," *Louisiana* (off-print of *Kunst*, no. 5, January 1957).

[104] Lawrence Alloway, *The Venice Biennale, 1895-1968; from Salon to Goldfish Bowl* (Greenwich, Conn.: New York Graphic Society, 1968), 133-139.

[105] Henry Meyric Hughes, "The Promotion and Reception of British Sculpture Abroad, 1948–1960: Herbert Read, Henry Moore, Barbara Hepworth, and the 'Young British Sculptors'," in *British Art*

Beyond the works of the Impressionists, visitors to the 1948 Biennale would have encountered Peggy Guggenheim's presentation of her own collection (installed by Carlo Scarpa) in the unoccupied Greek Pavilion; works by Egon Schiele and Oskar Kokoschka in the Austrian Pavilion; Braque, Chagall, Picasso and Rouault in the French pavilion; Jackson Pollock in the American pavilion; Henry Moore in the British pavilion; and in the Danish pavilion: paintings by Ejler Bille, Egil Jacobsen, Richard Mortensen, and Carl-Henning Pedersen. The appearance of young Danish artists at the Biennale – the most prestigious and widely publicized art exhibition in Europe – was undoubtedly a major event in Copenhagen's artistic community, as well as a matter of national pride. If the Danish press coverage somehow escaped Jensen's notice, we can be certain that he knew about the exhibition through his artist-friends, including the ever-reliable Astrid Noack.

In addition to the picturesque setting, the Biennale provided an alternative model of an exhibition building, in the form of the national pavilions that had been designed in a variety of architectural styles, but were uniformly one-story buildings – modest in scale, if not in decoration. By 1948, the Giardini included thirteen pavilions; primarily essays in neoclassicism that included buildings for Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and Denmark, which was represented by Carl Brummer's austere building of 1932. **[Figs. 1.66–1.67]** There is no documentation that Knud W. Jensen visited the Biennale prior to Louisiana's opening, but it defies reason to imagine that a wealthy European art collector failed to visit Venice during the series of widely-heralded biennials, 1948–56, that re-shaped European art history.[106] In fact, Jensen's 1952 suggestion to Pierre Lübecker – "build a low pavilion, with not too high ceilings and good lighting … make it inviting … an oasis in the park" – suggests that the Giardini di Castello was somewhere in his thoughts.

It would be unsupported speculation (and an exaggeration) to suggest that the Venice Biennale provided a direct model for Jensen's new museum. However, it would be equally speculative to ignore the effect of visiting the Giardini, where the pavilions still offer a vision of an informal, dispersed museum; fragmented into low buildings

---

Studies, Issue 3 (July 2016): https://britishartstudies.ac.uk/issues/issue-index/issue-3, accessed 28 November 2017.

[106] See Note 104.

that are arranged in the landscape. Indeed, Jensen's 1955 sketch for a detached exhibition building, with columned porches of apparently neoclassical inspiration, could be interpreted as a reference to the Danish pavilion in Venice; mirrored to frame a green lawn overlooking the Øresund. **[Fig. 1.14]** While Jensen considered this option long enough for Agnete Petersen to draw a pair of site plans, both dated March 1955, he soon abandoned this notion to pursue a more domestic model.

1.10 The House as Model

At some point in 1955, Knud W. Jensen arrived at the idea of an exhibition building with the character of a single-family house. The most familiar example would have been Ordrupgaard, the former home of the insurance baron and art collector Wilhelm Hansen, which had recently been re-opened to the public as *Ordrupgaardsamlingen*. **[Fig. 1.68]** Jensen could hardly compare the works in his own collection to the treasures that Hansen had amassed, and he barely mentioned Ordrupgaard in his autobiography *Mit Louisiana-liv*.[107] And yet, Ordrupgaard anticipates Jensen's plans for Louisiana in so many ways that it would be myopic not to consider the parallels.

During 1892–1916, Wilhelm Hansen acquired an exemplary collection of Danish paintings, primarily contemporary works by artists such as Vilhelm Hammershoi and L. A. Ring. In 1916, Hansen had turned his attention to French art of the late 1800s and began building a collection of international stature. By that point, Gotfred Tvede had already been drawn plans for a summer retreat located on the edge of Ordrup Krat. With Hansen's collection straining the limits of the family flat in Copenhagen, he instructed Tvede to re-design the house as a year-round residence and to add an exhibition building for his French collection. **[Figs. 1.69–1.70]** Upon completion in 1918, Hansen opened the exhibition building to the public, on Monday afternoons.[108] The Danish collection was installed in the villa, which was not open to the public.

Following the 1922 collapse of Landmandsbanken, which had financed Hansen's acquisitions of art, he was forced to sell more than half of his French holdings to

[107] MLL, 14. Jensen recalled that he initially imagined his museum somewhat closer to Copenhagen, noting that Ordrupgaard only received 7–8,000 visitors per year, despite its proximity.

[108] Haarvard Rostrup, *Histoire du Musée d'Ordrupgaard 1918–78, D'après des documents inédits*, English trans. Janet Rønje, (Copenhague: Musée d'Ordrupgaard, 1981), 73–74.

foreign buyers. Prior to these sales, he had offered the entire collection to the Danish State at a reduced price, but the offer was refused.[109] Eventually, the New Carlsberg Foundation acquired twenty of the most important paintings and drawings, and donated them to the New Carlsberg Glyptotek – where they were later installed in galleries designed by Vilhelm Wohlert. As Hansen's finances stabilized, he worked to fill the gaps in his collection and restore it to a coherent body of art. However, his disappointment at the State's refusal to purchase the collection caused him to close Ordrupgaard to the public. After Wilhelm Hansen's death in 1936, his widow Henny (Jensen) Hansen occupied the estate until her own death, in 1951. In her will, she left the entire property, including buildings, furnishings and artworks, to the nation. The new museum opened to the public in 1953.

The parallels between Ordupgaard and Louisiana are both obvious and obscure; the most obvious being the two villas situated in park-like surroundings. Indeed, Kay Fisker began his 1958 review of Louisiana by comparing the new museum to Ordrupgaard, even as he noted the contrast between the centralized exhibition in Ordup and the de-centralized exhibition in Humlebæk.[110] Moreover, Ordrupgaard included a rose garden that was designed by Fabricius Hansen and decorated with a ceramic fountain commissioned from Jean Gauguin. **[Fig. 1.71]** For a few years, Louisiana included a rose garden designed by Agnete Petersen, described in Chapter 3. At Ordrupgaard, the museum includes the furniture, lighting and ceramics that Thorvald Bindesbøll designed for the Hansens' flat in Copenhagen, and the suite of mahogany furniture that Johan Rohde created for the 1918 exhibition building. At Louisiana, Jensen would furnish the 58-Building with examples of modern Danish applied art, including furniture, textiles and ceramics, as detailed in Chapter 2.

In the mid 1950s, as Jensen's idea of a private museum began to take form, the opening of Ordrupgaardsamlingen was a recent event and fresh in his mind. Returning to Point 3 of Jensen's mission statement for Louisiana; "Architecture, Painting, Sculpture, Applied Art, Garden Art, experienced together as one multifaceted expression of the same spirit of the time"; it seems very likely that Ordrupgaard

[109] Rostrup, 76.

[110] Kay Fisker, "Louisiana," *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8: 145.

provided a primary source of inspiration or even a partial model for Louisiana. And yet, Vilhelm Hansen's collection was devoted to art of the nineteenth century; the architecture, artworks and furnishings enshrined a way of life that effectively ended with the advent of First World War. In contrast, Jensen was dedicated to recent art and hoped to create an important example of modern Danish architecture, which was then in the midst of a dramatic renewal.

At the beginning of the 1950s, Danish residential architecture – particularly the design of single-family houses – was undergoing a transformation that paralleled Knud W. Jensen's vision of exhibiting art in a natural setting. Rather than creating exhibition buildings, the architects of these dwellings promoted a vision of living in connection with the garden. In general, these houses continued the developments of the 1930s, when architects such as Arne Jacobsen and Mogens Lassen had used new types of plans and arrangements of windows to open the closed form of a traditional brick house to the surroundings.[111] After 1948, architects such as Henrik Iversen and Harald Plum employed recent technological advances to advance this vision. **[Figs. 1.72–1.73]** Large sections of exterior wall were replaced with lightweight panels of wood and insulated glass; bedrooms were reduced in size and the living room became the most important part of the house. Towards the garden, pergolas, terraces and overhanging roofs eroded the distinction between indoors and out.[112]

The signs of this transformation were evident as early as 1952 and the publication *Enfamilliehuset af Idag*, which was the first book in a four-volume series.[113] Written by Svend Erik Møller and illustrated with thirty-one examples, the book was intended as a guide for people who might imagine building their own houses, with sections explaining such matters as financing, site planning, kitchen layout, heating systems and the conventions of architectural drawings. The majority of houses in the book

---

[111] See Lisbeth Balsev Jørgensen, *Arkitekten Mogens Lassen, en biografi* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1989); Vibeke Anderson Møller, *Arkitekten Frits Schlegel* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2004); Carsten Thau and Kjeld Vindum, *Arne Jacobsen* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1998). For a summary, see my essay "Det moderne hus i Danmark" in *Mesterværker*, 9–29.

[112] See Jens Mollerup, *Skal De bygge eget hus, 32 nye enfamiliehuse og bygherrevejledning med materialoversigt* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1953).

[113] Svend Erik Møller, *Enfamilehuse af Idag* (København: Høst & Søn Forlag, 1952). See the bibliography for a complete listing, with the second collection compiled by Møller and later volumes compiled by Helge Nissen.

were financed with low-interest State Loans, which placed limits on their area and cost, and typically resulted in one-story buildings with pitched roofs. With a wide variety of architects, both famous and obscure; a range of budgets, from seaside villas to suburban houses financed with State Loans; and a diversity of formal approaches, Møller's book provided a cross-section of Danish residential architecture at the time.

In most of Møller's examples, the house was conceived *a priori* as a rectangular box, to be opened to the surroundings by a process of subtraction, as sections of brickwork were replaced with windows. However, *Enfamilliehuset af Idag* contained one house that had been designed on the premise of space, rather than mass, and served as a sign of a new direction in Danish architecture. That house, designed and constructed by Jørn Utzon for his own family during 1950–52, was so radical that Utzon was denied a State Loan, due to the flat roof and large expanses of glass.[114] **[Figs. 1.74–1.76]** While the Utzon House was unique in its degree of simplification, it signaled the beginning of a new era, in which younger architects would assimilate foreign influences and create a synthesis of abstract architectural space and local building materials.

1.11 A Modern Vernacular

As we consider Jørgen Bo's and Vilhelm Wohlert's development prior to their work at Louisiana, it is useful to observe that their American journeys and sources of inspiration were far from unique. Moreover, Bo was among a small number of young Danish architects who employed lessons from the United States to pursue a new, deliberately constructivist approach to the single-family house. In that regard, the members of this group were exceptional among their generation. While many young Danish architects followed American architecture in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the vast majority preferred an evolution of the national tradition established in the 1930s, by Fisker, Jacobsen and others, as is evident in *Enfamilliehuset af Idag*.

By contrast, the young Danish constructivists pursued a modern conception of architectural space developed by Frank Lloyd Wright, Mies van der Rohe and their professional progeny, in which the interior of a building was understood as part of a continuous field of space that extended out into the surroundings. Their common

[114] Richard Weston, *Utzon: Inspiration, Vision, Architecture* (Hellerup: Edition Bløndal, 2001), 67.

project was to join the interior with the setting, by reducing the building to a series of structural elements – walls, roof, posts and beams – that define space without completely enclosing it, and filling the openings between the elements with large sections of insulated glass. In addition to Utzon and Bo, other members of this circle included Erik Christian Sørensen, Halldor Gunnløgsson, Børge Glahn (Bo's 1952 traveling companion) and Ole Helweg (Glahn's professional partner).

By mid 1955, as Knud W. Jensen began his search for an architect for Louisiana, by visiting recently completed single-family houses, the young constructivists had completed a string of dwellings that constituted the beginnings of a movement. Conveniently for Jensen, three of these dwellings were a few minutes walk from Strandholm, his family's summer estate in Vedbæk. The nearest example was Erik Christian Sørensen's Villa Østerstrand on Immmortellevej, one street over; a neighborly inquiry would have led Jensen to Sørensen's own house-studio in Gentofte. **[Figs. 1.77–1.79]** On the far side of Strandvejen, on Elmevej, Halldor Gunnløgsson occupied a house of his own design composed of segments of brickwork and covered by a saddle roof. **[Figs. 1.80–1.81]** Further afield, Gunnløgsson had recently completed an expansive villa for Jørgen Lytting, overlooking Birkerød Lake. **[Fig. 1.82]** A half-kilometer to the south, on Henriksholm Allé, Børge Glahn and Ole Helweg had completed a home with a double-height studio for the sculptor Torsten Johannson that closely anticipated Bo and Wohlert's 58-Building at Louisiana. **[Figs. 1.83–1.85]** The plan reveals the influence of Richard Neutra, whose dwellings of the 1940s can be considered mid-century equivalents to Wright's Prairie Houses.[115]

Given the extraordinary similarities between most of these houses: the unbroken masonry walls that extend into the landscape, exposed timber framing and floor-to-ceiling windows, and flat, overhanging roofs; a casual observer might conclude that they were primarily exercises in style, derivative of the Utzon House. There is no doubt that Utzon's pioneering achievement in Hellebæk had a powerful effect on his peers, including Bo. Utzon was the first Danish architect to combine an imported, open-plan with the national tradition of precise brickwork, and to divide the dwelling

[115] I am referring to Neutra's Kaufmann Desert House (1945–46) and the Tremaine House (1946–47), which were especially influential in Denmark. See *Richard Neutra. Buildings and Projects*, ed. Willy Boesinger, trans. Werner Czapski, (Zurich: Girsbirger, 1950), 70–79, 80–85.

into separate material-elements. However, if we compare the backgrounds of the various architects, we find so many common experiences and overlapping sources of inspiration that we can identify the development of a shared architectural language. Indeed, the pursuit of anonymity appears to have been a primary goal.

The intellectual origins of this shared language can be found in the education that all of these architects received at the Royal Academy's School of Architecture, under the guiding hand of Professor Kay Fisker. Fisker's ideal – evidenced in his lectures, texts, and built work – was an anonymous architecture based on elementary volumes and standard profiles, which could be combined to unify the content of the building with the surroundings.[116] In 1947, Fisker distilled many of his guiding principles into a lecture – "The Moral of Functionalism" – that put recent architectural developments into a historical framework and argued against a formalist approach to building. He proposed that a functionalist approach had actually been established in the 1850s, in England, in ways that anticipated modern architecture of the twentieth century; and that this proto-functionalism was the foundation of contemporary practice,

"Convenience, spaciousness, division of the plan according to the use of the rooms, orientation for sunlight, ventilation and the best view – all these were considered more important than symmetry, regularity and monumentality, indeed even more important than the architectural proportions of the room, window bays and building elements. Thus the plan became free and irregular with rooms grouped around a large, often two-storied central room. The shape and orientation of our rooms today is based on logical adaptations of this point of view. In the modern house, exterior and interior are no longer separate conceptions but merge into each other."[117]

As Urs Item has observed, Fisker was arguing for the primacy of space over exterior form and a response to the setting rather a preconceived volume or stylistic method.[118] In retrospect, Fisker's lecture seems to be a prescription for the future work of his former students. While Christopher Harlang has suggested that the audience included

---

[116] See the discussion above, as well as the sources cited in Notes 53–55.

[117] Kay Fisker, "Funktionalismens Moral," *A5*, no. 4 (1947): 7–14. An English translation was published as "The Moral of Functionalism," *Magazine of Art*, no. 2, 1950: 62–67. Reprinted in *Nordic Architects Write*, ed. Michael Asgaard Andersen (New York: Routledge, 2008), 35–39.

[118] Urs Item, "Kravet om et anonymt arkitetursprog," in *Architectura 15: Kay Fisker 1893–1993*, ed. Hanne Raabyemagle and Jørgen Sestoft (København: Selskabet for Arkitekturhistorie, 1993): 94–96.

Utzon and Sørensen, we can reasonably assume that Bo, Wohlert and Gunnløgsson were also in attendance; in 1947, all three were working as teaching assistants at the school.[119] The continued presence at the Academy of these recent graduates is only one indication that Fisker's influence extended beyond their student years.

Beyond a typical education, the chain of shared experiences continued with journeys to the United States, supported by Danmark-Amerika Fondet.[120] Fisker played a decisive role in these journeys, by arranging for guest-teaching positions at American universities, and inspiring the travelers' itineraries. The first guest-teacher was Erik Christian Sørensen, dispatched in 1947 to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he taught under the supervision of Fisker's friend, William Wurster. Following Wurster's appointment at the University of California, Berkeley, where he became dean of the architecture school, Wohlert was invited to teach there, as described in the Documentation.[121] Bo and Glahn's 1952 journey did not involve teaching assignments, but we can assume that their study of Thomas Jefferson's architectural work was inspired by Fisker's 1950 article "Den funktionelle tradition," which cited Jefferson's buildings within a survey of historical American architecture.[122]

Jørn Utzon's 1949 journey to the U.S. was also supported by Danmark-Amerika Fondet, and anticipated Bo and Wohlert's visit to Los Angeles. In addition to Utzon's famous journey to the Yucatan Peninsula in Mexico, his itinerary included meetings with Mies, Wright, and Eero Saarinen in the American Midwest; and Charles and Ray Eames, at their own recently completed house in Los Angeles.[123] Whether Utzon visited the Schindler-Chace House is unknown, but he certainly visited Neutra's CSH #20, next door to the Eames's house. After returning to Denmark, Utzon began

[119] Christoffer Harlang, "Negotiating with the Surrounding Society" in *Nordic Architects Write*, trans. Dan Marmorstein, 13. Bo's, Wohlert's and Gunnløgsson's teaching positions are listed in *Weilbachs kunstnerleksikon* (4th edition), ed. Sys Hartmann. (København: Munksgaard/Rosinante, 1994–2000).

[120] The foundation's awards to Utzon and Wohlert are recorded in their Weilbach entries. The awards to Bo and Glahn are recorded in their book *En Amerikansk Arkitekt, Thomas Jefferson*. See Note 62.

[121] As well: Vilhelm Wohlert, "En Amerikansk arkitektskole," *Arkitekten* (U) 1954, no. 24: 189–193.

[122] Kay Fisker, "Den funktionelle tradition – Spredte indtryk af amerikansk arkitektur," *Arkitekten* (M) 1950, no. 5-6: 69–100.

[123] Richard Weston has documented Utzon's meetings with Mies, Saarinen, and Wright, in *Utzon: Inspiration, Vision, Architecture*, 24. Jaime J. Ferrer Forés refers to the meeting with Ray and Charles Eames in *Jørn Utzon, Works and Projects*, trans. Paul Hammond, Anna Puyuelo (Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 2006), 14.

designing the house for his own family that synthesized his primary influences to date; Asplund and Wright, Mies and Neutra; and eventually captured Knud W. Jensen's attention. The instrument of that synthesis was a 12-centimeter module derived from a standard brick, which ordered the entire construction and anchored the imported ideas in vernacular building practices.[124]

There is no evidence that Gunnløgsson or Helweg traveled to the United States during the 1950s, but their wartime years in Stockholm – alongside Utzon, Sørensen, Eva and Nils Koppel, and others – exposed them to an exhibition of recent American architecture that included works by Wright, Mies and Neutra.[125] Gunnløgsson's house on Elmevej (1950–52) was a subtle synthesis of Swedish and American models, with a plan based on Wright's Usonian houses, a split-level section that recalls Gunnar Asplund's 1937 summerhouse and full-height glazing apparently inspired by Neutra and/or Mies.[126] While Gunnløgsson's remarkable achievement was overshadowed by Utzon's more radical approach to the dwelling, a comparison of the two houses that were designed simultaneously, using overlapping sources of inspiration, reveals the models and influences common to their generation.

It is clear that by 1955, Utzon and his peers had developed a distinctively Danish approach to modernist architectural space, which was defined by a combination of national building traditions and advanced technology. Their fundamental strategy was a stark contrast between solid masonry walls and large sections of insulated glass, which created the sensation that the interior continues out into the surroundings. We can regard this synthesis of universal space and local building culture as a modern equivalent to vernacular construction, in that it was anonymous, rooted in tradition and specific to a region. While I am extremely wary of linguistic analogies, it would

---

[124] Jørn Utzon, "Eget hus i Hellebæk," *Arkitekten* (M) 1953, no. 1: 8. In my chapter on the Utzon House, in *Mesterværker*, I failed to recognize the extent of Neutra's influence on Utzon, which becomes apparent after the study of Neutra's single-family houses occasioned by this research.

[125] *Amerika Bygger* was assembled by the Museum of Modern Art and opened at the National Museum on 14 June 1944. See *The Bulletin of the Museum of Modern Art*, vol. 12, no. 2 (November 1944): 3–5. The exhibition appeared in Copenhagen, in September 1945, and in Oslo, in January 1946. See "Amerika bygger. Kommende Udstilling i Raadhushallen," *Arkitekten* (U), 1945, no. 28: 117, and "Amerika bygger," *Byggekunst*, no. 1–2, 1946: 20. *Tiden i Stockholm,* ed. Finn Monies and Karen Zahle, (København: Arkitektens forlag, 1999), includes first-person accounts of war-time exile, written by Monies, Tobias Faber, Ole Helweg, Eva and Nils Koppel, and Erik Christian Sørensen.

[126] Halldor Gunnløgsson, "Eget hus i Vedbæk," *Arkitekten* (M) 1953, no. 1: 5–7.

be imprecise to describe this combination of ideas, methods and materials as a formal approach, because it was based on principles that could be applied to different settings and produce a variety of results. As a result, I will describe this principled approach as a *modern vernacular* architectural language that was dedicated to the union of setting and building, materials and space.

While the young Danes' ideal of an anonymous language originated in Kay Fisker's lessons, the actual language was a product of the elemental aesthetic that originated in Europe during the 1920s. The primary sources of that aesthetic were the "Prairie Houses" designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, which reached Europe with the publication of the two-volume Wasmuth Portfolio (1910–11), and the Suprematist paintings of Kazimir Malevich, who developed a vision of geometric shapes floating in an infinite void, circa 1915. **[Figs. 1.86–1.87]** The combined influences of Wright and Malevich led to the architectural experiments of the Dutch group *De Stijl*, founded by Theo van Doesburg, in 1917.[127] **[Fig. 1.88]** Van Doesburg's ideals of universal space and elemental forms had a profound effect on Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, as seen in Mies's project for a Brick Country House (1923) and the German Pavilion (1928–29) at the 1929 International Exposition, in Barcelona.[128] **[Figs. 1.89–1.91]** During the early 1930s, the flow of influence across the Atlantic was reversed, as Frank Lloyd Wright embraced a new level of abstraction, evident at Fallingwater and in the Usonian houses that provided prototypes for Utzon and many others.[129] **[Fig. 1.92]**

---

[127] Regarding Malevich and the spread of his ideas to the Netherlands, see Christina Lodder, "Constructivist Visions of Utopia" in *Utopia 1900–1940, Visions of a New World*, ed. Doris Wintgens Hötte (Rotterdam: nai010, 2013), 94–105. Regarding Wright's influence on the European avant-garde and vice-versa, see Kenneth Frampton, "Neoplasticism and Architecture: Formation and Transformation" in *De Stijl: 1917–1931: Visions of Utopia*, ed. Mildred Friedman (New York: Abbeville Press, 1982), 98–123. For a summary, see "Cubism, De Stijl and New Conceptions of Space" in William J.R. Curtis, *Modern Architecture Since 1900*, third ed. (London: Phaidon, 1996), 149–159.

[128] See Detlef Mertins, "Architecture of Becoming: Mies van der Rohe and the Avant-Garde" in *Mies in Berlin*, ed. Terence Riley and Barry Bergdoll (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001), 106–133.

[129] See Frampton, Note 127. For a detailed account, see Anthony Alofsin, "Frank Lloyd Wright and Modernism" in *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect*, ed. Terence Riley and Peter Reed (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1994), 32–57. In fact, Alofsin identifies a reversal of influence as early as 1910, when Wright was in Berlin supervising the production of the Wasmuth publication, and subsequently traveled to Vienna. Wright's exposure to the works of the Secessionists initiated a new phase in his treatment of ornament.

A reader might wonder at the similar developments in Europe and Los Angeles during 1920–48. The common source was the publication of the Wasmuth Portfolio, which inspired Schindler to immigrate to the United States, in 1914, and Neutra to follow him, in 1923.[130] Schindler's years with Wright (1917–23) provided him with insight into Wright's methods, but we can regard the Schindler-Chace House as an original invention. Schindler had been obsessed with ideas of an archetypal shelter since his time in Vienna; in America, he found his constituent parts in the traditional adobe buildings of New Mexico and the wood-and-canvas structures he encountered on a camping trip.[131] After 1923, Schindler became aware of the Wright-inspired works emanating from the Netherlands, through publications.[132] The influence of De Stijl is visible in the Lovell Beach House (1925–26), as well a series of later, wood-framed buildings constructed during 1928–53. Despite a prolific career, Schindler died in obscurity and was only re-discovered in the 1960s, by writers such as Esther McCoy.

When Richard Neutra finally arrived in the United States, he came directly from Berlin, where he had spent two years working for Erich Mendelsohn and observing the latest tendencies in avant-garde art and architecture.[133] After a few months with Wright at Taliesin, Neutra moved to Los Angeles, where he brought avant-garde dreams to reality at the Lovell Health House (1927–29) and achieved immediate, international fame. **[Fig. 1.35]** In 1930, Neutra embarked on a round-the-world tour that included lectures across Europe and the CIAM congress, in Brussels, where he served as the American delegate. In each country, he was greeted as a prophet of modernism and given a tour of the latest modernist buildings.[134] Most importantly, he returned to Berlin, where he met Alvar Aalto and Walter Gropius; as well as Mies van der Rohe, who invited him to spend four weeks teaching at Bauhaus Dessau. These months in Europe allowed Neutra to acquaint himself with the major developments since his emigration, including Mies's work at the Weißenhofsiedlung, the Tugendhat House and the German Pavilion, in Barcelona.

---

[130] Hines, 22–23. See Note 68 for full citation.

[131] Curtis, 232–234. As well: Smith, 18.

[132] David Gebhard, *Schindler* (San Francisco: William Stout Publishers, 1997), 55–61, 75–79. See Chapter VII, "Schindler's 'de Stijl'." Reprint of the original edition (London: Viking Press, 1971).

[133] Hines, 32–33.

[134] For a detailed account of Neutra's journey, including his time at Bauhaus Dessau, see Hines, 94–97.

Schindler's work was rarely published during 1930–60; as a result, he was almost unknown in Denmark. However, Neutra's talent for promoting his work through publications and lectures – including a 1948 appearance at the Royal Academy's School of Architecture – made him a well-known figure among young Danish architects, even prior to Kay Fisker's 1950 profile in *Arkitekten*.[135] Beginning in 1937, when Neutra began to work with redwood siding, he gradually moved away from the industrial building systems that had fascinated him during the 1920s.[136] As such, his works of the late 1930s and the 1940s presented an intermediate position between Wright's romantic rusticity and Mies's industrial abstraction. This position does not make Neutra's finest buildings any less compelling, but it does help to explain his popularity among Danish architects during the 1950s.

During the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s, a number of Nordic architects participated in an aesthetic debate that was framed as the opposition between Apollo and Dionysus, which pitted advocates of rationalism against advocates of an intuitive "organic" approach.[137] The use of Greek gods as philosophical proxies originated in Asger Jorn's critique of Functionalism (following Nietzsche), and was adopted by partisans of either Wright or Mies; who assigned their respective hero mythological status. By contrast, Neutra worked in a flexible, inherently constructivist manner; freely mixing spatial concepts and formal strategies pioneered by Wright and Mies, according to site, budget and client. **[Figs. 1.93–1.94]** In this way, Neutra produced buildings that were open to multiple interpretations and could appeal to architects on either side of the Apollo-Dionysus debate. And yet as Edward R. Ford noted, describing Neutra's influence on Danish architects during the 1950s, "[…] their debt to Neutra is less than the mutual debt of all of them to Mies van der Rohe."[138]

---

[135] Halldor Gunnløgsson's review of the 1948 lecture indicates prior knowledge of Neutra's work and enthusiasm for a planned monograph. See "Richard J. Neutra," *Arkitekten* (U) 1948, no. 48: 210–211. Utzon referred to Neutra's lecture in his description of his own house, referenced in Note 124.

[136] Hines, 197.

[137] See Lucy Creagh, "Asger Jorn and the "Apollo and Dionysus Debate" 1946–48" in *Architecture + Art: New Visions, New Strategies*, ed. Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen and Esa Laaksonen (Helsinki: Alvar Aalto Akatemia, 2007), 96–112. As well: Nils-Ole Lund, *Nordic Architecture* (Copenhagen: Danish Architectural Press, 2008), 23–25.

[138] Edward R. Ford, "Richard Neutra and the Architecture of Surface: 1933–1952" in *The Details of Modern Architecture – Volume 2: 1928–1988* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1996), 112.

It would be reductive to assign Bo and Wohlert positions at either end of the Apollo-Dionysus spectrum; neither architect was so dogmatic. This becomes evident when considering their individual, pre-Louisiana works, which display general tendencies, but also reveal affinities for architects of contrasting temperaments. While Wohlert was a rational mathematician, he was also fascinated by the work of Frank Lloyd Wright, as seen in his slides from Los Angeles and his competition entry for the Langelinie Pavilion. **[Figs. 1.34, 1.36, 1.52]** While Bo was a painter of landscapes and devoted to nature; he was also fascinated by Neutra's abstraction, as seen in his own house and at Skoleparken. As such, we can recognize a pair of complex characters, who each displayed a dominant trait that was tempered by other aesthetic interests.

Both architects accepted the terms of the Apollo-Dionysus debate, but hoped to transcend simple dichotomies or stylistic categories. As they explained in a statement to the German journal *Magnum*, responding to the question "Zukunft ohne Stil?"

"It would hardly be possible to consciously create a style. Art Nouveau was a deliberate style. It did not have a long lifespan and was more of a curiosity in the history of style. It is a different matter when posterity recognizes the existence of a style in a period of creative activity, because in such a period, one worked according to fixed principles and had a particular attitude towards things; conditioned by the intellectual and material conditions of the time. Therefore, if one asks oneself whether there is any prospect of a style that will characterize this era, the answer must be that such a style can hardly develop consciously. It has to crystallize very quietly and of itself reflect the principles of artistic creation that have been most strongly asserted during that time.

And what is stronger at this time than what can be expressed with the words 'rationality' and 'effectiveness'? In architecture, these terms are expressed in a strictly mathematically clear design. But opposing movements that try to lessen the damage rationalism is doing to humanity are also very strong in our time. In architecture, they correspond to works with a more lyrical character. If anything is characteristic of the architectural style of the time, it is probably the struggle between the mathematical-logical and the spontaneously lyrical. No style is created based on market research. In the past, consumer demands were a stimulus for quality. Today the responsibility rests

mainly with the producer, and it is, to a very high degree, the demands for quality in the production that are the determining factor."[139]

Reunited at Louisiana, four years after their travels together in California, Bo and Wohlert would adopt the modern vernacular language for their first building at the museum. In place of pre-determined forms, the anonymous language of elements offered a balance between space and construction that was based on materials and modules, but dedicated to the union of building and landscape. As such, it provided common ground for Bo's and Wohlert's individual principles and preoccupations. For Wohlert, it was the reliance on geometry and the unity of space and materials that he had absorbed from Kaare Klint. In Bo's case, the appeal must have been even more pronounced – due to his relationship with C. Th. Sørensen, who had tutored him in the placement of buildings in the landscape; and his employment with Kay Fisker, whose advocacy of anonymous form could be applied to the imported conception of space. By adopting a neutral language devoid of stylistic references, the two architects would join their complementary talents and create an exhibition building that neither could have imagined alone.

[139] Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, "Lyrik und Mathematik," *Magnum. Zeitschrift für das moderne Leben*, no. 38 (October 1961): 42. Wohlert referred to this binary opposition in his eulogy for Bo, "It is as if this tension: Apollo-Dionysos goes through Jørgen's life's work. That it was contained in his complex personality, those who knew him can hardly doubt." See Vilhelm Wohlert, "Jørgen Bo, 1919–1999," *Arkitekten* 1999, no. 20: 28–29.

Observations

Knud W. Jensen's arrived at his decision to create Louisiana through an intersection of personal experience and general cultural currents. As a result of his exposure to Art in the School and fascination with Greek and medieval sculpture, he was particularly receptive to the aesthetics and ethos of the post-war, open-air sculpture exhibitions. Jensen was aware of those exhibitions by 1951, at the latest, when a delegation from the Middelheim Museum visited Denmark to acquire artworks. As a result, we can regard the Middelheim as one of several sources of inspiration for Louisiana. Jensen's mission statement for his new museum establishes Louisiana among the post-war, social-utopian experiments in the popularization of art.

Jensen's purchase of the *Louisiana* estate represented another convergence of biography and influence. Louisiana can also be regarded as a miniature version of Middelheim Park, but Jensen's search for a coastal property was apparently inspired by his parents' summer estate, Strandholm. Another important precedent is found at Ordrupgaardsamlingen; a small-scale museum with a domestic atmosphere that is located in a park-like setting and dedicated to a personal collection. Further parallels to Ordrupgaard can be found in Jensen's decision to name his museum after the estate, his desire to construct notable works of architecture and garden art, and his expansion of the collection to include applied art.

Jensen's decision to establish Louisiana resulted from a gradual accumulation of ideas and impulses. He was aware of the Middelheim Museum by 1951; imagined a new museum in a Copenhagen park in 1952; and took a leading role the formation of Art in the Workplace in 1954, as he began to search for a site. His vision for Louisiana was part of a cultural movement, but none of the open-air exhibitions included indoor space. His innovation was to imagine an entire museum with the character of an open-air exhibition, in which the experience of the landscape was the defining feature. We can identify partial models in Antwerp, Ordrup and Vedbæk, and likely sources of inspiration in London, Arnhem and Venice, but Louisiana was a unique experiment.

Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert were not alone in their study of recent American architecture, and both men received the basic education typical for Danish architects of their generation. However, they also received specialized training from their mentors that extended far beyond the typical experience of a building architect.

That training endowed Bo and Wohlert with highly individual approaches that eroded the distinctions between buildings and either landscape architecture or cabinetmaking. As a result, their collaboration would employ a range of principles and techniques that exceeded the capacity of any single architect or even a like-minded duo such as Glahn and Helweg, whose partnership was a result of choice rather than happenstance.

Bo and Wohlert's individual, pre-Louisiana works reveal a common pursuit of unity between the parts and the whole, following two, opposite approaches. Bo began by considering the character of the site, in order to determine the placement of the building and arrangement of space, before proceeding to the structure. In that sense, he started with the environment and worked towards the details. Wohlert began by searching for a functional, structural or material dimension that would provide a simple module and establish the other types of dimensions. In that sense, he started with the detail and worked towards the whole. While one architect pursued harmony through the study of topography, the other pursued harmony through geometry.

The modern vernacular language pioneered by Jørn Utzon was based on a fluid conception of space and the modular use of materials. This informal, innately constructivist approach was sufficiently general to accommodate both Bo's and Wohlert's individual sets of principles and experiences, and to reconcile their two, very different approaches to architectural design. Their time together in California allowed them to discover a shared aesthetic sensibility and provided a set of common references. Pursuing a unity of topography and geometry, the two architects would eventually reveal the false dichotomy between mathematics and lyricism; as they were certainly aware, both music and poetry are based on ratios.

On the evidence of Richard Neutra's 1948 lecture in Copenhagen and the influence of his work on single-family houses designed by Utzon, Glahn and Helweg, Sørensen, Gunnløgsson and Bo, we can regard Neutra as the central figure in the development of Constructivist tendencies among young Danish architects. Through his conflation of ideas and strategies developed by Wright and Mies van der Rohe, Neutra presented a model of an anonymous, non-dogmatic modernism that could be adapted to many different inclinations. Most particularly, Neutra made Mies's work accessible to post-war Danish architects, by adapting Mies's vision of continuous space to the design of single-family houses that were constructed of natural materials.

Chapter 2
A Home for Art: 1956–58

This page intentionally blank.

A Home for Art: 1956-58

Documentation

In the summer of 1956, Knud W. Jensen, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert began work on a new type of art museum. Jensen wanted to create an alternative to traditional institutions: to challenge conventional ideas about how visitors were treated, how they should behave and how they would encounter art. He hoped that by exhibiting his art collection in a relaxed, unpretentious environment, he would persuade people that art could be a normal part of everyday life, and enjoyed by anyone who was interested. Louisiana would be an informal museum, with a domestic character and welcoming atmosphere; the landscape would be part of the museum experience and visitors would be free to wander indoors and outdoors. Initially, Jensen intended to display his collection in the existing villa and service buildings, but after an unexpected turn of events, he commissioned Bo and Wohlert to design a new exhibition building that would be an extension of the villa.

Bo and Wohlert came to the project with different talents and principles, but they shared a devotion to the setting that allowed them to work in tandem. After Jensen directed the architects to incorporate features of the setting into their plans, they took this idea to an extreme and designed the building from the outside to the inside. The result was a building that is so specific to the place – so much a product of *genius loci* – that it could not exist anywhere else. However, the architecture is anonymous, so as to avoid competing with the villa, the art or the landscape. Bo and Wohlert's first building for the museum was a direct and precise expression of Jensen's original vision for Louisiana, and the essential point of reference for all of the later buildings at the museum. It was also a work of architecture sufficiently rich in ideas and experiences that it requires an individual chapter.

2.1 The Collection

The first exhibition building at Louisiana was completed in August 1958, and simply called the "new building": to distinguish it from the villa. After the first extension was constructed in 1966, the "new building" became known as the 58-Building. (Since the completion of the South Wing, in 1982, the 58-Building has also become known as the North Wing.) The 58-Building was designed for a specific setting, but it was also

designed to exhibit a specific collection of art. To understand the architecture, it is helpful to consider the character of that collection and Knud W. Jensen's intentions for the museum.

During the mid-1950s, Jensen collected approximately 250 works of art that formed Louisiana's original collection.[1] Aware of his limitations in both connoisseurship and finances, he shied away from collecting works by famous foreigners and focused on Danish artists.[2] They included a number of painters whose work Jensen had first encountered as a high school student, among them Harald Giersing and Niels Larsen Stevns, as well as later discoveries such as Erik Hoppe. Apparently, Jensen's study of Greek art [1.3] had convinced him that sculpture (the primary form in which ancient art has survived) is as important as painting, and he acquired works by Astrid Noack, Adam Fischer, and Gunnar Westman that could be displayed indoors and out. The focal points of Jensen's collection were roughly fifty paintings and drawings by Larsen Stevns and twenty sculptures by Noack. While the sculptures varied in scale, most of the paintings in the collection were fairly conventional in both subject matter and size; still-life compositions, portraits and landscapes that could easily be hung on the walls of a private home. **[Fig. 2.1]** The scale of the paintings was a primary consideration in the design of the 58-Building, which established a minimum height of 3 meters in the main exhibition spaces.

Private collections created from passion (rather than for speculation) are invariably personal, even autobiographical, statements. Jensen's focus on Danish art was a practical decision, but it also seems to have been an emotional decision guided by his formative experiences and his aspirations for his museum. Reviewing the facts of Jensen's life, reading his own words and examining his initial plans for Louisiana, it becomes evident that he imagined the museum as a public version of the idyllic settings in which he had been raised, surrounded by paintings, music and books. [1.3] The evidence can be found in Jensen's search for a coastal property and his fleeting

[1] The artworks are documented in *Katalog over Louisiana – Samling af nutidskunst og kunsthåndværk*, ed. Pierre Lübecker (Humlebæk: Louisiana, 1958). In addition, the catalog contains a list of the craftspeople and designers represented in Louisiana's collection of applied art. There is also a brief text by Bo and Wohlert, "Om Bygningen," that describes their intentions for the 58-Building and the main features of the design.

[2] MLL, 28. Jensen refers to an exhibition of French art, in Stockholm, that caused him to shy away from internationally recognized masters and focus on Danish art. The exhibition was *Fra Cézanne till Picasso. Fransk konst i svensk ägo*, installed at Lijlevalchs Konsthall, 3 September – 10 October 1954.

idea of taking over his family's summer estate Strandholm, the traditional subject matter and scale of the paintings in his collection, the focus on collecting artists he had encountered in his youth and the importance of the library in his 1955 sketch for an exhibition building. **[Fig. 1.14]** (We can regard the library as a tribute to Jensen's bibliophile father.) His decision to name the new museum after the old estate was rooted in modesty: " […] Jensen's Museum – people would die laughing", but it also signaled his desire to create a museum with a domestic character, as discussed in the previous chapter. Louisiana would be a new type of museum; rather than being a temple for the muses, it would be a home for art.

Once Jensen had settled on the domestic character of his new museum, he expanded the exhibition program to include modern Danish applied art, including furniture, textiles and ceramics. In itself, this was not a great innovation. Many museums exhibit applied art, typically antiques that are used to create period rooms displaying furniture and art from the same era. The radical difference at Louisiana was that the works of applied art would furnish the exhibition spaces, as though they were rooms in a home. Visitors would be able to sit in the chairs and touch the objects, reinforcing the link between art and everyday life. By early 1956, Jensen had assembled most of his collection and found the setting for his museum, his curatorial direction and his architects. The missing link was an exhibition building that would realize his vision for Louisiana and embody his visceral attachment to the place.

2.2 A Change of Fortune

In early 1956, Knud W. Jensen lacked the funds necessary to construct the exhibition building that he had sketched the previous year. Instead, the villa would serve as the centerpiece of the museum. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work began simply enough, with an assignment to make minor alterations to the old house and convert the two service buildings into galleries. **[Figs. 2.2–2.3]** In the villa, the former servants' wing and parts of the upper level would be renovated for offices. The former sunroom would be converted into a lobby for selling tickets and the remaining rooms on the ground floor would be used as galleries. Next to the entrance, the former coach house would be renovated to display Niels Larsen Stevns's watercolor studies for the murals

at Ranum Church; a promised loan from the New Carlsberg Foundation.[3] Across the courtyard, the former stable would be used for temporary exhibitions, with a row of partitions replacing the stalls and a special, high-ceilinged gallery in the former garage. **[Figs. 2.2–2.3]** Aside from the partitions and new windows, most of the architectural work consisted of replacing ceilings and floors.

Bo and Wohlert's sketches from the summer of 1956 show the modest scope of the renovations; either architect could have handled the work by himself. However, an undated sketch from the same period illustrates a sophisticated attempt to unify the three buildings, and suggests that the collaboration between the two architects was starting to take root. **[Fig. 2.4]** In what can be considered an embryonic version of the 58-Building, a glass corridor links the north end of the villa with the galleries in the former stable, while a new opening joins the sunroom to the former coach house. The informal geometry of the corridor, the glass wall facing the park, and the deliberate contrast between solid and transparent walls suggest a more fluid approach; and foreshadow the union of architecture and landscape that would later be developed. However, these plans would be cast aside and the project essentially started from scratch, because by the end of the summer Jensen's resources equaled his ambitions.

During the first decade that Knud W. Jensen managed his family's wholesale cheese business, 1944–54; he increased the annual sales by approximately 500%.[4] The key to his success was a 1946 journey to the United States, where he found new corporate customers that included Kraft Foods, a major distributor of dairy products. By 1956, had Kraft decided to establish its own subsidiary in Denmark, where the company accounted for 25% of Jensen's business. Two executives from the company visited Jensen's office in Copenhagen and pointed out that unless he was willing to sell his company; he would not only lose their business, but also find himself in direct competition with Kraft.[5] He agreed to sell without hesitation, although it took some time to negotiate the terms. In the end, the price was 10 million Danish crowns in

---

[3] Vilhelm Wohlert, "Louisiana – Memories of Working Together," a lecture delivered to celebrate Knud W. Jensen's eightieth birthday, in 1996. Reprinted in John Pardey, *Louisiana and Beyond: The Work of Vilhelm Wohlert* (Hellerup, Edition Bløndal, 2007), 97.

[4] MLL, 25–26.

[5] Ibid.

cash and stock.[6] Jensen transferred a large part of the proceeds into the Louisiana Foundation; the non-profit entity that already owned the estate and most of the art he had collected; and began to contemplate his future. He later recalled his emotions,

"No more double life, but a new kind of life that I should try to create for myself. It was Louisiana and its future that were now in my thoughts. The actual task of building up a museum tempted me beyond all reason. … Out of pure, unadulterated egoism I wanted to have a body of artistic material in my hands. For twenty years, I thought, I had trained for such a task, read about art, gone to museums, collected, been a friend to artists and had discussions with them at their studios. In my business training I had learned the major languages and developed a certain practical experience and an ability to react quickly. This training and the revenue from the sale to Kraft were now to be invested in Louisiana."[7]

Following his sudden change of fortune, Jensen asked Bo and Wohlert to design an exhibition building of roughly 800 square meters, which would include galleries for painting and sculpture, and a library overlooking the sea. Agnete Petersen, Jensen's collaborator from 1955, would continue as Louisiana's landscape architect. Early in the design process, Jensen provided Bo and Wohlert with three directives that would be essential to the design of the new building. The first directive was that the villa should serve as the entrance to the museum, so that visitors would "arrive through the modest, non-threatening, nineteenth-century entrance hall, to feel as if they were perhaps just coming to visit a stodgy, comfortable, slightly eccentric country uncle."[8] The second directive was that the building should be located at the end of the bulwark created by the excavation of Humlebæk Lake, overlooking the sea, as in Jensen's own scheme from 1955. The third directive, provided slightly later in the process, was that one of the galleries should be oriented to the lake.

Given the distance between the villa and the end of the bulwark, which was more than 100 meters, the new exhibition building would require an enclosed connection to the villa. The earliest drawings of what would become the 58-Building are a trio of rough

[6] The terms of the sale are described in "Peter Jensen Ost er solgt for 10 Mill. Kroner," Børsen, undated clipping (late July or early August 1956). As well: Ole Wivel, *Lyset og market: Mit venskab med Knud W. Jensen* (Herning: Poul Kristensens Forlag, 1994), 41.

[7] MLL, 27.

[8] All three directives are described in Weschler, 42.

sketches that are undated, but presumably from the beginning of August 1956. All three sketches were drawn by the same hand, and one of them is initialed “JB,” indicating that it from Bo’s hand. **[Figs. 2.5–2.7]** In each sketch, the connection to the villa was divided into several segments, so that the corridor would be experienced as a series of shorter paths, preventing monotony and creating anticipation. At that point, the geometry was uncertain and the corridor was distinct from the exhibition building, which was modeled on Jensen’s 1955 sketch. Nonetheless, natural features were becoming part of the composition, as the architects began to respond to the landscape.

In Option A, the corridor acts as a bridge over the fern-filled cleft, and leads directly to the library, forming a patio in front of the exhibition building. The breakthrough in the planning appears in Option B, as Bo wrapped the corridor around the enormous beech tree with nine trunks, which would become a focal point of the new building. In Option C, Bo began to move away from a single mass, dividing the building into parallel wings and placing a gallery for paintings opposite the enormous beech.

By the end of August, Jensen had apparently introduced the idea of a gallery facing the lake. The two site plans from that period illustrate the architects’ struggle with the orientation of the building and the relationship between the parts. **[Figs. 2.8–2.9]** In both of the site plans, the exhibition building was distinct from the corridor, which functioned as the architectural equivalent of an umbilical cord. Moreover, the corridor was split into segments that were joined to the villa and the first gallery at 90° angles. However, the connections between the segments were arbitrary and unrelated to any significant feature in the landscape. As long as the corridor was simply a conduit between the villa and the galleries, a unity of architecture and landscape would elude the architects. The solution lay in an expanded understanding of what the corridor could offer, but that would only arrive after a change of scenery.

In September 1956, Jensen invited Bo, Wohlert and Wohlert’s wife on a tour of museums in Italy and Switzerland, to study lighting and exhibition techniques. Jensen’s autobiography refers to several of their destinations, including Florence, where “… the main thing for us was the recently rebuilt halls at the Uffizi with their fine daylight, which was a mixture of skylight and sidelight, and their rustic, pure

materials..."[9] He was referring to the six galleries that had recently been renovated by the team of Ignazio Gardella, Giovanni Michelucci, and Carlo Scarpa. The galleries included Sala 2, an installation of Italian painting from the thirteenth century to the beginning of the Renaissance, which was illuminated by a band of clerestory windows above the outer wall. **[Fig. 2.10]** Overhead, the timber trusses and wooden ceiling gave the room a modest character and provided a deliberate contrast to the altarpieces with golden backgrounds and gilded frames.

According to Jensen's autobiography, the itinerary included Milan, where the group visited Castle Sforzesco and a new building for contemporary art. Jensen did not identify the new building, but his comments indicate that it was Ignazio Gardella's Pavilion of Contemporary Art, completed in 1954. Gardella's building had been constructed on the ruins of the stables at Villa Reale, facing a park that had been laid out in the English style and was filled with mature trees.[10] Jensen faulted the architect for the angled exhibition walls in the painting hall, which were set at a 45° angle. Nonetheless, the ground floor with full-height windows and a panoramic view of the trees must have reminded Jensen, Bo and Wohlert of their own park, and the attempts to design a corridor between the villa and the galleries. **[Figs. 2.11–2.12]** The itinerary also included Kunsthaus Zürich, where a new, open-plan wing would be illuminated by a glazed roof and equipped with modular walls that could be rearranged for varied exhibitions. Jensen referred to the building as an "exhibition machine" and rejected this approach as alien to the domestic character that he imagined for Louisiana.[11]

2.3 Passages and Pavilions

After returning to Denmark, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert moved into the villa at Louisiana for two weeks, so they could develop a better understanding of the place.[12] Very quickly, they began to integrate the building with the landscape. Their first step was abandoning the idea of a single exhibition building and treating the galleries as three separate structures – what they later called pavilions – that were linked by

---

[9] MLL, 29. The renovation at the Uffizi is summarized in *Carlo Scarpa: Architecture and Design*, ed. Guido Beltramini and Italo Zannier (New York: Rizzoli, 2007), 100.

[10] See Saverio Ciarcia, *Il Padiglione di arte contemporanea di Milano* (Naples: Clean, 2002).

[11] MLL, 29.

[12] Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, "Om Bygingen" in *Katalog over Louisiana – Samling af nutidskunst og kunsthåndværk*, unpaginated. See Note 1 for full citation. The text was reprinted in *Mobilia* no. 38 (September 1958), in Danish and English.

different sections of corridor. The strategy recalls Wohlert's 1944 project for an exhibition building, but Rudolph Schindler's house in Los Angeles can also be described as a set of pavilions that are connected by lower rooms for circulation and services. [1.4, 1.6] In Humlebæk, the pavilions would be connected to the villa by glass-walled passages, with floor-to-ceiling windows that join the interior with the setting and recall Gardella's example in Milan. At the same time, Bo and Wohlert introduced a planning grid of 60 x 60 centimeters, which was based on a module of 12 centimeters: the combined width of a brick and a mortar joint. The grid would govern the layout of the entire building, assuring coordination between the different materials and an organic relationship between the parts and the whole.

An early sketch shows the importance of the grid to the development of the plan, as the architects threaded the passage between a chestnut tree overlooking the lake and a stand of elms in the park. **[Fig. 2.13]** While the grid ordered the plan, the locations of the pavilions and passages were determined by the setting. The first gallery was set at a right angle to the lake and established the orientation of the entire building, with the second and third galleries treated as parallel pavilions that were staggered to follow the shape of the plateau at the end of the bulwark. What had previously been a single corridor was now split into three different passages that were oriented to distinctive features in the landscape. Extending out from the villa, what I will refer to as the Tree Passage wraps around the enormous beech at an oblique angle and continues between the neighboring trees, terminating at the Lake Gallery.

Another sketch of the galleries includes the outline of the fern-filled cleft, indicating its importance to the experience of the building. **[Fig. 2.14]** To heighten the presence of the cleft, the architects had it extended by several meters, so that the depression would engulf the weeping willow and terminate in front of what I will call the Cleft Passage. Beyond the second gallery, we see the outline of what would become the Basin Passage, then a third gallery, and finally a library with a fireplace and two glass walls facing the park.

From the beginning, Knud W. Jensen imagined that a visit to Louisiana would culminate in a reading room overlooking the Øresund; what he had labeled "library" in his 1955 sketch. **[Fig. 1.14]** As long as Bo and Wohlert were preoccupied with the layout of the galleries, the library was simply an appendage at the end of the building.

As the plan of the building took shape, they faced the challenge of integrating the library into their system of passages and pavilions, while also creating a fitting climax to the journey through the landscape. Their unconventional solution was entirely determined by the location. Rather than add a third part to their system of passages and pavilions, they created a room that combined the length and width of a pavilion with the full-height windows of a passage. To intensify the experience, they rotated the 60-centimeter grid by 30°, so that the interior would command views down the coast to Vedbæk Harbor and across the water to Sweden. The result was at once typical and extraordinary; governed by the grid and oriented to the sea. **[Fig. 2.17]**

In order to increase the height of the windows; above the 240 centimeters in the passages; Bo and Wohlert designed the library with two floor levels. Visitors would enter at the same elevation as the galleries, and then step down to a lower level with a sheltered reading area around the fireplace. **[Figs. 2.15–2.16]** The design process went on for several months, as the architects experimented with the location of the fireplace and explored various solutions for shelving. As they worked, the purpose of the room became increasing complex. With the introduction of a grand piano, the library would also be a recital hall. In addition, Jensen decided that visitors should be able to buy drinks, sandwiches and pastry, and that the library would also serve as a cafeteria. In response, Bo and Wohlert added a small kitchen behind the long brick wall to the north, a serving hatch near the entrance and seating for twenty people on the upper level, overlooking the reading corner.

After the plan was fixed and sketches made of the various parts of the building, the detailed design work could finally begin. The first step was determining the location of every piece of material that would be used in the construction; bricks and boards, beams and posts; using the 60-centimeter matrix derived from the brickwork. **[Fig. 2.18]** Wohlert delegated the work to his assistant, Mogens Prip-Buus. Prip-Buus spent several months working in the villa; creating a set of coordination drawings that would guide the development of the construction drawings.[13] His goal was ensuring that the entire building could be constructed using whole units of material, while would result in a precise correspondence of space, structure and materials.

[13] Mogens Prip-Buus, conversations with the author and Lærke Rydal Jørgensen, 27-28 October 2015.

Prip-Buus worked alone, but he was often visited by Jensen and frequently interrupted by Bo, who believed that his work was unnecessary because details could be resolved during construction. At Wohlert's instruction, Prip-Buus simply ignored Bo.[14] There were also regular project meetings between Jensen, Bo and Wohlert, to discuss the development of the design. As Prip-Buus recalled,

"At the time, Bo and Wohlert worked as one man, and when Knud Jensen entered the room, that man became even greater … Jensen wasn't trained as an architect; he couldn't make drawings, but he had a great sensitivity."[15]

Jensen was especially sensitive to the lighting in the galleries. The visit to the Uffizi had convinced him that Louisiana should provide a variety of lighting conditions and atmospheres.[16] Given the location, the Lake Gallery would be illuminated through a wall of windows facing the water, but the other two galleries would be lit from above. During one of the project meetings, Jensen hung a painting on the gigantic beech tree, noted the light filtering through the branches and told Bo and Wohlert that he wanted a similar effect in the galleries.[17] The eventual solution combined the exposed wooden trusses observed in Sala 2 at the Uffizi, as well as Bernard Maybeck's First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Berkeley, with the roof lantern in Carl Petersen's "Indian Hut." A few weeks before Louisiana opened, Wohlert explained the importance of Petersen's work to the 58-Building,

"In my view there is a straight line from the "Indian Hut" at Grønningen to Louisiana: we are continuing a tradition; I learned to respect the lantern light rooms from Kaare Klint. We have, after all, rejected the skylight except for a few places where we have been looking for very special effects. The light from the lanterns makes the walls the dominant surfaces in the halls; that must be the point when one is to look at paintings. Incidentally, when one exhibits sculpture and applied art, the lantern light also emphasizes form, for example the textures of the materials."[18]

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] As above.

[16] MLL, 29.

[17] As above.

[18] See Pierre Lübecker, "Museet skal ikke være en kirkegaard for kunst," *Politiken*, 27 July 1958. Lübecker's title echoes the famous declaration by the French poet Alphonse de Lamartine, who wrote, "The gymnasium erected by Capo d'Istrias displays its white sides in the centre. Its museum I have not visited – I am tired of museums – they are cemeteries of the arts! – Fragments detached from their

Working with Mogens Voltelen; the lighting instructor at the Royal Academy's School of Architecture; Wohlert developed a split-level system of windows that would provide even levels of illumination on all but the most overcast days. **[Fig. 2.19]** At the upper level, long bands of windows facing east and west ensure that the exhibition walls are the brightest surfaces in the room. Above the walls, the low ceilings limit direct sunlight and provide a human scale. While the overhanging roof protects the interiors from low angles of direct sun, clerestory windows between the roof beams allow light to flow across the low ceilings; eliminating deep shadows. To diffuse direct sunlight, the upper windows were covered with thin white curtains, and the clerestories were fitted with woven bamboo mats. For added illumination, Wohlert developed a special lighting fixture that was inspired by the broad-beam lamps in the sculpture studios of the Royal Academy and consisted of a copper hemisphere with concentric louvers.[19] This "Louisiana" lamp was hung from the ceilings and easily repositioned, and produced in three different diameters: 30, 45, and 60 centimeters, with corresponding levels of illumination.

By early 1957, the design of the 58-Building was essentially complete. **[Fig. 2.20]** There were still refinements to be made, including the addition of a shallow pool that would provide a focal point for the passage between the two lantern galleries, which I refer to as the Basin Passage. Moreover, the planting scheme had yet to be fixed. Agnete Petersen was responsible for the earthwork and plantings, and intended the area behind the Basin Passage to be developed as a small garden. However, Bo had his own ideas. In fact, he had so many ideas for the development of the surroundings that he created his own landscape plan, complete with a playground, plantings, outdoor seating and locations for sculpture. **[Fig. 2.21]** That scheme was never carried out, but Bo's detailed site plan illustrates the final arrangement of the passages and pavilions, and reveals the degree to which the 58-Building was integrated into the setting. What Jensen initially imagined as a self-contained building had developed into a loose arrangement of parts that were spread across the landscape and oriented to the natural attractions.

---

natural places, from their destinations and their ensemble, are dead – the dust of marble that no longer lives." See Alphonse de Lamartine, *A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Comprising Recollections, Sketches and Reflections Made During a Tour in the East, in 1832–33*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1836), 78.

[19] Vilhelm Wohlert "Light Has to Fall on the Object You Want to See," *NYT* 1998, no. 557: 14.

The 58-Building was designed for a specific type of art and a specific setting, but it was also designed as an extension of the villa, which the architects referred to as the entry pavilion.[20] Evidently, Bo and Wohlert wanted to provide a sense of continuity between the old and new buildings, and they were especially sensitive to the scale of the villa. Treating the 58-Building as a series of parts – the passages and pavilions – provided the architects with the flexibility necessary to fit the new building into the setting. It also allowed them to reduce the scale of their extension and avoid diminishing the older building. What is more, the three galleries have roughly the same footprint as the villa – 9 x 20 meters. As a grace note, the whitewashed brick walls of the 58-Building matched the color of the villa, so that the entire museum could be seen as a string of white pavilions leading out to the sea. **[Fig. 2.22]**

After Prip-Buus finished his coordination drawings, Bo's assistants used them to prepare the working drawings for the contractor, the renowned firm of A. Jespersen & Søn. This was a natural division of labor; Wohlert's staff consisted of recent graduates from the School of Architecture at the Royal Academy. In contrast, Bo's office was staffed with veterans of his partnership with Knud Hallberg; who were accustomed to drawing and supervising large-scale projects. With Bo's office in charge of the construction and no new work on the horizon, Wohlert gave up his office space in Copenhagen and moved his practice to the suburban row house where he lived with his family. Working in the living room, Wohlert and his assistants, Annelise Bjørner and Peter Hjorth, drew up the remaining details and woodwork for the 58-Building (signage, bookshelves, kitchen cabinets, etc.) and waited for the public's response to the new museum.[21]

Construction began in July 1957, under the supervision of Folmer Christensen, the site architect from Bo's office; twelve months late, the building was nearly finished. As the artworks were installed, the degree to which the interior is experienced as part of the setting became apparent. That experience is the result of two factors that fuse the building with its surroundings and create an organic backdrop for the art. The first and most apparent factor is the union of architectural space with natural space; which is to say, the sense of continuity between the interior of the building and the place in

[20] Bo and Wohlert, "Om Bygingen." See Note 1 for full citation.

[21] Annelise Bjørner, conversation with the author, 24 July 2015.

which it is set. The second factor is the absolute clarity of the construction: the degree to which every brick and piece of wood reinforces that continuity between inside and outside. Bo and Wohlert's ideas were actually quite simple, but the interactions between space, construction and place are subtle. As a result, it is useful to consider the treatment of space and the assembly of materials in two sections, starting with a spatial tour of the building.

2.4 Space

On 14 August 1958, Knud W. Jensen inaugurated *Louisiana: Samling af nutidskunst og kunsthaandværk* (Collection of Contemporary Art and Handicrafts) with a party in the park for approximately 400 people. What the guests encountered that day were a revitalized villa and a new exhibition building so carefully tailored to the setting that the experience of encountering the art was identical to the experience of encountering the landscape. The most direct way to explain the 58-Building is that it gives form to *genius loci*, by creating a sequence of spaces that bring the visitor into contact with the most distinctive features of the place. It was as though Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert had made a list of the natural attractions along the north side of the park, and then created a building that would connect those attractions and present them to the visitor. **[Fig. 2.23]** That is essentially what they had done. As Bo later explained,

"We pictured to ourselves the landscape experienced from the inside in such a way that it varied continuously and would be seen as clearly defined pictures. What we did was to set up strings to mark the room sequence before the final drawings were made, so that we could imagine quite precisely what picture we had in view. The building has been drawn on the site – as simple as that."[22]

We can trace this pictorial approach to Jensen's three directives: his suggestions that the villa, the lake and the view of the sea from the plateau provide the foundation of the visitor's experience. Bo and Wohlert took this idea and developed it even further; drawing the trees and the cleft into the composition, and eventually adding other features that served as architectural equivalents to the natural attractions, such as the basin and a planted terrace for outdoor dining. In this sense, the building was designed from the outside to the inside. The passages and pavilions were inspired by

[22] Jørgen Bo, "Lecture on Louisiana," Technical University Delft, 12 December 1985. See Pardey, 99.

the program and the villa, and then precisely placed – between the trees, at the lake, next to the cleft, on the plateau – so that the building was a direct result of the setting. The result was a journey through the place, in which each passage or pavilion and its corresponding features – both art and landscape – provided a unique encounter along the route from the villa to the plateau.

The 58-Building was conceived as an extension to the villa, but Bo and Wohlert had no interest in mimicking a historical style. Instead, they emphasized transparency over mass and created a deliberate contrast to the closed form of the villa. **[Fig. 2.24]** Their fundamental goal was an airy, transparent architecture that would provide visitors with the sensation of being simultaneously inside and outside; at once sheltered from the climate and exposed to the landscape. To create this sensation, they simplified the architecture to a set of elements – straight walls and flat roofs, horizontal beams and vertical posts – that exist within the natural space of the park and intersect to define the interior of the building. The gaps between the elements allow light and space to flow through the building, so that the interior is experienced as part of the setting, while panels of insulated glass provide protection from the weather.

At every turn, the elements project out into the landscape, connecting architectural space with natural space. **[Fig. 2.25]** The brick walls that wrap the galleries extend beyond the glass walls of the passages, so that the brick walls are perceived as freestanding objects, rather than the surfaces of a closed form. The laminated wood beams that carry the roofs over the galleries also extend out into the surroundings, underscoring their structural role and repetition. **[Fig. 2.26]** Throughout the building, the roofs were treated as thin slabs that appear to hover over the ground, and the wooden ceilings are flush with the overhanging soffits. Outside the passages, bands of brick paving make it appear as though the floors are spreading out over the terrain. Along the passages, the end of the Lake Gallery and the walls of the library, the narrow wooden posts between the windows were stained black, so that they are distinct from the teak sill and appear to be independent elements, rather than parts of a frame. As the walls, beams and roofs project out into the surroundings at right angles, the 58-Building dissolves into an array of abstract forms, endowing the building with an anonymous character that heightens the presence of the villa.

From the north end of the villa, a few steps lead down to the first segment of the Tree Passage. The first section of the passage was designed with a narrow skylight, so that it could serve as a gallery, which was initially hung with works by Carl Kylberg and furnished with a pair of Kaare Klint's Safari chairs. **[Fig. 2.27]** As the passage turns around the enormous beech, the corner opens up at an angle of 110° and the interior is transformed from an extension of the villa to an enclosed section of the park. **[Figs. 2.28–2.30]** The deliberate contrast between the brick wall and the glass wall facing the park draws the eye out into the surroundings. The architects heightened the contrast through a careful detailing that was inspired by the window-wall at the Ludekens House. In order to avoid columns in front of the glass, the architects concealed the structure in the frame around the windows. The posts between the windows are in fact very narrow, closely spaced columns that support the roof. At Louisiana, the top of the framing is concealed within the ceiling, so that the wooden surface continues beyond the glass and the interior seems to be joined with the park.

The second segment of the Tree Passage has glass walls on both sides of the passage, allowing visitors to enjoy the trees that frame the journey, and creating a contrast to the brick walls at either end of the passage. In the final segment of the passage, the dialogue between art and nature was made explicit by the sightline between the large Nikko fir (which still stands) and the skylight at the entrance to the Lake Gallery. **[Figs. 2.31–2.32]** That gallery was originally planned as a showcase for works by Astrid Noack and Niels Larsen Stevns; the two pillars of Jensen's collection; and the skylight was placed to illuminate Noack's bronze figure *Kneeling Figure, Young Man Planting a Tree*.[23] As Wohlert explained,

"We wanted a warm, human environment in which the building itself and the surrounding gardens worked together in a dialog with the works of art, both inside and outside."[24]

In the end, it is the repetition of the elements that fosters that dialogue. By treating the walls, beams and posts as standard elements that appear throughout the building, Bo and Wohlert ensured that the pieces of the building become part of the background. By designing the three galleries as essentially equivalent pavilions, they made certain

[23] Vilhelm Wohlert, "Lecture on Louisiana," 5. Unpublished transcript, courtesy of Claus Wohlert.

[24] Vilhelm Wohlert, "Louisiana – Memories of Working Together," 1996 lecture. See Note 3.

that variations between the galleries were based on the exhibition or the immediate surroundings, rather than their own imaginations. The anonymous character of the architecture heightens the experience of the setting, and as a result, the interplay between art and nature. The most memorable experience in the 58-Building was and remains the sensation of entering the Lake Gallery. As the terrain drops away, the floor follows; the double-height space originally known as the Larsen Stevns Room is revealed; and the lake comes into view. **[Fig. 2.33]** Behind the stair, a low room illuminated by artificial light was used to display Larsen Stevns's watercolors for Ranum Church.

In the Cleft Passage, visitors encounter Alexander Brun's weeping willow as it rises from the fern-filled depression that separates the lawn in front of the villa from the plateau at the end of the bulwark. Like the enormous beech with nine trunks, the weeping willow serves as a marker in the landscape, and an organic counterpart to the artwork. Beyond the corner of the Lake Gallery, the width of the passage was doubled to provide additional space for displaying art on the north side. When Louisiana opened, both the Cleft Passage and Basin Passage were equipped with thin partitions for hanging paintings. At the end of the Cleft Passage, near the opening to the first Lantern Gallery, a seating area with furniture designed by Børge Mogensen allowed visitors to relax between the galleries. **[Fig. 2.34]**

The lighting in the galleries was intended to reinforce the domestic scale of the building, providing visitors with the sense of wandering through a private home, rather than an institution. As the architects noted,

"Diffuse 'museum lighting' has been deliberately avoided." […] "there may here and there be glimpses of the sun, just as in ordinary rooms, even if direct sunshine is everywhere kept out by means of curtains."[25]

The lantern galleries provide the clearest examples of Bo and Wohlert's modular planning, in which the dimensions of the brickwork were extended to create a matrix that governed every aspect of the construction. **[Fig. 2.36]** The two galleries vary slightly in length, but have a consistent width, with the centerlines between the long walls spaced at 840 centimeters. The deep beams that carry the lanterns are spaced

[25] Bo and Wohlert, "Om Bygingen." See Note 1 for citation.

360 centimeters apart, while the roof beams are elevated 300 centimeters above the floor, at increments of 240 centimeters and project 120 centimeters beyond the centerlines of the brick walls. Finally, the brick walls project 480 centimeters beyond the glass walls of the passages, extending the exhibition surfaces into the landscape and expressing the equivalence of interior and exterior space. The result is a building with a consistent set of proportions based on squares and cubes, and a simple order that is sensed as well as seen.

In early 1957, the architects added a basin next to the final passage, which lacked a natural focal point. A row of granite slabs formed a path out to a sheltered garden, where Astrid Noack's life-sized bronze *Standing Woman* stood perpetually poised to enter the building. **[Fig. 2.35]** Noack's bronze provided a surrogate for the visitors, and encouraged them to experience the sheltered clearing that was one of Louisiana's most charming and intimate spaces. At one end of the basin, a fountain provided sound and stirred the water. **[Fig. 2.37]** As in the Cleft Passage, the Basin Passage expands to provide space for displaying art. At the end of the passage, a seating area with furniture designed by Hans Wegner provided a place to admire Noack's sculpture, while a partition defined the end of the second Lantern Gallery.

While the 58-Building was under construction, Jensen broadened the scope of Louisiana's collection, by embracing abstract art and acquiring works by a younger generation of Danish artists, including Robert Jacobsen and Richard Mortensen. He installed many of the new acquisitions in the second Lantern Gallery, completing the chronological installation that began with the works of Astrid Noack and Niels Larsen Stevns in the Lake Gallery and continued through the first Lantern Gallery. Focal points included Søren Georg Jensen's untitled plaster sculpture and Mortensen's 9-meter-long *Opus Normandie*. **[Figs. 2.38]** At the north end of the room, the partition along the Basin Passage provided another hanging surface and a backdrop for a pair of Poul Kjærholm's chairs and the corresponding table. The steel structures of the furniture corresponded to the character of the works in the gallery, and represented another step in Jensen's quest towards a union of art, architecture and design.

At the opposite end of the gallery, a handcrafted table and chairs designed by Finn Juhl provided a seating area next to the small hatch where refreshments were sold. At the entrance to the library, a row of wooden panels followed the 30° rotation of the

architectural grid; filtering the daylight and defining the end of the exhibition, without interrupting the flow of space towards the sea. The panels were attached to the ceiling and supported on rubber blocks, so that they could be easily removed for the musical events that would fill the gallery and extend into the library. Between the panels, glass shelves supported displays of applied art and industrial design. **[Fig. 2.39]**

By the time that the 58-Building opened, the library had developed into a combination of reading room, cafeteria and gallery; with paintings, sculptures and applied art arranged throughout. **[Figs. 2.40–2.41]** The focal point was the reading corner that wrapped around the fireplace and was experienced as an intimate room within the room. Bo and Wohlert treated the fireplace as a pair of geometric elements that corresponded to the elemental architecture, with a concrete chimney and a steel smoke-box that was cantilevered on two sides. Thick panels of Swedish marble provided a backrest for the built-in seating around the fireplace, which included storage for magazines and newspapers**.** Above the reading corner, the seating area for the cafeteria included perhaps twenty chairs and tables with marble tops that matched the stone panels around the lower level.

As the building neared completion, Jensen decided that twenty seats for cafeteria patrons would be insufficient, especially during the summer. In response, Bo and Wohlert extended the 60-by-60-centimeter grid into the corner between the Basin Passage and the second Lantern Gallery, creating an outdoor dining terrace that would be sheltered from the wind. Working within the architectural grid, Agnete Petersen created a series of planting beds; for yucca, juniper, lavender and several varieties of iris; that divided the terrace into a series of smaller areas and provided the diners with a sense of privacy. **[Fig. 2.42]** The furnishings consisted of simple wooden chairs and small tables with round tops of Swedish marble, so that the terrace was experienced as an open-air equivalent of the cafeteria. Jensen installed Søren Georg Jensen’s concrete sculpture (informally known as *Louisiana*) between the two sections of paving, where it could also be enjoyed from the Basin Passage. To the east, where the long brick wall followed the rotation of the library, a section of projecting bricks created a shifting pattern of shadows during the afternoon. **[Figs. 2.43–2.44]**

2.5 Construction

In almost every case, the most nuanced and meaningful works of architecture reflect the complexity of human experience. Which is to say, those buildings contain ideas and inspiration that were gathered from many different sources and then transformed into a unique structure that is specific to its place and purpose. That is especially true of the 58-Building. Just as there is no central room on the inside or a single point in the park from which to understand the building at a glance, there is no single model or source of inspiration to which we can attribute Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's powerful fusion of space, construction and landscape. The anonymous character of the 58-Building has made it difficult to trace the sources of the architecture. And yet, understanding the ideas and influences that contribute to a work of architecture is important, because it allows us to understand the intentions of the architect and appreciate that building more fully. Over the years, several observers have attempted to explain the 58-Building in terms of style and suggested a variety of sources.

The most commonly suggested sources of inspiration are traditional Japanese buildings and Modernist single-family houses constructed in California after 1945. Wohlert certainly knew about Japanese architecture from books, but the zig-zag layout of the 58-Building was not inspired by Katsura Detached Palace or any other imported model. The plan of the building was determined by the features in the landscape and the contours of the bulwark, and the precedents for the orthogonal layout were Wohlert's 1944 project for a museum of applied art and Bo's chains of row houses at Skoleparken. In addition, Skoleparken carries the traces of Aarhus University, where the authors of the master plan included Bo's mentors Kay Fisker and C. Th. Sørensen. If we were to distill the master plan for the university into a set of principles – the preservation of the natural terrain, the treatment of the buildings as repetitive blocks, the staggered arrangement of the buildings in a park-like landscape – we could be describing the 58-Building.

Bo and Wohlert's time together in California was critical for their development as architects, and at least three of the buildings they encountered there; Jack Hillmer's Ludekens House, Rudolph Schindler's own house and Richard Neutra's CSH #20; informed the design of the 58-Building. But Bo and Wohlert's interests were quite broad, and the houses in California were only points in a much larger constellation of

references that included Ignazio Gardella's galleries in Florence and Milan, Carl Petersen's Grønningen building, Frank Lloyd Wright's Usonian houses, Jørn Utzon's house and the various works of their respective mentors, Klint and Fisker. There are also the unrealized villas that Ludwig Mies van der Rohe designed in the 1920s and 1930s, with freestanding brick walls that project out into the surroundings. A number of Bo and Wohlert's single-family houses from the same period display a family resemblance to Mies's unbuilt villas and that lineage is explicit at Pinehøj West (1959–61). **[Figs. 3.39–3.40]**

There were undoubtedly other buildings that provided lessons and inspiration as Bo and Wohlert developed their union of architecture and landscape, including their own individual works, pre-Louisiana. In fact, the variety of their interests and points of reference highlights the degree to which the 58-Building transcended any single model or source of inspiration. In the end, they transformed what they had learned from other buildings into a new and unique work of architecture, guided by the landscape and using a set of ideas that were more important to the 58-Building than any existing building. If we consider architecture as Bo and Wohlert did; as more than a matter of forms; and expand our conception to include the creation of space, the use of materials and a philosophical approach to construction, it becomes obvious that the construction of the 58-Building was rooted in the principles of Kaare Klint.

Klint's influence is absolutely clear in the use of a module to create simple units of space and coordinate the assembly of the materials; the choice and treatment of those materials; and the devotion to precise craftsmanship that binds all the units of material into a whole. Bo and Wohlert conceived the 58-Building in terms of space, starting with the features in the landscape and using them to plan the interior; in that sense the building was designed from the outside to the inside. At the same time, the building were planned using the 60 x 60-centimeter grid based on the brickwork; in that sense the building was designed from the inside to the outside. The result was such a precise coordination of space and construction that it is difficult to distinguish between them. As the space within the building extends out into the landscape, the elements of the construction are experienced as parts of the setting. **[Figs. 2.45–2.46]**

The floors and ceilings were constructed of bricks and boards that provide regular subdivisions of the interior, as well as the gaps between the elements. All of the bricks

on the floor were laid in the same direction, which reinforces the sensation of continuous space, even as the pattern rotates 20° at the enormous beech tree and 30° in the cafeteria. The floors in the galleries are 75 bricks wide, and either 69-½ bricks long, or 75 bricks long. The joints in the floor also align with the ends of the brick walls, and the junction between the two surfaces is so natural that one hardly notices the transition. In the passages, the ceilings are evenly subdivided into 19 or 41 boards, providing a regular rhythm that is continued by the 5 boards that cover the roof soffit on either side. The orientation of the ceiling boards varies according to the width of the space and the direction of the concealed steel beams, but the consistent width of the boards ensures a continuous effect.

Klint's influence is also apparent in Bo and Wohlert's use of materials. Klint favored natural materials that were treated as simply as possible or simply left untreated, in order to display their innate colors and textures.[26] In the 58-Building, Bo and Wohlert combined a Klintian fixation on natural materials with a palette of neutral shades that was based on the presence of the art. **[Fig. 2.47]** Their fundamental decision was the use of brickwork for the exhibition walls, which would provide both structure and hanging surface, and could be used inside and outside. **[Fig. 2.48]** The standard yellow bricks were laid up in a running bond pattern with lightly tooled joints, so that the outline of each unit is distinct and the underlying module is visible. The whitewashed texture provides a subtle background for the artworks, anchoring them in the physical world. As the architects explained,

"The buildings had to be white, inside the house because of the works of art, and outside in order to contrast with the green park and to link the old and new together. The natural effects of the material in the brickwork and the woodwork are neutral, and yet they increase the effects of the works of art. In this way the materials and the construction appear direct and clearly perspicuous, and the architecture of the building represents a Danish tradition, brought about by local climatic conditions and conditions with regard to materials."[27]

---

[26] Gunnar Biilman Petersen, "Traditionen, Naturen og Kunstneren," in Rigmor Andersen, *Kaare Klint Møbler* (København: Kunstakademiet, 1979), 16. The book reprints Biilman Petersen's speech at the opening of Klint's 1956 memorial exhibition. Also reprinted in *Arkitekten* (M) 1956, no. 7: 97–101.

[27] Bo and Wohlert, "Om Bygingen." See Note 1 for full citation.

The floors were constructed of yet another kind of brick: hard-fired pavers of the type often found in old, Danish churches. The dark-red color of the pavers makes the white walls appear even brighter and emphasizes their role as freestanding elements, while subtle color variations across the floors provide variety and reinforce the handcrafted nature of the building. In fact, the pavers were factory rejects that had been discarded because they were not sufficiently uniform in color. Before construction started, Jensen, Bo, and Wohlert visited the Hasle factory on Bornholm, hoping to persuade the company to fabricate the dark-brown bricks used on Copenhagen's Langebro Bridge, which were no longer in production. As they toured the warehouse, inspecting different samples, Bo came across a pile of dark-red bricks that been cast aside for their varied shades and announced that the search was over.[28]

Most of the other parts of the building were constructed of wood, using a variety of species that were chosen for their durability and/or natural color. **[Figs. 2.49–2.52]** The roof beams and window posts were made of laminated pine, and the beams were planed to a smooth finish that closed the pores and eliminated the need for a sealant. The ceilings and soffits were made of a select grade of pine and left unfinished, while the interior doors, paneling and other woodwork were made of Douglas fir, which has a golden color and a tight, linear grain. Inspired by Jack Hillmer's use of redwood at the Ludekens House, the architects used teak for the exterior doors and paneling, the sill plates in the passages and the boards that cover the edges of the roofs.

In addition to the lamps for the galleries, Wohlert designed a small, copper wall lamp to illuminate the floors in the passages. **[Fig. 2.54]** All of the copper lamps were given a coat of clear lacquer to prevent oxidation, while the hardware and other small things that are frequently touched were made of unfinished brass and allowed to patina. The door hardware was custom-made for the museum and designed by Annelise Bjørner; Wohlert's assistant, as her graduation project from the department of industrial design at the Academy's School of Architecture. After Knud W. Jensen saw the prototypes, he insisted that the system be used throughout the new building and; as the system was not yet in production; the hardware was cast in brass by a special smith, using the lost-wax process.[29] **[Fig. 2.53]**

[28] MLL, 184-185.

[29] Annelise Bjørner, conversation with the author, 24 July 2015. See *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8: A280.

Where Bo and Wohlert needed a second material for paving or wall surfaces – on the stair in the Lake Gallery and around the reading corner – they used Kolmården marble from Östergötland, Sweden, that was either honed to a matt surface or sandblasted to emphasize the natural structure. **[Fig. 2.57]** Aside from the brick walls and the wood posts between the windows, most of the materials were left unfinished or treated as lightly as possible, and this emphasis on raw materials was integral to the architects' philosophy. **[Figs. 2.55–2.56]** For Bo and Wohlert, natural materials had a value that went far beyond their utility and was unrelated to cost. Following Klint's teachings, they believed that natural materials have an inherent beauty that is independent of style or fashion. The use of organic materials allowed them to create architecture that was neutral without being abstract, and colorful without the use of artificial color, which would have competed with the artwork. The only instances of applied color in the building – the white brick walls and fireplace, the black posts between the windows, and the gray wall in the Lake Gallery – were neutral hues that would not compete with the setting or the art. **[Fig. 2.58]**

The most tangible example of Klint's legacy is the precise craftsmanship – the careful joinery and painstaking attention to detail – that is evident throughout the building. Klint was fixated on elegant, apparently inevitable details, and he could lecture his employees for hours on such topics as the best way to join bricks at an inside corner of a wall (there isn't one and inside corners should be avoided).[30] Bo and Wohlert combined this refined approach to construction with the fluid sense of architectural space that they had encountered in California. Every meeting of materials and intersection of elements was crafted to reinforce the impression of continuous space flowing through the building and out into the park. **[Fig. 2.59]** Bo and Wohlert's approach to architecture was based on anonymous forms and the rejection of pre-conceived styles, but they were hardly Puritans. In place of applied decoration and personal artistic statements, they used architectural details to provide an abstract type of ornament that was derived from the materials and construction techniques.

The 58-Building filled with inventive details that are at once essentially anonymous and extremely specific to the building. Some of the details are barely visible; while other details converted necessity into a source of pattern and are experienced as

---

[30] Ole Schultz, "A Brief Introduction to the Architect Vilhelm Wohlert," in Pardey, 6.

architectural features. Regardless of visibility, each of these details enriches the experience of the setting; the most obscure detail occurs in precisely one spot. Bo and Wohlert were determined that the interior of the building would be experienced as a continuous, free-flowing space – like the museum park – that was free of abrupt transitions. As a result, they went to great lengths to ensure that the floor was experienced as a continuous surface, until the final encounter with the horizon, in the library-cafeteria. In the final segment of the Tree Passage, the floor follows the natural slope and descends 20 centimeters from one end to the other. As the floor slopes down, the base course of vertical bricks along the wall follows, stepping down in increments equal to the height of a brick, maintaining a consistent meeting with the floor and obscuring the slope. **[Fig. 2.60]**

At the corners of the roofs, the teak boards were joined with dovetail joints adapted from traditional furniture-making techniques. The dovetails prevent the ends of the boards from separating as the wood is exposed to water and weather, and protects the layers of waterproofing and insulation. The most striking example of a functional ornament occurs at the ends of the cantilevered roof beams. Bo and Wohlert were concerned that the exposed wood grain might absorb water, and covered the ends with aluminum plates. While aluminum weathers to a dull-gray, gold resists discoloration. When construction was complete, the plates were covered with gold leaf, creating rectangles of reflected light that reiterate the rhythm of the structure and vary with the weather. **[Fig. 2.61]**

Throughout the building, Bo and Wohlert answered practical requirements with an elaborate use of craft, creating patterns that heighten the experience of the space. One example, already mentioned, is the acoustic ceiling above the reading corner. Another example is the stair in the Lake Gallery, now known as the Giacometti Room, after the group of sculptures that was installed there during 1973–75. The steps are paved with Kolmården marble and cantilevered from the cast-in-place concrete wall that supports the upper level of the gallery. When Louisiana opened, the concrete was painted gray, so that it was distinct from the brickwork; preserving the impression of one large room framed by two white walls.

For physical safety and psychological comfort, the stair required some sort of barrier towards the lake, but a solid railing would have blocked the view. Instead, Wohlert

designed the wooden screen that extends from floor to ceiling and is experienced as an independent structure within the room. **[Fig. 2.63]** The screen stops short of the bottom three steps, so that it is distinct from the stair, and was constructed from two rows of teak boards that are anchored to the floor and ceiling. The upper row of boards is slightly wider than the lower row, providing more material and greater rigidity. Where the rows are joined, the upper row projects out, so that the screen registers as a pair of overlapping rectangles that form a patterned relief. **[Fig. 2.62]** The linear pattern resonates with the posts between the windows, and the stair is as specific to the room as the view of the lake.

Beyond the library, the long wall that shelters the terrace from sea winds dissolves into a pattern of projecting bricks for which there is no functional explanation; only the principles that guided Wohlert and his assistants. **[Fig. 2.64]** As Mogens Prip-Buus drew his way through the 58-Building, plotting the location of each brick and board, he finally came to the end of the second Lantern Gallery, where the library turns 30° to face the sea. Inside the building, he could resolve the meeting of the two, 60 by 60-centimeter grids by simply cutting the paving bricks and ceiling boards at a 30° angle. But the wall along the terrace consists of two sections with different orientations. Constructing the rotated section as though it were a normal wall; at a right angle to the passages; would have resulted in an odd segment of brickwork that was unrelated to the rest of the building. Instead, Prip-Buus extended the normal grid to the rotated wall and used it to plot the locations of the facing bricks, which are framed by vertical courses at the top and bottom. For all of the apparent complexity, the faceted pattern is simply the result of two sets of bricks intersecting at a 30° angle. **[Figs. 2.65–2.66]**

After Wohlert saw the drawings, he applauded Prip-Buus's persistence and approved the faceted brickwork. The bricks were laid in the running bond used elsewhere in the building; offset a half-brick between each course. Alternating courses were embedded in the wall, to support the course above, so that the bricks are also offset by a half-brick in depth. The result was the distinctive feature of the landscape that Wohlert later called "Mogens's Wall," which is as much a part of the place as the enormous beech or the fern-filled cleft.[31]

---

[31] For Wohlert's reference to "Mogens's Wall," see Pardey, 72.

Ultimately, the 58-Building can be understood as an architectural hybrid that combines the modern idea of unbounded architectural space, pioneered by Frank Lloyd Wright and developed in Europe during the 1920s, with an approach to materials and construction that was rooted in the Danish Arts and Craft movement of the early 1900s and continued by Kaare Klint. In this sense, the 58-Building continued a Danish building tradition, but it also updated that tradition. Klint had worked with a traditional idea of space: a room was a clearly defined cell, a building was understood as an object and both were distinct from their surroundings, as seen in traditional brick structures. Bo and Wohlert were working to dissolve the boundaries between inside and outside. As such, they combined Klint's principles with a modern conception of space, essentially turning his method inside–out. The whitewashed brick walls and continuous interior of the 58-Building would have been alien to Klint, but he would have recognized the modular planning, celebration of natural materials and rhythmic order of construction that joins the interior with the space of the park.

The 58-Building was the most subtle and most refined building that Bo and Wohlert would create at Louisiana. As Jensen's vision for the museum changed, his requirements for the exhibition spaces also changed; and the character of the architecture shifted from an open framework with a domestic scale towards a series of enclosed rooms with a more institutional character. Bo and Wohlert would both continue working on Louisiana for more than thirty years. As a result, the principles that guided the design of the 58-Building – the devotion to the setting and use of anonymous forms, the modular planning and celebration of natural materials, the dedication to craft and, not least, the profound concern for the experience of the visitors – would guide the design of all their extensions to the museum.

Analysis

From the Documentation, we can understand the 58-Building as a harmonious union of architecture and institutional program that precisely embodied Knud W. Jensen's vision for Louisiana. At the same time, the building can also be understood as a synthesis of two, completely opposite tendencies in European museum architecture. Those tendencies can be summarized as the design of individualized settings for specific artworks, and the design of neutral volumes that can be use for temporary installations. As it happened, the 1956 study trip to Switzerland and northern Italy exposed Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert to both of those tendencies. By returning to their destinations, we can identify strategies that informed their work at Louisiana.

2.6 The Italian School

The 1948 revival of the Venice Biennale [1.9] was only one part of a larger cultural policy developed by the Italian government that was intended to make art accessible to its citizens and remind them of their cultural history, after a twenty-year period in which the arts had been used as a tool of Fascist propaganda. One of the pillars of this policy was the expansion of the country's museums, so as to unite the present with the distant past. In the words of the art historian Giulio Carlo Argan, "[…] if art is education, the museum must be the school."[32] Rather than construct new buildings, the government repaired the many war-damaged museums and converted historic buildings into new museums that would display the nation's artistic patrimony.

The result of this cultural-educational policy was a distinctive approach to museum architecture that has been labeled the Italian School, in which a permanent collection was installed in a carefully planned sequence of individual exhibits.[33] Franco Albini described this approach as "an art of offering," in which each object or work of art was presented in a special setting, so that it becomes part of the visitor's real time and space, and is restored to the present.[34] As Albini explained,

---

[32] Orietta Lanzarini, "Scarpa," *The Architectural Review*, no. 1427 (January 2016): 51. Lanzarini summarized Scarpa's methods within the context of post-war Italian cultural policy. As well: Richard Murphy, *Carlo Scarpa and the Castelvecchio* (London; Boston: Butterworth Architecture, 1990).

[33] Murphy, 18. For a compendium of these works through 1962, see Roberto Aloi, *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica* (Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962).

[34] Federico Bucci, *Franco Albini*, trans. Translating.eu (Milan: Mondadori Electa, 2009), 6.

"The exhibit invention must engage the visitor in its game; it should generate the most suitable atmosphere around the works to enhance them, but without ever overwhelming them."[35]

In addition to Albini, leading practitioners of this "art of offering" included Ignazio Gardella, Ludovico Belgiojoso and Carlo Scarpa. Beginning around 1950, with Albini's renovation of the Palazzo Bianco, in Genoa, these architects established a choreographic approach to exhibition architecture that was firmly in place by 1956, when Knud W. Jensen, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert arrived in Italy. The critic Bruno Zevi highlighted the contrast between the products of the Italian School and traditional museum architecture, in 1958, when he declared,

"We had been accustomed to museums conceived architecturally on a monumental scale, a shell into which the works of art were inserted at a later stage. But now this concept is being reversed: the works of art themselves create the architecture, dictating the spaces and prescribing the proportions of the walls. Each picture and statue is studied for the best possible view. It is then set in the necessary spatial quality."[36]

Perhaps the most famous example of this approach – due to the architect's use of color – was Carlo Scarpa's conversion of the fifteenth-century Palazzo Abatellis, in Palermo, into the National Gallery of Sicily, during 1953–54. Working from the visitor's point of view, Scarpa considered each of the artworks for its intrinsic character and then placed them in a precise sequence, with individual fixrues and panels that accentuated their material, contours and color.[37] **[Figs. 2.67–2.69]**

At the Uffizi Gallery, Jensen, Bo and Wohlert encountered this approach in the six rooms, previously mentioned, that Scarpa had designed in collaboration with Ignazio Gardella and Giovanni Michelucci. **[Figs. 2.70–2.72]** Working within the existing structure, the architects created new openings that resulted in a new system of circulation. The asymmetrical placement of the openings between the rooms provided an alternative to the traditional practice of axial alignment, which often emphasizes the route at the expense of the artworks. As well, the narrow slots that eased the

---

[35] Ibid., 6.

[36] Michael Brawne, *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*, 30.

[37] Aloi, 274–284. In color: *Carlo Scarpa: Architecture and Design*, ed. Guido Beltramini and Italo Zannier (New York: Rizzoli, 2007), 84–89. Beltramini and Zannier's list of secondary sources is a scholarly treasure and an essential tool for investigating Scarpa's work.

passage of large artifacts also provided views into adjoining rooms. Each room was treated as an individual composition that was based on the relationship between the artifacts, which were installed using custom-designed brackets, pedestals and panels. The centerpiece of Sala 2 was Cimabue's monumental crucifix, supported on a delicate metal armature and suspended at an angle that recalled its original installation in a Tuscan Gothic church.[38]

At the Pavilion for Contemporary Art, in Milan, Ignazio Gardella used changes in floor level to provide three different ceiling heights and lighting techniques within a single volume. **[Figs. 2.73–2.75]** In this way, he created spaces suitable for a wide variety of artworks, while providing a sense of connection between them. As previously illustrated, the ground level facing the trees was intended for sculptures that would benefit from directional light and be seen against the park. **[Fig. 2.12]** A half-level above the park, the large hall for paintings was divided into narrow bays and illuminated from above, with continuous skylights and a ceiling of adjustable louvers. At the entrance to each bay, the Y-shaped partitions that so disturbed Knud W. Jensen mirrored the partitions at the opposite end, where they resolve the acute angle of the site. Overlooking the hall, a balcony provides access to a long, narrow gallery for prints and drawings, illuminated by artificial light.

Within the Italian School, Gardella's building was exceptional for the absence of a permanent collection and the use of advanced technology, but typical in the degree to which the artworks determined the scale and character of the spaces. Jensen's autobiography refers to another destination, not far from Gardella's building,

"In Milan's Castello Sforzesco, the architects had gone overboard in their dramatization of museum objects; the collection seemed more than staged, but the audacity with which it was conducted showed yet new roads."[39]

Jensen was referring to the first section of the Castello Sforzesco Museum, where Ludovico Belgiojoso, Enrico Peressuti and Ernesto Rogers (BBPR) had recently converted a portion of the ancient fortress into Milan's municipal museum. One of the museum's focal points was Michelangelo's final, unfinished sculpture, the *Rondanini Pietà*, in Room 15. To provide visitors with an intimate experience of the work, the

[38] Roberto Salvini, "Il nuovo ordinamento della Galleria," *Casabella Continuità* 1957, no. 214: 23–24.
[39] MLL, 29.

architects installed the sculpture between a pair of faceted partitions, which obscure the figures of mother and child until the visitor passes the higher partition, turns and experiences a moment of discovery. **[Figs. 2.76–2.77]** Other primary attractions at the museum included Leonardo's fresco of vines in Room 8, where freestanding iron lamps suggested an open-air atmosphere; and the presentation of sculptural fragments on bronze-and-walnut fixtures, in Rooms 11 and 13. **[Figs. 2.78–2.79]** The exquisite level of craft undoubtedly made an impression on the Danes, particularly Wohlert, who had recently completed his exquisite installation of Degas's bronzes. [1.4]

Beyond the three destinations in Florence and Milan that are referenced in Jensen's autobiography, the remainder of the group's itinerary in Italy is unknown. But as they were in the northern part of the country, we can reasonably assume that they also visited Venice, where the XXVIII Venice Biennale continued until 1 October 1956 and included Scarpa's new Venezuelan Pavilion. As well, the first section of Scarpa's Museo Correr (1952–53), located on St. Mark's Square, had recently opened with an exhibition of civic treasures, and would hardly have escaped the group's notice.

2.7 Universal Space

In Switzerland, the group probably visited several museums, but the only certain destination is Kunsthaus Zürich, where the new wing that Knud W. Jensen would dismiss as an "exhibition machine" was under construction. [2.2] The main building; a classically inspired scheme designed by Karl Moser; had opened in 1910, under Director Wilhelm Wartmann. Moser extended the building with additional galleries and a library, in 1925, and designed a modernist extension in 1935, but died the following year. In 1943, the museum held a competition for the design of a new wing, to be financed by the arms manufacturer and art collector Emil G. Bührle. The winning entry was designed by brothers Hans and Peter Pfister, who proposed a two-story wing running parallel to the original building, with the upper level divided into a variety of rooms arranged *enfilade* and illuminated by individual skylights.[40] The project history published in *Werk* [Note 42] indicates that the Pfisters spent the next several years developing the design and conducting tests of the lighting system.

[40] Alfred Roth, "Die projektierte zweite Erweiterun des Zürcher Kunsthauses," *Werk*, vol. 31, September 1944: 283–292.

In 1950, Wilhelm Wartmann retired and was succeeded by his deputy René Wehrli, who imagined a new program for the museum focused on temporary exhibitions and instructed the Pfisters to redesign their building. In 1948, Wehrli had conducted a study trip of foreign museums.[41] As a result of the devastation in post-war Europe, it is reasonable to assume that his journey led him to the United States. If so, he would have visited the Museum of Modern Art, in New York, where the program was based on temporary exhibitions and installed on two floors of open-plan exhibition space.

In 1952, Kunsthaus Zürich unveiled a revised project for the Bührle Wing that maintained the footprint of the Pfisters' original scheme, but included substantial changes. **[Fig. 2.80]** Most importantly, the upper level of the new building was now a single room that could be subdivided by lightweight, demountable panels. **[Fig. 2.81]** Evidently, Wehrli was not satisfied and the architects continued to revise the design for several more years.[42] The final project for the Bührle Wing was published in September 1955, along with a sketch that illustrated options for dividing the exhibition space; and the degree to which exhibition techniques originally developed for non-art exhibitions were now accepted in the museum world. **[Fig. 2.82]** Construction on finally began in late 1955 or early 1956 and the new wing was inaugurated in June 1958, with an exhibition of the artworks that Bührle had donated to the museum.[43]

When Jensen and his group visited Kunsthaus Zürich, in autumn 1956, the Bührle Wing was still under construction. But Jensen's reference to an "exhibition machine" indicates that they were given a tour and/or some type of presentation. On the upper level of the building, a vast exhibition hall; roughly 72 meters long, 18 meters wide and 5 meters high; would be covered by a ceiling of plexiglass panels. The panels were suspended beneath a glazed roof that allowed for continuous daylight, and many of them included rotating spotlights and air conditioning vents. At either end of the hall, a large window could provide sidelight for sculpture or be completely blocked by exterior louvers. Between the ceiling and glazed roof, a mechanical zone included flexible ducts and conduits to service the lighting and ventilation systems. As the

[41] Felix Baumann, "Alt Kunsthausdirektor René Wehrli gestorben," *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 16 December 2005.

[42] "Ausstellungsflügel des Kunsthauses Zürich," *Werk*, vol. 46, February 1959: 37–44.

[43] Hans Pfister, Peter Pfister, "Das Erweiterungsprojekt für das Zürcher Kunsthaus" in *Werk*, vol. 42, September 1955: 280–282. The 1959 article referenced in Note 42 includes a timeline of the project.

panels could be re-positioned, the spotlights and air vents could also be relocated, and sections of the ceiling could be blacked out with opaque mats. Beneath the ceiling, metal posts would support a system of partitions with four different heights (2.2 – 5 meters) that allowed the space to reconfigured, as needed.[44] **[Fig. 2.83]**

The Bührle Wing at Kunsthaus Zürich consolidated a number of modernist exhibition practices – neutral surfaces, open-plan exhibition spaces and demountable partitions – that originated in Europe during the 1920s, were developed in the United States during the 1930s and 1940s, and then repatriated to Europe after 1945. A brief history of these practices provides context for an expanded appreciation of the 58-Building, as well as Bo and Wohlert's additions to Louisiana.

Walter Grasskamp has traced the development of monochrome exhibition walls to the French Impressionists' exhibitions of their work, during the 1880s; and the arrival of unadorned white walls to an exhibition of Gustav Klimt's work at the 1910 edition of the Venice Biennale.[45] As Grasskamp explained, reformist museum directors in Germany adopted the use of monochrome walls, until the Nazis seized power in 1933. The reformers included Ernst Gosebruch, founding director of the Museum Folkwang Essen, which opened in 1929.[46] **[Fig. 2.84]** Visitors that year included Paul J. Sachs; a leading figure in the founding of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), in New York; and his protégé Alfred H. Barr Jr., the museum's first director. The neutral display surfaces and informal installations that Barr encountered in Essen provided the definitive model for his work in New York.[47] After occupying borrowed premises for a decade, MoMA completed its own building in 1939, which Barr inaugurated with the exhibition *Art in Our Time*. **[Fig. 2.85]**

---

[44] See Aloi, 83–91 and Brawne, 124–125.

[45] Walter Grasskamp, "The White Wall – On the Prehistory of the 'White Cube'" in *On Curating*, ed. Marianne Eigenheer, Issue 9 (2011): 81. Available for download at: www.on-curating.org/issue-9.html. Accessed 2 October 2017. Grasskamp's point of departure is Alexis Joachimides's *Die Museumsreformbewung in Deutschland und die Entstehung des modernen Museums 1880–1940* (Dresden: Verlag der Kunst, 2001).

[46] Katherine Kuenzli, "The Birth of the Modernist Art Museum: The Folkwang as Gesamtkunstwerk," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 72, no. 4 (December 2013): 522–524. Kuenzli's article chronicles the pioneering work of the collector Karl Ernst Osthaus, who opened Museum Folkwang in Hagen, in 1902, and operated the museum until his death, in 1921. That same year, the municipal museum in Essen purchased Osthaus's collection. During 1925–29, Edmond Körner renovated a pair of donated villas and constructed a new entry building between them.

[47] Ibid. For added context, see the work of Mary Anne Staniszewski, whose research established the link between Essen and New York, in *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1998), 61–65.

MoMA's new building included two floors of exhibition space that were equipped with lightweight, movable walls and illuminated by artificial light.[48] Designed by Philip L. Goodwin and Edward Durell Stone, the building presented a new model of museum architecture that was no longer dependent on skylights or light-wells, in which works of art were completely isolated from the surroundings. From a curatorial point of view, this artificial environment was nearly ideal, because the exhibition spaces could be quickly and economically reconfigured for temporary installations. Assuming that René Wehrli visited New York in 1948, he would have gained first-hand knowledge of Barr's practices and MoMA's galleries, as seen in the exhibition *Collage* (21 September – 5 December 1948). **[Fig. 2.86]**

After 1945, the combination of neutral surfaces, demountable partitions and enclosed galleries that had been codified at the Museum of Modern Art during the 1930s and 1940s became the international standard for the presentation of modern art.[49] The hegemony of these self-contained environments, which reduced the encounter with an artwork to an exclusively formal experience, eventually provoked a backlash within the art world. In 1976, the artist and critic Brian O'Doherty (also known as Patrick Ireland) published a trio of essays critiquing the generic exhibition space that he labeled the "white cube."[50] Describing the displacement of the artwork from any sort of external reality, he explained,

"The outside world must not come in, so windows are usually sealed off. Walls are painted white. The ceiling becomes the source of light. [...] The art is free, as the saying used to go, 'to take on its own life.' [...] Art exists in a kind of eternity of display, and though there is lots of "period" (late modern), there is no time." [and] "The development of the pristine, placeless white cube is one of modernism's triumphs – a development commercial, esthetic and technological."[51]

---

[48] Dominic Riccioti, "The Building of the Museum of Modern Art: The Goodwin-Stone Collaboration," *American Art Journal*, vol. 17, no. 3 (1985): 50–76. Initially, the galleries received diffused daylight through a wall of translucent glass along 53rd Street. As Riccioti notes, the diffused light was difficult to control and the glass wall was soon covered on the interior.

[49] See Bruce Altshuler, *Salon to Biennial: Exhibitions That Made Art History. Volume 1, 1863–1959*. (London: Phaidon, 2008), 17.

[50] The essays were published in *Artforum*, vol. 14–15, in March, April and November 1976.

[51] Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1986), 15, 79. The book includes the three essays from 1976 and a postscript.

The prototypical White Cubes that Alfred Barr developed in New York were derived from an avant-garde conception of exhibition space that originated in Europe, during the 1920s. The pioneering work appears to have been Frederick Kiesler's 1924 design for the *International Exhibition of New Theater Technique*, constructed for a music and theater festival in Vienna.[52] **[Fig. 2.87]** The entire installation was constructed using two elements (L and T) that were assembled in different configurations, to create display fixtures that were independent of the setting. The following year, Kiesler created *City in Space* for the Austrian Pavilion at the 1925 World Exhibition in Paris; a matrix of lines and planes that suggested a much larger assembly within an infinite field of space.[53] **[Fig. 2.88]** According to Alfred Barr, *City in Space* was "technically and imaginatively the boldest creation in the De Stijl tradition."[54]

Over the next decade, a host of artists and architects working in Germany; including El Lissitzky, Lazlo Moholy-Nagy, Walter Gropius and Herbert Bayer; would build on Kiesler's examples and produce the innovative presentation techniques that supported the shift towards temporary museum exhibitions, in New York and then elsewhere during the post-war era.[55] **[Fig. 2.89]** Even before the Second World War, German practices influenced modernist architects beyond the De Stijl-Constructivist-Bauhaus circle, including Edoardo Persico and Franco Albini, whose exhibition designs of the 1930s provided the foundation for the post-war, Italian School of museum architecture.[56] **[Fig. 2.90]** As such, we can regard Carlo Scarpa's artisanal fittings for permanent installations of Italy's cultural patrimony as the ultimate result of the temporary, avant-garde installations of the 1920s.

Kiesler was a member of De Stijl, from 1923, and his "Leger und Träger" exhibition system was certainly influenced by Gerrit Rietveld's designs for furniture. **[Fig. 2.91]**

---

[52] Dieter Bogner, "Kiesler and The European Avant-garde," in *Frederick Kielser*, ed. Lisa Phillips (New York: Whitney Museum, 1989), 48–54.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Lisa Phillips, "Architect of Endless Innovation," in *Frederick Kiesler*, 13.

[55] See "Framing Installation Design: The International Avant-Gardes" in Staniszewski, *The Power of Display*, 25–27. See Note 47 for full citation. For excellent documentation of this period, see Richard Paul Lohse, *Neue Ausstellungsgestaltung. Nouvelles conceptions de l′ exposition. New Design in Exhibitions*, trans. The English Institute, Zurich, (Erlenbach–Zürich: Verlag für Architektur, 1953). Lohse's book examines seventy-five important examples from 1930–52, prefaced by a list of major exhibitions during 1851–1929. Lohse was a well-known artist in Zürich and René Wehrli undoubtedly owned a copy of this book.

[56] For Italian exhibition designs of the 1930s, see Lohse. As well: Staniszewski, 50–57. (Note 47)

However, both men were working with the conception of universal space developed by Piet Mondrian and Theo van Doesburg, which provided the theoretical foundation for De Stijl. Mondrian and van Doesburg shared a belief that the material world is simply a veil that obscures a spiritual realm, which can be accessed through the limitless, universal space of Neoplastic art.[57] **[Figs. 2.92–2.93]** In their minds, access to this spiritual-spatial realm reveals the "indivisible unity of the world" and widespread access would result in a new era of global harmony.[58] Mondrian and van Doesburg both recognized that two-dimensional art had limited potential as "a tool of universal progress."[59] As a result, they viewed the transposition of art into architecture as the only possible means of re-constructing the world into a continuous Neoplasticist environment, and realizing their vision of universal enlightenment.[60] That is to say, the architectural program of De Stijl originated as a vehicle for the salvation of humanity through the production of universal space. As such, Mondrian and van Doesburg's vision illuminates the fundamental paradox of Utopia, which is that the creation of an ideal world requires the negation of the existing world.

The leading figure in the realization of avant-garde space was Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, whose experimental structures of the 1920s and early 1930s provided the prototypes for modernist museum architecture. In fact, Mies had been Alfred Barr's preferred candidate to design MoMA's building.[61] Mies was not a social-utopian, but his conception of space as an infinite continuum was derived from De Stijl.[62] His version of universal space held enormous appeal for museum directors and architects, who idealized open-plan galleries that were isolated from their settings and emptied of architectural content. These institutionalized segments of universal space, enclosed by solid walls and dependent on electrical and mechanical systems, made explicit

---

[57] Valerie J. Fletcher, *Dreams and Nightmares, Utopian Visions in Modern Art*, (Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1983), 90–95. The preconditions of this art were the elimination of organic form, material and color, which resulted in a state of complete abstraction that was placeless, impersonal and promoted communal consciousness.

[58] Fletcher, 97.

[59] Kenneth Frampton, "Neoplasticism and Architecture: Formation and Transformation" in *De Stijl: 1917–1931: Visions of Utopia*, ed. Mildred Friedman (New York: Abbeville Press, 1982), 106.

[60] Piet Mondrian, "The Realization of Neoplasticism in the Distant Future and in Architecture Today" (1922). See Hans L. C. Jaffé, De Stijl (New York: Abrams, 1971), 168.

[61] Franz Schulze and Edward Windhorst, *Mies van der Rohe, A Critical Biography* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 178–179. As well: Riccioti, 63–64

[62] See Kenneth Frampton, "Mies van der Rohe: Avant-Garde and Continuity," in *Studies in Tectonic Culture* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1995), 159–207.

what was implicit in Mies's own, placeless-utopian conception of space. As Kenneth Frampton observed,

"The career of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1886–1969) may be regarded as a constant struggle between three divergent factors: the technological capacity of the epoch, the aesthetics of avant-gardism, and the tectonic legacy of classical romanticism."[63]

While the first factor is evident in the steel columns and glass screens that revealed the infinite continuum of Mies's architectural space, the second factor can be seen in his asymmetrical compositions of the 1920s and 1930s, which undermined any sense of stability or classical repose. Frampton's third factor is a reference to Mie's goal of creating buildings that would equal the cultural monuments of the past, by translating the artistic-philosophical currents of his own era into architectural terms.[64] While Mies derived essential inspiration from H. P. Berlage and Wright, his personal role model was Karl Friedrich Schinkel, whose work provided both a catalogue of types that could be interpreted in modern terms, and examples of what Mies regarded as the unified expression of spiritual and material values.[65]

In 1919, Ludwig Mies extended his family name, rearranged his private life and transformed himself into an avant-garde architect.[66] Following his first meeting with Theo van Doesburg, in 1921, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe drifted away from the Expressionistic impulse that informed his two schemes for glass skyscrapers (1921–22) and embraced the Constructivist impulses emanating from De Stijl.[67] **[Fig. 2.94]** Much as Mies substituted luxurious materials for the De Stijl-palette of primary colors, he also rejected van Doesburg's dream of global harmony, in favor of his own metaphysical priorities. Rather than re-design the world, Mies hoped to create ideal

---

[63] Ibid., 159.

[64] Mies's metaphysical preoccupations are often described as "spiritual," but rarely discussed in more precise terms. The most detailed exploration of his thinking can be found in Fritz Neumeyer's landmark study, which was based on Mies's own statements and his heavily annotated library. *The Artless Word: Mies van der Rohe on the Building Art*, trans. Mark Jarzombek (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991).

[65] For a discussion of Schinkel's influence, see Wolf Tegethoff, "Catching the Spirit: Mies's Early Work and the 'Prussian Style'," in *Mies in Berlin*, ed. Terrance Riley and Barry Bergdoll (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001), 135–151.

[66] See Detlef Mertins, "Architectures of Becoming: Mies van der Rohe and the Avant-Garde," in *Mies in Berlin*, 107–133. As well: see Mertin's monumental *Mies* (Phaidon: London, 2014), 92–113.

[67] It is likely that Mies regarded Constructivism as the contemporary equivalent of neoclassicism, in that it represented a new model of reality based on the scientific theory of the space-time continuum.

object-buildings, using the aesthetic conceptions and the technology of his own era – which were abstract and universal. As he explained in 1928,

"The building art is in reality always the spatial execution of spiritual decisions. It is bound to its times and manifests itself only in addressing vital tasks with the means of its times. […] It must be possible to heighten consciousness and yet keep it separate from the purely intellectual. It must be possible to let go of illusions, see our existence sharply defined, and yet gain a new infinity, an infinity that springs from the spirit."[68]

Mies's pursuit of infinite space produced a series of buildings and projects that were, simultaneously, open to the surroundings and detached from their settings. His primary instruments of detachment were the pictorial treatment of nature made possible by steel and glass, which had the effect of distancing the observer from the setting; and the use of plinths and platforms inspired by neoclassical practices, which separated the construction from the terrain and elevated the occupants above the setting. Jean-Louis Cohen has observed,

"Urban and suburban, this landscape was never a tabula rasa, but it was essentially a support for forms whose significance remained dissociable from their actual resting place. Mies's bases, front steps, and platforms define a space of negotiation between essentially universal types and specific locations." [69]

During 1927–34, Mies – typically collaborating with Lilly Reich – used a series of temporary exhibitions to experiment with abstract, overlapping space: investigating effects of transparency, reflection and layering.[70] **[Figs. 2.95–2.96]** His most fully realized and influential experiment was the German Pavilion at the 1929 World Exposition in Barcelona. **[Figs. 2.97–2.98]** As Michael Brawne observed, the pavilion was "in effect a museum building."[71] This becomes obvious if we regard the pavilion as an exhibition of architectural space, rather than artworks: with paintings replaced by richly-figured stone paneling and sheets of reflective glass, and Mies's classically-

---

[68] Excerpted from Mies van der Rohe, "The Preconditions of Architectural Work," 1928 lecture at the Staatliche Kunstbibliothek Berlin. Reprinted in Neumeyer, 299–301.

[69] Jean-Louis Cohen, *Ludwig Mies van der Rohe*, second ed. (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2007), 165.

[70] For a detailed discussion of Mies's collaborations with Lilly Reich, as well as his individual work on the German Pavilion, see Wallis Miller, "Mies and Exhibitions," in *Mies in Berlin*, 338-349.

[71] Brawne, 16. For a detailed description of the pavilion, see Mertens's chapter "Barcelona Pavilion: Spiritualizing Technology," in *Mies*, 138–167. As well: Neumeyer, 210–215.

inspired furniture serving as sculpture. Despite their mass, the stone-paneled walls were treated as partitions that divided the space, in a way that anticipated the flexible exhibition spaces in New York and elsewhere; the roof was (apparently) supported on the eight, cruciform steel columns. Mies's placement of Georg Kolbe's *Morning*; in a courtyard paneled with green marble, was a first step towards what he would later describe [below] as "a garden approach for the display of sculpture."[72]

The German Pavilion was the defining work of Mies's European career (and possibly his entire career) and a paradigm that would be interpreted and re-interpreted, by Mies and many, many others. In 1931, he applied the underlying spatial and structural concepts of the pavilion to the design of an actual dwelling and constructed a "House for a Childless Couple," at the Berlin Building Exhibition.[73] **[Figs. 2.99–2.100]** Whereas the German Pavilion had no functional program, the 1931 exhibition house distilled lessons from Mies's Tugendhat House (1928–30), to create a new model of residential architecture, as seen in a number of Frank Lloyd Wright's Usonian houses. In 1942, Mies applied a number of the ideas from the German Pavilion to the design of an art museum, projecting a continuous space that would be subdivided by works of art. One of a series of projects for a post-war construction ("New Buildings for 194X") that were commissioned by the American journal *Architectural Forum*, Mies's "Museum for a Small City" was published in May 1943.[74]

Mies imagined the museum as a single zone of space defined by a rectangular roof, which would be supported on a square grid of steel columns and enclosed by floor-to-ceiling windows. **[Figs. 2.101–2.102]** The enclosed areas, including an auditorium, would be freestanding volumes within the continuous space defined by the roof. A stone floor would extend beyond the windows to provide terraces, which included a reflecting pool. The published project included a diagrammatic plan, a rough sketch of the exterior and a pair of collages that included photographic reproductions of artworks. Both collages employed Mies's preferred single-point perspective, which

[72] See Note 75.

[73] Schulze and Windhorst referred to the exhibition house as "The Barcelona Pavilion recast as a residence," and provided detailed a description, 143–144. As well: Lohse, 138–141; *Mies in Berlin*, 264–267.

[74] "Museum," *Architectural Forum*, vol. 78, May 1943: 84–85. As well, Philip C. Johnson, *Mies van der Rohe* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1947), 174–179. For the collages in color, see *Mies van der Rohe: Montage, Collage*, ed. Andreas Breitlin, et al. (London: Koenig Books, 2017), 154–159.

reduces space to a series of parallel planes and allows for startling juxtapositions. **[Figs. 2.103–2.104]** Beyond a summary of the functional divisions, Mies's text referred to a union of art and nature that seems prophetic in relation to Louisiana,

"The museum for the small city should not emulate its metropolitan counterparts. The value of such a museum depends upon the quality of its works of art and the manner in which they are exhibited."

"The first problem is to establish the museum as a center for the enjoyment, not the interment of art. In this project the barrier between the artwork and the living community is erased by a garden approach for the display of sculpture. Interior sculptures enjoy an equal spatial freedom, because the open plan permits them to be seen against the surrounding hills. The architectural space, thus achieved, becomes a defining rather than a confining space."

"A work such as Picasso's *Guernica* has been difficult to place in the usual museum gallery. Here it can be shown to greatest advantage and become an element in space against a changing background. [...] Small pictures would be exhibited on free-standing walls. The entire building space would be available for larger groups, encouraging a more representative use of the museum than is customary today, and creating a noble background for the civic and cultural life of the whole community."[75]

During the Second World War, readership of *Architectural Forum* was limited to North America. However, "Museum for a Small City" was assured a much wider audience by Mies's 1947 retrospective at the Museum of Modern Art. That exhibition was accompanied by a catalog that included six pages on the project and was issued in an unusually large edition of 12,000 copies.[76] The size of the print run assured an international readership, which only increased when the book was reprinted in 1953. Moreover, Gerd Hatje published a German translation in 1956.

As Barry Bergdoll has observed, Mies's museum project was "a harbinger of a new type of exhibition space."[77] As with the German Pavilion, Mies's paradigmatic project for a museum would be adapted to a range of programs and locations, by a variety of

[75] Ibid., "Museum," 84.

[76] Philip Johnson, *Mies van der Rohe* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1947).

[77] Barry Bergdoll, "Walk-In Collage: Mies van der Rohe's Design of His 1947 Exhibition at MoMA," in *Mies van der Rohe, Collage: Montage*, 187. See Note 74 for full citation.

architects. Mies would eventually realize his premise of unbounded exhibition space in two additions to the Museum of Fine Arts, in Houston, Texas; Cullinan Hall (1954–58) and the Brown Pavilion (1965–74); and at the Neue Nationalgalerie, in Berlin (1962-69). In each of these monumental buildings, column-free exhibition spaces with ceiling heights of 14 meters overwhelm whatever artworks are placed in the spaces, while uncontrollable amounts of daylight pour in through the glass walls.

However, Mies's conception of flexible exhibition space would be developed in more moderate ways that were better suited to exhibiting art. In addition to the Bührle Wing at Kunsthaus Zürich, other important examples of flexible exhibition spaces in Europe during the 1950s include Musée Maison de la Culture, Le Havre (Guy Lagneau et al., 1952–61), Kunsthalle Darmstadt (Theo Pabst, 1955-57) and the Austrian Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels Exhibition (Karl Schwanzer, 1956–58), which would be rebuilt in 1962, as the Museum of the Twentieth Century, in Vienna.[78] Perhaps the most nuanced example was the 58-Building at Louisiana.

2.8 Standardized Flexibility

In the autumn of 1956, following their return from the study trip with Knud W. Jensen, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert designed an exhibition building that fused the opposing approaches to museum architecture they had encountered in Italy and Switzerland. This is not to suggest that Bo and Wohlert intellectualized their work to the same degree with which we examine it, or that they had a conscious ambition to unite the two schools of thought. Rather, we can understand this synthesis as a result of intuitive responses, to installations that resonated with their individual interests. As a result, we should not expect to find duplication of received examples from Florence, Milan and Zürich; but examples of ideas and impulses that were adapted to the setting in Humlebæk and interpreted according to the architects' preoccupations with landscape, materials, craftsmanship, and modular units of space. The result was an exhibition building that was designed around a series of fixed reference points, even as it provided spaces that could be subdivided as needed.

In the 58-Building, the primary example of flexible exhibition space is the lantern gallery: a generic gallery-type that was based on modular construction, suitable for

[78] See Aloi, as well as Brawne, *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*.

subdivision and could be repeated (or even extended in length) *ad infinitum*. In fact, Wohlert did not begin sketching the lantern gallery until after he and Bo returned from the study trip, as is evident from the sketches. **[Figs. 2.13–2.14]** It is certainly true that Wohlert found direct inspiration in Carl Petersen's 1916 building for the Grønningen artists, as documented above. However, that inspiration was apparently confined to the lighting. Beneath the lantern, Petersen's building contained a suite of rooms that were symmetrically arranged around a vestibule, following the traditional model of cell-like galleries. **[Fig. 2.105]** In contrast, Bo and Wohlert's idealized gallery is a single room of 120 square meters; roughly the area of a typical State Loan house, but emptied of thresholds, partitions or moldings that might interrupt the sensation of continuous of space.

Bo and Wohlert's pursuit of an ideal gallery-type is underscored by the fact that they constructed two lantern galleries. Furthermore, they repeated the typical roof beams and clerestory windows in the Lake Gallery, so that it would be understood as a variation on the basic type and reinforce their pursuit of uniform volumes. As seen in Zürich, museum directors and their architects typically construct the largest possible container, to allow maximum flexibility. The domestic scale of the lantern gallery provides a reminder that flexibility is not a function of a vast area, but the absence of features that might prevent subdivisions and the use of neutral surfaces that do not interfere with the experience of the art. Bo's exclamation that the walls "had to be white" locates the 58-Building within the modernist convention of white walls, even as the texture of the brickwork countered the general tendency towards smooth, immaterial surfaces.

Within each lantern gallery, the laminated wood beams that carry the roof were detailed to allow the installation of lightweight partitions, allowing the room to be subdivided as needed. **[Fig. 2.106]** Those beams divide the galleries into regular bays of 240 centimeters, which are wide enough to provide a comfortable distance between two exhibition surfaces. On the bottom edge of each beam, two metal sockets (still in place) provide attachment points for metal posts that support wooden panels, similar to the system employed at Kunsthaus Zürich. By attaching the panels to the beams, the architects ensured that subdivisions of the space would correspond to the structural module, providing flexibility while preserving the architectural order.

The architects extended this combination of flexibility and order into the Cleft Passage and Basin Passage. **[Figs. 2.107–2.109]** In both passages, metal sockets were set into the ceiling boards, at increments of 240 centimeters that align with the window posts and allowed an orderly installation of temporary panels or display cases. Despite the universalizing impulse represented by the panels, the natural tone and texture of the grass-cloth related the surfaces to the exposed wood and rough brickwork. Rather than enforcing a regular order, the removable panels between the second Lantern Gallery and the library-cafeteria resolved the transition between the two construction grids, while also allowing the spaces to be joined for concerts and special events. **[Figs. 2.110–2.111]**

2.9 Exhibiting the Landscape

Alongside the flexible exhibition spaces, the 58-Building displays the influence of the Italian School at a variety of scales, from the overall plan to specific details. One example is the round skylight in the Lake Gallery, which was designed to illuminate Astrid Noack's bronze figure, *Kneeling Figure, Young Man Planting a Tree* (1948–52). **[Fig. 2.112]** Noack created the sculpture as a symbol of post-war regeneration; Knud W. Jensen intended that it would be a permanent installation that would mark the beginning of the collection. While the round skylight was unique within in the 58-Building and contradicted the general lighting program, it corresponded to the Italian practice of tailoring the architecture to specific works of art. That practice is also evident in the final segment of the Tree Passage, where the architects created niches for Noack's smaller sculptures. In fact, the installation of those works suggests a familiarity with Palazzo Abatellis. **[Figs. 2.31/2.69]**

At a more fundamental level, we can attribute the general layout of the 58-Building; in fact, Bo and Wohlert's underlying concept of a path that connects the features of the setting; to the Italian model of choreographed movement between a series of individual exhibits. While the architects of the Italian School employed this approach to create a union of architecture and art within a building, Bo and Wohlert turned this model inside-out and created a union of architecture and landscape that unites the interior with the setting. In essence, they substituted natural features for works of art and directed attention out into the surroundings, creating a permanent exhibition that

both complements and contrasts the works of art. Michael Brawne drew our attention to this effect when he noted that,

"In any serial viewing, the relationship between the path and the object will also largely determine the sequence in which things are seen. Thus when the control is absolute, as around the *Pietà Rodanini* [Castello Sforzesco], the sequence is equally predetermined. Occasionally, the expression of the route becomes the dominant architectural theme; this is the case at the Guggenheim and, to a lesser degree, at Louisiana."[79]

Supporting evidence for the influence of the Italian School on the design of the 58-Building can be found in a series of decisions that Bo and Wohlert made after their 1956 study trip. Collectively, these decisions transformed the new building from a loose array of parts that followed Jensen's three directives – to emphasize the villa, lake and view of the sea – into a carefully calculated sequence of encounters with the defining features of the place. The primary design decisions were the introduction of the oblique angle around the large beech tree, the alignment of the second passage with the fern-filled cleft, the split-level design of the reading room and the elaboration of the stair in the Lake Gallery.

At the beech with nine trunks, the introduction of an oblique angle in the passage transformed the tree from a turning point to a focal point. By increasing the angle beyond the 90° illustrated in the early site plans, Bo and Wohlert extended the sightlines in both directions and introduced a sense of rotation around the mass of trunks. The result was a presentation of the tree as an object in the round, as though it occupies a vitrine created by the full-height windows and overhanging roof. Bo's rough sketch – in which the tree is labeled *skulptur* – illustrates the degree to which the architects equated works of art and natural features, and documents their intention to treat those features as a series of outdoor exhibits. **[Fig. 2.113]** As described in the Documentation, they continued this strategy en route to the Lake Gallery, creating a direct path between the Nikko fir and Astrid Noack's *Kneeling Figure*.

Studying the early site plans **[Figs. 2.8–2.9]**, it is evident that Bo and Wohlert were fascinated by the weeping willow at the end of fern-filled cleft, which would later be

---

[79] Brawne, 14.

extended by several meters. In both plans, the tree appears at-or-near the end of the gallery that is oriented to the lake. Following the study trip; as the architects divided the exhibition building into separate pavilions; they shifted the Lake Gallery towards the villa and placed a glass-enclosed passage in front of the cleft. The rough sketch with an outline of the depression and Wohlert's watercolor of lush greenery both illustrate the importance of the cleft to the design. **[Figs. 2.14/2.114]** The direct relationship between the cleft and the passage strongly suggests that the architects added the basin alongside the final passage, circa July 1957, to provide an external focal point to the space that I have labeled the Basin Passage.

The most literal example of the setting – *per* Zevi – "dictating the spaces and prescribing the proportions of the wall" was the design of the final pavilion that included the library-cafeteria. As seen in the sketches of late 1956, the library was initially an appendage to the final gallery, with a central fireplace and a glass corner to the southwest, all set on the same level. As Bo and Wohlert placed the reading room in a separate pavilion and rotated the structure to enhance the view, they also lowered the floor. While the angle of rotation framed a specific view, the change in elevation allowed taller windows and enhanced the view of the sea, which can be considered the most spectacular of the natural features at Louisiana. **[Fig. 2.115]**

At the scale of architectural detail, the Italian influence is most apparent in the teak screen that obscures the view of the lake. While the motif of vertical boards was adapted from the shop for F.A. Thiele [1.4], Wohlert's use of parallax was entirely specific to the gallery. At Louisiana, the row of teak planks heightens the sense of discovery, by blocking the view from the Tree Passage and revealing the view through movement towards the screen and along the stair. **[Figs. 2.116–2.118]** An obvious precedent to this sequence of discovery is the installation of Michelangelo's *Rondanini Pietà*, at Castello Sforzesco, but Wohlert's careful combination of materials and precise handicraft are typical of the installations encountered throughout the Italian leg of the study trip. That journey had an effect on Bo and Wohlert's work that extended well beyond the 58-Building.

Sponsored by UNESCO, *5000 Years of Egyptian Art* toured Europe during the early 1960s.[80] When the exhibition reached Louisiana (1 April – 27 May 1962), it was

[80] MLL, 95–98.

supplemented with important loans from the National Museum of Denmark and the New Carlsberg Glyptotek, and filled the 58-Building.[81] As the exhibition architects, Bo and Wohlert arranged the objects and designed all of the installations, including a system of custom-made display cases with silk backdrops, in varied shades of blue. **[Fig. 2.109]** While the approach can be traced to the Italian School, Bo and Wohlert employed a constructivist language to unify the objects and the environment, presenting the traces of an ancient, alien civilization within the visitor's frame of reference. **[Figs. 2.119–2.122]** Their work on the exhibition was a unique event at Louisiana, but Bo would apply lessons from Italy to a series of later projects. Notable examples include Louisiana's South Wing, where the slots between the L-shaped galleries recall Scarpa's work, and the re-installation of the medieval collection at the National Museum, where the vitrines were tailored to the artifacts.[82] **[Fig. 4.61]**

Having traced Bo and Wohlert's synthesis of two opposing tendencies, we can recognize that they "universalized" the Italian model by extending the visitor's gaze beyond the walls, in a way that recalls the collages from Mies van der Rohe's 1942 museum project. **[Figs. 2.103–2.104]** At the same time, they localized Mies's project of infinite exhibition space, by replacing generic scenery – nature-as-wallpaper – with specific features that were presented as organic equivalents of artwork. Lena Buchtel provided the crucial insight, when she observed that Mies's collages act " […] as frames that elevate the surrounding nature to the status of art."[83] That effect would hardly have escaped Bo, whose background as a landscape painter [1.5] would have sensitized him to Mies's framed views of Nature.[84] Bo confirmed this pictorial approach when he explained the process of laying out the 58-Building,

"We pictured to ourselves the landscape experienced from the inside in such a way that it varied continuously and would be seen as clearly defined pictures."[85]

In isolation, the affinity between Mies's collages and Bo and Wohlert's pictorial approach to the surroundings might be regarded as a coincidence. However, there is

---

[81] Steffen Fisker, "Ægyptisk kunst på Louisiana," *Arkitekten* 1962, no. 11: 240–242.

[82] Harald Langberg, "Nationalmuseets middelaldersamling," *Arkitektur DK* 1981, no. 6: 210–216.

[83] Lena Büchel, "Between Reality and Ideal: The Function of Collage in Mies van der Rohe's Oeuvre in Relation to the Design Context," in *Mies van der Rohe, Collage: Montage*, 146. See Note 74.

[84] From this perspective, we might even attribute the invention of the basin near the second Lantern Gallery to the example of Mies's collage **[Fig. 2.103]**, but that is merely conjecture.

[85] Jørgen Bo, "Lecture on Louisiana." See Note 22 for full citation.

also a remarkable similarity between the interlocking walls of Mies's 1931 House for a Childless Couple and the pavilions in the 58-Building. **[Fig. 2.23/2.99]** The similarity might be interpreted as a natural consequence of Bo and Wohlert's modern vernacular language, which was largely derived from Mies's avant-garde works, by way of Richard Neutra. [1.11] However, it would be nonsensical to imagine that Danish architects who studied Neutra's production were ignorant of Mies's work. In fact, the popular conception of the Apollo-Dionysus debate was based on a dichotomy between Wright's "organic" approach and Mies's rationalism.

Wohlert repeatedly denied Mies's influence on the 58-Building. In 1988, during a lecture celebrating Kaare Klint's 100th birthday, he explained,

"Many years later, when I, along with Jørgen Bo drew "Louisiana", it was helpful to have Klint's knowledge, regarding light and space, regarding the building's humane scale, regarding the module's influence on architectural form. All this did not come to us from Mies van der Rohe, as it sometimes has been claimed. The solution of the lantern also had its source in Klint's studio."[86]

Wohlert continued this pattern of denial during an interview with Thomas Kappel, as he explained that Mies's architecture had no effect on Louisiana, because the buildings are disconnected from their settings.[87] As in his 1988 lecture, Wohlert employed a general fact to preempt a more nuanced discussion of an extremely complex building. Kappel reinforced Wohlert's position, by referring to Mies's Neue Nationalgalerie (1962–68), in Berlin, which occupies a plinth, while ignoring Mies's constructivist works of the 1920s and 1930s. Moreover, Kappel dismissed the possibility of Mies's influence on Bo, by citing Poul Erik Skriver's suggestion that Bo's own house was probably indebted to Wright.[88] In both cases, a more thorough knowledge of modern architecture might have led Kappel to different assertions.

John Pardey also encountered Wohlert's unwillingness to acknowledge the possibility of Mies's influence on the 58-Building. Describing Bo and Wohlert's demonstration house at the 1959 exhibition *Huset i Haven* **[Fig. 3.17]**, Pardey suggested an affinity

---

[86] Reprinted in *De gamle mestre – Carl Petersen, Ivar Bentsen, Kaj Gottlob, Kaare Klint, Kay Fisker,* ed. Karen Zahle, et al., (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2000), 96.

[87] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 51.

[88] Ibid., 99.

with Mies's German Pavilion. He then recorded Wohlert's statement, "Jørgen and I never talked very much about Mies; he was not very much on our minds."[89] While it is entirely possible that the two architects did not debate the finer points of Mies's work, Wohlert's conflation of his and Bo's mental states should not be accepted as fact. His exclusive emphasis on Klint's teachings is unfortunate, in that it obscures the sophistication of their joint achievement; and unnecessary, in that Bo could not have created the 58-Building without Wohlert.

Mies's direct influence on the 58-Building – in the conception of space, pictorial treatment of nature and constructivist composition of walls – is evident to anyone with an open mind and a basic understanding of his work. On the strength of Wohlert's denials, we can identify Bo as the student of Mies's work. As documented in Chapter 1, Bo's 1952 tour across the United States with Børge Glahn included a stop in Chicago, Mies's adopted home after 1937 and the center of his production during the 1950s. We can presume that Bo and Glahn visited the apartment buildings on Lake Shore Drive, the new campus at the Illinois Institute of Technology, and perhaps the Farnsworth House. While Bo studied Neutra's CSH #20 for the design of his own house, it would have been natural for him to consult Mies's work when confronted with the task of designing an art museum.

Acknowledging Mies's direct influence on the 58-Building and identifying Bo as the conduit is useful, in that it advances our understanding of Bo's role in the design of the building. Considering Bo's authorship of the early site plans at Louisiana and the "skulptur" sketch, and his description of a pictorial approach to the landscape, it is evident that Bo took the leading role in the spatial conception of the 58-Building. That is to say, he imagined the natural features as points of reference, introduced the idea of a spatial continuum that joins the interior with the surroundings and was primarily responsible for the concept of a meandering path through the landscape. And yet, Bo's contributions were not sufficient to realize the unity of space, place and materials that was realized in the 58-Building.

While Bo's sketches emphasized the relationship between space and landscape, Wohlert's gridded site plans and repeated references to Kaare Klint indicate that he took the leading role in developing the construction. Which is to say, Wohlert

[89] Pardey, 108.

supplied the module based on the brickwork, played the primary role in the choice and treatment of materials, and designed the structure, lantern galleries and most of the details. This assessment is supported by the two-step design process, in which Wohlert's assistant, Mogens Prip-Buus, translated the sketch project into an actual building, by establishing the dimensions based on units of material.

Returning to the individual works that Bo and Wohlert designed prior to their collaboration at Louisiana [1.4, 1.5, 1.7], we recognize most of the principles and practices that guided the design of the 58-Building. Bo's sensitivity to topography and his use of walls to unite interior with setting were distinguishing features of his 1948 house for his parents, and realized in a more fluid, abstract version with his own house of 1953–1954. In between, the design of multi-family housing estates provided him with experience working on large sites, using standardized components. In fact, Kærparken (1947–48) was also known as "Elementbyen." Wohlert's unity of modular space and structure is evident as early as 1944, and continued through a series of projects that were characterized by the primary material, whether oak, spruce or ash. The only aspect of the 58-Building not found in the architects' pre-Louisiana output is the strategy of movement along a meandering path, which they encountered in Italy.

As with their travels in California, Bo and Wohlert's 1956 study trip provided them with a repertoire of examples that could be transformed according to their established principles. We can regard the tour around northern Italy as the decisive leg of the journey, because it provided examples of exhibition spaces that were designed for specific artworks. By substituting organic features for artworks, Bo and Wohlert imported the surroundings into the building and located the visitor in the landscape. The creation of a path between those features resulted in a building that is essentially a circulation diagram. At the same time, the architects' process of substitution allowed them to transcend the pictorial approach that Bo described as the basis of the 58-Building. Rather than simply viewing the surroundings, the visitor experiences the landscape from varying angles, elevations and distances. The effect is dynamic and kinesthetic, rather than static and merely optical. **[Fig. 2.123]** Through this conflation of continuous space and choreographed movement, Bo and Wohlert arrived at a museum experience that was distinct from any received example or abstract diagram, and entirely specific to the place.

Observations

Knud W. Jensen’s three directives to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert reinforce our understanding of his motivations and sources of inspiration. Jensen’s directive that the villa serve as the entrance to the museum reflected his conception of Louisiana as an idealized version of Strandholm, but it also supports the assertion that Ordrupgaard provided a partial model. (During 1953–2005, visitors to Vilhelm Hansen’s collection entered through the villa, rather than the exhibition building.) Jensen’s directive for a reading room overlooking the sea; the “library” in his 1955 sketch, can be understood as a tribute to his bibliophile father. **[Fig. 1.14]** His request for an exhibition space that would be oriented to the lake underscores the catalytic effect of the open-air exhibitions; in Antwerp and perhaps elsewhere; that resonated with Jensen’s interest in sculpture and supplied him with a social program for his autobiographical project.

The underlying principles of the 58-Building can be found in Bo and Wohlert’s early, individual works. [1.4, 1.5, 1.7] As with Bo’s residential buildings, the design of the 58-Building was derived from the topographic conditions. Moreover, Bo’s own house served as a prototype for the unity of interior and exterior space. As in Wohlert’s early work, the design was rationalized using a simple module that unites space and construction, with the materials providing architectural character. Moreover, we find repetitive elements in almost all of their early buildings and projects. As such, we can recognize a set of principles that were innate to their practices and independent of any particular formal language or spatial model. The missing principle was the strategy of choreographed movement that the architects discovered in Italy.

After tracing the development of modernist exhibition practices, we can recognize the placeless character of conventional museum spaces. While the avant-garde project was rooted in metaphysical ambitions, museum professionals adopted universal space for more prosaic reasons and arrived at the model of the White Cube. In both of those iterations, the exhibition space is conceived as an ideal volume devoid of people. In contrast, the examples of the Italian School were premised on the experience of the visitor, whose movement unites the artifacts. At Louisiana, the Italian model of a choreographed exhibition produced a building that is essentially a promenade through the landscape. As such, we can recognize Bo and Wohlert’s meandering path as the tool by which they adapted Mie van der Rohe’s model of universal space to the place.

Bo and Wohlert's collaboration was rooted in shared values, but they played distinct roles in the design of the 58-Building. Recognizing Bo's sensitivity to landscape, the spatial design of his own house and his authorship of crucial site plans, it is clear that he was largely responsible for the outlines of the project. Conversely, Wohlert set the module, selected the materials and was largely responsible for the construction. Those roles are recorded in the drawings and confirmed by the two-step design process, in which Wohlert's assistant, Mogens Prip-Buus, translated the sketch project into dimensioned drawings, based on units of material. As such, it becomes clear that the collaboration was based on complementary talents: Bo's intuitive treatment of space and formal imagination, Wohlert's precision and mastery of details.

Wohlert's loyalty to Kaare Klint blinded him to Mies's influence on the 58-Building, which was both indirect and direct, and realized through his own efforts. Faced with the task of designing an art museum, Bo went back to first sources, beyond Neutra's work, and found his spatial model in Mies's production. However, Bo's scheme of continuous space was entirely dependent on Wohlert's mastery of detail. As noted at some length, Klint's lessons were essential to the 58-Building; but they provided a conceptual framework, rather than a direct model, as was the case in Wohlert's 1944 project for an exhibition building. As such, we can regard the 58-Building as a site-specific version of universal space, which was localized using the example of the Italian School and made tangible by Klint's principles of materials and construction.

Bo and Wohlert's synthesis of two, opposite exhibition practices resolved the conflict in Jensen's vision of an art museum characterized by the experience of the landscape. Unlike the open-air exhibitions, Louisiana required surfaces for two-dimensional art. By fusing flexible exhibition space and an exhibition of natural attractions, the two architects created a hybrid that serves artwork and visitor in equal measure. While the white walls and temporary partitions support the artworks, the tactile materials anchor those works in an actual place. Equally, the exhibition of natural attractions locates the visitor in the setting and provides both spatial and temporal variety, as the seasons change. Arranged in an alternating sequence, the passages and pavilions created a state of equilibrium between exhibition and orientation, and advanced Jensen's institutional agenda of providing visitors with "the 'cleansed' impression." [1.8]

Chapter 3
Organic Growth: 1959–71

This page intentionally blank.

Organic Growth: 1959-71

Documentation

During the second phase of Louisiana's development, Knud W. Jensen, Jørgen Bo, and Vilhelm Wohlert struggled to expand the museum. The expansion plans were driven by an unexpectedly high number of visitors and by Jensen's evolving vision of what Louisiana could offer those visitors. As the public streamed in and embraced his new type of museum, he diversified the programming to include a variety of the performing arts and exhibitions of foreign art. Despite the crowds, the museum's finances could hardly keep pace with Jensen's ambitions, and most of the expansion schemes were either abandoned or scaled back. In the early years, Bo and Wohlert's work was complicated by Jensen's uncertainty: as to whether he should preserve Louisiana's intimate scale or transform the museum into a much larger institution.

Just as Jensen's vision for Louisiana was evolving, his ideas regarding museum architecture were also changing. Not long after the museum opened, he declared that any future exhibition spaces should follow the conventional model: closed to the surroundings and illuminated from above. After temporary exhibitions became a leading attraction and the scale of contemporary art increased, Jensen also insisted that new galleries should be larger and more flexible than the existing pavilions. Eventually, he decided that Louisiana would become a large institution, but growth would be delayed by a persistent shortage of funds. As a result, the early additions were relatively modest and organic to the 58-Building.

3.1 A Union of the Arts

In 1956, Knud W. Jensen conceived Louisiana as a union of painting and sculpture, applied art and architecture. By the time the museum opened, he had extended that union to include industrial design, graphic design, and music. Every aspect of the new museum was intended to convey a unified approach, with an extremely high level of quality. The interior of the 58-Building was treated as an interactive exhibition of modern design, in which visitors could actually touch the objects on display. In addition to the furnishings in the galleries, and the lamps and chairs that Vilhelm Wohlert had designed for the building, Jensen installed changing exhibitions of

design and handicrafts on the shelves at the end of the second Lantern Gallery. The cafeteria was equipped with flatware designed by Arne Jacobsen and glassware designed by Per Lütken, and the entire museum was furnished with custom-made tableware – black, anodized aluminum ashtrays, candleholders and vases – that Wohlert designed while the building was under construction.[1] Jensen also hoped to include landscape architecture (or "garden art") and commissioned Agnete Petersen to create a rose garden behind the first segment of the Tree Passage.[2] **[Fig. 3.1]**

Jensen's ideal was a union of the arts; "an artistic synthesis"; in which different forms of culture come together and create an immersive experience that is more powerful and more moving than any encounter with a single type of art. [1.8] He hoped that Louisiana could create this type of immersive experience and – through the domestic character of the museum – erode the popular belief that there is a boundary between art and everyday life. Jensen's pursuit of this synthesis, and his decision to continually expand Louisiana's offerings, would drive the next phase in the development of the architecture and the landscape.

Shortly after Louisiana opened, Jensen's ambitions soared and he began to think of Louisiana as a cultural center, rather than simply an art museum. To advance his goal of artistic synthesis, he expanded the original agenda of exhibiting Danish art and presenting concerts of classical Western music. Neither of those programs would ever disappear from the museum, but they would be joined by an array of performances and an endless cycle of temporary exhibitions that would render Jensen's original vision of an intimate, peaceful setting completely unsustainable. During the first year of operation, the museum hosted approximately sixty musical events, mostly open-air concerts and evening programs that were staged in the café-reading room and the second Lantern Gallery, which could be joined to accommodate nearly 300 people. There were also jazz evenings, visiting choirs and troupes of folk dancers, readings of poetry and drama, and a ballet festival. **[Fig. 3.1]** By the spring of 1959, Jensen was planning to construct a concert hall.

---

[1] For brief period, circa 1959–60, these objects were sold to museum visitors as *Louisiana Design*. See "Louisiana-tingene," *Berlinske Aftenavis*, 25 November 1959.

[2] Agnete Petersen's drawings of the rose garden, complete with varietal names, can be found in the Edith and Ole Nørgaard archive. Louisiana's archive does not contain any images of the garden, which suggests that Knud W. Jensen's interest waned as his ambitions for the museum expanded. The garden is visible in a 1964 newspaper photo, but it was eventually replaced by the 66-Building. **[Fig. 3.44]**

While Jensen was expanding the programming in the performing arts, he was also expanding the program of exhibitions. He had always planned to install occasional temporary exhibitions in the Lake Gallery, but Louisiana was founded as a museum of Danish art; any loans could be handled with a small truck. When the 58-Building was designed, there was no reason to imagine that shipments of foreign art might someday be moving in and out of the museum. Most of the temporary exhibitions during 1959 were homemade affairs; a retrospective of Niels Larsen Stevns's career; *Dansen i Kunsten*, which included works by Edgar Degas borrowed from the New Carlsberg Glyptotek; and a presentation of Robert Jacobsen's iron sculpture.[3] **[Figs. 3.2–3.4]** Soon after, Jensen began borrowing works from foreign museums, accepting exhibitions that were traveling around Europe and presenting six or seven exhibitions per year. It quickly became apparent that Louisiana required both additional galleries and facilities for shipping and storing art.

While Jensen dreamed of a concert hall and new galleries for temporary exhibitions, Louisiana required more basic facilities. The day that Jensen inaugurated the museum, most of the major Danish newspapers carried feature articles. The coverage amounted to a chorus of praise and the pitch ranged from rhapsodic to ecstatic, with headlines that included "A Collector's Great Gift to Danish Cultural Life", "A Pearl of An Art Collection", "The Art Museum is A Work of Art", and most famously, "Miracle in Humlebæk."[4] That same month, Professor Kay Fisker reviewed the 58-Building in the journal *Arkitektur* and declared,

"Rarely has painting and sculpture been highlighted in a better way than in this setting. However, if the press and the public's admiration follow a professional assessment, this must be that Louisiana is one of the most important works in modern Danish architecture. It will stand as a monument in the history of Danish architecture, and around the world will create admiration for our architecture. For me personally it has been the greatest architectural experience for many years."[5]

[3] See *Louisiana 1959 Årbog*, ed. Knud W. Jensen (København: Gyldendal, 1959), 86.

[4] All four newspaper articles appeared on 14 August 1958: Svend Erik Møller, "A Collector's Great Gift … ," *Politiken*; Pierre Lübecker, "A Pearl … ," *Politiken*; Johan Møller Nielsen, "The Art Museum is …, *Social-Demokraten*; Ole Thomassen, "Miracle … ," *Information*.

[5] Kay Fisker, "Louisiana," *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8, 148.

Jensen had optimistically imagined that Louisiana might draw 40,000 visitors in the first year of operation. The first weekend, the museum received 4,000 visitors. After three months, 80,000 people had visited the museum, and by the end of the first year, the museum had recorded 225,000 visitors.[6] Long before the first anniversary, it was apparent that the museum's most pressing needs were a larger cafeteria and more plumbing facilities for the visitors. **[Fig. 3.4]**

3.2 Plan B

The first project to enlarge Louisiana was drawn up less than a year after the opening. A small addition behind the second Lantern Gallery would include a new seating area for the cafeteria, an enlarged kitchen, additional restrooms and a guest room for visiting artists and performers. **[Figs. 3.5–3.6]** The project was effectively sabotaged when the owner of a nearby restaurant, fearing competition from the expanded cafeteria, threatened to take Louisiana to court. As Knud W. Jensen recalled in 1973, while contemplating another scheme to enlarge the cafeteria,

"The drawings had been done but were shelved, as so often, for economic reasons and because we encountered opposition from Køllesgård, which has legal rights over this part of the property (due to an old easement). The matter could have been resolved either by a court case or a settlement whereby [Ernst] Kølle had once demanded about DKK 30,000. The expansion was projected to cost around DKK 200,000, and of course it should have been implemented, for today the price has quintupled."[7]

The project for a new cafeteria was only part of a larger effort to plan Louisiana's expansion. The main questions were where to build, and how much. To narrow the options, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert prepared two, extremely different proposals for expanding the museum; Plan A and Plan B; both schemes included the small addition behind the cafeteria. Jensen's reactions to the two proposals revealed his priorities for the new museum, and the choice that he made would guide Louisiana's expansion for nearly twenty years.

---

[6] Jensen's projection for the first year is cited in Stensgaard, 38. The visitor figure for the first weekend appeared in *Helsingør Dagblad*, 18 August 1958. The visitor figure for the first three months appears in MLL, 40; and the 1959 museum yearbook refers to 225,000 visitors during the first year. See Note 3.

[7] M1, 17.

Plan A was an ambitious scheme to construct an entirely new wing at the south end of the park. **[Fig. 3.7]** The main entrance would be moved from the villa to the former coach house, which would be converted into a lobby for selling tickets and open into a large foyer. The foyer would include restrooms and a coatroom, and orient visitors to the park through a wall of windows that would mirror the first segment of the Tree Passage. Beyond the foyer, a long, narrow building parallel to Gammel Strandvej would provide galleries for temporary exhibitions. The exhibition building would also provide access to a concert hall, which would be oriented towards the park and organized on a diagonal, with a stage in the corner and seating on two sides. This diagonal layout would reappear in a string of later schemes for concert halls, and was finally realized in 1976. At the end of the wing, a restaurant with roughly 200 seats would provide patrons with a panoramic view of the sea.

Plan B was a much more modest proposal to construct an addition along the Tree Passage, with a large exhibition building on the site of the rose garden. **[Fig. 3.8]** The plan included two galleries for temporary exhibitions, and a narrow extension of the passage that would provide a coatroom. To harmonize with the 58-Building, the north face of the exhibition building was divided into two walls of windows that would recall the end of the Lake Gallery, and were roughly the same width. The design of the larger gallery, which is labeled "concert hall" on the drawing, was based on Jensen's idea of a multipurpose gallery that would reduce the size and the cost of the addition. When it was not used for exhibitions, the gallery could be filled with chairs and used for concerts, readings or theatrical performances. To accommodate audiences, and reduce congestion in the villa and Tree Passage, the service wing of the villa would be converted into a second entrance, with direct access to a coatroom.

Plan A exceeded even Jensen's vision for expanding Louisiana, and he rejected it immediately on the grounds that "At one blow it changes Louisiana into a great institution, a large cultural entertainment machine."[8] His resistance to Louisiana becoming "a great institution" probably reflected his antipathy to traditional institutions, but he explained his rejection in practical terms. His first concern was that the place would simply become too large and the distance between the ends of the museum too great, transforming a visit to Louisiana from a leisurely stroll into a test

[8] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, "Bemærkninger om udvidelserne på Louisiana," 20 July 1959, 1–2.

of stamina. As he noted, many visitors would feel compelled to get the full value of their two-crown admission fee, and see the entire museum in one visit. He feared that the resulting traffic through the buildings and across the park would spoil the atmosphere of "calm and contemplation" that he still hoped to maintain.[9]

Jensen also worried that a new wing might undermine the museum's primary mission, by diverting people and money away from exhibitions and publications. At the time, the museum only had seven or eight full-time employees to cope with the expanded programming.[10] Rather than compromise Louisiana's mission and/or atmosphere, Jensen decided to expand the museum in stages and selected Plan B for further development. His letter includes the assertion that audiences would be better served in the second Lantern Gallery, close to the expanded cafeteria; and that a concert hall could someday be constructed on the slope overlooking the lake, as seen in his sketch for future extensions to the museum. **[Fig. 3.6]** In the meantime, he instructed Bo and Wohlert to continue planning the new cafeteria and to revise the drawings for an exhibition building along the Tree Passage.

Jensen's list of instructions for the new exhibition building included a critique of the 58-Building and were the first step in the transformation of Louisiana's architecture, from open galleries with windows to closed chambers with skylights. The first item on his list was a demand that the new building be isolated from the surroundings,

"It must be closed to the outside, with the possible exception of a single window or some glass doors. There's enough 'competition from nature' at Louisiana."[11]

Further down the list, Jensen criticized the lighting in the 58-Building, complaining that the lantern galleries were too dark on overcast days and that the roof beams had cast shadows onto the northern walls during the previous spring.[12] **[Fig. 3.9]** While occasional shadows and instances of direct sun – comparable to light filtering through the branches of a tree – had always been part of the plan [2.3], Jensen declared that new galleries should provide even, diffused daylight,

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Kirsten Strømstad, conversation with the author, 16 April 2016.

[11] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, "Bemærkninger om udvidelserne på Louisiana," 20 July 1959, 5.

[12] Ibid., 5–6.

"The new hall should correct these small flaws, so that the overall impression of the light at Louisiana is better than it is now. How it should be done, I do not know. The combination of skylights and lantern lights at the Skagen Museum works very well. Perhaps it requires an extensive system of skylights, which would include wooden slats to filter and direct the light. But preferably not something that requires adjustment to control the light, as that would require constant supervision."[13]

While Bo and Wohlert considered Jensen's change in direction, they returned to the immediate problem of expanding the cafeteria. With their initial project thwarted by the threat of a lawsuit, they developed a scheme to excavate the slope in front of the cafeteria and construct a new cafeteria underneath the existing terrace. **[Fig. 3.10]** A flight of steps behind "Mogens's Wall" would descend to a lower level with a large dining room, a sunny kitchen facing the sea and a new terrace for outdoor dining. Towards the cleft, a pair of outdoor stairs would join the terraces to the lower level of the park and the walls around the terraces would include built-in planters, to soften their edges and blend the building with the slope. After the addition was complete, the former cafeteria would revert to being a library, as Jensen had initially intended.

3.3 The Louisiana Project

Knud W. Jensen would eventually revisit his conviction that Louisiana should remain a small museum, but his decision to pursue Plan B was a turning point in Louisiana's development and in his life, and in the lives of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert. Jensen's strategy of incremental growth meant that expanding the museum would take decades, rather than years. The 58-Building was already the defining work of both architect's careers; as a result, they would be bound together and bound to Louisiana for the rest of their careers.

As it became clear that expansion would occur in phases, Jensen initiated an ongoing planning process; the Louisiana Project, that would continue into the 1970s. Over the years, there would be many changes of direction and reversals of opinion, abandoned visions, fanciful proposals from Jensen and a great deal of patience on the part of Bo and Wohlert. Some of the projected schemes would have been inspired additions to Louisiana, while a few of them would have been a disaster. But it is important to

[13] Ibid.

distinguish between having an idea and actually intending to build it. Judging from Jensen's written responses to Bo and Wohlert's various schemes, which record the extended design process, he was unable to abandon an idea without first having seen it on paper. Indeed, it appears Jensen was uncertain how to proceed, and that the Louisiana Project was a way of searching for answers.

By early 1961, Jensen had revived the idea of a concert hall along the Tree Passage, with separate galleries for temporary exhibitions. In March, Bo and Wohlert submitted a site plan with a 1000-square-meter addition that included the concert hall and galleries, as well as a wing for shipping and storing art. **[Fig. 3.11]** In order to provide turning space for trucks, the gardener's house would be moved a short distance to the north. Aside from a single window, the new galleries were closed to the surroundings and illuminated by narrow skylights above the walls, as in the first section of the Tree Passage. The project also addressed Jensen's concerns about the cramped entrance in the villa, and the lack of a shop for selling books and prints. Notes on the drawing indicate that the former coach house would be renovated as a museum shop, the "children's museum" under the stair would be converted to a ticket lobby and the service wing of the villa would be rebuilt to provide restrooms and a coatroom. While the drawing omitted the 1959 scheme for a terraced cafeteria, it remained part of the general plan for several years.

After studying the drawing, Jensen apparently revived the idea of a multipurpose gallery that could also serve as a concert hall. Bo and Wohlert's revised and expanded project of August 1961 featured a large, square gallery that could seat nearly 500 people, and a smaller gallery that resembles the Lake Gallery in the 58-Building. **[Figs. 3.12–3.14]** The new version of a multipurpose gallery had a terraced floor with three different levels, and was organized on a diagonal, with the lowest level in the corner. When the gallery was not being used for exhibitions, the corner could be used as a stage and the upper levels furnished with chairs. Above the stage, the suspended wooden ceiling included a grid of truncated glass cones, which would filter daylight and also scatter sound waves, to improve the acoustics.

Bo and Wohlert were clearly struggling to satisfy Jensen's demand for overhead lighting and closed rooms, without sacrificing all contact with the surroundings. The gallery-hall would be wrapped by an L-shaped loggia that provided a view of the lake,

and sketches of the interior depict solid walls for exhibiting paintings. The project also included a plan for a sculpture garden, with courtyards surrounded by walls of whitewashed brickwork, roughly 3 meters high. A central path would step up the slope, following the 3-meter rise to a final courtyard on the plateau, where visitors would encounter a panoramic view of the sea.

It took Jensen nearly a year to respond to the 1961 project, but in the summer of 1962, he wrote a long, detailed letter that records one of the turning points in Louisiana's institutional history. After admitting that the project satisfied all of his requests, he once again dismissed the idea of a gallery-concert hall, concluding that a multi-purpose room would compromise the quality of the exhibitions. He also reminded Bo and Wohlert,

"There is no need for a single glass wall in this house, precisely because the absolute contrast with the old Louisiana should be the goal, so that there will be a balance between closed and open spaces throughout the building complex."[14]

Jensen dismissed the proposed sculpture garden as too enclosed, and asked for a design that was more open and better connected to the setting, (what he referred to as the "Forest Triangle") and included places to sit and relax. He also hoped that the sculpture garden would include a variety of places where visitors could sit and rest, and reminded the architects of his desire for a major work of landscape architecture that would further the union of the arts at Louisiana. The most important part of Jensen's letter had nothing to do with the specifics of the 1961 project, but concerned the future of the institution. Three years after he rejected the idea of transforming Louisiana into "a great institution," Jensen was evidently prepared to sacrifice one of his goals in order to achieve another. The tension between his two, contradictory impulses – creating a tranquil, intimate museum with a domestic character *and* making art accessible to a wide public – had finally been resolved and the public had won, by virtue of their numbers and enthusiasm.[15] As Jensen imagined Louisiana's growth, he had a definite model in mind,

[14] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, "Responsum om Louisiana's byggeri, Juli 1962. Udstillingsbygningen. Projektet af 1961," 2.

[15] Louisiana's popularity made it impossible to maintain the original furnishing program and the applied art was removed by early 1962. Kirsten Strømstad, email to the author, 4 February 2017.

"Sometimes it has been said that Louisiana should stay a small museum. I don't believe that. […] Even with the outlined maximum expansion of the institution, the museum will not become a truly big museum; ideal conditions will simply be obtained for all the activity so far. There's no reason why Louisiana shouldn't be a place where someone with a particular interest in art can spend a half or a whole day. […] When you talk about a museum getting too big, you think first and foremost of the old, dark museums; the tiring walks, the uniform look of the rooms; but a museum typified by light and movement can easily be relatively large. I can cite the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam. What makes that museum something special is the multiplicity of opportunities it offers its visitors: A permanent collection that keeps changing its position in the large complex and is exhibited in new combinations. […] You feel comfortable in the atmosphere of the Stedelijk, whether there are many or few people. It's a living, intelligent and inspiring place to go. The diversity of activities gives you variety. […] What can we learn from this at Louisiana? That the place can get bigger, as long as the extensions add real qualities to the existing ones. In 25 years, the museum may be in the center of the Ørestad."[16]

By this point, Louisiana's need for additional galleries and art handling facilities had become critical. The temporary exhibitions were becoming more frequent and more elaborate, taking over the galleries designed for the museum's collection, often for months at a time. **[Figs. 3.15–3.16]** The first blockbuster arrived in 1961 with the exhibition of the *Henie-Onstad Samlingen* (14 January –12 February), assembled by the Olympic-champion figure skater and film star, Sonja Henie and her husband Niels Onstad.[17] It was during this period that Jensen developed his *sauna* strategy, alternating presentations of more popular work; 'hot' exhibitions that would keep the museum solvent; with displays of more challenging or obscure works: the "cold" exhibitions that were central to Louisiana's mission of promoting contemporary art.

One of the "hottest" exhibitions from that time, and certainly the most elaborate, was *5000 Years of Egyptian Art* (1 April – 27 May 1962), which had been organized by the Museum of Antiquities in Cairo and transported to Europe by UNESCO. **[Figs. 2.116–2.122]** When the exhibition reached Louisiana, it was supplemented with

---

[16] "Responsum om Louisiana's byggeri, Juli 1962. Udstillingsbygningen. Projektet af 1961," 10–11.

[17] Kirsten Strømstad, conversation with the author, 16 April 2016. Attendance was particularly high during the weekends, when the couple visited Louisiana, so that Henie could greet her adoring fans.

important loans from Denmark's National Museum and the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek. The exhibition was both an aesthetic triumph and a popular success, attracting more than 70,000 visitors. But it had filled every square meter of exhibition space in the 58-Building, which required storing Louisiana's collection in the former stable and the gardener's house, and underscored the necessity of expanding the museum.[18]

In the spring of 1963, Jensen enlarged the planning group to include the landscape architect Ole Nørgaard (1925-78). After Louisiana's original landscape architect, Agnete Petersen, married and moved to England in 1961, Bo had begun searching for a replacement. His initial candidate was his friend Morten Klint, a son of Wohlert's teacher Kaare Klint and former employee of C. Th. Sørensen, who had acted as a mentor to Bo. [1.5] The chemistry between Jensen and Morten Klint was not particularly auspicious, and Bo turned to another of Sørensen's former employees, Ole Nørgaard.[19] Nørgaard had established an office with his wife Edith Nørgaard in 1954, and he quickly became the landscape architect of choice for young Danish architects such as Jørn Utzon and Halldor Gunløgsson. His first work with Bo and Wohlert had been the terrace for their 1959 "Dream House," one of a string of residential projects they designed after Louisiana opened.[20] **[Fig. 3.17]**

After Nørgaard joined the planning group, Jensen asked Bo and Wohlert to prepare a new master plan that would include a new cafeteria along one side of the terrace, and a concert hall below. They prepared two different schemes; both proposals included nearly identical versions of Jensen's own ideas: an exhibition building behind the Tree Passage that would step down the slope to the lake and an amphitheater at the mouth of the cleft; an apparent vestige of Jensen's admiration for classical Greek culture.[21] However, the galleries on the slope would have been so small as to limit their use, and the amphitheater would have destroyed one of the characteristic features of the landscape. Both of these whimsical notions were soon abandoned, and it is tempting to dismiss the 1963 project as a failure. And yet, the 1963 project was an

[18] Louisiana's visitor logs, April–May 1962. Kirsten Strømstad recalled the storage problem in a conversation with the author on 16 April 2016.

[19] A 1961 planting plan by Morten Klint can be found in Edith and Ole Nørgaard's archive. Kirsten Strømstad recounted the lack of personal chemistry between Jensen and Morten Klint during a conversation with the author on 16 April 2016.

[20] See Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, "Ønskehuset," *Arkitekten* 1959, no. 11: 216–217. As well: Poul Erik Skriver, "Et Ønskehus," *Arkitektur* 1959, no. 3: 100–103.

[21] Jensen's sketch illustrating both features is located in the Knud W. Jensen Archive, LMMA.

important stage in Louisiana's development. The concert hall had finally been moved from the Tree Passage and placed next to the cafeteria. Studies for the concert hall would continue through the end of 1963 and then put aside until the end of the decade. Moreover, the location for the new exhibition building was now fixed, and studies for that building would now proceed with the utmost urgency. Most importantly for the museum's expansion, Bo's site plan included Nørgaard's scheme for a sculpture garden at the south end of the park. **[Fig. 3.18]**

3.4 The Sculpture Garden

When Louisiana opened in 1958, two of the most prominent installations were the sculptures by Astrid Noack and Søren Georg Jensen that extended the exhibition beyond the walls of the building. By 1961, Knud W. Jensen hoped to construct an outdoor exhibition space and expand the museum's collection of sculptures in a new direction, with support from the New Carlsberg Foundation. Under the leadership of Jørgen Sthyr, the Foundation made a commitment to purchase sculptures that Jensen selected and deposit them in Louisiana's collection as long-term loans.[22] In 1961, the foundation's first purchase; Luciano Minguzzi's *Six Characters*; was also the first work by a foreign artist to enter Louisiana's collection and the first step in the shift from the entirely Danish collection that Jensen had assembled in the 1950s. **[Fig. 3.19]**

With a new landscape architect at hand, Jensen pushed the construction of a sculpture garden to the top of Louisiana's agenda, by scheduling an outdoor exhibition for the autumn of 1964. In May 1963, he traveled to Antwerp, Belgium, and arranged to borrow fifty works from the Middelheim Museum; an open-air exhibition of sculpture located in a nineteenth-century, English-style park. The loan included a diverse group of treasures that included traditional statues as well as more abstract works. The exhibition, *Middelheim besøger Louisiana* (Middelheim Visits Louisiana), would serve as a demonstration project for the new sculpture garden, allowing Jensen to work with the New Carlsberg Foundation, to determine what types of works were best suited to the setting and plan future purchases.[23] As he recalled,

[22] MLL, 62-63. In 1964, the foundation's support expanded to include paintings; all of the loans were converted to donations on Louisiana's tenth anniversary, in 1968. See *The Creation of a Collection. Donations from the New Carlsberg Foundation to the Louisiana Museum,* ed. Øystein Hjort, Knud W. Jensen and Kjeld Kjeldsen, trans. Jean Olsen (Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 1975.)

[23] MLL, 109–111.

"For a long time the aim was to preserve a purely Danish collection indoors; and gradually create a foreign sculpture collection in the park."[24]

The site for the new sculpture garden was the "Forest Triangle" defined by the edge of the lawn in front of the villa, the stand of birch trees that covers the slope down to the beach, and the street that borders the museum; Gammel Strandvej. The center of the triangle contained the remains of Alexander Brun's orchard, a mixture of apple and pear trees that continued to bear fruit after almost a century. From the edge of the lawn, the ground sloped up to the apex of the triangle, rising 3 meters to the highest point at Louisiana and the old gazebo that Jensen had imagined as a gatehouse in 1955. Nørgaard's greatest challenge would be arranging the exhibition areas in a way that reconciled the angle between the street and the birch trees, so that the sculpture garden would seem like a natural development of the triangular setting.

Norgaard's first scheme divided the triangle into two sections: a set of hedged courtyards that were set at a diagonal to the slope and an open area parallel to Gammel Strandvej that would include a sculpture pavilion. At Jensen's suggestion, Nørgaard replaced the old gazebo with a wooden observation deck and extended it beyond the edge of the cliff. Over the next six months, Nørgaard simplified the layout, eliminating the water features and replacing the courtyards with terraces that stepped up the slope. Nonetheless, all of the exhibition areas were oriented to Gammel Strandvej, as though the street was more important than the terrain or the forested slope. He was still struggling in December, when Jensen suggested rotating the three terraces, so that they were aligned with the edge of the slope, and asked him to preserve Alexander Brun's orchard, to the extent possible.[25]

Working from the center of the triangle to the edges, Nørgaard used the orchard as a buffer zone and treated the areas on either side as different environments. **[Fig. 3.20]** The area along Gammel Strandvej followed the natural rise and took its character from the grove of beech trees at the end of the enormous beech hedge. The area facing the beech-covered slope would be excavated to create terraces that gradually increased in height, as they stepped up the 3-meter-rise. Rather than create three identical terraces, he created three terraces that had the same shape and orientation,

[24] MLL, 105.

[25] Knud W. Jensen to Ole Nørgaard, 5 December 1963.

but provided different degrees of enclosure. As the terraces progressed up the slope and their areas decreased, the height of the retaining walls along the orchard remained constant in the Lower and Middle Terraces, and increased in the Upper Terrace. Nørgaard's drawing of a cross-section through the terraces illustrates the retaining walls along the orchard, while the dashed line indicates the natural slope. **[Fig. 3.21]**

Construction began in the spring of 1964, and the terraces and observation deck were finished in time for the opening of the Middelheim exhibition, in early September. The terraces were set about a half-meter below the edge of the birch forest, and outlined by two sets of retaining walls: high walls along the orchard and low walls along the forest. Nørgaard initially planned to enclose the terraces with hedges, but worried that shadows from the tall trees on the slope would block the sun and slow their growth.[26] Working on a tight schedule, he employed a traditional technique for constructing ivy-covered retaining walls: *vedbendgærder*, using timber frames that were covered with wooden boards and filled with earth. The narrow gaps between the boards were planted with thousand of ivy cuttings, which would grow relatively quickly: covering the boards and blending the walls with the surrounding vegetation. **[Fig. 3.22]**

As the ivy matured, the dark color and consistent texture would provide a dense, neutral background for the art. Nørgaard chose the other building materials – granite, gravel and wood – for their muted color and ability to age gracefully. In fact, the granite had been used for several hundred years before it arrived at Louisiana. While the slabs that formed the stairs and provided stepping-stones were surplus from a renovation of the square at Roskilde Cathedral, the cobblestones on the paths and forecourt had been salvaged from Slotsholmen, the ancient palace-island in the center of Copenhagen. In Nørgaard's words,

"The most traditional choice of materials does not result from partiality for old things, but was motivated by objective consideration for the surface structure and the colouring of the sculptures, the damp Danish climate, and especially the drips from the trees. They will not affect the chosen materials, whereas concrete for instance would nearly always have a damp, mottled appearance."[27]

[26] Ole Nørgaard, "The Louisiana Sculpture Garden," *Mobilia*, no. 116 (March 1965): unpaginated.
[27] Ibid.

At the end of the summer, the Belgian visitors arrived in two railroad cars and were installed across the museum grounds. The more abstract works were presented in the new terraces, with the entrance marked by Max Bill's *Endless Loop,* displayed in the small forecourt. In front of the villa, Jensen's installation of the figurative works created an updated version of the eighteenth-century, English sculpture parks that were ornamented with statues of mythological figures. **[Fig. 3.23]** In place of Apollo, Auguste Rodin's *Monument to Balzac* surveyed the park from the highest pedestal, asserting dominion over all the lower works, including Alberto Giacometti's *Standing Woman IV*; frozen in place between the fir trees. Aphrodite made an appearance in the form of her Roman equivalent; Pierre-Auguste Renoir's *Venus Victorious*, holding the golden apple awarded to her in the Judgment of Paris.

The genius of Nørgaard's terraces was the way in which they fused the experience of the artworks with the experience of the place. While the different terraces provided a variety of settings for art, they also intensified the journey from the open lawn in front of the villa to the steep slope overlooking the sea. The key to this intensity was the increasing degree of enclosure that visitors felt as they moved up the slope and through the three very different spaces. The first step was the Lower Terrace, roughly 16 by 14 meters, which was experienced as a shallow depression in the landscape; more like a tray than a courtyard, and barely separated from the lawn by rhododendron bushes. The spacious character of the terrace made it especially suitable for groups of sculptures created to be seen in the round, including the quartet of bronze figures that signaled Jensen's gradual embrace of abstraction. **[Fig. 3.24]**

Just inside the Middle Terrace, a narrow passage contained a few steps up to the orchard and the Heerup Garden; a permanent exhibition of Henry Heerup's carved granite sculptures that were set beneath and between the old fruit trees. **[Fig. 3.26]** The assortment of creatures included witches, fertility goddesses and fantastic animals, which were arranged in the uncut grass around the trees. **[Fig. 3.25]** The deliberately unkempt, slightly wild installation was inspired by Heerup's outdoor garden-studio in Rødovre, where he painted in the summer and sculpted in the winter, to keep warm. Jensen's sympathetic placement of Heerup's sculptures, in a setting that recalled their place of origin, was the first of the large-scale, outdoor installations of sculpture that would become one of Louisiana's characteristic features.

Nørgaard's careful treatment of space reached a crescendo in the Upper Terrace, which was intended for smaller or more delicate sculptures. The relatively small area (roughly 10 by 11 meters) gave the space a pronounced sense of enclosure. **[Fig. 3.27]** Nørgaard amplified the effect by increasing the height of the retaining wall along the orchard, to 3 meters. By this point on the slope, the terrace floor was nearly level with the end of the orchard, allowing Nørgaard to construct a thin wall with exposed boards on both sides. The other tall walls were treated in the same way, reinforcing the sensation of being in an outdoor room. The stair to the clearing was constructed of wood, which provided a resilient surface underfoot and underscored the transition from the slope to the plateau. To provide a sense of compression before the moment of release, Nørgaard framed the stair with two walls that created a threshold and heightened the experience of passage. **[Fig. 3.28]**

After the ascent through the terraces and the passage through the final stair, visitors emerged into a clearing, and space expanded in every direction. **[Fig. 3.29]** The clearing was framed by a loose arrangement of wooden walls that provided solid, neutral backgrounds for the art, and continued Nørgaard's strategy of framing space without completely enclosing it. The wall from the Upper Terrace continued along the edge of the birch trees, and corresponded to the wall along Gammel Strandvej. In order to slow the visitors' progress and encourage them to examine the art; before taking in the view, Nørgaard placed another wooden wall in front of the observation deck. A gap between the walls provided access to the deck and the final moment of release, as the earth fell away and the sea appeared in panorama. **[Fig. 3.30]**

By any standard, whether of utility, aesthetics or human experience, we can regard the sculpture garden as a masterwork. Just as Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert gave form to the north edge of the of the park; by gathering the natural features into a sequence of episodes; Nørgaard gave form to the south end of the park, by intensifying the experience of moving up the slope and arriving at the edge of the cliff. Along the way, visitors encountered a variety of exhibition areas that could accommodate many different types of sculpture, each according to its inherent character. Guiding visitors from the lawn to the observation deck, Nørgaard realized Jensen's early goal of constructing a truly important work of landscape architecture and moved Louisiana even closer towards a union of the arts.

Over time, the ivy covered the surfaces of the retaining walls, softening the lines and creating a lush state of equilibrium between construction and nature. By 1970, the terraces had been paved with cobblestones, making them easier to maintain. The intricate pattern of the stones complemented the texture of the ivy, uniting the floors with the walls, and heightening the impression of outdoor rooms. **[Fig. 3.31]** In 1980, the sculpture garden was dismantled and replaced by a new exhibition building. Despite the loss of Nørgaard's masterwork, parts of two terraces are still intact and – as described in the following chapter – his influence on the design of the South Wing is visible inside and out.

3.5 Bo and Wohlert After 1958

Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert are best known for their work at Louisiana, but their collaboration extended far beyond Humlebæk. The first phase of their work outside of Louisiana began in 1957 and continued through 1964. The result of this intensely fertile period was a group of about twenty buildings, interiors and unrealized projects that constitute one of the most refined chapters in the history of Danish architecture. Most of these works were single-family houses that were extensions of their work at the museum. However, one of the buildings, a distribution center for the publishing house Gyldendal (which was owned by the Louisiana Foundation), included skylights with light-diffusing scrims that provided a new model for illuminating the galleries at Louisiana. That model was eventually developed and applied to two major additions: the 71-Building and the South Wing, so that most of the skylights in the museum today can be traced back to the building for Gyldendal.

In the summer of 1956, Bo joined Wohlert at Louisiana as a sideline to his partnership with Knud Hallberg [1.5], but that changed after only a few months. In October, Hungarian dissidents mounted a national uprising that toppled their Soviet-backed regime. After the new government announced that Hungary would be exiting the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union invaded the country and – determined to set an example for dissidents in other Soviet satellites – crushed the uprising with a level of brutality that shocked the world. More than 200,000 Hungarians fled the country and a number of them sought refuge in Denmark, where they were greeted with sympathy. Aware that Hallberg was a longtime supporter of the Soviet Union, Bo asked if he

could continue that support after the bloodshed in Hungary. When Hallberg replied that he could, Bo dissolved the partnership and established his own office.[28]

While the 58-Building was under construction Bo and Wohlert began work on a second project for Knud W. Jensen, renovating and extending the old house where he lived with his family, overlooking the harbor in the old fishing village of Sletten.[29] **[Figs. 3.32–3.35]** To make the most of the extraordinary view and the very large garden, the addition took the form of a narrow wing that extends out from one end of the original house. The placement of the wing divided the garden into two parts: a secluded western side that receives late-afternoon sun and a more active area to the east, which enjoys a panoramic view of the water.

Most of the narrow wing is occupied by the parents' section, with separate sleeping areas on either side of the bathroom and a long wall of cabinetry that includes bookshelves, various types of storage, and a kitchenette for hosting parties on the adjacent terrace. Rudolph Schindler's influence is evident in the copper hoods over the twin fireplaces, which recall the fireplace in Pauline Schindler's studio, and in the sliding panels along the passageway. At the north end of the wing, next to the child's room, a new vestibule provided an entrance to both parts of the house, which were united under a massive black roof that recalls Bo's 1948 house for his parents.

Within a few weeks of Louisiana's opening, Bo and Wohlert began to receive commissions from clients who wanted a home with the same character as the 58-Building. The architects decided to continue their collaboration, at the museum and elsewhere, but would maintain separate practices, with their own employees. Many of their joint projects resemble the 58-Building, but it would be a mistake to imagine that Bo and Wohlert were cloning their work at Louisiana or working in a preconceived style. The design of the 58-Building was based on a rejection of style and a search for an anonymous type of architecture that would not compete with the art, the setting or the villa. By the time the completion of the building, Bo and Wohlert had developed an architectural vocabulary – a set of elements and a palette of materials – that could be deployed in different places, to create ever-changing effects of space, light and

[28] Morten Bo, conversation with the author, 9 June 2015.

[29] Vilhelm Wohlert, "En tilbygning," *Arkitektur* 1960, no. 1: 18–24.

experience. As at Louisiana, the most important factor in each project was the character of the setting.[30]

Most of Bo and Wohlert's early works were single-family houses that were designed for open sites and surrounded by a garden. Drawings are known to exist for an exhibition house and thirteen individual houses, of which eight were constructed. The typical requirements of the projects – a number of bedrooms, a kitchen, and a place to store a car – led the architects to develop a number of strategies that reappear from house to house. In nearly every design, a long brick wall divides the house and continues out into the garden, joining the interior with the setting, but separating the car from the garden, or private rooms from shared living areas. While the walls divide the sites into different zones, the roofs project out into the surroundings to create carports and covered storage areas, providing a sense of shelter that extends beyond the walls and relates the interior to the ground.

On level sites, the roofs are typically flat, undermining the sense of mass found in a traditional house, and providing the impression that the surrounding space simply continues through the interior. On more dramatic sites, the roof was often sloped, so that the space beneath it corresponds to the form of the terrain. **[Fig. 3.36]** Elaborating on their work in the passages at Louisiana, Bo and Wohlert created a system of windows that could be applied to kitchens, bedrooms and bathrooms, with wooden posts spaced at distances of 30, 60 and 120 centimeters, to provide different levels of density and corresponding degrees of privacy.

Aside from Knud W. Jensen, Bo and Wohlert's most important client was Ole Palsby, a stockbroker with a passion for architecture and applied art.[31] Their first commission from Palsby was a compact three-bedroom house for his family, *Elmehuset* (the Elm House), which sits on a slope and faces a clearing with southwestern exposure. **[Fig. 3.37]** Working with their usual sensitivity to the setting, the architects placed the dining room and the living room near a stand of tall beech trees, which filter late-afternoon sun and fill those rooms with dappled light. Two segments of whitewashed brickwork provide retaining walls against the slope and extend into the surroundings,

[30] Poul Erik Skriver, "Arbejder af Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlert," *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 5: 161–200. The entire issue is devoted to Bo and Wohlert's work outside of Louisiana, and includes the building for Gyldendal that would be critical to Bo's later work at the museum.

[31] All three projects are described in *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 5. See Note 30.

separating the clearing from the driveway. Entering the house, the clearing suddenly appears over the roof of the lower level and a short flight of steps leads down to the living room, and then a cellar. In 1967, Bo extended the upper level, filling in the carport and doubling the size of the sleeping quarters.

The second commission from Palsby was Piniehøj West, a group of seven single-family houses on flat site along Strandvejen, the busy coastal road between Copenhagen and Helsingør. **[Figs. 3.39–3.40]** While there are minor variations in the floor plans, which vary slightly with the location of the driveway, all of the houses include a large living room oriented to the southwest. Each of the houses was designed as part of the group as well as the setting, and the placement of the rooms reflects the arrangement of the brick walls, and vice versa, much like Bo's house for his own family. The result was an immensely subtle work that preserved the natural beauty of the landscape, and blurred conventional distinctions between architecture and planning, the house and the community, the interior and the garden. As at Louisiana, the freestanding brick walls join the interiors with the surroundings, but at Piniehøj they also shield the residents from the traffic, and their neighbors.

In addition to the Elm House and Piniehøj, Palsby commissioned Bo and Wohlert to design Kirstineparken, a group of fifty row houses on a ridge overlooking the Kokkedal Forest in Hørsholm. **[Fig. 3.38]** To reduce the visibility of the development, the architects abandoned their customary whitewashed brick walls and employed yellow brickwork with red tile roofs. All of the houses are entered from the north, where the carports define small courtyards, and include living rooms that face southwest. In each house, the ground floor is terraced to follow the natural slope, alternately stepping up or down from the entrance and dining area to the living room. The result was a group of houses that are unique to the terrain and form a constructed version of the landscape. Palsby and Bo decided to preserve the center of the property as a communal open space, and it was planted with oak trees that will eventually grow above the houses and crown the ridge.

In 1963, Bo and Wohlert completed a distribution center for Gyldendal; the publishing house owned by the Louisiana Foundation; that would have a profound effect on the architecture at the museum. **[Figs. 3.41–3.42]** The building was an addition to the company's main warehouse, a neoclassical block with a mansard roof

that was designed by Ludwig Andersen and completed in 1903. The addition included a large hall for packing books and a lower, two-story wing that provided offices and a canteen. Bo and Wohlert designed the shipping hall as a large, anonymous block of red brickwork that would defer to the existing building, and treated the loading dock, canteen and offices as a series of smaller elements that were grafted onto the south and east faces of the block. In the hall, the sorting area and the loading dock were shifted off-center to provide shelving alongside the warehouse, and a row of columns supported the roof beams. The primary requirement for the hall was bright, even lighting for the tables where the staff sorted and packed the books.

The shipping hall was illuminated by a row of enormous skylights, which were carried by reinforced concrete beams that bear on the brick walls, and supported in mid-span by concrete columns. To reflect as much daylight as possible, the beams were designed with a V-shaped cross section, and the columns were faceted, so that they would minimize shadows and preserve as much floor area as possible. (The effect recalls the printing hall in Aalto's building for Turun Sanomat, 1928–30) Beneath the skylights, stretched panels of canvas diffused the daylight and spread it across the hall. The ideas of skylights supported by faceted beams and a ceiling of light-diffusing fabric panels would play a major role in Louisiana's expansion, as Jensen, Bo, and Wohlert continued the planning for an exhibition building along the Tree Passage. But Bo and Wohlert were already preparing separate schemes for that building, as the first phase of their collaboration had given way to a division of labor.

By the completion of the Gyldendal building, the differences in personality and principles that had led to such a fertile collaboration had also made it difficult for Bo and Wohlert to continue working so closely. Another complication was that both men were now collaborating with other architects. While Wohlert and Rolf Graae (a former colleague at Kaare Klint's office) had recently completed Stengaard Church (1961-63), Bo was designing Blågaard Teachers' Training College (1961-66) with Karen and Ebbe Clemmensen.[32] As well, both Bo and Wohlert now had an extremely experienced staff, and it made little sense to divide the work at Louisiana between two offices. As planning for additions to the museum continued, it became apparent to Bo and Wohlert that a division of labor would be necessary.

[32] Nils-Ole Lund, "Stengård Kirke," *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 4: 144–154. Jørgen Bo, Karen and Ebbe Clemmensen, "Blaagaard Seminarium og Enghavegård Skole," *Arkitektur* 1969, no. 2: 54–65.

Bo and Wohlert agreed to continue working together during the planning process with Jensen. However, only one of them would be responsible for the final design and construction of each addition, on an alternating basis. Since both architects would be involved in the planning, and the designs would follow the principles established by the 58-Building, any additions to Louisiana would be officially credited to both architects.[33] At the same time, they agreed that the architectural vocabulary they had developed at Louisiana would be reserved for work at the museum, and that neither of them would employ that distinctive set of elements and materials for individual projects.[34] There would not be any more single-family houses with freestanding walls of whitewashed brickwork and flat roofs edged in teak. The final work from their first phase of collaboration was a pair of red brick, single-family houses, designed in 1963 for *Nordisk Villaparade*; part of the exhibition *NU 64* in Norrköping, Sweden; and completed the following year.[35]

Bo and Wohlert continued to collaborate until the mid 1980s. Outside of Louisiana, they worked together on a variety of buildings that included the Cabinetmakers' School (1965-67), in Tunisia; the Borrebakken nursing home and housing complex (1967-70), near Copenhagen; and the Royal Danish Embassy (1968-73), in Brazil. They also entered several architectural competitions in West Germany, eventually completing Museum Bochum (1978-83). The most important of their German museum projects was never constructed. In 1977, they placed second in the competition for a new National Gallery in Stuttgart, losing to the English architect James Stirling. Stirling's building, completed in 1983, helped popularize the "post-modern" style of architecture, which relied on a collage of historical motifs and placed imagery above actual experience. While both Bo and Wohlert had successful individual careers; working individually and with other collaborators; their names will always be joined and their professional reputations defined by the union of architecture and landscape they created at Louisiana.

---

[33] Kirsten Strømstad, email to the author, 17 October 2015.

[34] Vilhelm Wohlert, conversation with the author, June 2005.

[35] Plans for the houses were published in *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 5. See Note 30 for full citation. The completed houses were published in Poul Erik Skriver, "Nordisk villaer," *Arkitekten* 1964, no. 17: 341–357. Bo and Wohlert's houses were parts of a model development that also included dwellings by Sven Silow, Lennart Kvarnström, Sverre Fehn, and Kristian Gullichsen, within a landscape designed by Gunnar Martinsson.

3.6 The 66-Building

While Ole Nørgaard was planning Louisiana's sculpture garden, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert were focused on the design of the new exhibition building alongside the Tree Passage. The building would consist of two galleries with different ceiling heights: 6 meters and 3 meters, with the High Gallery next to the passage and the Low Gallery further down the slope. Both architects agreed on the design of the Low Gallery, which was organized around a courtyard, but they prepared separate schemes for the High Gallery. Knud W. Jensen was eventually persuaded by Bo's scheme, which featured a roof structure of tapered concrete beams adapted from the Gyldendal building. **[Fig. 3.43]** The beams would form a grid of light-reflecting surfaces and support an array of custom-made skylights, to provide even, shadow-free daylight. Following the calculations of Mogens Voltelen, who had returned as the lighting consultant, the skylights took the form of pyramids that were cut at an angle to eliminate direct sun and oriented to capture light reflected by the northern sky.[36]

Like his choice of Plan B in 1959, Jensen's decision to pursue Bo's scheme for the High Gallery was a turning point in the history of Louisiana's architecture. Over the next five years, Bo would develop several versions of an open roof structure with a grid of skylights, and finally create a new system for lighting the museum's galleries. The appeal of Bo's skylights was not their form, but their effect. In theory, the field of skylights would provide a completely consistent level of lighting, and allow Jensen absolute freedom in placing the art works. He wanted the same degree of freedom in the Low Gallery and proposed eliminating the courtyard, in favor of a single room that could be subdivided with movable partitions; not unlike the "exhibition machine" at Kunsthaus Zürich that he had rejected in 1956. As Jensen wrote to the architects,

"Let us rather have the big anonymous space for the art exhibitions where the architecture is as neutral as possible and the flexibility as great as possible. Perhaps one might consider letting a little sidelight [window] into a single wall or two, and thus create contact with the surrounding world."[37]

[36] Bo's and Wohlert's sketches for the exhibition building, and Voltelen's drawings for the pyramidal skylights are located in the Architectural Drawings Collection of the National Library of Denmark [Royal Library].

[37] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, 24 February 1964.

By the spring of 1964, the courtyard was gone and Bo was sketching a Low Gallery that could be subdivided by freestanding screens. In spite of the fact that the design was not finished, Jensen could not wait to present the new exhibition building to the world. He unveiled a model of the High Gallery at a press conference in May 1964, announcing that Louisiana would finally be expanding, with a sculpture garden and an exhibition building that would double the area of Louisiana's galleries.[38] **[Figs. 3.44–3.45]** Bo and Wohlert revised the design through the end of 1964, extending the first segment of the Tree Passage to provide art storage and restrooms, and aligning the two galleries to simplify construction. At the same time, they reversed the locations of the galleries, placing the High Gallery at the back of the building, so that it would be less visible from the park. **[Figs. 3.46–3.47]** From the Tree Passage, a few steps would lead down into the Low Gallery and the floor would continue into the High Gallery, creating a mezzanine with stairs on either side. In the basement, a square gallery would allow art to be shown under artificial light.

Evidently, Jensen was still intrigued by the idea of a dual-purpose gallery. The drawing indicates that the two galleries could accommodate nearly 600 chairs for performances and special events. In contrast to the grid of skylights in the High Gallery, the Low Gallery would have separate, more conventional skylights: along the end walls and in the center of the ceiling, where a double skylight could illuminate both sides of a temporary partition. The two galleries could be separated by large sliding doors, but would normally be experienced as a single space with two floor levels, two ceiling heights and two types of daylight.

After the preliminary drawings were made, the estimated cost of the concrete roof structure with custom-made skylights was so high that Jensen decided to construct the building in two phases. Wohlert's office had made the preliminary drawings for the building and he would construct the first phase, with the Low Gallery and a portion of the High Gallery, as well as a basement and the extension along the Tree Passage. Eventually, Bo would complete the building by adding the lower level with the remainder of the High Gallery and installing a new roof with the pyramidal skylights over the entire gallery. It was a compromise on Jensen's part, but after six years of planning, Louisiana would finally have new galleries for temporary exhibitions, a

[38] "Louisiana udvides til det dobbelte," *B.T.*, 6 May 1964.

large room for handling art, and more restrooms. There was even the possibility of hosting lectures and performances in the new half-building.

By June 1965, Wohlert had revised the scheme and begun the process of working drawings. While the Low Gallery would be constructed to match the 58-Building, with whitewashed brickwork and an overhanging roof with teak edges, the High Gallery would be a simple box that was clad in vertical wood boards and stained black for an anonymous appearance. **[Fig. 3.48]** Whenever Jensen had the funds for the second phase of construction, the black wood cladding could simply be extended to cover the rest of the building. Until then, the High Gallery would not have any skylights. In order to provide the gallery with daylight, Wohlert increased the height of the ceiling, from 4.8 meters to 6 meters, and inserted a band of tall windows that faced the park. **[Fig. 3.49]** As he raised the ceiling, the walls at either end of the gallery became very nearly square – a neutral proportion suitable for displaying any type of object, no matter its shape. At the same time, the back wall became a double square, which could accommodate various types of art without infringing on their character.

Wohlert's addition opened in late 1966 with an exhibition of Robert Jacobsen's work and became known as the 66-Building, to distinguish it from what was now known as the 58-Building. As intended, the addition provided the museum with two different galleries that were also very larger and more anonymous that the exhibition spaces in the 58-Building. The Low Gallery was a broad expanse (19 meters wide, 12 meters deep and 3 meters high) made possible by a row of steel beams that were concealed above the ceiling. **[Fig. 3.50]** The gallery was intended to be as flexible as possible and could be subdivided with a temporary wall for displaying paintings, but it was also spacious enough for exhibitions of large sculpture. Opposite the Tree Passage, the space narrowed and continued into the High Gallery, a shallow chamber (12 meters wide, 6 meters high and 6 meters deep) that was illuminated by the clerestory window and had the compressed character of a chapel. **[Fig. 3.51]**

Despite the contrasts with the older galleries – in character, size and lighting – the two new galleries were experienced as a natural extension of the 58-Building. The 12-meter-wide opening at the Tree Passage was aligned with the wooden posts along the passage, providing a sense of continuity from one building to the other. At the entrance, the floor steps down 60 centimeters to allow for higher walls, but the

ceilings of the two buildings are aligned and experienced as a single surface. Aside from the new ceilings, which were painted white to reflect more light, and the four steps of Porsgruun marble, which alert visitors to the change in level, the materials were adopted from the 58-Building. The walls in the Low Gallery were constructed of whitewashed brickwork with recessed joints, and the enormous sliding doors at the Tree Passage were made of Douglas fir. The paving brick used in the 58-Building was no longer available, but Wohlert's assistants located a slightly larger and more rustic paver at the Höganäs works in Sweden. The Swedish bricks were less uniform in color than the original pavers, but the variation was well suited to the large rooms and the Höganäs pavers were used in a number of later additions.

The most obvious sources of continuity between the two buildings were the sightlines to the beech with nine trunks, which oriented the visitors to the park. **[Fig. 3.52]** In this sense, Wohlert's addition restated the original idea of Louisiana in a new and more anonymous manner. It was architecture in a lower key; the materials less assertive, the craftsmanship more restrained; but the addition was distinctly a part of the 58-Building and, by extension, a product of the natural setting.

The 66-Building was critical to Louisiana's development. Beyond the necessities of a room for handling art and more restrooms for the visitors, the two galleries were essential additions to the museum's inventory of exhibition spaces. If Louisiana were going to develop into a major museum with a wide range of exhibitions, it would require galleries with a variety of spatial conditions, ceiling heights and lighting techniques. Despite Jensen's complaints about shadows and occasional direct sun in the lantern galleries; which were remedied by thicker curtains; the 58-Building was excellent for exhibiting many different types of art. Nonetheless, it could not accommodate every form of artistic production; the 66-Building addressed that problem in a practical and organic manner.

Wohlert had satisfied Jensen's demands for flexible galleries with solid walls and an introverted character, but he had done so without sacrificing continuity with the 58-Building and the surroundings. Working in the service of both the art and the visitors, he created a careful balance between flexibility and order – the universal gallery and the local landscape – that emphasized the art, but also provided visitors with a sense of being at Louisiana. The first version of the High Gallery only existed for five years,

but the Low Gallery has proven its utility for more than a half-century. The gallery is still in use and, beyond its importance as an exhibition space, provides a graceful transition from the Tree Passage to the much larger and even brighter galleries that were constructed during the next phase of expansion.

3.7 The 71-Building

For all of its merits, the 66-Building only provided a fraction of the exhibition space that Knud W. Jensen needed to fulfill his ambitions for Louisiana, and he still hoped to realize his goal of even, diffused lighting in the galleries. Two months after the opening of the addition, Jensen wrote to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, asking for a plan that would make full use of the triangular area behind the Tree Passage, and outlining his requirements for an ideal exhibition building,

"An exhibition building that can house even very large exhibitions, or two exhibitions at a time, so that the 1958 buildings need never be used again for changing exhibitions. With a growing collection of Danish and international art it is becoming more and more untenable to store these collections. […] The rooms should be closed, preferably on one floor level, with different wall heights, with the greatest light intensity that can be obtained from skylights, easy for the public to get their bearings in (the circulation problem), easy to keep clean (floor drains), easy for setting up screens, display cases and plinths, and for hanging pictures."

"Architecturally the spaces must be well proportioned, calm (as little disturbance of the art works as possible), not dully neutral, but felt as good functional museum architecture, of varying sizes and heights, which combats monotony. First and foremost, one has to move in a world of art; in an enclosed space that will form an effective contrast with the many open ones in the earlier buildings."[39]

As Jensen writes about moving "in a world of art," it becomes clear that he is referring to self-contained galleries that are completely isolated from the setting. By 1966, Louisiana was routinely hosting important exhibitions that were traveling around Europe. While Louisiana had been established to promote the union of art and everyday life, most major museums draw a sharp distinction between daily life and the artworks they exhibit. Those institutions reinforce that distinction with closed

[39] Knud W. Jensen, "Notat, Funktionsanalyse for Louisianas udstillingsbygning," 31 January 1967.

galleries that provide even lighting and a uniform atmosphere, regardless of the hour or the weather. We can regard Jensen's renewed demand for enclosed galleries as a sign that his ambitions for Louisiana were outgrowing his original vision for the museum. At the same time, contemporary art was outgrowing the 58-Building.

While Louisiana was evolving into a museum of international stature, contemporary art was being transformed in scale, subject matter and materials. The 1964 exhibition *American Pop Art, 106 Forms of Love and Despair*, borrowed from the Moderna Museet in Stockholm, had exposed Jensen to works that exploded the boundary between art and popular culture, and apparently reinforced his ambition to buy contemporary, foreign art. If he had any doubts about the inadequate scale of his galleries, they were dispelled by the 1965 exhibition of James Rosenquist's 86-foot-wide painting *F-111*, an assembly of 10-foot-high canvases that are taller than the walls in the Lantern Galleries, and could only be installed in the lower level of the Lake Gallery. **[Fig. 3.53]** In order to accommodate contemporary art in all of its forms and allow for future developments, Louisiana's new galleries would not only be closed to the surroundings and lit from above, but much larger in scale.

The next addition to Louisiana would be Bo's responsibility; by the time Jensen had secured the funds to move forward, he had also expanded the building program. Rather than simply complete the split-level building that had been designed in 1964, Bo would extend the floor of the Low Gallery and complete the High Gallery on the same level, creating a vast chamber roughly 12 by 16 meters and 6 meters high. Alongside the High Gallery, he would create an entirely new gallery that would be partially buried to reduce its profile. **[Fig. 3.54]** Bo's first draft for this Long Gallery was a simple box, roughly 8 by 30 meters, with 6-meter-high walls and a coffered ceiling that carried a grid of skylights; the second system of top-lighting derived from the Gyldendal building.[40] The lower edges of the roof beams would support a string of light fixtures, while a border of wooden strips would reinforce the shape of the room. **[Fig. 3.55]** The floor of the High Gallery would continue into the Long Gallery and create a mezzanine, where a long stair would provide a dramatic descent to the lower

[40] Model photographs of Bo's initial scheme, which included windows at the end of the Long Gallery, were published in *Berlingske Tidende*, 18 May 1969.

level. Beneath the mezzanine, another opening would lead to the basement of the 66-Building and a stair leading up to Wohlert's Low Gallery.

While Bo was developing the scheme, Jensen added another component to the building: a 100-seat cinema. In addition to the new galleries, Jensen had been planning an underground building beneath the slope in front of the cafeteria. Very little evidence of this scheme has survived, but a 1967 letter describes a concert hall and a cinema for film festivals.[41] By early 1969, Jensen had decided that the cinema would be better located beneath the High Gallery, where it could be used for screenings related to the exhibitions. **[Fig. 3.56]** With the addition of the cinema, the Long Gallery was not only a destination, but also a passageway for crowds of filmgoers. Bo divided the steps into two segments and introduced a change of direction, making the stair more compact. At the same time, he raised the floor at the north end of the gallery, which further reduced the length of the stair and made it a feature of the space, rather than a freestanding object. The result was a single gallery with three different floor levels, and ceiling heights of 3 meters and 4.8 meters. **[Fig. 3.57]** Added together, the existing Low Gallery, the extended High Gallery and the new Long Gallery would create a self-contained West Wing with more than 700 square meters of exhibition space.

Jensen planned to finance the addition with a loan from *Østifternes Kreditforening*, which had helped to finance the 58-Building, but the sum was not sufficient for the entire project. To cover the shortfall, Jensen auctioned the collection of rare books that he had helped his father to assemble during his youth [1.3] and recently inherited from his mother, and then donated to the Louisiana Foundation. The proceeds were deposited into the building fund. Construction finally began in the spring of 1970, but was delayed by the necessity of shoring up the very old house formerly occupied by the harbormaster and then the gardener, so that it would not slide into the construction pit. As part of that work, the slope beneath the building site had to be reinforced with steel sheet piling. As the costs spiraled out of control, Jensen contacted the officers of The Anniversary Fund of 1968; the philanthropic arm of the Danish National Bank,

[41] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, 17 April 1967. Jensen described a later version of the hillside project in a newspaper interview: Knud Cornelius, "Louisianas udbygning til kulturcentrum for Ørestad ligger klar," *Frederiksborg Amts Avis*, 1 January 1970. The article includes a photo of an architectural model. No drawings of the project have been located.

which pledged its support and essentially salvaged the project.[42] The West Wing would be completed, but the cost overruns meant that Jensen's plan for a concert hall would be postponed, indefinitely.

Bo's addition was completed in the autumn of 1971 and – following the convention established by Wohlert's addition – became known as the 71-Building. Jensen signaled his ambitions for Louisiana by inaugurating the West Wing with the exhibition *American Art 1950-70*, which included works by Jim Dine, Donald Judd, Ellsworth Kelly, Roy Lichtenstein, Morris Louis, Frank Stella, and Andy Warhol. **[Fig. 3.58]** All of these artists would soon be represented in the museum's collection. While the ceiling in the Low Gallery was left intact, Bo's new lighting system was installed over the Long Gallery and the extended version of the High Gallery; creating Louisiana's version of conventional, top-lit exhibition space and finally satisfying Jensen's demand for galleries with even, diffused daylight.

To illuminate the galleries, Bo's combined the grid of skylights from his 1964 scheme with the stretched fabric panels used in the Gyldendal building. By 1965, Jensen had concluded that Louisiana would never be able to afford the pyramidal skylights that Bo had developed with Mogens Voltelen.[43] Forced to develop a less costly system, Bo turned to acrylic domes. The domes were supported on a grid of timber beams, which were carried by steel roof beams supported on steel columns within the brick walls. Beneath the steel beams, a suspended ceiling of metal channels and white fiberglass panels concealed the roof structure and diffused the light, spreading it across the room. **[Fig. 3.59]** To prevent shadows on the ceilings, the ductwork and other equipment was placed around the edges of the galleries and concealed by recessed borders of narrow wooden strips, which make the ceilings appear to float.

Working with the lighting manufacturer Louis Poulsen, Bo and his staff integrated a spherical light fixture into the system of fiberglass panels.[44] Their goal was to minimize projections from the ceiling (such as track lights) that would catch the visitor's eye and distract from the experience of the art. The fixtures could be rotated

---

[42] MLL, 183.

[43] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, 7 October 1965. The letter is among Jørgen Bo's drawings in the Architectural Drawings Collection of the National Art Library of Denmark [Royal Library].

[44] The light fixture, known as the *Globespot*, was designed by Einer Graa and Henning Helger, and manufactured by Louis Poulsen.

to adjust the lighting angle according to the height of the wall, and were spaced at intervals of 60 centimeters: a natural subdivision of the 120-centimeter module that governed the construction and determined the width of the ceiling panels. The effect was a union of space, materials and light that was very different from the museum's original galleries, but carried the architectural DNA of the 58-Building. **[Fig. 3.60]**

Just as Wohlert's addition had been an extension of the 58-Building, Bo's addition was very much an extension of the 66-Building. The walls of the Long Gallery were constructed of whitewashed brickwork with raked joints; the woodwork was made of Douglas fir; and the floors were covered with Höganäs pavers. At the same time, the design of the woodwork was simplified, for an even more anonymous appearance. The wooden railing above the stair in the Long Gallery is a simplified version of Wohlert's screen in the Lake Gallery, the handrails are planks bolted to the wall and the borders around the suspended ceilings are rows of narrow sticks. In the cinema, the walls were plastered and the ceiling hung with inexpensive, painted wood panels that were intended to scatter sound waves.

As intended, Bo's addition created a wealth of opportunities for new types of exhibitions. During the extension of the High Gallery, Jensen ordered the removal of Wohlert's clerestory window, restricting the lighting to the ceiling. **[Fig. 3.61]** In both of the new galleries, the ceilings could be covered with opaque mats, to eliminate daylight. The Long Gallery is an especially useful room that provides flexibility without the use of temporary partitions. While a typical gallery has a flat floor and a single ceiling height, the varied ceiling heights in the Long Gallery allow artworks of different scales to comfortably coexist in the same space. Moreover, the stair to the lowest level seems like a natural extension of the route from the mezzanine, rather than the entrance to a cellar, and the lower level of the gallery is experienced as an extension of the higher space.

The completion of the 71-Building marked a turning point in Louisiana's evolution. After thirteen years of planning and struggle, the museum now had an entire wing of galleries that would allow Jensen and his curators to install temporary exhibitions without de-installing the museum's permanent collection. Moreover, those galleries could accommodate large-scale works of art and installations that simply would not fit in the 58-Building, regardless of one's attitude about lighting and ideas about

"competition from nature." Rather than creating a suite of uniform galleries that required temporary partitions, Bo and Wohlert had achieved flexibility through variety. The range of ceiling heights could accommodate many different scales and types of art, and this new "West Wing" could also be subdivided to show multiple exhibitions under different lighting conditions. **[Fig. 3.62]** The opening of *American Art 1950-70* signaled Louisiana's maturation as a museum of contemporary art. It was also the first act in a dramatic transformation that would be attended by an identity crisis, a reorientation of the museum's collection and a series of construction projects that would radically alter both the landscape and the institution.

Analysis

Amid the chaotic process that surrounded Louisiana's expansion during the 1960s, a number of issues invite further study. Knud W. Jensen's rejection of the 58-Building as a model for the museum's expansion is clear, but his motivation is obscure. In fact, it is the central mystery of Louisiana's architectural history. In the search for clues, it is useful to examine the institutions that supported the museum's shift to temporary exhibitions during the early 1960s. Conversely, Bo and Wohlert's joint works beyond Louisiana illuminates their efforts to extend the 58-Building. A comparison between the 58-Building and another private museum constructed during the same period provides further insight. Examining Louisiana's evolution in relation to the anti-art movement of the 1960s illuminates Jensen's institutional agenda, while providing an introduction to the currents that engulfed the museum during the 1970s.

3.8 A New Agenda

Within twelve months of opening Louisiana, Knud W. Jensen had decided to shift the museum's focus from the permanent collection towards temporary exhibitions, and was insisting that any future buildings provide enclosed galleries with overhead lighting. As recorded in Jensen's mission statement, he had always planned to install temporary exhibitions in the Lake Gallery, using works related to the permanent collection. [1.8] However, the opening of the museum enlarged his circle of contacts and range of artistic interests, giving him access to artworks previously unavailable or unknown. It is natural to assume that Jensen's new architectural agenda was rooted in his new exhibition program. But as documented below, he understood that temporary exhibitions do not require enclosed galleries with skylights. Moreover, his redirection of Louisiana's programming was gradual and occurred over several years, while his pivot to enclosed galleries was sudden and decisive.

Considering Jensen's original ambition to construct an important example of Danish architecture – and the fact that the 58-Building was hailed as a masterwork [3.1] – his rejection of that building is puzzling. One clue can be found in his critique of the building, which suggested that the source of his discontent extended beyond seasonal shadows. [3.2] Jensen's phrase "competition from nature" referred to a contest between art and landscape for the visitor's attention, but it also implied a contest between his autobiographical art collection and the building that reveals the landscape. As such, Jensen's phrase can be interpreted to mean "competition from architecture." In fact, as Kay Fisker noted in his review, some members of the public were more enthusiastic about the buildings than the artworks.[45] Jensen's rejection of what Fisker termed "one of the most important works in modern Danish architecture" suggests a determination that Louisiana should be known for the exhibitions.

In tracing Jensen's motivations, it is important to acknowledge that he regarded the entirety of Louisiana as an autobiographical project. As he explained, the sale of the family business to Kraft Foods had liberated him; "No more double life, but a new kind of life that I should try to create for myself." [2.2] Initially, he imagined himself as "a stodgy, comfortable, slightly eccentric country uncle" who would welcome the museum's visitors to his private aesthetic paradise. [2.2] By the completion of the 58–

[45] Kay Fisker, "Louisiana," *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8, 148.

Building, Jensen had adopted another persona more suited to his actual age. It is clear that his placement of Astrid Noack's *Kneeling Figure, Young Man Planting a Tree*, at the entrance to the first gallery, was a symbolic gesture that symbolized his role as the founder of the new museum. [**Fig. 2.32**] The obvious precedent can be found at the Faaborg Museum, where Kai Nielsen's sculpture of the founder; Mads Rasmussen, is also illuminated by a round skylight. In time, Jensen would title his autobiography *Mit Louisiana-liv*, as though his four decades prior to establishing the museum were merely a prelude to his life's work.

Reviewing Louisiana's exhibition history during the early years, it becomes evident that Jensen's demand for enclosed galleries was unrelated to his work with foreign museums. Examining the three institutions that supported Jensen's shift towards temporary exhibitions circa 1959–60, we find that none of them provided a plausible model for his new architectural agenda. Louisiana's first important display of foreign art was the 1959 shipment of paintings from *documenta II*, the second edition of the quadrennial exhibitions of contemporary art in Kassel, then West Germany.[46] During 1960–65, Louisiana borrowed a series of exhibitions from the Stedelijk Museum, in Amsterdam; and Moderna Museet, in Stockholm, that were fundamental to changes in Louisiana's programming, public profile and future collection.[47] As described in *Mit Louisiana-liv*, each of those institutions was led by a charismatic figure whom Jensen regarded as a role model: Arnold Bode, founder of *documenta*; Willem Sandberg, director of the Stedelijk Museum; and Pontus Hultén, director of Moderna Museet.[48]

Evidently, Jensen met all three of these inspiring figures through Denise René, the Parisian art dealer who specialized in Constructivism and other forms of geometric abstraction.[49] Her roster of artists included Robert Jacobsen and Richard Mortensen, and she apparently supplied Louisiana with many of the works in the second Lantern Gallery **[Fig. 2.XX]**. As Kristian Handberg has revealed, it was René who advised Jensen to visit *documenta II* (11 July – 11 October 1959) and to write Arnold Bode in

[46] *Værker fra Documenta* (20 October – 5 November 1959).

[47] The exhibitions borrowed from the Stedelijk Museum were *Vitality in Art* (1960), *Kasimir Malevich* (1960), *Stedelijk Museum Visits Louisiana* (1961) and *Vincent van Gogh* (1963). Moderna Museet was equally supportive, sending *Movement in Art* (1961), *Moderna Museet Visits Louisiana* (1961), *American Pop Art. 106 Forms of Love and Despair* (1964), and *F-111* (1965).

[48] MLL, 50-74.

[49] We can assume that Jensen first met Madame René in 1951, when she opened *Klar Form*, a traveling exhibition of works by her artists that was installed at Charlottenborg. See MLL, 41.

advance of his visit, asking to borrow some of the artworks after the exhibition closed.[50] **[Figs. 3.69–71]** Jensen wrote that letter on 21 August 1959 and traveled to Kassel later that month, after he had formulated his critique of the 58–Building. Even if he had attended the opening, Bode's installation of the painting section – derived from the Constructivist experiments of the 1920s [2.7] – bore no resemblance to the enclosed galleries with skylights that Jensen now required from his architects.[51]

We can infer that René also provided Jensen with introductions to Sandberg and Hultén, during the planning for Louisiana's exhibition *Robert Jacobsen* (10 October – 15 November 1959). That exhibition traveled to both Moderna Museet (5 January – 7 February 1960) and the Stedelijk Museum (10 March – 18 April 1960), probably at René's suggestion. Sandberg was a proponent of Constructivism, which was largely a Dutch development, and René supplied a number of works to the Stedelijk Museum. In addition, she had known Hultén since his years in Paris, during the early 1950s, when he co-curated *Le Mouvement* (April 1955) at Galerie Denise René.[52] Given the multiple venues, the planning for *Robert Jacobsen* would have started before the summer of 1959. As such, it is evident that Jensen was familiar with the Stedelijk Museum and Moderna Museet, even as he was writing his critique of the 58-Building.

Considering Jensen's expressed admiration for Willem Sandberg, we might imagine that he found inspiration for Louisiana's expansion at the Stedelijk Museum. But the so-called *Sandbergvieugel* (Sandberg Wing), which was designed for temporary exhibitions and opened in 1954, was antithetical to Jensen's plans for Louisiana's

---

[50] Kristian Handberg, "The Shock of the Contemporary: documenta II and the Louisiana Museum," *Oncurating*, no. 23 (June 2017): 34. Available for download at: www.on-curating.org/issue-9.html. Accessed 16 December 2018. In 1959, Jensen's 1959 account of his visit focused on the sculpture. See "Indtryk fra Documenta," *Louisiana 1959 Årbog*, 61–75 (full citation in Note 3). In 1986, Jensen wrote of his "documenta-chok," which provided "[…] a new perspective on how the collection could and should have been and what the museum should display in its future exhibitions." See MLL, 50–53. And yet, if Jensen visited any edition of the Venice Biennale between 1948 and 1956, he would have seen works by many of the painters he claimed to have discovered in Kassel, even if their works were too abstract for his taste at the time. Jensen's *mea culpa* can also be read as a means of rationalizing his original, exclusively Danish collection and the shift in the museum's artistic focus that began in 1959.

[51] See Klaus Franck, *Exhibitions* (New York: Praeger, 1961), 88–89. Nonetheless, as Handberg noted, Bode's outdoor installations of sculpture had a direct influence on Jensen's installation of Robert Jacobsen's work, six weeks later. Compare **Fig. 3.3** and **Fig. 3.65.**

[52] The exhibition included works by Robert Jacobsen, Alexander Calder, Marcel Duchamp, and Jean Tinguely, and served as the prototype for the 1961 exhibition *Movement in Art*. See Note 4 in Patrik Andersson, "The Inner and Outer Space. Rethinking movement in art," in *Pontus Hultén and Moderna Museet: The Formative Years*, ed. Anna Tellgren, trans. Gabriella Berggren (Stockholm: Moderna Museet; London: Koenig Books, 2017), 39–63. As well: Calvin Tompkins, "A Good Monster." [Profile: Pontus Hultén] *The New Yorker*, 16 January 1978: 42.

expansion. Designed by Amsterdam City Architect Johannes Leupen, with a great deal of input from Sandberg, the building was a two-story framework of reinforced concrete with full-height windows on both sides.[53] **[Figs. 3.72–74]** While the windows met Sandberg's requirement for lighting that would recall an artist's studio, the structure followed his demand for a modest, neutral architecture based on industrial materials and construction techniques; as he later described it, "no marble; no velvet; no Greek columns; no skylights."[54] The Sandberg Wing might well have appealed to Jensen in 1956, but it was precisely opposite to his architectural agenda in 1959.

We arrive at a similar observation by examining the premises of Moderna Museet, which was established as a satellite of Sweden's National Museum and initially located in a decommissioned naval base on the island of Skeppsholmen. In 1958, Pontus Hultén opened the museum as a curator; after becoming director in 1960, he staged a series of provocative and groundbreaking exhibitions, including *Rörelse i konsten* (Movement in Art, 1961), *Den Inre och Den Yttre Rymden* (The Inner and The Outer Space, 1965) and Andy Warhol's first museum exhibition (1968).[55] **[Figs. 3.75–76]** But all of those exhibitions were presented in brick buildings with exposed timber trusses and large windows, which were more-or-less primitive versions of Louisiana's lantern galleries. Moreover, Jensen's critique of the 58–Building rejected Hultén's reliance on temporary partitions: "The hall should preferably not be one large square or rectangular room with plenty of free-standing screens, as in Moderne [sic] Museet in Stockholm."[56]

Collectively, the three institutions in Kassel, Amsterdam, and Stockholm provided the basis for Louisiana's institutional development during the 1960s and into the 1970s: sponsoring the museum's entry into the international art world, shaping Jensen's artistic interests and providing role models for his work as a museum director.[57] The

---

[53] Leupen delegated the interior to his colleagues F.A. Eschauzier and J. Sargentini. See Paul Kempers, *Binnen was buiten: de Sandbergvieugel Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2010), 72–73.

[54] Ibid., 36. Excerpted from Willem Sandberg, "Museum at the Crossroads," Herbert Read Lecture, Institute of Contemporary Art, London, 22 September 1973. Published in *Museum in Motion? The Modern Art Museum at Issue*, ed. Carel Blotkamp, et al. (Den Haag, Staatsuitgevrij, 1979), 329.

[55] See Patrik Andersson, "The Inner and the Outer Space. Rethinking movement in art." and Anna Lundström, "Movement in Art. The layers of an exhibition." in *Pontus Hultén and Moderna Museet,* 39–63; 67–93. See Note 52 for full citation.

[56] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, "Bemærkninger om udvidelserne på Louisiana," 20 July 1959, 6.

[57] MLL, 50-74.

fact that none of those institutions inspired his turn to conventional galleries indicates that his institutional agenda and his architectural agenda were evolving independently. Despite Jensen's critique of the 58-Building, he eventually recognized that it was suitable for many different types of contemporary art. As he explained in 1962,

"It has been found that temporary exhibitions do not need a great deal of flexibility in the room arrangement. The current Louisiana, which of course is not very flexible, is extremely useful for changing exhibitions and most of the exhibits look considerably better off with us than in the large museum halls in Stockholm and Amsterdam, where the troubling arrangement of small screens form a bewildering total picture. I have compared the impression of the same show in different places."[58]

Jensen continued his letter by insisting, as previously documented, that any future buildings create an "absolute contrast with the old Louisiana, so that there is balance between closed and open spaces of the whole edifice."[59] As well, he restated his demand for overhead lighting,

"The spaces must be illuminated as strongly as possible by overhead light. Louisiana's current lighting conditions are far from ideal, because the lush vegetation around the buildings steals a great deal of light. Contemporary art requires more light than historical art, the paintings actually cannot get enough light."[60]

Surveying the evidence – Jensen's autobiographical conception of the museum, the extraordinary popular success of the 58-Building, the autonomous character of his new architectural agenda – the solution to Louisiana's central mystery presents itself. By insisting on generic exhibition spaces, Jensen hoped to neutralize Bo and Wohlert's future contributions to the museum. The additions to the museum would not be celebrated masterworks, but anonymous backdrops for Jensen's programming.

Beginning in 1962, Jensen's instructions to Bo and Wohlert became increasingly precise, which suggests that he had arrived at a definitive model for Louisiana's expansion. Having eliminated the three obvious points of reference; *documenta*, Stedelijk Museum and Moderna Museet; our attention turns to the Bührle Wing at

[58] Knud W. Jensen to Bo and Wohlert, "Responsum om Louisiana's byggeri, Juli 1962. Udstillingsbygningen. Projektet af 1961," 1. Jensen was evidently referring to *Movement in Art*.

[59] Ibid., 2.

[60] Ibid.

Kunsthaus Zürich [2.7]. Jensen's instructions to the architects do not refer to the Swiss museum, but they do record his gradual acceptance of temporary partitions and growing fascination with illuminated ceilings. The vast hall in Zürich might not have been a conscious source of inspiration in 1962, when Jensen declared that "paintings actually cannot get enough light", but it was almost certainly in his thoughts, in 1964,

"Let us rather have the big anonymous space for the art exhibitions where the architecture is as neutral as possible and the flexibility as great as possible."[61]

The implicit reference to Kunsthaus Zürich was even more pronounced in 1967,

"We can never get enough daylight! […] Artificial lighting in the roof construction can also now be complemented with spotlights."[62]

The importance of the Bührle Wing to Louisiana's expansion is reinforced by a comparison of the exhibition histories in Humlebæk and Zürich.[63] During 1961–65, Louisiana presented a series of exhibitions that were circulating through Europe and had already appeared at Kunsthaus Zürich: *Henry Moore*, *5000 Years of Egyptian Art*, *Mexican Masterpieces* **[Fig. 3.77]**, *Jackson Pollock*, *Sengai*, *Max Ernst* and *Alberto Giacometti*. The number of shared exhibitions might be a coincidence based on Louisiana's need for programming, but it indicates that Jensen had not forgotten about René Wehrli's "exhibition machine." It also suggests that Jensen made periodic visits to Kunsthaus Zürich during the early 1960s, to preview exhibitions that would appear at Louisiana. As a result of Jensen's instructions to his architects and the overlapping exhibition histories, it is reasonable to infer that the flexible exhibition space in Zürich provided the primary model for Louisiana's expansion after 1962.

Examining Bo and Wohlert's early expansion schemes for Louisiana, 1959–63, there can be no doubt that they hoped to expand the museum using the modern vernacular language they had employed for the 58-Building. Those schemes also reveal their commitment to developing that language according to the requirements of program and setting. As seen in "Plan A" and "Plan B," the continued use of the modern

[61] Knud W. Jensen, letter to Bo and Wohlert, 24 February 1964, 2.

[62] Knud W. Jensen, "Notat, Funktionsanalyse for Louisianas udstillingsbygning," 31 January 1967, 5.

[63] Pernille Stensgaard's book on Louisiana contains a list of temporary exhibitions during 1958–2008; see the bibliography. The exhibition history of Kunsthaus Zürich is recorded in a document compiled by the museum, "Ausstellungen 1910–2019."

vernacular language would not have generated more lantern galleries, but different configurations of space and elements. That same commitment is also evident in the single-family houses and other projects they designed during after Louisiana opened, including the project for an apartment building in Cologne.[64] **[Fig. 3.78]** Working with others, both architects applied the modern vernacular to institutional programs that required enclosed spaces, as seen in the churches that Wohlert designed with Rolf Graae and the complex of educational buildings that Bo designed with Karen and Ebbe Clemmensen. **[Figs. 3.79–3.80]** Bo and Wohlert were so consistent in their work that Stensgaard Church and the Blågaard-Enghavegaard complex might easily be mistaken for two of their joint works.

At Louisiana, Jensen's insistence on enclosed galleries made it impossible for Bo and Wohlert to continue using the modern vernacular language, which relies on a contrast between solid walls and transparent surfaces. However, Bo and Wohlert's work on the 58-Building followed a set of principles that preceded their work at Louisiana and were independent of any specific architectural language or spatial model. [2.9] Determined to maintain some degree of consistency between Louisiana's buildings, the two architects would apply the underlying strategies of the 58-Building to the design of enclosed exhibition spaces.

In each of the later buildings, the arrangements of interior space would be determined according to the character of the topography. Each new building would be designed using the cubic module that Wohlert had established in 1956 (60 x 60 x 60 cm.) or a multiple of that module that followed the introduction of steel framing. Within each building, the character of the exhibition spaces would be determined by the materials; typically whitewashed brick walls and red-brown pavers. Throughout the museum, the architects would employ repetitive elements to reveal the modular nature of the spaces. Each of the new buildings would create a meandering path through a series of contrasting spaces that were derived from the setting.

As a result of Bo and Wohlert's consistent approach, the additions to Louisiana would be experienced as variations on the 58–Building, despite the shift to enclosed spaces.

[64] "Haus Pesch," *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 5: 163. As well: *Mobilia* no. 50 (September 1959), unpaginated. The unrealized scheme records Wohlert's continuing interest in Frank Lloyd Wright's work, with a pin-wheel plan inspired by Wright's Suntop Homes, in Ardmore, Pennsylvania (1938–39).

In this way, the two architects were able to accommodate Jensen's demands without sacrificing the museum's architectural identity. They would encounter resistance from their client, whose involvement became increasingly detailed and resulted in several deviations from standard practices. Nonetheless, the additions to Louisiana would be sufficiently consistent to provide visitors with a continuous experience between the different phases of construction. While the most visible references to the 58–Building are in found in the use of materials, the most profound references occur in the paths through the exhibition spaces, which substitute unions of architecture and art for the original union of architecture and landscape.

3.9 Constructed Landscapes

Knud W. Jensen's decision to construct a sculpture garden at Louisiana was a direct extension of the aesthetic impulse that led him to establish the museum. In fact, he began placing sculptures in the park before the 58-Building was completed, in a manner that recalled the open-air exhibitions in London, Arnhem and Antwerp. **[Figs. 3.81–3.82]** As such, we can regard Jensen's installation of the figurative sculptures from the Middelheim Museum, in 1964, as the final act in a drama that had begun in 1951, or earlier. With the opening of *Middelheim Visits Louisiana*, Jensen had finally succeeded in creating his own version of the museum that had so inspired his work in Humlebæk. It is hardly a coincidence that Louisiana's original collection included duplicates of the sculptures by Adam Fischer and Astrid Noack that the Belgians had purchased for their museum, in 1951.[65] [1.8]

Despite Jensen's use of the Middelheim Museum as a model, Louisiana's sculpture garden presented a radical alternative to the typical placement of sculpture in the landscape. To better understand Ole Nørgaard's terraced earthwork, it is helpful to read the notes that Jensen compiled following his 1963 study trip to Hamburg and the Low Countries, where he gathered impressions for various projects at Louisiana.[66] The itinerary included the Middelheim Museum, where Jensen arranged the loans for

[65] See *Katalog over Louisiana – Samling af nutidskunst og kunsthåndværk*, ed. Pierre Lübecker (Humlebæk: Louisiana, 1958), unpaginated.

[66] Knud W. Jensen, "Rejsenotat 21. – 25. maj 1963." Jensen's notes visits to eleven institutions, where he studied every aspect of museum operations from toilets to lighting techniques. Evidently, Nørgaard, Bo and Wohlert accompanied Jensen on at least part of the journey, as seen in the photo from Antwerp that records a mock arrest by the police. See *Mit Louisiana-liv*, second ed., 133.

the 1964 exhibition, as described in the Documentation; and the Kröller-Müller Museum, near Arnhem, which had opened a sculpture park in 1961. As Jensen noted,

"Kröller-Müller: Sculpture Park unsuccessful. Forest area with lobed, oblong grass lots filled with sculptures that do not suit each other (difficult mixing figurative and abstract art together, better separate). It's quite a neat placement of [Henry] Moore, fun to see the area from above. The idea of the floating sculpture is funny, but here turned into decorative art. Learning from the Kröller-Müller how it should not be done."

"Mittelheim: Better than I remembered it. Terrible groups alternate with successful single-setups. The effect is best where the sculpture is isolated; disastrous at large accumulations of cloaked men, polar bears, eagles, naked ladies and abstract sculptures: a cacophony of incompatible sizes. Some sculptures fine between large groups. Where planting (crowns of trees, for example) forms the imaginary semicircular space (as around Meunier), freestanding sculpture is fine. Sculptures by weeping willow and azalea bushes have a quiet yet vibrant background. Pedestals awful, a major problem, by the way."[67]

Reading Jensen's comments, it becomes clear that Nørgaard's terraces were not only a response to the setting, but also to the problems of visual separation that are inherent in open-air exhibitions. Nørgaard explained those problems, and his intention to develop an alternative model, in a description of his own work at Louisiana,

"Sculpture has detached itself from architecture, or perhaps the cleavage was forced. […] Thereby the artist may have gained more independence and richer means of expression, but his works have lost those qualities that emerge from interplay with their surroundings. This can be experienced in the worst form at the big exhibitions of sculpture, where the individual piece often has to be viewed on a kaleidoscopic background of other sculptures, flowering shrubs, and a multitude of visitors. From these experiences, when the new sculpture section in the Louisiana garden was designed, an attempt was made to overcome these difficulties, at the same time working to respect the intrinsic value of the individual piece of sculpture and its requirements of open space and independence of fixed architectonic uses of form."

"The many-angled boundaries of the orchard together with the boundaries round the sculpture garden form a number of sites, emphasized by the terraces of the sloping

[67] Knud W. Jensen, "Rejsenotat 21. – 25. maj 1963," 1–2.

terrain. Not strictly defined sites, they are just indicated, but with their horizontal planes and rectangular form make it possible for the individual pieces of sculpture to be viewed without a distracting background."[68]

Nørgaard's terraces – his "not strictly defined sites" – provided an intermediate state between clearly defined courtyards and the amorphous space of a picturesque landscape. We find precedents for those shallow trays of space in his second-prize entry to the 1951 competition for Lyngby Chapel and Crematoria, where a continuous hedge defined the burial plots; and in the sloping parterre of clipped hedges that he and C. Th. Sørensen designed for the square facing Vor Frue Kirke, in Kalundborg (1952–55). **[Figs. 3.83–84]** It is tempting to attribute Nørgaard's preoccupations with geometry and clipped vegetation to his years with Sørensen, as an employee from 1951 or 1952 and partner during 1955–1958.[69] However, it is logical to assume that Nørgaard's formative experience was his training as an architect, at the Royal Academy, during 1945–48. Why Nørgaard ended up renouncing buildings for landscape and how he became Sørensen's protégé are important questions for future scholarship.[70]

Nørgaard was not alone in seeking an alternative to the conventional placement of sculpture in the landscape, nor was Jensen unique in imagining an alternative to conventional museums. In July 1964, six weeks prior to the opening of Louisiana's sculpture garden, the French art dealers Aimé and Marguerite Maeght inaugurated *Fondation Maeght* (the Maeght Foundation), near Saint-Paul-de-Vence, in Provence. That private museum features permanent outdoor installations of sculpture, including an ensemble of works by Joan Miró. Miró installed his works in *The Labyrinth*; a series of undulating terraces that were planned with his involvement and tailored to the artworks. **[Figs. 3.85]** In fact, there are few commonalities between Nørgaard's

[68] Ole Nørgaard, "The Louisiana Sculpture Garden," *Mobilia*, no. 116 (March 1965): unpaginated.

[69] For Nørgaard's 1951 competition entry, see *Arkitekten* (U) 1952, no. 19: 145–151. As well: Malene Hauxner, *Med himlen som loft* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2003), 158–159. For the work in Kalundborg, see Hauxner, 117; and Sven-Ingvar Andersson, Steen Høyer, *C.Th. Sørensen – en havekunstner* (København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2001), 88–93.

[70] According to Weilbach, Ole Nørgaard was employed for two years in the office of Povl Hoff and Bennet Windige, immediately following his graduation from the School of Architecture at the Royal Academy. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive survey of the many important works that Ole and Edith Nørgaard created between 1953 and 1978. The most numerous references are found in Hauxner's *Med himlen som loft* and in Johannes Hedel Hansen, *Eva og Nils Koppel* (København: Strandberg Publishing, 2017).

constructed landscape and Miró's symbolic landscape; one embodies the character of the setting, the other is a union of sculptural space and form. A comparison between the buildings at the two museums reveals the same stark contrast, but also provides insight into Bo and Wohlert's efforts to expand Louisiana.

In 1945, Aimé and Marguerite Maeght established their gallery in Paris and quickly attracted a roster of modern masters that included Miró, Georges Braque, Fernand Léger and Alexander Calder. Four years later, the Maeghts purchased a hillside property in their native Provence, where they constructed a summer retreat. Following the death of their son in 1953, the couple decided to create a memorial, in the form of an ideal setting for the art they promoted and collected.[71] Similarly to Knud W. Jensen, the Maeghts hoped to create an alternative to a conventional museum. While Jensen regarded traditional institutions as unwelcoming to people [1.4], the Maeghts regarded them as unwelcoming to art: tomb-like places where the products of creative struggle were enshrined and emptied of their vitality.[72] As a corrective, the Maeghts would involve their artists in the design of the new foundation and pursue a unity of art, architecture and landscape.

In 1957, the Maeghts visited Miró at his new home-studio on Mallorca, which was designed by José Lluis Sert, the Catalan architect who had worked for Le Corbusier during 1929, returned to Paris during the Spanish Civil War and immigrated to the United States, in 1939. Soon after the visit, Aimé Maeght wrote to Sert and offered him the commission for the Maeght Foundation. Even before Sert began work on the design, in late 1958, he and his clients had agreed on a village-like complex of buildings that would incorporate artworks by Braque, Miró, Marc Chagall, Pierre Tal-Coat and Raoul Ubac.[73] Sert had been preoccupied with the integration of art and architecture at least as early as 1936, when he and Luis Lacasa designed the *Pabellón*

[71] *Sert. Half a Century of Architecture: 1928-1979. Complete Work*, ed. Josep M. Rovira (Barcelona: Fundació Joan Miró, 2005), 235–245. As well: *José Luis Sert; Architecture, City Planning, Urban Design*, ed. Knud Bastlund (New York: Praeger, 1967), 170–191.

[72] Jan K. Birksted, *Modernism and the Mediterranean: The Maeght Foundation* (Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004), 16–17. Birksted obliquely refers to Alphonse de Lamartine's equation between museums and cemeteries [2.3, Note 17], and quotes the philosopher Marcel Merleau-Ponty, "The museum kills the vehemence of painting."

[73] For the schedule and organization of the project, see Rovera. For the site-specific artworks, see José Luis Sert, "The Integration of the Visual Arts," in Bastlund, 168.

Espanol at the World Exposition in Paris, as a showcase for artworks intended to raise awareness of the Spanish Civil War and attract support for the Republican cause.[74]

By early 1959, Sert had divided the architectural program for the Foundation into three parts. The main building (the Town Hall) would include a double-height gallery, along with a library and offices; a one-story building (the Cloister) would provide unique rooms for works by Braque, Miró, Marc Chagall and Wassily Kandinsky, as well as a hall for temporary exhibitions; a house for the foundation director could also accommodate visiting artists. **[Figs. 3.86–91]** The new buildings and an existing chapel would be connected with patios and a series of terraces supported by the dry-set walls of *pierre de Provence* that are common to the region. Between the two exhibition buildings, the main patio would be populated by a group of Giacometti's upright figures, while Miró's Labyrinth provided a transition with the slope. Construction began in October 1960 and the new institution was inaugurated on 28 July 1964, with a speech by André Malraux that included the statement "This is not a museum."[75]

At the Maeght Foundation, Sert addressed the gap between universal technology and regional culture, by combining reinforced concrete structures with local materials. Gaps within the concrete frames were filled with local bricks or shading devices constructed of volcanic stone. The quarter-round vaults that illuminate the galleries in the Cloister and the inverted canopies that crown the Town Hall were derived from vernacular examples that moderate the intense light and heat of the Mediterranean sun. The result was a thoughtful adaptation of modernist principles and techniques to a specific building tradition. From that perspective, Sert's work at the Foundation can be considered as a parallel to Bo and Wohlert's combination of modern architectural space and traditional construction practices in the 58-Building. However, there are such fundamental differences between the two museums that they can also be understood as polar opposites in both conception and experience.

A comparison between the 58-Building and the Maeght Foundation reveals a number of polarities – craft vs. artistry; assembly vs. modeling; materials vs. forms. The sum of these oppositions is the difference between a constructed version of the landscape

[74] The artworks included Miró's mural *Catalan Peasant in Revolt*, Calder's *Mercury Fountain*, and Pablo Picasso's *Guernica*. See Lohse, 36–41; Bastlund, 38–45; and Rovira, 105–107.

[75] Rovira, 237. See Note 71 for full citation.

and the architectural equivalent of sculpture. As a result, we can recognize two types of museum architecture with very different capacities for evolution. Following Le Corbusier, Sert believed that architecture is the creative equivalent of painting and sculpture; he was determined to create a personal, artistic statement derived from the particulars of the setting: landscape, climate and culture.[76] The resulting complex of buildings and patios recalls his master's dictum that "Architecture is the masterly, correct and magnificent play of masses brought together in light."[77]

Despite his genuine commitment to *genius loci*, Sert created a museum with a monumental character; which is not a function of size, but of intention.[78] He imagined the Foundation as a modernist equivalent to the medieval hill towns of the region, using Saint-Paul-de-Vence as a point of reference.[79] The result was a sculptural composition of masses and voids, to which nothing can be added or subtracted without undermining the whole. The complete and self-contained character of Sert's work would make it nearly impossible to extend the museum without undermining the original scheme. Any new buildings would have to replicate the formal vocabulary of the original complex, as seen in Sert's unrealized expansion scheme, circa 1976, which projected a theater, cafeteria and additional galleries.[80] **[Fig. 3.92]** The Maeght Foundation continues to host important exhibitions, but the architecture is essentially unchanged from 28 July 1964.

In contrast to Sert's monument, Bo and Wohlert created a building that was essentially incomplete. Despite the precise construction, the 58-Building was not conceived as an independent structure, but an extension to the villa. As a result, it lacked any distinct identity or autonomous figural quality. There were no spatial hierarchies or artful contrasts between symmetry and asymmetry, but rather a chain of standard building segments that were assembled from repetitive elements. The only

[76] As Sert's assistant explained, "One should also attribute some of the Maeght Foundation's formal richness to a moment of euphoria. […] It was a gesture of pure form," Birksted, 27.

[77] Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture*, trans. Frederick Etchells (New York, Dover Publications, 1986), 29. Sert dimensioned the complex using Le Corbusier's *Modulor*; see Rovera, 240.

[78] See the 1943 statement by J. L. Sert, F. Léger and S. Giedion, "Nine Points on Monumentality," reprinted in *Architecture Culture, 1943–1968: A Documentary Anthology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Rizzoli, 1993), 27–30.

[79] Rovira, 235.

[80] Birksted, 131–134.

formal logic was the module derived from the brickwork, which produced a generic set of proportions based on squares and cubes. Because the 58-Building was not a self-contained composition, the architects would be able to construct extensions at various points, in different ways, without undermining the existing building. As Wohlert later explained,

"In principle, Louisiana was also a completed facility, albeit compositionally open. The later additions are conceived and designed as new buildings on their own terms, which today gives the place its distinctive character. […] However, the rhythm is maintained. Jørgen Bo and I have had the philosophy in common."[81]

We can regard Wohlert's "terms" as a reference to Jensen's requirements for the new buildings. The most salient example of Bo and Wohlert's "philosophy" is the direct relationship between architectural space and the terrain, which is at once continuous and constantly changing. In contrast to Sert's metaphorical village, Bo and Wohlert derived the layout of the 58-Building from the setting, which was then ordered by the construction module. [2.3] This intersection of geometry and topography is most apparent in the Tree Passage, where the twists were determined by the trees, and in the three galleries, where the differences were the result of the locations; either in the slope or on the plateau. As the architects extended the museum, their consistent use of this topographic method would produce variations between the buildings, even as the modules and materials provided continuity.

Sert's sculptural architecture was inseparable from his use of reinforced concrete, which has no innate character and provides unlimited formal possibilities. Bo and Wohlert deliberately limited their means of expression to the innate qualities of the natural materials and the elaboration of the construction. Their primary concern was interior space, as defined by boards, bricks, posts and beams that had no architectural character until they were assembled. Paradoxically, Bo and Wohlert's limited means of expression would provide them with a great deal of flexibility as they worked to expand Louisiana. Confronted with Knud W. Jensen's new architectural agenda, they could assemble their units of material in new configurations that would be consistent with the 58-Building, as long as "the philosophy" remained intact.

---

[81] See Eric Messerschmidt, "En samtale med Vilhelm Wohlert: Man skal være ydmyg i sit udgangspunkt," *Arkitektur DK* 1991, no. 7: 337.

At both Louisiana and the Maeght Foundation, the buildings represent a precise alignment of architectural and institutional agendas. Sert's pursuit of unity between art and architecture corresponded to the Maeght's desire for an ideal cultural institution characterized by the integration of the visual arts. Bo and Wohlert's pursuit of unity between landscape and architecture corresponded to Knud W. Jensen's vision of a museum characterized by the natural setting. While Bo and Wohlert carried on a dialogue with the landscape, Sert carried on a dialogue with Miró, Braque and the other artists. As a result of these varied intentions, we can identify the fundamental difference between the two museums: the visitor's experience of the exhibition.

Sert's work is, in essence, part of the museum's collection: the super-work of art that unites all of the other artworks, both indoors and outdoors, into a total environment. As a result of this unity, a visitor leaves the familiar world and enters a self-contained world of art; like the enchanted castle in a fairy tale. The separation between the two worlds is made explicit at the entrance, where a bridge crosses over a symbolic moat. In contrast, the 58-Building was distinct from Louisiana's collection and played an intermediate role between the landscape and the exhibition, anchoring the artists' private visions in the shared reality of the natural world. In this way, the architecture advanced the union of art and everyday life that was Louisiana's founding principle.

3.10 The Dynamic Museum

During the late 1950s; while the two sets of clients and architects, in Humlebæk and Saint-Paul-de-Vence, worked to create idyllic settings for painting and sculpture; a cultural movement was taking shape in direct opposition to such refined settings and traditional forms of artistic expression. In place of a single group, we can recognize an array of collectives and factions that varied in their politics and practices, but shared an ambition to create artworks as a form of social criticism. In Europe, the epicenter of the "anti-art" movement was Paris, where many of the participants adhered to one of several esoteric interpretations of Marxism and hoped to dissolve the boundary between art and everyday life, following the theories of the sociologist Henri Lefebvre.[82] Despite a diversity of techniques, these cultural dissidents shared an

[82] Lefebvre's "critique of everyday life," introduced in his 1947 book of the same title, became part of the fabric of French, post-war intellectual life. See Michael Gardiner, "Utopia and Everyday Life in French Social Thought," *Utopian Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1995): 90–123.

ambition to revive the subversive energy of the pre-war avant-garde, by employing Dadaist strategies of collage and the use of found objects.

One of the central figures in this neo-Dadaist movement was the French art critic Pierre Restany, who regarded traditional forms of artistic practice as obsolete,

"Easel painting (like every other type of classical means of expression in the domain of painting or sculpture) has had its day. At the moment it lives on in the last remnants, still sometimes sublime, of its long monopoly."[83]

Restany believed that contemporary art required an engagement with consumer society, through the "poetic recycling of urban, industrial and advertising reality."[84] To this end, he championed a group of artists who often worked with discarded objects and/or the junk of popular culture, including Arman, César, Christo, Yves Klein, Daniel Spoerri, Niki de St. Phalle, and Jean Tinguely. **[Figs. 3.93–3.95]** Restany labeled them *Les Nouveaux Réalistes*.[85] Restany believed that the transformation of art would also require the reform of the art museum, in order to make the new art accessible to the general public. In 1967, he published the first in a series of four articles on progressive European museums, which appeared in the Italian journal *Domus*.[86] He introduced the series by contrasting what he called the "dynamic museum" with traditional museums devoted to collection and conservation,

"When discussing contemporary museography one inevitably stumbles on the problem of the social function of art. With respect to this function, the immobile museum, the temple-museum, the museum as the final consecration of the work of art (which then becomes the everlasting patrimony of the Nation or of the community) may no longer be sufficient. The function of the museum in contemporary society may also have something to do with the informing of the community – it is after all part of the community's natural right – of the latest developments of art in its own time, and of what the latest experiments might be."

---

[83] Pierre Restany, "Les Nouveaux Réaliste," in *Arman, Dufrêne, Hains, Yves Klein, Villeglé, Tinguely* [exhibition catalog] (Milan, Galerie Apollinaire, 1960).

[84] Pierre Restany, *60/90: Trente ans de Nouveau Réalisme* (Paris: La Différence, 1990), 76.

[85] See Michèle C. Cone, "Pierre Restany and the Nouveaux Réalistes," *Yale French Studies*, no. 98, *The French Fifties*, ed. Susan Weiner (2000): 50–65. And: Benjamin Buchloh in *1945 to the Present*, vol. 2 of *Art Since 1900* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2004), 434–438.

[86] *Domus* no. 453 (August 1967): 45–50 [Giron]; no. 454 (Sept. 1967): 53–57 [Sandberg]; no. 459 (Feb. 1968): 52–56 [Hultén]; no. 461 (April 1968): 50–54 [Stanislawski].

"The concept of the immobile museum focuses on permanent collections and its activities are usually limited to belated homages to great artists in the form of vast retrospectives or to non-engagées international shows, which form the currency of international cultural exchanges. On the contrary, the concept of a dynamic museum is that of an information centre and a laboratory of living art; this must reflect in its various activities the accelerating rhythm of contemporary artistic life."[87]

Restany followed this comparison with profiles of "[…] the men, the institutions, and the cultural policy that correspond to the new orientation of contemporary creative thought" that summarized their policies and major exhibitions. His subjects were Robert Giron and the Palais des Beaux Arts, in Brussels; Willem Sandberg and the Stedelijk Museum; Pontus Hultén and Moderna Museet; and Richard Stanislawski at Museum Sztuki, in Lodz, Poland.

Restany's critique of traditional cultural institutions and forms of artistic practice was paralleled by a group of architects, who rejected the conventions of professional practice and pursued architectural design as a form of art and/or social criticism. By 1966, it was possible to recognize an architectural avant-garde in Europe, whose members created visionary schemes that were intended as forms of provocation or protest, depending on their political commitment.[88] While the Pop-architects in England were more inclined towards entertainment, a number of activist-architects in France and Italy hoped to incite revolution. The common thread among their positions was the belief that technology could promote social transformation, by dissolving the barriers between social classes and liberating people from oppressive regimes of taste and behavior:

"The grand architectural assumption of the '60s, one inherited from the postwar optimism of reconstruction and the atomic era, was that technological progress and social development were interdependent. In other words, technology would inevitably lead to a more prosperous, liberal, enlightened global humanity."[89]

---

[87] Pierre Restany, "Ou en sont les musees dans le monde? Per un museografia moderna," *Domus* no. 453 (August 1967): 45.

[88] See Craig Buckley, *Graphic Assembly: Montage, Media, and Experimental Architecture in the 1960s*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019). For an international cross-section of these visionary schemes, see Peter Cook, "Experimental Architecture," (New York: Universe Books, 1970).

[89] Jack Self, "Is Everything Architecture?" *The Architectural Review*, no. 1423 (September 2015): 18.

The key figure in the development of this techno-avant-garde was the English critic and historian Peter Reyner Banham, who regarded the Italian Futurists as the forgotten apostles of Modernism and promoted Buckminster Fuller as a contemporary prophet.[90] After 1960, Banham's twin passions for technology and popular culture led him to argue that buildings were another class of consumer goods and to promote visionary projects of every type, including the works of the Archigram group.[91] **[Fig. 3.96]** Their provocative projects spread Banham's ideas to the Continent, where they influenced a generation of artist-architect-activists, including the Florentine collectives Archizoom and Superstudio, and the Utopie group in Paris.[92] **[Figs. 3.97–3.98]** The emblematic project of the era was Cedric Price's "Fun Palace" (1961-67), a steel "megastructure" with movable floors and walls that could be reconfigured to meet the users' desires, as the citizens of a post-industrial society devoted their free time to leisure and education.[93] **[Figs. 3.99]**

Similarly to the neo-avant-garde artists whom they often emulated, many of the techno-utopian architects employed strategies of collage, appropriation and the ready-made, using popular culture as a primary source. Unlike the artists, who were able to create their own works, the architects struggled to advance their proposals beyond publications and exhibitions. By the early 1970s, the techno-utopian project had collapsed under the weight of its own disappointments. Nonetheless, aspects of 1960s anti-architecture would enjoy a significant afterlife, as the conception of architecture as popular entertainment, the resulting emphasis on imagery and the corresponding method of collage characterized architectural "post-modernism" of the 1970s. [4.10]

It is notable that Pierre Restany's series in *Domus* did not include a profile of Louisiana; Restany was well acquainted with the museum – through Pontus Hultén – and had even contributed to *Louisiana Revy*.[94] One likely factor is that Restany had a limited number of pages and was already committed to profiling Moderna Museet and

---

[90] See Reyner Banham, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age* (London: Architectural Press, 1960). For a summary of Banham's role in the techno-utopian movement, see "Clipping: The Promiscuous Attachments of Reyner Banham," in Buckley, *Graphic Assembly*, 33–72.

[91] Simon Sadler, *Archigram: Architecture without Architecture* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005).

[92] Ibid., 183, 186.

[93] Stanley Mathews, *From Agit-Prop to Free Space: The Architecture of Cedric Price* (London: Black Dog Architecture, 2007). The "megastructure" can be traced back to Kiesler's 1925 *City in Space*. [2.7]

[94] Pierre Restany, "Kunsten som leg (Art as Play)," *Louisiana Revy*, vol. 8, no. 3 (December 1967): 30–32.

Hultén, his friend and fellow *provocateur*. Hultén's membership in French cultural-intellectual circles extended back to the early 1950s, when he lived in Paris, and he was especially close to Tinguely, de Saint Phalle, and Spoerri; three of Restany's *Nouveaux Réalistes*.[95] **[Fig. 3.95]** Another possible factor is that Restany considered Knud W. Jensen to be too focused on traditional forms of art and his "sauna" policy too accommodating to the public; a dilettante rather than an agent of revolution.

Nonetheless, we can observe that Louisiana was an example of a "dynamic museum" in 1967, and had been so since it was established. Restany's critique of the traditional museum centers on the "social function of art," which requires opening the museum to a broad segment of society, even prior to installing the "latest developments" in contemporary art. Viewed from this perspective, Louisiana was a dynamic museum *avant la lettre*, to the extent that Jensen's goal of popularizing art was a primary factor in his decisions to lead Art in the Workplace and to establish Louisiana [1.3, 1.8]. In both instances, he was attempting to cultivate audiences who would not normally visit an art exhibition, more than a decade before Restany proposed his concept of the dynamic museum.

As described above, Jensen reinforced Louisiana's mission of social outreach with innovative facilities and an eclectic program of the performing arts. In 1958, the only other modern museum in Europe (of which I am aware) that included a café, a public reading room with art books and periodicals, and regular readings and performances was the Stedelijk Museum. The fact that Jensen was ignorant of Willem Sandberg's vibrant cultural center prior to opening Louisiana only underscores the progressive character of Jensen's original vision.[96] We can also recognize Louisiana's collecting policy as a sign of openness to institutional change. In 1956, Jensen had arranged the by-laws of the Louisiana Foundation, which owns the museum and most of the art, so that he could treat the collection as a work-in-progress. Michael Brawne referred to this unusual provision in his discussion of collection policies,

---

[95] For a discussion of Hultén's relationship with Tinguely, Saint-Phalle and Spoerri, see Benoît Antille, "'Hon – en kathedral': Behind Pontus Hultén's Theatre of Inclusiveness," *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Inquiry*, Issue 32 (Spring 2013): 72–81.

[96] The inclusion of a café-reading room in both museums appears to be a coincidence. The fact that Jensen's 1956 study trip with Bo and Wohlert did not include Amsterdam supports his statement that he was unaware of the Stedelijk Museum until after Louisiana opened. [1.9] The café-reading room at the Stedelijk Museum was completed in May 1957. See Ad Petersen, *Sandberg, Designer and Director of the Stedelijk* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2004), 179.

"Secondly, we no longer take as self-evident that the museum must be the final resting place of any worthwhile work of art or scientifically interesting object. […] We now accept that the museum will select, sift and discard. Under its statutes, the Louisiana Foundation, for example, may sell or – in collaboration with the artist – exchange pictures."[97]

While Louisiana was a "dynamic museum" in social mission, facilities and collecting policy from its inauguration, it also answered Restany's insistence on "an information centre and a laboratory of living art" beginning in 1960, with the opening of *Vitality in Art*, on loan from the Stedelijk Museum. The following year, Louisiana installed *Movement in Art* (22 September – 22 October, 1961), which was curated by Hultén and Spoerri, and shipped from Stockholm.[98] Jensen opened the exhibition with the presentation of Jean Tinguely's self-destructing sculpture *Study for the End of the World no.1* **[Fig. 3.100]** and invited Fluxus-member Nam June Paik to stage a performance that (as intended) alienated many members of the audience.[99]

By 1967, Jensen had transformed Louisiana into a showcase of advanced art, with exhibitions and purchases of works by Restany's *Nouveaux Réalistes*, the CoBrA painters whom Sandberg championed and the American Pop artists promoted by Hultén. In time, works from those three movements would become pillars of the museum's permanent collection. [4.6] The most tangible evidence of Louisiana's dynamic character during the 1960s was the pair of exhibition buildings that opened in 1966 and 1971.

3.11 Dynamic Additions

In the architectural ethos of the late 1960s, which favored indeterminate forms and kinetic structures, the first additions to the 58–Building would have appeared reactionary. Aside from the track lights and a temporary partition in the Low Gallery,

---

[97] Brawne, *The New Museum*, 16.

[98] See "Meget andet – men ikke kunst (Much else– but not art)," *Helsingør Dagblad*, 23 September 1961; "Skrammelkunst (Junk Art)," *Børsen*, 18 October 1961; and "Kunst og Kynisme (Art and Cynicism)" *Aarhus Stiftstidende*, 25 September 1961.

[99] In what has become one of the beloved episodes in Louisiana's popular history, the fireworks in Tinguely's sculpture misfired; directing sparks towards the audience, killing a caged dove and giving the public yet another reason to protest the exhibition. See Pontus Hultén, *Jean Tinguely, A Magic Stronger than Death* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1987), 97–98. As well: MLL, 65–75 and almost any Danish newspaper between 23 September and mid October 1961. For Paik's visit, see MLL, 75.

there were no moving parts. Nonetheless, we can regard the two buildings as dynamic in terms of function, in that each of the galleries is well suited to many different types of artworks. **[Figs. 3.101–3.102]** The two buildings can also be considered dynamic because they embodied a process of architectural evolution, as Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert applied the underlying strategies of the 58-Building to the design of enclosed exhibition spaces. Following the Documentation, further analysis reveals that both of the additions were fundamentally consistent with the existing building – in their response to genius loci; modular conception of space; basic palette of materials; use of repetitive elements; and (ultimately) emphasis on movement – despite the fact that the architects had designed them individually.

Wohlert's reference to a shared set of principles – "Jørgen Bo and I have had the philosophy in common" [3.9] – draws our attention to the creative exchange that occurred after 1958, with each architect adopting traits that the other had contributed to the 58-Building.[100] In 1956, Bo had been primarily responsible for the arrangement of space and response to the landscape, while Wohlert had introduced the module, coordinated the materials and developed the details. [2.9] In 1964, as Wohlert designed the 66-Building, he adopted Bo's fluid treatment of space and sensitivity to the landscape. In 1969, as Bo designed the 71-Building, he adopted Wohlert's modular methodology and developed his own refined details. Through this exchange of creative traits, both architects were able to design their individual additions using a common set of strategies, so that they would be experienced as variations on the 58–Building and, finally, as a single building.

As the architects extended the 58-Building, the introverted character of the galleries limited opportunities for the expression of structure and the anonymous character of Louisiana's architecture became even more pronounced. The solid walls necessary to create Knud W. Jensen's "world of art" required the elimination of windows and vertical elements that could reveal the underlying module. Overhead, the increased spans resulted in the use of steel beams, which were concealed to maintain the palette

[100] We can regard this creative exchange as the result of their collaboration during 1958–63, as the design of single-family houses and other projects provided further opportunities to combine their principles and methods. This exchange is also evident in the institutional buildings that Bo and Wohlert designed with other architects, which might be mistaken for joint works, as noted above.

of natural materials. As a result, the architects' work underwent a process of further simplification: shifting from the interplay of structural elements and continuous space to an unfolding of solid surfaces and clearly defined volumes. And yet, the principles of the 58-Building are discernible in ways that are both obvious and obscure.

The dialogue with the landscape that guided the design of the 58-Building also guided the design of the two additions, in that the differences in height and lighting technique reflected their distance from the Tree Passage. In the 66-Building, the placement of the Low Gallery alongside the passage reduced the visibility of the High Gallery from the park. Within the building, the four separate skylights created a transition between the solid ceiling in the passage and the illuminated ceiling that would cover the next phase of construction. Five years later, Bo was able to extend the High Gallery by ten meters, while maintaining the existing profile of the building, as seen from the park. After Jensen added another gallery to the building program, Bo derived the proportion of the Long Gallery from the remaining area of the triangular plateau and embedded the volume into the slope, to maintain the roofline of the Low Gallery.

In retrospect, we can regard the 66-Building as the crucial phase in Louisiana's expansion, at least in terms of architectural continuity. At the point of direct contact with the 58-Building, Wohlert employed alignments in both plan and section to unite spaces with opposite degrees of enclosure. As a result, visitors experience the three steps at the threshold as a transition between two sections of a single building, rather than the entrance to a separate building. **[Fig. 3.103]** Beyond the threshold, Wohlert planned the galleries using a 120 x 120-centimeter-grid and employed the original, 60-centimeter module to determine the elevations. Bo extended both grids to his new building and used a multiple of the module to determine the steel roof that supported the roof. Moreover, he employed Wohlert's grid to dimension his new lighting system and reveal the modular character of the spaces, as described below.

Both architects continued the palette of materials from the 58-Building, with Wohlert introducing minor changes in color. As mentioned, a shortage of materials forced him to introduce a new type of paving brick, which was slightly larger and more irregular in color. Nonetheless, the familiar combination of whitewashed walls and red-brown pavers ensured that the new floors are experienced as a variation on the original. We can recognize similar experiences at the entrance to the 66-Building: in the use of

grey marble for the steps (rather than the green marble used in the 58-Building) and the different treatments of the wooden ceilings on either side of the threshold, which were constructed using boards of equal width. While the ceiling in the Low Gallery was painted white to reflect more light, the grey marble can be understood as a consequence of the new paving bricks. In both cases, the variations in color represent a variation on the original palette, rather than the reflexive pursuit of uniformity.

In both of the new buildings, the architects employed repetitive elements to provide rhythmic divisions of space, shifting their attention to the ceilings as a consequence of the solid walls. Based on Wohlert's modular methodology, it appears that he intended the four glass laylights in the Low Gallery to be experienced as repetitive elements, but that effort was not entirely successful. The effect of repetition is undermined by the two different orientations and disintegrates when the temporary partition is not in its assigned place, and the two, central laylights are revealed as a single rectangle. **[Fig. 3.103]** It follows that the temporary partition and track lighting resulted from Jensen's concern for flexibility, and that the visual clutter of the light fixtures led to the use of fixed spotlights in the 71-Building.

Bo was more successful in inventing new types of elements, as he designed a lighting system that integrated natural and artificial sources. By constructing the ceilings as suspended metal frameworks, Bo converted what is typically a solid surface into a large element that seems to float overhead. Further, he revealed the modular character of the galleries by subdividing the ceilings into segments that are also perceived as elements, in a way that recalls the exposed beams in the 58-Building. **[Fig. 3.104]** The built-in spotlights provided another set of geometric elements that reveal the module. Bo's combination of translucent ceilings and rotating spotlights supports the assertion that the Bührle Wing in Zürich was an important point of reference for Louisiana's expansion. [3.8] In the Long Gallery, the juxtaposition of the lighting system and the three-level section, which recalls Ignazio Gardella's exhibition building in Milan, suggests that the synthesis of lessons from Italy and Switzerland continued beyond the completion of the 58-Building. [2.8, 2.9] **[Fig. 3.105]**

As detailed in Chapter 2, the defining feature of the 58-Building is the meandering path that unites a series of contrasting spaces. Considering Bo's leading role in the planning of the 58-Building, it is not surprising that the completion of the 71-Building created another type of meandering path. Prior to 1971, the 66-Building was simply an extension of the Tree Passage, with a symmetrical plan that reflected Jensen's idea of using the new wing as an occasional auditorium. In 1969, Jensen's decision to add another exhibition space (the Long Gallery) allowed Bo to incorporate Wohlert's Low Gallery into an asymmetrical sequence of exhibition spaces, and create a continuous path through the two additions.

Bo's decisive move was dividing the Long Gallery into three levels, which required a two-part stair. The two flights of steps coincide with the change in direction necessary to reach the cinema, providing visitors with an architecturally determined path. As a result, the visitor's movement from the Low Gallery into the High Gallery is the first leg of a circuitous journey, as he or she turns 90° to enter the upper level of the Long Gallery; another 90° to follow the stair to the middle level; 180° to follow the stair to the lower level; 90° towards the cinema; and another 90° to enter the Cellar Gallery that includes the straight stair back to the Low Gallery. This meandering path through a sequence of contrasting spaces recalls the journey in the 58-Building, which had been transformed from a promenade through the landscape into a closed, multi-level loop that begins and ends at the Tree Passage. **[Figs. 3.106–3.112]**

Observations

Knud W. Jensen was responsible for the shift to enclosed galleries, but there is no evidence that it was related to his exhibition program. By his own admission, he did not have a model in mind. Furthermore, none of the three institutions that assisted Jensen's shift to temporary exhibitions provided plausible models. Absent evidence of a curatorial agenda, it becomes clear that Jensen's pivot to generic galleries was rooted in a personal impulse. Given his autobiographical conception of Louisiana and the public reception of the 58-Building, it is very likely that Jensen imagined a conflict between architecture and institution. As such, we can recognize his new architectural agenda as a means of neutralizing Bo and Wohlert's additions to the museum and thus limiting the importance of their work to Louisiana's identity.

Jensen's transformation of Louisiana during the 1960s did not follow any consistent model, but was instead based on impulses from a variety of institutions. By 1964, Jensen had settled on a vision of Louisiana as a much larger museum – with a diverse program inspired by the Stedelijk Museum, an artistic program inspired by Moderna Museet and exhibition spaces evidently inspired by Kunsthaus Zürich. At the same time, he found a new curatorial direction that was focused on large-scale canvases and corresponded to his desire for enclosed galleries with skylights. Thus, he exchanged his initial vision of an open-air type of museum for a new type of institution, which would exhibit provocative art in conventional exhibition spaces that were located in a natural setting. The result was intended as a dramatic contrast to the "old Louisiana."

Despite Jensen's decision to transform Louisiana into a much larger museum with an international focus, he remained committed to his institutional agenda of popularizing art through the experience of nature. He re-directed the museum's artistic focus based on the example of Pontus Hultén, who shared his social-utopian ethos and promoted art that was rooted in popular culture. Further, Jensen continued to place sculpture in the landscape, installing abstract works that reflected his evolving taste. And yet, Jensen's new architectural agenda was based on isolating the exhibitions from the setting. Because that agenda was rooted in a personal impulse and Louisiana was an autobiographical project, it follows that he could not recognize the conflict between his program of enclosed galleries and his principle of "the 'cleansed' impression."

Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert attempted to satisfy Jensen's demand for enclosed exhibition spaces, but they were equally devoted to maintaining some connection to the setting, in order to provide the visitor with a sense of location. Their resistance to the total isolation of the exhibition spaces is evident in all of their expansion schemes, from Plans A and B through the sketches of the 71-Building, which included windows facing the lake. While the earliest schemes were based on the modern vernacular language, they were also specific to the programs, locations and lighting conditions across the museum grounds; there were no new lantern galleries in Plan A or Plan B. Bo and Wohlert's attempts at nuance were contradicted by Jensen's insistence on absolutes, even as he often contradicted himself. The sketches he provided to the architects, beginning in 1959, suggest that he regarded himself as the third architect.

A comparison between Louisiana and the Maeght Foundation reveals the 58-Building as essentially incomplete, contingent and anonymous. Furthermore, the self-contained character of Sert's metaphorical village illuminates the role of the 58-Building as a link between private expression and public experience, due to its neutral character. Because the 58-Building was not an autonomous composition, Bo and Wohlert would have a large amount of flexibility as they worked to extend the building. They would take individual responsibility for the additions, but each was able to employ the full range of principles that produced the 58-Building. The root of their consistency was the creative exchange that had occurred during the creation of their other joint works, 1958–63, as they learned from one another and adopted principles that the other had contributed to the 58-Building. Their common goal was harmony with the setting.

Jensen's demand for enclosed galleries made it impossible for Bo and Wohlert to simply extend the modern vernacular language they had employed in the 58-Building. However, the two architects were able to expand Louisiana in a consistent manner, by applying the principles of the 58-Building to a new spatial model. The instruments of continuity were the dialogue with the setting, familiar palette of materials, continuing role of the module, new systems of geometric elements and a circuitous path through the exhibition spaces. The multi-level loop created by the 71-Building reiterated the importance of the visitor's movement as a primary factor in the architects' work. As such, it is evident that the principle of choreographed movement adopted from the Italian School was as fundamental to Louisiana's architecture as Bo's topographic conception of space and Wohlert's obsession with modular construction.

A Qualified Utopia:
The Work of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art

Volume 2 of 3

Chapter 4–Appendices

ISBN 979-8218190828

Volume 1: Introduction–Chapter 3

Volume 2: Chapter 4–Appendices

Volume 3: Illustrations

This educational and non-commercial document has been produced under the doctrine of fair use and contains visual material that is under copyright, including drawings, paintings, photographs and depictions of artworks within photographs. All visual material remains the exclusive property of the various rights holders and may not be reproduced without their consent. Primary copyright holders are identified in the List of Illustrations on pages 338–351. In addition to the primary copyright holders, the rights of individual artists and their representatives remain in force, including but not limited to:

Jean Arp, Alberto Giacometti, Richard Serra, Henry Moore, Henri Laurens, Richard Mortensen, Erik Hoppe, Aksel Jørgensen, Carl Kylberg, Karl Isakson, Niels Larsen Stevns, Astrid Noack, William Scharff, Adam Fischer, Jeppe Vontillius, Gunnar Westman, Knud Agger, Robert Jacobsen, Søren Georg Jensen, Mogens Andersen, Mogens Jørgensen, Vilhelm Lundstrøm, Harald Leth, Aage Vogel-Jørgensen, Asger Jorn, Harald Giersing, Henry Heerup, Mirko Basadella, Reg Butler, Alberto Viani, Lynn Chadwick, Alicia Penalba, Max Bill, Naum Gabo, Francis Bacon, James Rosenquist, Jackson Pollock, Kenneth Noland, Frank Stella, Ellsworth Kelly, Morris Louis, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Piet Mondrian, Robert Morris, George Segal, Claes Oldenburg, Andy Warhol, Tom Wesselman, Roy Lichtenstein, Robert Indiana, Donald Judd, Richard Long, Kenneth Noland, Sam Francis, Alexander Calder, Frei Otto, Gunnar Aagaard Andersen, Susanne Ussing, Mette Aarre, Niels Lergaard, Carl Henning Pedersen, Yves Klein, Gerhard Richter, Lucio Fontana, Jean Tinguely, Richard Hamilton, César, Martial Raysse, Robert Rauschenberg, Jim Dine, George Rickey, Dieter Roth, George Trakas, Jasper Johns, Jan Groth, Mario Merz, Cindy Sherman, Sean Scully, Michael Singer, Tony Cragg, Jenny Holzer, Alfio Bonanno, Olafur Eliasson, Per Kirkeby, Candice Breitz, David Hockney, Edward Kienholz and Nancy Reddin Kienholz, Andreas Gursky, Sophie Calle, Pamela Rosenkranz, Wolfgang Tillmans, Marianna Uutinen, Theo van Doesburg, Cornelius van Eesteren, and Franz West. Works by Pablo Picasso © 2023 Succession Picasso.

Text and line drawings not otherwise credited © 2023 Michael A. Sheridan. Excerpts of source texts are copyrighted by their respective authors and publishers.

Produced and printed by Sheridan Academic Projects, Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A.

Contents - Volume 2

Chapter 4 A New Museum: 1972–82 171

Documentation 171

4.1 Temple or Forum? 172
4.2 The 76-Building 173
4.3 Centers of Gravity 179
4.4 An Alternative Era 183
4.5 The Lake Garden 189
4.6 A New Collection 192
4.7 The Master Plan 194
4.8 The South Wing 200

Analysis 207

4.9 A Concrete Utopia 207
4.10 An Eclectic Era 211
4.11 Bo and Wohlert in West Germany 220
4.12 "Wanted: Qualified Utopias" 229

Observations 240

Chapter 5 Earthwork: 1983–94 243

Documentation 243

5.1 Site-specific 243
5.2 The East Wing 247
5.3 Transitions 254
5.4 Epilogue 256

Analysis 260

5.5 Movement in Space 261
5.6 Below the Surface 267
5.7 A Complete Museum 273

Observations 278

Conclusions 281

1. Knud W. Jensen's Architectural Agendas 281
2. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's Unitary Building 288
3. A Qualified Utopia 296
4. The Regional Tradition 304

Appendices 315

1. Sources 315
2. Bibliography 319
3. List of Illustrations 338

This page intentionally blank.

Chapter 4
A New Museum: 1972–82

This page intentionally blank.

A New Museum: 1972–82

Documentation

Louisiana as it exists today is very largely a product of the fertile and turbulent decade in which Knud W. Jensen finally transformed his home for art into a large cultural institution. It was during this period that he realized his dream of a concert hall and imagined the projects – a south wing, an underground east wing, a series of outdoor sculpture installations and new facilities for children – that would reshape both the landscape and the institution over the following twenty years. The catalysts for this transformation were a re-direction of the museum's collection; toward works by foreign artists; and an expanded vision of Louisiana as a total work of art. By 1976, Jensen had extended his definition of artistic synthesis to include intellectual currents and social concerns,

"A museum of modern art ought to reflect the ideas, which have occupied the artists during this century. It is not enough just to buy their works."[1]

Jensen's passion for new ideas and his commitment to Louisiana's social mission led him to embrace the informal, ad-hoc aesthetic of the 1960s counterculture. During 1976, he considered constructing a hippie version of Louisiana, in the form of a new wing at the south end of the park. Despite Jensen's enthusiasm for popular aesthetic tendencies, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert were committed to the principles of simplicity and anonymity embodied by the 58-Building, and they resisted his efforts to introduce a radically new type of architecture to the place. Eventually, Jensen experienced yet another change of fortune, and the three men reunited to develop a plan for completing the museum. The galleries in the next phase of expansion would follow the model of the 71-Building, with top-lit spaces that were isolated from the surroundings, but they would have an even more neutral character that corresponded to the museum's new collection.

[1] Knud W. Jensen, "Mod en ny museumstype," *Louisiana klubben*, no. 1 (October 1978): 3–7. The article was originally published in *Politiken*, 8 October 1976. The English manuscript is titled "Towards a New Type of Museum" and located in the Knud W. Jensen Archive, LMMA.

4.1 Temple or Forum?

In 1973, Knud W. Jensen wrote the first in a series of reports to the Louisiana Foundation that assessed the museum's collection and buildings, and explained his plans for the future. He began the report by asking a rhetorical question: Should the museum should be a temple, in the sense of a treasure house for the arts; or a forum, in the sense of a public space for gatherings and debates? After listing a number of popular interests and concerns (most of which were surely alien to him), including "the education explosion, the youth revolution, the Marxist wave, hashish, the gender role debate, the right to codetermination, pollution, communes, sexual liberation, the transformation of dressing habits, etc."[2] He pointed out that museums had been largely unaffected by these developments; wondered if Louisiana was in danger of stagnation; and proposed an expanded social role for the museum,

"This brings us to the main point: What kind of institution should a museum of modern art be? I think the museum needs content besides and beyond visual art. […] It goes without saying that the collection should be improved, increased, described, conserved – all the museums see that as their principal functions, and it is necessary to continue mounting exhibitions. But it should be equally obvious that the building and the artworks form a setting for present-day life. Louisiana is conceived half as a museum, half as a cultural center. In its entirety: as a new type of institution marked by the thinking of our time, not by an irrelevant tradition from the nineteenth century."[3]

Jensen had imagined Louisiana as a cultural center since 1959, but now he proposed transforming the museum into a gathering place that would engage society through political discussions, multimedia events, and festivals for music, film, and theater. The first step would be the construction of a new building containing the Great Hall, an enormous, multipurpose room that could be used for almost any sort of activity. The building would be a concrete box that was buried in the slope in front of the cafeteria; Jensen referred to it as a "culture bunker." He had hoped to construct a concert hall in the slope during 1963–64 and again in 1967–70, but both of those projects had been abandoned because of a shortage of funds. By 1973, his concern for Louisiana's role in Danish society and his zeal to expand the programming were so

[2] M1, 2.

[3] Ibid., 4.

intense that he was willing to sacrifice his cherished dream of a concert hall. While he still planned to host performances of chamber music, he realized that the Great Hall would never provide ideal acoustics for either music or theater.[4]

As Jørgen Bo had been the architect for the 71-Building, Vilhelm Wohlert would be responsible for the next addition. By early 1974, Wohlert had prepared drawings for a subterranean building that would be constructed of reinforced concrete and support an expanded terrace in front of the cafeteria. **[Figs. 4.1–4.2]** In the center of the new building, a rectangular room of 500 square meters with a ceiling height of 6 meters could accommodate a variety of seating arrangements for nearly 500 people. As a precaution, the cafeteria would have to be surrounded with steel sheet piling, so that it would not slide into the building pit; repeating the near-disaster with the gardener's house during the construction of the 71-Building. After Jensen learned that the costs of excavation and shoring up the cafeteria might reach several million Danish crowns, he agreed to relocate the project. The new site would be on the north side of the cafeteria, where a building could be set into the slope.[5] **[Fig. 4.3]**

4.2 The 76-Building

In June 1974, Vilhelm Wohlert prepared a second scheme for the Great Hall: a long, rectangular building with faceted, sound-reflecting ceilings at three different heights and bands of clerestory windows towards the sea. **[Fig. 4.4]** The hall would be located one level below the 58-Building and entered from a new stair along the brick wall of the cafeteria. Reviving an idea from the late 1960s; when Knud W. Jensen had considered a concert hall on the same site, Wohlert opened the back of the hall to the existing building. A small extension with additional seating for the cafeteria would serve as a balcony, ensuring that the hall was integrated into the daily life of the museum, whether or not there was an event. During performances that required sound control, a folding wall of acoustical panels would separate the balcony from the hall.

Despite Wohlert's ingenuity, the project quickly ran into problems. Evidently, the board members of the Louisiana Foundation did not share Jensen's enthusiasm for a multi-purpose space that would offer less than ideal acoustics for both music and

---

[4] M1, 20.

[5] MLL, 210-211. Knud W. Jensen to H. Maaløe Jespersen, 24 July 1974. Jespersen was the chairman of the building committee for the Fredensborg-Humlebæk city council.

theater. After the Board reviewed the drawings, Jensen wrote to Bo and Wohlert, informing them that the building would now contain an actual concert hall, with a separate theater in the basement. A week later, the local planning authorities reviewed Wohlert's project and insisted that the building be pulled back several meters from the beach road, Havnevej, in order to reduce its bulk.[6]

Retreating to his summerhouse in Ejby, Wohlert sketched a new scheme for a compact, three-level building that would provide performance spaces on two levels, and also address a number of longstanding problems in the cafeteria. **[Fig. 4.5]** The project included a narrow addition alongside the second Lantern Gallery – similar to the abandoned plan from 1959 – that would provide more seating for the cafeteria; an expanded kitchen; and a new room that would replace the "children's museum" in the villa. **[Figs. 4.6]** Next to the seating area, a new serving counter for the cafeteria would replace the small window from 1958 and a spiral stair would provide access to a foyer for the theater. As in Wohlert's previous scheme, the new seating area would serve as a balcony for the concert hall, and the main entrance to the hall was along the back wall of the cafeteria.

At the bottom of the spiral stair, the foyer included a straight stair down to the theater, and a separate entrance from Havnevej. **[Fig. 4.7]** Wohlert was designing the building using the standard Louisiana grid of 60 x 60 centimeters. After he shortened the building by 4.8 meters, to satisfy the planning authorities, he was left with a square room for the concert hall, roughly 15 meters on a side. He was intent on providing the audience with a view of the sea as they entered the hall, and his first draft of the seating plan featured a central stage and a band of windows facing the water. In the end, the shape of the room created its own functional logic; determining the designs of the roof, the seating arrangement, and even the chairs, so that space, structure and furniture are united by a single geometric form.

The design of the concert hall was dependent on the development of the acoustics and the most important consideration was reverberation time.[7] Early in the design process,

[6] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, 25 June 1974 and 8 July 1974.

[7] Reverberation time is the period it takes for sound to decay by 60 decibels and become essentially inaudible. If the sound dies too quickly, the music will sound flat; too slowly and it will interfere with the following notes. Ideal reverberation times vary according to the type of music and number of instruments; orchestral music requires a longer period than chamber music and soloists. The primary architectural factors are the degree to which surfaces reflect sound and the volume of air in the room.

Wohlert and his structural engineer Jørgen Petersen, who was also an acoustician, made several visits to the concert hall at Snape Maltings, in Suffolk, England; which provided them with a number of important lessons. The 824-seat hall was situated in a malting house from the 1850s that had been rebuilt by Derek Sugden and his team at Arup Associates, and inaugurated in 1967.[8] As one might expect in a nineteenth-century building, the corners of the building are not quite 90° and the walls are slightly out of parallel. The first lesson was that the skewed walls improved the acoustics, by preventing sound waves from being reflected at the same angle, which would cause them to overlap and degrade the quality of the sound. Another lesson was the importance of the roof in determining the acoustics. The new roof at Snape Maltings had been designed to create the volume of air in the hall necessary for a reverberation time of two seconds: the standard for a full orchestra. In order to allow sound waves to reverberate freely, the architects had reduced the roof structure to a series of delicate trusses, constructed of wooden struts and steel rods. **[Fig. 4.8]**

At Louisiana, Wohlert and Petersen combined the insight they had gathered in England with their own approach to construction and the particular character of the setting. Working as creative partners, they created a unique concert hall that is at once a natural extension of the 58-Building and an ingenious solution to a difficult site. Their great achievement was to integrate architecture and acoustics to such a degree that they are indistinguishable and the acoustical measures nearly invisible; leaving nothing but an exquisitely crafted room that yields a warm, clean sound. As they applied the lessons of Snape Maltings to Louisiana, the biggest challenge was creating the volume of air necessary to achieve a reverberation time of 1.5–1.6 seconds, which is ideal for chamber music and small ensembles. The root of the challenge was the constrained setting: the area for the concert hall was restricted on all four sides; the theater in the basement required its own space; and the building needed to be as low as possible, to satisfy the planning authorities. Following the English example, Wohlert and Petersen incorporated the attic into the hall, which allowed them to achieve the necessary volume without increasing the building height. **[Figs. 4.9–4.10]**

[8] See "Concert Hall, Snape, Suffolk," *The Architectural Review*, vol. 142 (September 1967): 176, 202–07. Wohlert acknowledged the example of the hall in "Louisianas koncertsal og teater, Humlebæk," *Arkitektur* 1978, no. 6: 243–248.

Drawing on his work at the Margrethe Church in Copenhagen, where a ring of timber roof trusses are joined by a central post, Wohlert proposed a roof structure of timber posts and beams that would be braced with steel rods.[9] As sound waves pass through the framework, the attic functions as a resonance chamber and the waves are reflected back down to the audience, even as they are partially absorbed by the pine ceiling. Along the edges of the hall, a border of pine slats; inspired by the ceilings in Bo's 71-Building; absorbs sound and conceals ductwork. The wooden border also conceals the fact that two of the walls are out of square, so that sound waves are reflected at slightly different angles and reach the audience at different instants. As an extra measure, the perforated wall panels beneath the windows are hinged and can be rotated to reflect sound, but in practice are almost never used.[10]

Wohlert's final seating plan was an unconventional arrangement that was derived from the shape of the room, and benefits the performers and the audience in equal measure. It was also a fallback solution, validated by a chance conversation. The basic idea of a corner stage with a diagonal stair had appeared in several of Bo and Wohlert's earlier schemes for concert halls, but Jensen had never been especially enthusiastic about any of those schemes. In any event, the concert hall was now close to the sea. The location suggested a band of windows along the beach road; the windows suggested rows of seats facing the water; and the arrangement of the seats suggested a central stage. Wohlert's scheme was simple, logical and integrated, until it was abandoned and he was forced to revisit an earlier solution.

During the planning for the "culture bunker" in 1973, Jensen consulted a variety of outside experts regarding acoustics and stage equipment. One of those consultants was Børge Wagner, the conductor of the municipal orchestra in Odense, which is also the home of the Carl Nielsen Academy of Music. Prior to 1976, the Academy was located in an old mansion and had no permanent performance hall. The students played in borrowed rooms around town, with temporary stages and improvised seating arrangements. Speaking with Jensen, Wagner mentioned that the largest room used by the Academy was nearly square and that the students sat in the corner, with the audience in a semi-circle. He explained that it was an excellent arrangement for

---

[9] "Margrethekirken," *Arkitektur DK* 1973, no. 6: 256–260.

[10] Lars Fenger, the director of Louisiana's musical programming, discussed the acoustics in the hall with the author on 7 January 2016.

the musicians because they were surrounded by spectators, even if attendance was sparse. Fortunately, Jensen outlined the conversation in a memo to Bo and Wohert.[11]

Eighteen months later, after Jensen apparently vetoed the placement of the stage in front of the windows, Wohlert recalled the semicircular arrangement in Odense and revived the idea of a corner stage. He treated the floor of the hall as a series of L-shaped terraces that step down towards the northeast corner and are covered in *Cabreuva* (also known as Santos Mahogany), a South American hardwood that requires very little maintenance. The main stair is set on a diagonal to the terraces, providing a direct route between the entrance and the stage, with rows of chairs on either side. **[Figs. 4.11–4.12]** Wohlert's right-angled amphitheater was a natural response to a square room with a corner entrance and suits the performers, but it also enhances the experience of the audience. The 45° angle between the main stair and the rows of chairs speeds the process of getting people to-and-from their seats and minimizes congestion on the steps. Even more importantly, the 90° angle between the rows allows audience members to see each other's faces, creating the sense of community that is one of the pleasures of a live performance.

Wohlert initially planned to furnish the hall with the same inexpensive armchairs that Bo had installed in the cinema of the 71-Building. But Jensen decided that the furniture should be as singular as the architecture and contacted Poul Kjærholm, the furniture architect who was legendary for his unrelenting standard of quality. Taking the chair at Snape Maltings as a point of departure, Kjærholm designed a folding chair made entirely of wood, with a solid bracket and frames, and panels of basket-woven splints that provide the seat and back.[12] Master cabinetmaker Ejnar Pedersen constructed 254 handmade chairs of white maple that were dimensioned according to the architectural module, 60 x 60 x 60 cm.; uniting space and furniture. Moreover, the chairs play an important role in the acoustics of the hall. The gaps between the basket-woven splints allow sound waves to pass through the panels, which prevents empty chairs from reflecting sound and limits variations in reverberation time.

[11] Knud W. Jensen, Notater om samtaler vedr. Salen; Salens akustik m.v., Samtale den 19.11 [1973] med Børge Wagner."

[12] Michael Sheridan, *The Furniture of Poul Kjærholm: Catalogue Raisonné*, (New York: Gregory R. Miller, 2007) 174-179.

By the end of 1974, Jensen had secured the funding to construct the building, gathering donations and loans from a range of sources, including the Knud Højgaard Foundation, the foundations of Bikuben, Sparekassen SDS, Privatbanken; and the Jubilee Foundation of the National Bank, which paid for Poul Kjærholm's handmade chairs. The 76-Building, which included the concert hall, theater and the narrow addition along the second Lantern Gallery, was completed in the summer of 1976 and inaugurated in September. Jensen was determined that the concert hall present an artistic synthesis of music, visual art, architecture and applied art, and he hoped to fill the room with sculptures by Alexander Calder.

In 1975, Jensen delivered an architectural model of the concert hall to Calder's studio in France, but the project failed to capture the artist's imagination, in what would be the last year of his life. When the concert hall was inaugurated in the autumn of 1976, the long wall next to the entrance was hung with a large painting by the American artist Sam Francis; *Joyous Lake*. Over the next several years, the hall was used to exhibit Calder's mobile *Four Red Systems* and Kenneth Noland's painting *Up Cadmium*. In 1979, Jensen and Francis began working on a permanent installation for the room. Louisiana purchased Francis's 1979 *Big Red II* for the wall behind the stage, and commissioned a new painting for the wall next to the entrance. That monumental work, *Untitled (Serpentine)*, was completed in 1983, and has become as much a part of the hall as the folding chairs and the view to the sea. **[Fig. 4.13]**

One floor below the concert hall, the small theater was finished with inexpensive materials that suited its experimental character. The ceiling formed by the floor of the concert hall was painted black, and the concrete walls were painted dark-blue. Seating consisted of pine bleachers, with removable segments on either side of the room, so that the floor could be incorporated into performances.[13] While Louisiana had a long history of musical programming, and a staff member (Head of Music) dedicated to arranging the events, the theater ended up as something of an administrative orphan. After an initial series of performances and workshops in the late 1970s, the theater fell into disuse. Over the years, the room was used for accommodating school groups; eventually the seating and equipment were removed and the room was converted to changing rooms for museum employees.

[13] See *Arkitektur* 1978, no. 6: 243-248.

Aside from the beauty of the concert hall, the most striking quality of Wohlert's addition is the degree to which it is experienced as an extension of the 58-Building. The whitewashed brick walls, timber framing, copper lamps and Douglas fir woodwork on the balcony continue the palette of materials established in 1957; bound to the older building by the continued use of the module derived from the brickwork. The brick walls have the same raked joints as the older building and the windows facing the sea are derived from the glass wall in the Lake Gallery. In the cafeteria, the ceiling over the new seating area is flush with the underside of the timber framing in the hall, creating the sensation of a single space when the sliding panels are open. The sense of scale, treatment of materials and attention to detail all contribute to a sense of continuity, and it is difficult to discern the seam between old and new.

4.3 Centers of Gravity

Knud Jensen's plan for an underground Great Hall was part of a larger effort to redefine Louisiana's mission and introduce new types of events and activities. But even as he worked to diversify the programming and destabilize the character of the institution, he was also working to stabilize the experience of the place. Despite his conviction that the museum should be transformed, he was still devoted to the setting and committed to the ideas on which Louisiana had been founded:

"The quality of the buildings and the landscape imposes requirements along the lines of the concept *Gesamtkunstwerk*. Certain places in the overall complex must be cultivated and made into striking focuses for experiences."[14]

And, one year later,

"It is a matter of finding the right things for the right places and of creating certain centers of gravity."[15]

While Vilhelm Wohlert was designing the 76-Building, Jensen was engaged in an ambitious project to create two permanent installations – the Calder Terrace and the Moore Garden – that would provide "centers of gravity" in the new institution. In both cases, he would supplement an existing sculpture with additional works by the same artist, creating a cluster of artworks that would define a specific location within the

[14] M1, 12.

[15] M2, 9.

landscape. His model was the modest Heerup Garden, but the new installations would be monumental in scale and involve a radical reshaping of the terrain, both in and around the lower level of the park.

The first of these installations was the Calder Terrace, located in front of the cafeteria. Alexander Calder's central role at Louisiana began rather modestly in 1961, when one of his mobiles – *Four Red Systems* – was included in the exhibition *Movement in Art* and then purchased for the museum by the New Carlsberg Foundation. In 1964, Jensen made his first visit to Calder's home and complex of studios in Saché, France, and on behalf of the foundation, negotiated the purchase of *Nervures minces* (Slender Ribs); one of Calder's early large-scale stabiles. Later that year, the sculpture was installed on the terrace in front of the cafeteria, overlooking the sea, where it immediately became Louisiana's defining work of art. **[Fig. 4.14]** After Louisiana exhibited Calder's 1969 retrospective, which included a group of stabiles in front of the cafeteria, Jensen began to imagine a more extensive installation of Calder's work, despite the fact that the museum was plagued by annual deficits.[16]

In 1971, the Danish government agreed to provide an annual subsidy to Louisiana, on a par with small, provincial museums in Denmark. As with all government support to museums, the funds could only be used for operating costs. Nonetheless, the subsidy freed some of Louisiana's own resources for acquisitions. Jensen returned to Saché where,

"As the years had passed, a large crowd of tall mobiles and stable mobiles had been assembled outside his 'Norman' studio building on the hill above the Indre Valley. When you approached, they could be seen from far off like a Calderesque Olympus, often with cumulus clouds behind the hill. They turned in the wind and sent flashes of color towards the sky, like a festive assembly of the gods."[17] **[Fig. 4.15]**

During one of his visits, Jensen spotted small models of two, unrealized sculptures from the same period as *Slender Ribs*; *Little Janey-Waney* and *Almost Snow Plow*; and began to imagine a three-part installation overlooking the sea. Despite the improvement in Louisiana's finances, the cost of fabricating the two sculptures exceeded the museum's resources. By the time Jensen had assembled the necessary

[16] MLL, 136–138.

[17] MLL, 140–141.

funding, the concert hall was nearing construction and, as previously mentioned, he hoped to fill the hall with Calder's mobiles and wall reliefs. After the artist ignored that invitation, Jensen returned to his earlier idea of a group of outdoor sculptures. In time, he persuaded Calder that the works could just as well be fabricated in Denmark as in France (at an enormous savings to Louisiana) and then returned to Saché for his review. Jensen recalled their final meeting in 1976 and the installation later that year,

"Calder modified certain details, drew reinforcements into the surfaces with crayons, and finally approved them. He signed one of the sculptures 'CA & KJ', that is his own initials and mine. Judging from the sidelong glance he sent me, it was probably meant as friendly teasing, because I had interfered a little too much in his working process. When we got the sculptures back home and finished them according to Calder's instructions, I had them set up on the terrace in front of the cafeteria, where they now form a triangle consisting of two black-painted stabiles and a red stable mobile, whose top of yellow, blue and white shapes turns merrily in the wind and sends Calderesque signals out across the Øresund. Some people think they stand too close, but they did not know Calder's Olympus in Saché."[18]

Under Ole Nørgaard's direction, the area in front of the cafeteria was rebuilt and reinforced during the summer of 1976, and the installation of Calder's works was completed in time for the inauguration of the concert hall. Today, the Calder Terrace is the most recognized point at the museum and the most spectacular example of the union of art and nature that was Louisiana's founding principle. **[Fig. 4.16]**

While the Calder Terrace created a dense cluster of sculptures, the Moore Garden was an extended installation across the lower level of the park; a hollow roughly 8 meters below the lawn in front of the villa; which had been eroded by an ancient off-shoot of the Hops Brook. Henry Moore's work had played an important role in the park since 1967, when the New Carlsberg Foundation purchased *Two Piece Reclining Figure No. 5* and Jensen installed the work at the edge of the lawn, overlooking the hollow and the sea beyond. **[Fig. 4.17]** Moore's recumbent figure quickly became a symbol of Louisiana comparable to *Slender Ribs*; and Jensen began to imagine acquiring additional examples of Moore's work. In 1975, he joined forces with Torben Holck Colding; Jørgen Sthyr's successor as head of the New Carlsberg Foundation; to make this vision a reality. After Jensen visited Moore at his home-studio north of London,

[18] MLL, 141–142.

the foundation purchased *Reclining Figure* and donated it to Louisiana, and the museum purchased *Three Part Reclining Figure: Draped*.[19]

The new sculptures would be placed in relation to *Two Piece Reclining Figure No. 5*, and create a three-part installation that would visually connect the two levels of the park. Jensen hoped that the Moore Garden would draw visitors down into an area that was often deserted. Creating the installation would involve raising the elevation of the lower level of the park, using soil excavated for the construction of the concert hall. At the same time, the surrounding slopes would be reconfigured to create stairs and ramps, to join the lower level of the park with the upper level and the Calder Terrace.

Nørgaard's 1976 drawing illustrates a cross section through the Moore Garden, with the sculptures on separate earthen pedestals and the upper level of the park in the background. **[Fig. 4.18]** The Calder Terrace is visible on the right and a dashed line indicates the elevation of the beach. The pedestals would provide a transition between the terrain and the bronze plinths of the sculptures, but Jensen eventually decided on a more naturalistic presentation. A photograph of the clay study model, which included miniature versions of all three sculptures, depicts a plateau that would unify the two works on the lower level and raise them above sea level, so that they would be presented against the horizon. **[Fig. 4.19]**

Work on the Moore Garden continued into 1977, as the slopes were reconfigured to include a stair and new paths, and Jensen experimented with the placement of the sculptures. By the time the project was completed, the Henry Moore Foundation had deposited another bronze sculpture, *Relief No. 1*, on permanent loan to Louisiana, and it was also installed in the garden. The final result was a dynamic, multi-level composition that revealed the degree to which Moore's work benefits from shifting vantage points. **[Figs. 4.20–4.22]** The scale of the installation allowed the sculptures to be experienced as though they were manmade features of the landscape, not unlike the ancient stone structures known as dolmens: at once organic and artificial. Despite the extraordinary character of the Moore Garden, it was only intact for a few years.

By the end of 1977, Jensen had decided that looking down on Moore's works robbed them of their character, and that the installation was a failure:

[19] MLL, 142–147.

"Down where Henry Moore now stands, a large abstract sculpture by Tony Smith; *The Snake is Out,* would be more reasonable to look down at than Henry Moore's sculptures, which are so strangely reduced by being seen from above (they are like Giacometti's sculptures; you have to experience them as you walk towards them at eye level or slightly above. Maybe because it is the human figure that still survives in these sculptures. It is always a reduction to see people from above."[20]

In the same letter, Jensen considered placing the works from the Moore Garden around *Two Piece Reclining Figure No. 5*, to create a Moore Terrace, but eventually decided that placing the sculptures too close together would also rob them of their individuality. In the early 1980s, the three bronzes were removed from the lower level, and the two large figures were hoisted by crane into the upper level of the park. Following the completion of the South Wing in 1982, *Three Piece Figure: Draped* was installed on the lawn in front of the new exhibition building. *Reclining Figure* was initially placed near the Tree Passage, and later installed in the courtyard in front of the villa, where it takes the place of a sign for the museum. Despite its brief duration, the Moore Garden brought Louisiana several of its finest sculptures and the reshaping of the terrain had finally unified the two levels of the park.

4.4 An Alternative Era

With the concert hall under construction, Knud W. Jensen turned his attention to the south end of the park, where he hoped to construct unconventional buildings that would signal Louisiana's engagement with recent social trends. The first of Jensen's experimental projects was a pavilion for the members of "Studio," Louisiana's club for young visitors aged 16–24; a multi-purpose room where they could enjoy their own rituals and forms of entertainment. The 800-square-meter pavilion would be located on the plateau at the end of the sculpture garden, and take the form of an inhabitable sculpture that would provide an absolute contrast to the older buildings. Jensen's 1975 statement to his Board described the pavilion as a faceted shell that might be constructed of triangular plywood panels and decorated inside with gilded mosaics, creating a fantastic interior that he compared to environments by Antoni Gaudí, Kurt Schwitters, and Gustav Klimt:

[20] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 23 December 1977.

"Without resorting to turgid mysticism, it should be poetic, irrational, dreamlike, with an atmosphere so intense that there is nothing directly comparable in our everyday life. […] Over the plywood panels we could have a layer of thin-rolled copper sheets or Corten steel plates or even a ceramic material, for example dark brown or green tiles. Inside the facets could be clad with something as crazy as mosaic tile in gold."[21]

The youth pavilion was only one part of Jensen's vision for an entirely new wing at the south end of the villa, which would include a lobby for selling tickets, a bookshop, and 500 square meters of galleries for temporary exhibitions of particularly challenging art. While he knew that those exhibitions would not draw large crowds, he believed they were an integral part of Louisiana's mission and would benefit from quiet galleries, away from the more popular offerings.[22] Ole Nørgaard's 1975 site plan of possible locations for sculpture also contains the outlines of the new south wing in three parts: a meandering exhibition building, a narrow glass passage and the faceted youth pavilion that Jensen had proposed on the site of Nørgaard's 1964 observation deck. **[Fig. 4.23]**

To learn more about low-cost building techniques and find additional sources of inspiration for the new wing, Jensen began planning an exhibition with the working title *Architecture's Dreamers*. The exhibition would include full-scale mock-ups of experimental buildings that would be erected in the park and serve as demonstration projects for Louisiana's new wing. At several points, Jensen invited Bo and Wohlert to participate in the planning of the exhibition, and reminded them it would influence the next phase of expansion.[23] Bo and Wohlert understood that introducing another type of construction to Louisiana would disrupt the existing union of architecture and landscape. Consequently, neither of them would contribute to the exhibition. Bo conveyed their attitude in a letter to Jensen, reminding him that aesthetics were the foundation of Louisiana and advising him not to become preoccupied with trends:

"The long and the short of it is that 'Louisiana' has won many of its laurels for being a nice thing and thus very attractive as a setting for exhibitions. Surely that quality should be preserved as something essential and be given priority. That there is currently a wave of

[21] M2, 21.

[22] M2, 11–13; M3, 13–14.

[23] Knud W. Jensen to Bo, Wohlert and Nørgaard, 9 December 1975 and 10 February 1976.

anti-art is not something that I take too seriously; it will kill itself off very soon. So whatever one does, one must surely do a lot to preserve 'Louisiana' as an exquisite setting for art and cultural activities. And indeed the institution, precisely by virtue of its location and the interaction between the park and the buildings, has extraordinary potential for continuing to be a beautiful environment. That must not be lost. It is worth insisting that it is the simplicity of the setting that underscores the wealth of the content."[24]

In addition to the demonstration projects, Jensen hoped that *Architecture's Dreamers* would include a building that he had designed with Ole Nørgaard. By early 1976, Jensen had abandoned the idea of a youth pavilion and introduced the idea of a glass hall for festivals on the same site. He hoped to construct the hall as the terminus of the new South Wing, where it could be used during the summer months. Over the next two years, Jensen and Nørgaard generated more than a dozen schemes for glass buildings, from crystalline lumps and large silos to rows of vaulted halls. **[Figs. 4.24–4.25]** During this period, Jensen immersed himself in the history of glass architecture. He was particularly interested in the Crystal Palace, the enormous glass hall that Joseph Paxton had devised for the Great Exhibition of 1851, in Hyde Park, London.[25] As Jensen later described the period,

"It was the easily aroused romantic in me that was in play again. With the exception of Ole Nørgaard, who was of the same mind, my architect friends were skeptical about the thought of introducing that kind of "junk construction" at Louisiana. But the escapists were having great fun. Ole and I were soon fantasizing about a sunken amphitheater with the Øresund as "backdrop," then a huge shed of recycled wood, and then a pure, unadulterated glass house with inspiration from the many forms we found in John Hix's book *The Glass House*. What particularly fascinated us were the semi-cylindrical arched roofs above the old glass architecture."[26]

By the time that Jensen's research exhibition opened in May of 1977, it was titled *Alternative Architecture.* The entire West Wing was filled with drawings, models and projections of visionary buildings, including works by Antoni Gaudí, the German

---

[24] Jørgen Bo to Knud W. Jensen, 23 March 1976.

[25] "While I followed the lengthy meeting procedure with half an ear, I drew little sketches for projects in Louisiana and hoped that one of them might be just as brilliant as the one Lord Paxton drew for the Crystal Palace on a piece of blotting paper, during a meeting." MLL, 87.

[26] MLL, 230.

Expressionists of the 1920s, young American 'post-modernist' architects interested in historical motifs and a European avant-garde largely inspired by Surrealism and Dada. The centerpiece of the exhibition was the group of experimental projects that were constructed at full-scale or presented on posters, and exhibited in the park. During the planning process, the focus of the full-scale mockups had shifted from Louisiana's building program to alternative types of dwellings. One of the factors behind this change in direction was the difficulty that the curators Kjeld Kjeldsen and Frans Gregersen encountered as they searched for examples of unconventional, institutional buildings. Another factor was Jensen's hesitation when confronted with a truly radical proposal for expanding the museum.

The largest and most spectacular mock-up in *Alternative Architecture* was the section of a three-story apartment building designed by Carsten Hoff, Susanne Ussing and Flemming Østergaard. The trio had first come to public attention in 1970, with their structures at *Thylejren* (Thy Encampment), an alternative community in northern Jutland that was established by the collective Det Nye Samfund (The New Society). **[Fig. 4.26]** Over the next several years, the trio conducted research on alternative planning practices and building methods, hoping to create architecture that could embody a new model of community. Their research culminated in the 1973 project *Boligkulisse* (Backdrop for Dwelling), a series of ring-shaped apartment clusters that was awarded first prize in a nationwide competition, but remained unrealized.[27] The underlying concept was that a building contractor would erect a concrete structure and install plumbing and electricity, but leave the design and construction of the dwelling units to the inhabitants. The structure that was erected for *Alternative Architecture* was actually Ussing, Hoff and Ostergaard's second project for the exhibition.

Jensen had initially invited the three architects to create a project for a new wing of Louisiana, which would extend out from the south end of the villa. According to Jensen's intention, the project would be constructed of inexpensive materials for the exhibition, and left in place for a year or so. After a period of study and design development, the mock-up would be demolished and construction could begin on the

[27] Ussing and Hoff described the genesis of the Boligkulisse project in "Læs husene," *Louisiana Revy* 17, no. 3, June 1977, 45-47. As well: Tom E. Petersen, "Boligerne skal leve og gro," *Villabyernes Blad*, 6 July 1977.

actual building.[28] In early 1976, Jensen informed Ussing, Hoff and Østergaard that he required a bookshop and roughly 500 square meters of galleries, but otherwise gave them a free hand. Over the course of six months, the three architects developed a scheme for a chain of informal structures, which would be built along the tall hedge that separates the park from the neighboring street, Gammel Strandvej. The project was titled *Manifest Byggeri 1976* (Building Manifesto 1976), and embodied the architects' rejection of fixed programs, preconceived experiences, institutional authority and a simple relationship between form and function. **[Figs. 4.27–4.28]**

Leaving the villa, visitors would enter a glass dome that served as a café-reading room and included a covered terrace facing the park. At the corner between the tall hedge and the former coach house, an amorphous, wedge-shaped building covered with sheets of plywood would provide a dark room for projecting films and slide shows. Beyond this multimedia cave, a chain of triangulated wooden frames would be covered in glass, creating a faceted greenhouse with nearly 700 square meters of galleries. At the end of the galleries, an observation tower constructed of steel pipes would provide visitors with views of the surroundings, and a curved, tunnel-like structure would create a transitional space back to the park. The project was very much a continuation of the architects' work at Thy, employing steel-pipe structures and the folded roofs of paraffin-impregnated cardboard they had developed for the encampment. New elements included the shingled mound and the triangulated timber frames that were developed for the galleries.

Despite the unconventional forms, inventive use of glass and abundance of natural light; all of which coincided with Jensen's interests; he found the project unnerving. Whether Jensen was disturbed by the political associations with the encampment at Thy, the sculptural forms or the palette of inexpensive industrial materials is unknown, but he decided that he could not present *Building Manifesto 1976* as the prototype for the next phase of Louisiana's expansion.[29] At the same time, he did not want to censor the architects and he agreed to present the project as a theoretical work for an exhibition building, in the form of posters and full-scale building components. Jensen apologized to the three architects for the change of course and offered them an

[28] Jensen described his intentions in M3, 15-16.

[29] Carsten Hoff discussed *Byggeri Manifest 1976* with the author on 17 August 2016. According to Hoff, Jensen asked the architects if the glass exhibition building would "actually keep the rain out."

opportunity to construct whatever other project they desired for the exhibition. Given the chance to realize some segment of *Backdrop for Dwelling*, the trio erected an undulating section of a three-story building, roughly 20-meters long, using materials donated by a variety of manufacturers.[30] **[Figs. 4.29–4.30]**

In a number of respects; including the source of materials, use of technology and attitude towards aesthetics; the most unconventional work in *Alternative Architecture* was an installation on the lake, created by an artist who scavenged his materials from the streets and canals of Amsterdam. During the planning for the exhibition, Jensen had instructed his curators to be alert for artists whose work involved some form of construction. One of those curators, Hugo Arne Buch, visited Amsterdam during 1975, where he came across the work of Viktor IV, an enigmatic American artist who lived on a houseboat that was as fantastic and eccentric as its creator.

Viktor IV was born Walter Carl Glück in Brooklyn, New York, and led a nomadic existence as a photographer in various European cities, before finding his place in Amsterdam and settling there in 1961. By 1966, he had established his home studio on *Berendina Fennegina*, an old cargo ship moored on the Amstel River near the Blue Bridge. In 1972, Viktor IV and his Danish muse Elisabeth "Ina" Munck announced the establishment of *The Second Quality Construction Company* and transformed the ship into a floating sculpture; adding rafts and floating towers that were constructed from salvaged materials. By the time Buch saw the sculpture in 1975, it included fourteen different structures; several of them 2-3 stories high; that were lashed to the mother ship using discarded nylon stockings, neckties and bicycle inner tubes. After Jensen heard about the floating installation, he invited Viktor IV to participate in *Alternative Architecture* and construct a raft on Humlebæk Lake.[31]

In April 1977, Munck and Viktor IV arrived in Humlebæk; in a truck filled with the scrap wood and other salvaged materials they had gathered in Amsterdam over the winter. At the first meeting with Jensen, they discovered that he wanted a rope-line ferry, so that visitors could convey themselves back and forth across the lake. Munck

[30] Hoff, 17 August 2016.

[31] Elizabeth "Ina" Munck described Hugo Arne Bech's visit and the history of the project during a conversation with the author on 8 April 2016. An outline of the artist's life can be found in Ida Munck, *Viktor IV: An American in Amsterdam* (Amsterdam: Foundation Viktor IV, 2013), with Louisiana's letter of invitation (18 May 1976) reproduced on page 70.

and Viktor IV spent much of the spring living in a boathouse behind the museum and constructing the raft, while Ole Nørgaard designed the moorings.[32] They christened the ferry *Ebbe Munck*, after Ina's father Hans Ebbe Munck; the journalist and diplomat who had been an important figure in the Danish Resistance during the Nazi occupation. The ferry service was launched in late June and operated into the autumn, before being suspended for the winter. **[Figs. 4.31–4.32]** Contrary to Jensen's original plan, *Alternative Architecture* had no direct impact on the design of a new south wing. However, the exhibition had a very real influence on Louisiana's later additions. Jensen's research into visionary architectural schemes had ignited a fascination with glass buildings, which would play a decisive role in the design of another wing of the museum, during the 1980s. [5.2] In the meantime, *Ebbe Munck* remained on the lake and provided the nucleus for the next phase in the development of the landscape.

4.5 The Lake Garden

Alternative Architecture was conceived as a form of research, but it was also the first in a series of summer exhibitions intended to draw visitors who might otherwise go to the forest or the beach. Knud W. Jensen recognized that many people; particularly those with small children, prefer to spend summer days outside; rather than trooping through museum galleries. In response, he imagined exhibitions that were focused on social topics and organized around activities or exhibits in the park, where visitors could encounter new ideas and experiences in the open air.[33] In 1978, Louisiana opened *Children Are A People*, an exhibition that transformed the 58-Building and much of the park into an interactive environment that celebrated fantasy and the creative potential of play. **[Figs. 4.33–4.34]**

The exhibition featured a series of installations by eight Danish artists, including Susanne Ussing, who gathered the artists and served as the artistic director. The installations varied from protests against the refined setting and assemblies of found objects to fantastic play-sculptures that suggested fragments of fairy tales. **[Fig. 4.35]** In the second Lantern Gallery, children could climb the wooden scaffolding of Ussing's *2 Svaner* and manipulate pairs of giant wings as they pretended to fly. Nearby, Mette Aarre's *Birkeskov* presented a grove of actual tree trunks and a large

[32] Munck, 8 April 2016.

[33] M3, 15.

bed covered by pieces of cloth, which were laced with plastic jewelry that children could discover and take home. As intended, the exhibition attracted large numbers of families. The most popular attraction was the Lake Garden, an adventure-play area that Jensen conceived as a permanent installation.

Jensen's concern for Louisiana's youngest visitors had been evident since the day the museum opened, in the form of the "children's museum" – a small room in the villa where children could work with art materials and decorate the walls. In 1958, that room had been a radical innovation, but by the early 1970s, Jensen was convinced that the children required more than piles of art materials and a few tables.[34] As a result, the 76-Building included a new room for children's activities, which replaced the room in the villa and provided direct access to the area around the lake. Writing to Louisiana's board of directors in 1975, Jensen raised the idea of a "children's village" on the lakeshore.[35] But after considering the costs and complications of operating a miniature town (with a functioning trolley system), he imagined a play area that would be experienced as part of the natural setting. As he explained in 1976,

"We have talked about a children's village, buildings in a variety of materials and with various functions; a poetic village as in the naïvistes' pictures of dream villages with their small houses. But that is going too far and would be too expensive; it must rather be something to do with nature: the slopes, the trees, the lake, the hill, where we can create an exciting outdoor play situation for the children."[36]

Children Are A People provided Jensen with an opportunity to realize this vision; using whatever resources he could gather. His creative partner on the project was Ole Nørgaard, who not only shared Jensen's enthusiasm for ad-hoc construction, but was also an admirer of the "junk playgrounds" conceived by his mentor, C. Th. Sørensen. During the late 1920s, Sørensen designed a number of playgrounds for large-scale housing developments on the outskirts of Copenhagen. Eventually, he realized that many children ignored his work and preferred to play on construction sites or vacant lots, using scraps of lumber and whatever junk was lying around. As an alternative, he proposed *skrammellegepladser* (lumber- or junk-playgrounds), which would provide

[34] M2, 15.

[35] M2, 15–16.

[36] M3, 16.

children with the cast-offs and scrap materials they enjoyed, minus the rusty nails and other health hazards.[37] Under Nørgaard's direction, Louisiana would construct a more naturalistic version of these ad-hoc play areas and incorporate *Ebbe Munck* into a larger system of transportation.

Jensen and Nørgaard's first decision was to extend the adventure of traveling across the lake, by adding an airborne leg to the journey. **[Fig. 4.36]** A small chair powered by gravity would carry children over the water to the ferry terminal at the mouth of the brook, which would be rebuilt and extended with an anchorage for the ropes. From there, travelers could board the ferry for the self-propelled journey back to the terminal below the museum, or return by foot. **[Fig. 4.37]** Nørgaard designed the suspension system, which was anchored by concrete columns, and the various terminals, which were set on timber piles to provide stability in the marshy soil. The Lake Garden was Nørgaard's final contribution to Louisiana: he completed the drawings for the ferry terminals shortly before his fatal heart attack in April 1978.

During the eight-week run, *Children Are A People* attracted nearly 160,000 visitors. The Lake Garden was especially popular, with visitors of all ages, but it was much less popular with people whose loved ones were buried in the adjacent cemetery. Some of them found that their visits to the graves were disturbed by the noise, and protested to the municipal authorities. The following year, when Jensen applied for permission to expand Louisiana, those unhappy visitors to the cemetery lent their voices to the opponents of the expansion. As part of the negotiations, Jensen agreed to shut down the aerial chair and end ferry service across the lake.[38]

Eager to maintain some sort of activity around the lake, Jensen revived his idea of a youth pavilion and commissioned Susanne Ussing to create an inhabitable sculpture for older children and young adults, who would presumably make less noise. Ussing began planning a dome, roughly 7 meters high and 5 meters in diameter, which would be constructed of interwoven branches gathered from a nearby forest and covered in thick blankets of seaweed. The choice of material was entirely conventional, at least

---

[37] Jan Woudstra, "Danish Landscape Design in the Modern Era (1920–1970)," *Garden History* vol. 23, no. 2 (Winter 1995): 236–237. For the original source, see C. Th. Sørensen, *Parkpolitik i sogn og købstad* (København: Gyldendal, 1931), 54.

[38] MLL, 245, 256.

on the Danish island of Læso, where the traditional houses are thatched with seaweed, rather than straw.

Ussing located the pavilion on the site of Nørgaard's launching tower, which provided an armature for the wooden structure. The large birch tree next to the tower was incorporated into the building, segments of the dome were left open to expose the branches, and Ussing inserted the base of a small tree at the peak, creating a symbolic *axis mundi* that joined the interior with the sky. Jensen had suggested that the dome be used as a video pavilion, and Ussing imagined that the interior would be dotted with small monitors, like a sky of electronic stars. After the technical challenges of wiring the monitors proved insurmountable, she decided the building would be a meditation center dedicated to love: *The Seaweed Church*.[39] **[Fig. 4.38]**

The Seaweed Church was completed in 1983, but it suffered from exposure to the elements and required total reconstruction in 1989. Ussing's partner Carsten Hoff designed a timber framework that followed the original form and was painted red; the dirt floor was replaced with painted plywood risers that followed the slope and the gaps between the seaweed blankets were filled with ornamental iron frames covered with plexiglass. **[Fig. 4.39]** Next to the birch tree, a small opening was covered with a custom-made steel door inscribed "God Amor." During the early 1990s, the *Seaweed Church* provided a strange and mysterious attraction, but it became increasingly fragile, until it was reconstructed once more and incorporated into Jensen's next scheme for the area around the lake, in 1994. [5.3]

4.6 A New Collection

A few weeks after *Alternative Architecture* closed in September 1977, fate intervened in the person of Peter Augustinus and the next phase in Louisiana's expansion began. Augustinus was an art collector and businessman who contacted Knud W. Jensen for advice about establishing a museum of modern art in Copenhagen.[40] After a series of conversations, it occurred to Augustinus that a new museum might be duplicating Louisiana's mission and he suggested that his family's philanthropic organization; the Augustinus Foundation, could provide Louisiana with a construction loan. With a

---

[39] Knud W. Jensen and Susanne Ussing, *The Seawood Church: A Sculpture by Susanne Ussing, Louisiana 1979–1994* (Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 1994).

[40] MLL, 234–238.

funding partner at hand, Jensen cast aside any thoughts of using recycled materials or ad-hoc construction techniques, and recalled Bo and Wohlert to develop a master plan for completing Louisiana with two new wings of galleries. The additional galleries would allow the museum to show several temporary exhibitions at the same time, while also displaying Louisiana's expanded collection. The changing character of that collection would drive the next stage in the development of Louisiana's architecture.

In 1973, Jensen began preparing the Board of the Louisiana Foundation for a reorganization of the museum's collection, which would involve selling off some of the older Danish artworks and making major purchases of contemporary art:

"In the years from 1953 to 1957, I bought almost all the pictures that Louisiana opened with, in 1958. Who says I bought the right things then? Certainly not myself."[41]

Jensen's main concern about the collection was the extreme difference in character between the older works and the more recent acquisitions, which included examples of Pop Art, Land Art and Minimalism that were quite unrelated to Jensen's pre-Louisiana life.[42] Louisiana had always been an autobiographical project for Jensen; as his small museum developed into a major institution with an international scope, his artistic interests evolved and his ambitions for the collection followed suit. In 1966, Jensen celebrated his fiftieth birthday by using his own assets to establish a new fund for purchasing art, *Museumsfonden af 7. december 1966*. While many of the early acquisitions were works by Danish artists of the CoBrA movement, the fund also purchased works by foreign artists, including important canvases by Yves Klein, Lucio Fontana and Andy Warhol.

During the early and mid 1970s, Jensen made use of a clause in Louisiana's bylaws that allowed the museum to sell works from the collection and, working with the New Carlsberg Foundation, placed a number of older works with other Danish museums. Other artworks that did not fit into Jensen's plan for the collection were loaned to smaller museums or simply donated to schools and cultural institutions around Denmark. At the same time, with support from the foundation and the Friends of the Louisiana Collection, Louisiana purchased more than 150 paintings and sculptures, including canvases by Roy Lichtenstein, Ellsworth Kelly, Frank Stella, and Morris

[41] M1, 11.

[42] M2, 9.

Louis.[43] Many of the new acquisitions were much larger than the traditional easel paintings that Jensen had collected in the 1950s, or the paintings of the CoBrA artists that he later purchased, and would require vast, unbroken expanses of wall. **[Fig. 4.40]**

Beyond the increased scale of the new works, the content was also much different from most of the older works in the collection. A number of the recent paintings were self-contained objects that lacked any subject matter beyond the acts of painting and perception. These abstract works required an extra degree of concentration from the viewer, but they also placed demands on the exhibition space, and were best enjoyed in a setting that had been emptied of competing colors and textures. While the new galleries for Louisiana's collection would continue the model of closed rooms with continuous skylights that had been established in the 71-Building, the palette of materials would be even more neutral, to accommodate the new collection.

4.7 The Master Plan

Studying Knud W. Jensen's papers, it appears that his ultimate goal was finishing Louisiana while he still had the stamina to oversee the work. The first step would be a master plan that could be presented to the Augustinus Foundation and then submitted for public review. In October 1977, Jensen wrote a six-page memo to himself, outlining his plans for two, entirely new wings of the museum that would finally complete Louisiana's expansion.[44] The South Wing would contain a string of galleries that extended out from the end of the villa, terminating at Jensen and Nørgaard's final scheme for a glass building overlooking the sea. Next to the cafeteria, the East Wing would include an enormous, double-height gallery under the Calder Terrace, and a glass exhibition building between the pergola and the fern-filled cleft. The two wings would be connected by a passage that was either buried underground, or set into the slope facing the recently completed Moore Garden.

Together with the 58-Building, the new wings and the passage would create a continuous indoor route around the edges of the park, allowing visitors to experience the entire museum without braving the rain or the cold. As Jørgen Bo was already designing a small addition to the villa, for selling tickets and books, he would be responsible for the South Wing. Vilhelm Wohlert had designed the most recent

[43] MLL, 215, 218.

[44] Knud W. Jensen, "Dagbogsnotater om byggeriet, Nerja, Oktober 1977."

project for a "culture bunker" buried under the Calder Terrace, and he would be responsible for the East Wing.

The East Wing presented Jensen with yet another opportunity to realize the underground Great Hall that he had imagined during 1967-70 and again in 1973-74, but the hall would now be used for exhibitions. Wohlert's initial sketches depict the 6-meter-high hall surrounded by lower galleries, with windows and skylights along the outer walls, which were sloped to resist the pressure of the soil. One of the sketches includes an underground passage with windows facing the lower level of the park, and a series of niches for displaying sculptures by Alberto Giacometti. **[Fig. 4.41]** At the time, Jensen was building the collection of Giacometti's work that is one of Louisiana's greatest treasures. He had installed several of the large figures in the Lake Gallery, but worried that the wall of windows reduced the figures to silhouettes, and that the slender posts competed with the sculptures for attention.[45] The final project for the East Wing included a small extension to the Lake Gallery, but it would never be constructed. Giacometti's works remain in place, occupying a gallery that seems to have been designed for them and providing one of Jensen's "centers of gravity."

One of the difficulties in designing the East Wing was creating a stair to the underground galleries that would be more than a dark hole in the floor. After Jensen ruled out a stair from the cafeteria, on the grounds that it would increase congestion, Wohlert's assistant Alfred Homann introduced the idea of a glass rotunda that would contain a circular stair and bring daylight to the lower level.[46] **[Fig. 4.42]** In fact, Jensen had been dissatisfied with the condition of the pergola since the early 1970s, and he was eager to convert it into a winter garden that would provide a year-round extension of the crowded cafeteria.[47] As the project developed, Wohlert replaced the rotunda with a narrow glass bulkhead nestled under the pergola, but the concept of a delicate steel structure would be revived in the late 1980s, and can be seen in the existing Winter Garden. [5.2]

Initially, Jensen imagined that the South Wing would present temporary exhibitions, while the East Wing would display Louisiana's permanent collection. By the spring of

---

[45] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 11 April 1978.

[46] Alfred Homann, email to the author, 16 May 2016.

[47] Knud W. Jensen, "Dagbogsnotater om byggeriet, Nerja, Oktober 1977," 4.

1978, he had reversed that arrangement and shifted the galleries for the permanent collection to Bo's project. As Jensen re-programmed the East Wing for temporary exhibitions, he expanded the size of Wohlert's project and insisted on windowless, column-free galleries that would be covered by coffered concrete slabs. As a result, Wohlert increased the construction module and simplified the floor plan, which was finally composed of square bays, 9.6 meters on a side; giving the building a rather coarse footprint. Beneath the pergola, a grand stair would descend to an 800-square-meter Great Hall with a 6-meter-high ceiling. On the far side of the hall, a ramp would descend to another level of galleries with lower ceilings, which would provide more than 700 square meters for temporary exhibitions and a planned collection of architecture and design. The size of the project exceeded Louisiana's immediate needs, but Jensen was determined that the East Wing include surplus space, so that he would not have to apply for a building permit whenever a new gallery was required.[48]

In the final scheme, the East Wing extended into the lower level of the park, forming a series of terraces that would be covered with grass and used for sculpture. **[Fig. 4.43]** Between the terraces and the cleft, a monumental stair would provide outdoor seating with views to the sea. In order to reduce the apparent size of the building, the outer walls would be sloped and covered with ivy; effectively turning Ole Nørgaard's sculpture terraces inside-out. It is difficult to believe that the ivy-covered walls were Wohlert's idea. His approach to architecture was based on celebrating building materials, rather than concealing them; covering the walls with ivy would have completely negated the architecture. More likely, the ivy-covered walls were Jensen's idea, as he attempted to make the large project more acceptable to the planning authorities. Jensen referred to the building as "grass architecture" and urged Wohlert to increase the height of the lower terrace, which would have elevated Henry Moore's sculptures, in the hopes of solving the problem with the Moore Garden.[49]

In the press release announcing the project, Jensen referred to the ivy-covered terraces as "bastions," implying continuity between the construction of the new wing and the re-shaping of the landscape that occurred during 1810–15; when the excavated soil from the lake was used to create the bulwark occupied by the 58-Building.[50] The

[48] Knud W. Jensen, "Dagbogsnotater om byggeriet, Nerja, Oktober 1977," 6.

[49] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 11 April 1978.

[50] Louisiana press release, "Udbygning af Louisiana. Samarbejde mellem Augustinus-Fonden og

comparison was more apt than he realized. The East Wing would have replaced the lower level of the park with an enormous platform that was elevated 3-5 meters above the beach road, giving the museum a fortress-like aspect towards the water. In both form and scale, the design of the East Wing was better suited to the stepped platforms of a Mayan city than the soft curves of the Danish coastline. But it was also a first draft. A decade later, the basic elements of Wohlert's 1978 scheme – a large hall below the Calder Terrace, a glass box containing a stair to a lower level, and a subterranean passage to the South Wing – provided the outline for a second, more sensitive, version of the East Wing, which closed the circle around the park, in 1991.

At the other end of the park, Bo was struggling – much as Nørgaard had struggled in 1963 – to reconcile the edges of the Forest Triangle and find a simple order that would join the building with the setting. He was also struggling to accommodate a vastly expanded program. In 1975, Jensen had planned to construct a modest extension to the south end of the villa, which would include the ticketing lobby he had been pursuing since 1961, a small bookshop and 500 square meters of galleries for temporary exhibitions. As Jensen's plans for acquiring contemporary art became a reality, he decided to install the museum's collection in the new South Wing, and increased the area of the galleries to 1,500 square meters. Another complication was the question of preserving Ole Nørgaard's three sculpture terraces. Given the size of the building, it was obvious that Henry Heerup's sculptures would have to be moved and the fruit trees felled, but Jensen was uncertain whether the terraces should remain.

Bo's fundamental challenge was arranging the number of square meters that Jensen required; for galleries, art storage, mechanical rooms and a lounge overlooking the sea; without cutting down every single tree between Gammel Strandvej and the beech forest, and covering the entire site. His initial schemes extended to the edge of the forested slope, but after Jensen worried about damage to the root systems of the trees, Bo pulled the building back towards the road and began experimenting with different arrangements of galleries. **[Fig. 4.44]** His most important experiment featured a row of galleries that were placed at a right angle to the sculpture terraces and shifted out of alignment. **[Fig. 4.45]** Shifting the galleries back and forth across the site would not only preserve the largest trees in the center of the site, but also present a faceted edge

---

Louisiana," 2 June 1978.

to Gammel Strandvej, reducing the apparent size of the building. Along the tall hedge, a low volume would provide a loading dock and art storage. Jensen approvingly compared the scheme to a sliced loaf of bread, and then asked for more space:

"The latest design of the South Wing with the staggered axes in the long loaf of bread is mighty fine as an overall plan and exploits the area in an exemplary way. To get the necessary room for a museum collection in the future too, the whole area has to be incorporated."[51]

Another of Bo's concerns was the height of the exhibition building. Jensen required galleries with ceiling heights of 5 and 6 meters. Bo responded by sinking the building into the slope, so that the gallery floors would be 3–4 meters below ground. He arranged the six galleries in pairs, at three levels that stepped up the slope and were connected by shallow ramps. **[Fig. 4.46]** The ramps were placed outside the galleries, on alternating sides of the building, and enclosed with glass walls. While the glass walls would provide views of the surroundings, the changes in level would provide a physical connection to the terrain, orienting visitors as they moved up and down the slope. Moreover, the staggered arrangement of the ramps would create diagonal movement through the galleries – as in the 58-Building – enhancing the visitor's exposure to the art. At the end of the final gallery, a stair would lead to the Panorama Room, which would be an enclosed version of Nørgaard's observation deck.

Sometime in March 1978, Bo made the breakthrough that would determine the final design of the South Wing. Working with his associate Niels Presskorn, Bo divided the galleries into two types with different ceiling heights; high and low; and treated the high galleries as L-shaped rooms that were nested together and set at a diagonal to the street. **[Fig. 4.47]** On the inside, the irregular shape of the galleries would encourage a serpentine route along the walls, creating a more fluid version of the diagonal paths in the "sliced bread" scheme. On the outside, the nested galleries allowed Bo and Presskorn to reduce the width of the building and maintain a distance from the street, at once making the building less imposing and preserving the grove of beech trees along Gammel Strandvej.

As in the preceding scheme, the galleries were arranged at different levels that followed the natural slope, much as Nørgaard's terraces followed the slope. It is

[51] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 24 February 1978.

obvious to imagine Bo's L-shaped galleries as enclosed versions of the sculpture terraces. The three galleries were set at different elevations, 60 centimeters apart, and connected by ramped passages that would fuse the experience of the art with the experience of the terrain. Beyond the high galleries, a long, rectangular section of the building would provide two levels of low galleries, with ceiling heights of roughly 3 meters. The upper level would have skylights, while the lower level would be artificially illuminated, making it especially suitable for light-sensitive works of art. The combination of high and low galleries allowed Bo to avoid covering the entire site, while still providing the floor area that Jensen required. From this point, the design of the South Wing would be a process of refinement, over two more years.

By May 1978, Bo's scheme included an underground connection to the East Wing. The passage from the villa and the bookshop now ended in a long, narrow gallery, which also served as a vestibule for the subterranean passage. **[Fig. 4.48]** Bo was still trying to establish a direct connection between the interior and the setting, even as he and his staff wrestled with the problem of transporting visitors from the Panorama Room to the foyer-gallery, 6 meters down the slope. Their solution was a stepped passage along the east side of the building with a flat roof edged in teak and floor-to-ceiling windows facing the trees. **[Fig. 4.49]** What could be usefully labeled the Forest Passage would have been an analog to the Tree Passage in the 58-Building and provided a sense of parity between the two wings of the museum. But Jensen was eager to use the outer walls of the building as a background for sculpture and he instructed Bo to remove the passage.[52] To provide some sort of shelter or mediating device towards the forest, Bo added a pergola to the exit from the Panorama Room, and the first stage of the design process came to an end. **[Figs. 4.50–4.51]**

In January 1979, Jensen presented the master plan for completing Louisiana to the municipality, the press and the public; it quickly became a lightning rod for criticism of the museum.[53] While some critics objected to trees being cut down, others worried that the new exhibition building would impinge on the public's experience of the waterfront. Owners of neighboring houses worried that an expanded museum would make the local parking situation even worse, and visitors to the cemetery who were

[52] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, 18 June 1978.

[53] The museum printed and distributed an A4-sized booklet entitled *Louisiana udbygningsplan, Forprojekt 25.01.1979*. There is a copy in the library of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.

disturbed by the activities in the Lake Garden also played their role. After nearly a year of public meetings and negotiations with the various parties, Jensen agreed to a variety of concessions. Ironically, they required Louisiana to cut the beech grove along Gammel Strandvej, in order to create parking places in front of the South Wing. In addition, the garden in front of the ancient house once occupied by Alexander Brun's gardener was paved and turned into a small parking lot, and the children's transportation system in the Lake Garden was dismantled.[54]

Eventually, the municipality granted Louisiana permission to expand. By that point, it was clear that the museum could not afford to construct both wings at once; despite the support of the Augustinus Foundation, which had developed from a loan into a donation. Wohlert's scheme for an East Wing would never be realized, but Bo's scheme for the South Wing would finally realize Jensen's vision of a new museum.

4.8 The South Wing

In early 1980, Jørgen Bo made the final revisions to the design of the South Wing. Most of the changes involved improvements to the circulation system: rearranging stairs to simplify movement through the building and adding an elevator between the low galleries. He also leveled the floors in the three, L-shaped galleries. As a rule, Jensen preferred level interiors, and he had been uncertain about Bo's plans for ramps between the three galleries. The problem was not a question of access – the ramps were quite shallow – but of attention. In general, Jensen wanted visitors to focus on the artworks and worried that the changes in elevation were a distraction.[55] In the end, he instructed Bo to remove the ramps and create a level floor through the L-shaped galleries, further isolating the interior from the setting.

Postponing the construction of the East Wing meant that the underground link would be also postponed, making the long vestibule-gallery in the South Wing unnecessary. Eliminating that gallery reduced the length of the exhibition building by 8 meters, which allowed Bo to shift the high, L-shaped galleries towards the villa. As a result, he was able to insert a large stair hall between the L-shaped galleries and the two levels of low galleries; dividing the building into two parts that can be used for

---

[54] MLL, 247; M5, 6.

[55] Jensen's 1967 memo describing a "world of art" describes his preference for a level floor in the galleries. [3.7]

separate exhibitions at the same time. The addition of a small stair between the Panorama Room and the ground floor created a continuous path at the back of the building. Finally, Jensen instructed Bo to remove the pergola outside the Panorama Room, so that the entire east side of the exhibition building could be used as a background for displaying sculpture.[56] **[Figs. 4.52–4.54]** Bo's office completed the working drawings during the summer of 1980, construction began in the autumn, and the building was ready to receive art in the summer of 1982.

The South Wing of Louisiana opened on 23 September 1982 and as always; the main entrance was through the front door of the villa. But once inside, visitors encountered a 3,400-square-meter addition that was very different from the buildings on the other side of the villa: bigger, brighter, much less rustic and much more technologically advanced. The addition was also much less crowded and more comfortable for the visitors. Tickets were now purchased at a freestanding island, which was clad in gray marble and illuminated by a round skylight. Descending a few steps or a short ramp, visitors entered a bookshop that was illuminated by an enormous, rectangular skylight and furnished with custom-made mahogany fixtures. **[Fig. 4.55]** Downstairs, new restrooms and a large coatroom added much-needed amenities, and an exit from the shop to Gammel Strandvej prevented congestion at the entrance to the villa.

The addition combined familiar experiences and devices with a monochrome palette of materials that announced Louisiana's more neutral, gently monumental approach to exhibiting art. The new approach was most apparent on the floor, where the rough, reddish-brick pavers of the older buildings had been replaced with dark-gray limestone tiles that matched the floors in the new galleries. The shop and the passage to the galleries were covered with flat roofs that recalled the 58-Building. While the ceilings and roof soffit were still aligned, those surfaces were now painted white to reflect more light. As in the 58-Building, the glass walls were constructed of teak sills and black posts, but the size of the module was increased to 270 centimeters, creating a series of square windows that reduced the number of posts and allowed more light.

Facing the park, a corner for resting and meeting friends was furnished with a custom-made mahogany bench, and a black marble version of Søren Georg Jensen's 1977

[56] Knud W. Jensen to Bo, "Notat om diverse uløste problemer vedrørende byggeriet, " November 1978.

sculpture *The Customs Building*. **[Fig. 4.56]** Outside, a small terrace was paved with granite cobblestones previously used in the sculpture garden, and defined by a low, ivy-covered retaining wall. The glass corner provided a sense of release from the enclosed confines of the shop, and introduced the museum's new strategy of encountering nature through a dramatic contrast, rather than a continuous journey.

Beyond the bookshop, a more abstract version of the Tree Passage looks out into the park and leads to the new galleries. **[Fig. 4.57]** The floor of what could usefully be called the Park Passage is set 90 centimeters below the ground outside, where the terrain begins to slope up towards the highest point on the property. The passage was designed to serve as an exhibition space, with a continuous skylight and a width of roughly 3.5 meters, which allows some visitors to linger in front of the art without blocking others. Along the route, the passage turns several times, to reconcile the angles between the villa, the street and the exhibition building. The bends in the passage divide the space into segments, avoiding the impression of a monotonous corridor and creating a sense of discovery as the visitor approaches the galleries.

At the end of the Park Passage, visitors encounter three, L-shaped galleries that provide 700 square meters of exhibition space and an unmatched variety of walls. The skylights and suspended ceilings had been adapted from the 71-Building, but the palette of materials had been adjusted to reflect Jensen's desire for neutral finishes. **[Fig. 4.58]** After Jensen complained that the brick floors in the West Wing reflected sunlight on very bright days; giving the lower sections of the walls a very slight reddish tint; he requested a substitute for the Höganäs pavers.[57] Bo and his project architect, Niels Halby, selected a dark-grey limestone from Portugal (*Azul Cascais*) that was completely devoid of colored minerals. The stone slabs were cut across the grain to provide a directionless surface and honed, rather than polished, to prevent harsh reflections. On the brick walls, the joints were left un-tooled and the surfaces were plastered prior to painting, to reduce the texture.

While the lighting system was modeled on the 71-Building, the technology in the new galleries was vastly more sophisticated. In place of acrylic bubbles, Bo's office developed a new type of glass skylight that would provide a full spectrum of daylight (rather than merely cool, bluish light reflected by the northern sky) and enhance the

[57] Stig Løcke, conversation with the author, 16 July 2015.

perception of color.[58] The three layers of insulated glass included a layer of 'Okopan', a proprietary material that contains polyester fibers and scatters visible light in all directions, while absorbing ultraviolet light. Beneath the skylights, long troughs reflect light onto the suspended ceilings, where panels of stretched fiberglass cloth diffuse the light. In addition, a system of opaque boards can be laid above the ceilings to completely eliminate daylight. As in the 71-Building, the suspended ceilings included rotating light fixtures and a border of narrow wood strips around the edge of each gallery conceals mechanical equipment.

In the South Wing, Bo's masterstroke was to abandon the traditional model of a rectangular gallery and create a gallery formed by two overlapping spaces, major and minor. **[Figs. 4.59–4.60]** While a rectangular gallery is experienced at a single scale, Bo's L-shaped galleries are experienced at two different scales; more expansive and more intimate; providing a variety of settings for the art and a variety of sensations for the visitor. In both cases, the key to this variety is the minor space in each gallery; the inside corner that is defined without being completely enclosed and experienced as a room within the room. **[Fig. 4.61]** From the major space, it is impossible to see all of the walls in the corner, which allows visitors to discover groups of artworks as they move through the gallery, rather than survey all of the walls from one point.

The three galleries have the same shape and are identical in width, but the lengths are slightly different. Bo was working with a module of 270 centimeters that was based on the steel framing in the roof, and he shortened the second gallery by one module to preserve a portion of Nørgaard's Middle Terrace. The third gallery is one module shorter than the second; to allow a walkway next to the forested slope trees; but the different ceiling heights in the galleries make it difficult to discern the differences in length. Based on his experience with the 71-Building, Jensen set the heights of the walls at 3.6, 4.8 and 6 meters.[59] As the ceilings rise, the proportions shift and the spaces change: from the horizontal expanse of the first gallery, to the classically balanced volume of the second gallery, and the soaring chamber of the third gallery.

Beyond the benefit to the visitors, Bo's L-shaped galleries serve the art by creating an extraordinary variety of exhibition surfaces. Rather than providing curators with four

[58] Løcke, 16 July 2015.

[59] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 7 February 1978.

walls, as in a typical rectangular gallery, each of Bo's L-shaped galleries provides eight walls of various widths, allowing artworks to be matched with walls of a suitable size and proportion. This abundance of walls also discourages the discordant pairings or overcrowding that sometimes occur on a single, very long wall. The variety of the widths is compounded by the three different ceiling heights. Altogether, the three galleries provide twenty-four walls that include twenty-one different sizes. While that might seem like an esoteric concern, the number of different surfaces makes the galleries more flexible than anyone could have imagined in 1980, when they were designed for the new works in Louisiana's collection.

Quite deliberately, Bo placed the openings between the L-shaped galleries out of alignment, creating a diagonal path that is clear without being distracting. **[Fig. 4.62]** In many traditional museums; which are either converted palaces (such as the Louvre) or follow the model of a palace; the galleries are arranged in a row (the French term is *enfilade*) and the openings are placed on an axis, creating a continuous line of sight. While that sightline provides orientation, it can also be distracting, as visitors are constantly reminded of what awaits them, and of how far they have to travel. Bo's strategy of a diagonal path, first developed in the 1978 "sliced bread" scheme, connects the L-shaped galleries in a way that balances orientation with contemplation. Walking back and forth across the path, visitors catch glimpses of where they have been and where they are going. But they enter each gallery at a right angle and encounter a wall with art, rather than an opening to someplace else. **[Fig. 4.63]**

In addition to the three high galleries, Jensen required lower, more flexible galleries that could easily be subdivided and used for installing temporary exhibitions or works from Louisiana's collection. Bo responded with two rectangular rooms that each provided 270 square meters: roughly equivalent to the two lantern galleries in the 58-Building. The lower level is a simple, box-like space, 3 meters high, with a suspended ceiling of metal latticework that allows light fixtures to be placed anywhere in the gallery. The upper level has the same roof structure and lighting system as the L-shaped galleries, but the ceiling is suspended at 3.2 meters. **[Figs. 4.64–4.66]** To compensate for the lower ceiling height, which required the light fixtures to be closer to the walls, the rotating light fixtures were set into the wooden border along the walls, and the pine strips painted white, to match the fixtures. Depending on the

exhibition, the suspended ceilings can be removed for unfiltered daylight; or the skylights completely blocked off and the gallery illuminated with artificial light.

The South Wing provided Jensen with a second chance to build his ideal museum, and the exhibition building ends in a pair of small rooms that can be traced back to his 1955 sketch of an exhibition building with a library. [1.9] By the 1970s, Jensen had apparently recognized the impossibility of combining a quiet setting with an extraordinary view, and he asked Bo to divide this new version of Jensen's "library" into two parts. The first part was a windowless reading room with a skylight, where visitors could study catalogs and other materials related to the exhibitions. **[Fig. 4.67]** At the opposite end of the spectrum; in atmosphere, lighting and outlook; the Panorama Room is an enclosed version of Ole Nørgaard's observation deck, and also recalls the nineteenth-century gazebo that stood on the same site. After the journey through the enclosed galleries, the space expands out to the horizon and visitors experience a sense of release. The details are extremely simple, and the ceiling, roof soffit and most of the fixtures were painted white, to reflect daylight. **[Figs. 4.68–4.69]**

Bo had originally designed the room with floor-to-ceiling windows, but Jensen worried that visitors might find the sheer drop to the beach unnerving, and insisted that the room be enclosed with low brick walls. After the brickwork was completed, Jensen walked into the room and realized his mistake. Bo raised the floor as much as possible (30 centimeters), and the corridor from the adjacent gallery includes a ramp that makes up the difference in elevation.[60] The raised floor forced Bo to change the material from limestone to wood, but the teak boards provide the sensation of walking on an outdoor deck, reinforcing the sense of arrival. The windows facing small sculpture court behind the room were covered with teak grills, which diffused the intense, late-afternoon sun. Bo's office also designed custom-made oak sofas and grey marble tables, employing simple forms and robust details that could withstand heavy use, and the furniture is still in place.

As the South Wing was completed, the remains of Ole Nørgaard's sculpture terraces were reconstructed, following the original border along the beech forest. The Upper Terrace was completely covered by the new exhibition building, but the Lower Terrace and a portion of the Middle Terrace were rebuilt with the old cobblestones

[60] Stig Løcke, conversation with the author, 14 September 2015.

from Slotsholmen. **[Figs. 4.70–4.73]** Despite the careful reconstruction, the two terraces have little of their former character. Originally, Nørgaard's terraces were surrounded with low walls of the same texture and color, so that visitors had the sensation of moving through shallow spaces embedded in the terrain. The substitution of brick walls for leafy surfaces, and the scale of the exhibition building in relation to the low walls along the forest, made it impossible to recreate the original experience. Before the site was cleared, Henry Heerup's colony of granite creatures was moved to the north side of the park and installed in front of the Cleft Passage, around the fern-filled cleft. Their new sanctuary was slightly more domesticated than the old orchard, but still in keeping with the artist's vision of presenting art in a natural setting.

By 1982, Jensen had finally realized his ambition to transform Louisiana into a new museum, by constructing halls for the performing arts and doubling the exhibition capacity with galleries that conformed to international standards for displaying contemporary art. **[Figs. 4.74]** Constructing the South Wing had entailed a number of very real sacrifices; most notably the sculpture garden; and the atmosphere of the museum had become less intimate, but much had also been gained. Louisiana was better prepared to handle large numbers of visitors, better positioned to participate in the international museum community and better equipped to install treasures of art historical importance. As a result, Louisiana would not fade into irrelevance, as Jensen had worried in the early 1970s. The next stage in Louisiana's architectural evolution would see Jensen and Wohlert working to close the circle around the park, but most of the construction would be invisible to preserve the beauty of the setting.

Analysis

The turmoil that attended Louisiana's growth during the 1970s was not specific to that museum. Instead, it reflected an aesthetic-ideological struggle between the promoters of modernism (such as Arnold Bode and Willem Sandberg), who regarded art as an instrument of popular enlightenment; and a younger generation of activist-curators (such as Pierre Restany and Pontus Hultén), who regarded art as an instrument of social transformation. As a result of his social-utopian sympathies and regard for members of both factions, Knud W. Jensen was caught between these two positions and internalized this struggle. By the mid 1970s, both positions were superseded by the cultural phenomenon generally known as post-modernism. The development of post-modernist architecture coincided with a burst of museum construction in West Germany, where Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert designed buildings that illuminate their work at Louisiana. A comparison between the South Wing and two of the exemplary post-modernist museums provides further insight into their methods.

4.9 A Concrete Utopia

In the Documentation, I have discussed Knud W. Jensen's "Alternative Era" in terms of an identity crisis, as he was confronted by social changes that he did not understand and worried that his autobiographical museum would become irrelevant. But Jensen's insecurity does not explain his embrace of an aesthetic agenda so foreign to his own, even as he continued to expand Louisiana according to his own taste. Instead, we can recognize that he was torn between two competing positions, both of which advanced a social-utopian agenda of popularizing art. In 1956, Jensen established Louisiana under the influence of a progressive movement that regarded art as an instrument of social stability. [1.8] During the 1960s, another progressive movement emerged that regarded art as an instrument of social changes. [3.10] While Jensen's social-utopian tendencies led him to embrace this new movement and its promoters, he eventually found himself trapped between the two positions.

Evidence of Jensen's conflicted position can be found in the aesthetic contrast between the projects he pursued during the mid 1970s: an exquisite concert hall with handmade chairs ***and*** a series of inexpensive, ad-hoc buildings; the Calder Terrace **and** the Lake Garden; the archeological exhibition *Pompeii 79 A.D.* **and** the neo-Dadaist festival of *Children Are A People*, both presented in 1978.

The first sign of conflict appeared in 1973, with Jensen's rhetorical question of whether Louisiana should follow the model of "Temple or Forum," described above. A clue to the origin of Jensen's "Alternative Era" can be found in his 1975 statement to the Board of the Louisiana Foundation, which began with an impassioned declaration,

"Every institution has its aura, its being, you know what it stands for: an opera, a court building, a library, a sanatorium. We also know what a museum is, and it is this institutional concept we will ignore. The museum is elitist, it does not function properly in our time and as an institution is not sufficiently relevant to society. This is also the opinion of many of our foreign colleagues (later it was expressed at a recent ICOM conference "The Museum and Its Audience"). […] Louisiana must have a humanistic orientation more than an aesthetic [orientation], it must be a house that is contemporarily engaged, progressive and humane, a concrete Utopia!"[61]

The telling phrase is "a concrete Utopia," a concept that originated in the writings of the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch and was adopted by the leaders of the 1968 Paris student uprising, under the influence of Henri Lefebvre.[62] Jensen's adoption of radical French rhetoric is peculiar; there is no reason to believe that he advocated a revolution in Denmark. Instead, we can infer that he was parroting his friend and role model Pontus Hultén, who traveled in Parisian intellectual circles and certainly believed in social transformation. [3.10] As Jensen was declaring his intention to transform Louisiana into a sociological workshop, Hultén was living in Paris; overseeing the construction of the French State's new super-museum, *Centre National d'art et de Culture Georges Pompidou*. As Hultén described it, Centre Pompidou would be "not so much a museum as a platform of modern sensibilities."[63]

---

[61] M2, 1.

[62] Bloch developed his concept of a "concrete utopia" as an alternative to what he labeled "abstract utopianism," which promised salvation at some distant point in the future. See Ruth Levitas, "Ernst Bloch on Abstract and Concrete Utopia," *Utopian Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1990): 13–26. Bloch's thinking was echoed by Lefebrve's "critique of everyday life." [3.10] See Gardiner, 116. [Chapter 3, Note 82] Hubert Tonka, Lefebrvre's assistant at the Institut d'Urbanisme de Paris during the mid 1960s, was one of the founders of the *Utopie* group. Tonka and other members of *Utopie* served as thought leaders in the tumult leading up to the Events of May '68. See Craig Buckley, "The Echo of Utopia," in *Utopie: Texts and Projects, 1967–1978* ed. Craig Buckley and Jean-Louis Violeau (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e); Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2011), 11.

[63] Calvin Tomkins, "A Good Monster," [Profile: Pontus Hultén] *The New Yorker*, 16 January 1978: 56. The titular "good monster" is Centre Pompidou, following Hultén's description of the program.

In 1969, Hultén opened his last major exhibition in Stockholm; *Transform the World! Poetry Must Be Made by All!* – a historical survey of artistic movements that advocated radical social change.[64] In 1971, fatigued and apparently disillusioned by the absence of revolution, Hultén took a sabbatical from Moderna Museet to write a monograph on Jean Tinguely.[65] A few months earlier, the government of President Georges Pompidou had announced an international, architectural competition for a new cultural center to be constructed in the center of Paris, on Plateau Beaubourg. The project was conceived as a response to the uprising in May 1968 and the protesters' demands for a more equitable society.[66] Initially, the government planned to construct a library with open shelving that would be accessible to the general public (the first such library in France). By 1971, the program had expanded to include a museum of modern art that would replace the decrepit facility at Palais d' Tokyo, a center for industrial design and a center for experimental music.[67]

The jury for the Beaubourg competition was packed with provocateurs, including Jean Prouvé, who served as chairman, Philip Johnson, Oscar Niemeyer and Willem Sandberg, who had retired from the Stedelijk Museum in 1962.[68] The winning scheme was submitted by Richard Rogers and Renzo Piano, who proposed a six-story megastructure of column-free floors, roughly 48 x 166 meters, suspended within an exposed steel framework that would carry the mechanical services on the outside. The art museum would occupy the top, two floors of the building and provide the ultimate version of the flexible "exhibition machines" that had developed since the 1950s [2.7]. As is widely recognized, Rogers and Piano's project was based on Cedric Price's "Fun Palace", while also drawing on the graphic strategies developed by Archigram.[69] **[Fig. 4.75]** The project can be regarded as a final attempt to realize the

---

[64] Tomkins, 45. Curated by Ronald Hunt, the exhibition was an elegy to the 1968 student uprising in Paris. See "Fragments of a Conversation with Ron Hunt" in *Bricks from Kiln*, no. 1 (December 2015). Available online at: www.b-f-t-k.info. Accessed 12 May 2020. The exhibition title combined statements by Karl Marx and Comte de Lautréamont [Isidore Ducasse], an eighteenth-century French poet who was re-discovered by the Surrealists and then revered by the Situationists.

[65] Tomkins, 45.

[66] See the chapter "Paris 1968: "Reform Yes, Masquerade No." in Francesco Dal Co, *Centre Pompidou – Renzo Piano, Richard Rogers and the Making of a Modern Monument* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2016), 1–13.

[67] Tomkins, 51–52.

[68] Susan Holden, "Possible Pompidous," *AA Files*, no. 70 (2015): 34–45. Holden describes the genesis of the competition and provides commentary on a representative sample of the entries.

[69] Sadler, *Archigram*, 162–64.

techno-utopian project of the 1960s, in which technology served as an instrument of liberation. [3.10] According to Rogers, it would be "a people's center, a university of the street capable of reflecting the constantly changing needs of its users."[70]

As the French bureaucracy began searching for a director of the new art museum, Willem Sandberg suggested they contact Pontus Hultén.[71] By the end of the summer of 1973, the French government had persuaded to Hultén to relocate to Paris, where he had first engaged the artistic-intellectual communities that would shape his work as a museum director. [3.8] After his years at Moderna Museet, the new position offered Hultén a second chance to realize his dream of using the museum as a tool for social transformation, now supported by the resources and power of the French State. His return to Paris roughly coincided with the beginning of Knud W. Jensen's personal-institutional identity crisis, as seen in his August 1973 statement "Temple or Forum?"

In 1976, as Centre Pompidou was moving towards completion, Knud W. Jensen was preoccupied with his own populist architectural project, which was also indebted to the techno-utopian movement that had originated in England. Like many architects of the era, Carsten Hoff, Susanne Ussing and Flemming Østergaard believed that dwellings should be adaptable to changes in family size and circumstance, and that residents should participate in the design and construction.[72] As a result, they advocated the use of inexpensive, industrial materials and hardware that could be easily re-configured by the residents. In that sense, Hoff, Ussing and Østergaard can be considered low-tech utopians developing the ideas of the high-tech architects using ready-made components. At Louisiana, the lightweight structures of *Building Manifesto 1976* had precedents in the Total Exhibition Structure of Archigram's "Living City" (1963) and parts of the "Instant City" (1968–70).[73] **[Figs. 4.76–4.77]**

Centre Pompidou opened in January 1977 and was an immediate public success. The plaza in front of the building quickly became one of the most vibrant spaces in Paris and 20,000 daily visitors streamed into the vast entrance hall (The Forum), most often

---

[70] Tomkins, 42. See Note 63 for full citation.

[71] Ibid., 56.

[72] See Susanne Ussing and Carsten Hoff, *Om organisk bigger: Huse for mennesker* (København: Forlaget Beboertryk, 1977). Well-known advocates of this approach included Lucien Kroll and Ralph Erskine.

[73] Both of these projects were included in *Archigram*, ed. Peter Cook. (New York: Praeger, 1973), 18–25, 86–101. For a less feverish discussion, see Sadler, *Archigram*, 53–72.

to admire the building before riding the escalator to the top floor. Almost as quickly, a consensus emerged within the art world that the enormous, open-plan exhibition spaces, subdivided by temporary partitions and overshadowed by ductwork and the exposed steel trusses, were unsympathetic to most types of art.[74] **[Fig. 4.78]** On the strength of Centre Pompidou's popularity, Hultén moved to Los Angeles in 1981, where he became founding director of the Museum for Contemporary Art. As a condition of employment, his successor at Centre Pompidou, Dominque Bozo, insisted on a radical renovation of the exhibition spaces.[75] During 1982–85, Gae Aulenti constructed a series of White Cubes on the top floor.[76]

4.10 An Eclectic Era

It is generally recognized that the opening of Centre Pompidou, in January 1977, marked the beginning of the era of spectacular museum architecture that continues today. At the same time, the opening signaled the end of an era in European museum architecture that was premised on endlessly flexible exhibition spaces, as is evident in Gae Aulenti's reconstruction only five years after the opening. As well, the opening of Centre Pompidou coincided with the end of the popular faith in technology as a source of social transformation or personal freedom, at least for a period. That faith had been premised on an optimistic view of the future and an unlimited supply of natural resources; both premises were dealt a severe blow by the worldwide oil crisis of 1973–74. Introducing a 24-page profile of Centre Pompidou with commentary by Reyner Banham, the editors of *The Architectural Review* described the technological-social ideals of the building in the past tense,

> "The Centre reflects the supreme moment of technological euphoria in Western society: the moment when we genuinely believed that 'freedom' was to be got by providing ourselves with endless power-supplied facility: with servicing which would be so elaborate and so heavily duplicated that you could do anything you want, any where, at any time."[77]

---

[74] Victoria Newhouse, *Towards A New Museum*, second ed. (New York: Monacelli: 2006), 197.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Margherita Petranzan, *Gae Aulenti* (New York: Rizzoli, 1996), 128–133. As well: Josep Maria Montaner and Jordi Oliveras, *The Museums of the Last Generation* (Stuttgart, Zürich: Karl Krämer Verlag, 1987), 140–141.

[77] "The Pompidolium," *The Architectural Review*, May 1977, vol. 161, no. 963: 272.

The end of the popular faith in technology as a means of liberation reflected a more profound loss of faith in modernism, or – more accurately – the mythical correlation between modernist aesthetics and objectivity promoted by the pioneers of the Modern Movement and their supporters. As Walter Gropius had explained, in 1935,

"The forms of the New Architecture differ fundamentally [...] from those of the old, they are [...] simply the inevitable, logical product of the intellectual, social and technical conditions of our age."[78]

In Europe, primary factors in this apostasy included the grotesque results of post-war reconstruction, the tragic character of so much large-scale residential construction and the inability of modernist dogma to accommodate the subtleties of human behavior and the particularities of place. As a result, many architects abandoned their belief in a shared set of architectural values, and by extension the validity of any common language or objective criteria for building. What followed was an era of widespread eclecticism that was characterized by a renewed interest in historical styles, a new interest in theories adopted from other fields, particularly literature and the social sciences, and the use of collage as a compositional strategy.[79]

The development of post-modernist architecture found especially fertile ground in West Germany, where a boom in museum construction would produce more than thirty new buildings in the span of two decades.[80] While the federal system encouraged competition between strong state governments, with cultural institutions serving as trophies, the country's recent history encouraged openness to new ideas. Typically, the architects for the new museums were selected through competitions that included some number of West Germans and a handful of foreigners, who were invited to compete on the basis of their international reputations. The invitations to foreigners demonstrated a rejection of the extreme nationalism that had characterized the Nazi era, but also increased the likelihood of eye-catching buildings that would generate publicity and prestige for their host cities.[81]

---

[78] Walter Gropius, *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*, trans. P. Morton Shand (London, Faber and Faber: 1935), 18.

[79] See *Transformations in Modern Architecture* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1979), 3–17. William J. R. Curtis, in *Modern Architecture Since 1900*, third ed. (London: Phaidon, 1996), 589–613.

[80] David Galloway, "The New German Museums," *Art in America*, vol. 73, July 1985: 74–89.

[81] Manfred Sack, "Mere værksted end temple. Museer i Tyskland," *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3: 81.

The standard bearers for this era of eclectic museum architecture were two former members of the 1960s techno-avant-garde, Hans Hollein and James Stirling, who now regarded the expression of industrial technique as one of many valid styles, and composed their museums using a variety of ready-made architectural fragments. Despite this shared compositional strategy, the two architects pursued opposite approaches to the design of exhibition space, alternately pursuing models of complete freedom or absolute order. Both approaches represented a rejection of the model of universal space that originated in the interwar works of Mies van der Rohe [2.7] and culminated in Centre Pompidou. As with the previous examinations of foreign museum buildings, detours to Hollein's Stadtisches Museum Abteiberg (1972–82), in Mönchengladbach; and Stirling's Neue Staatsgalerie (1977–83), in Stuttgart, provide new perspectives on Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana.

***

Prior to 1972, the Viennese architect Hans Hollein was best known for the illustrated polemics that he published in *Bau* (1965-71), the avant-garde journal that he founded and edited with Walter Pichler and Günther Feuerstein.[82] Under the influence of Reyner Banham, Hollein promoted a visionary, neo–Dadaist approach to architecture that would dissolve the boundaries between buildings and objects of consumer culture.[83] As he proclaimed in *Bau*, "Alles is Architektur."[84] Hollein's architectural work was indivisible from his artistic practice, which centered on collage and installations. In 1970, he created *Tod* (Death), an exhibition of environmental sculptures at the townhouse occupied by the municipal museum in Mönchengladbach, a small city near Düsseldorf. The founding director of the museum, Johannes Cladders, was determined to construct a new building that would create a dialogue between art and architecture, and constitute an autonomous work of art.[85]

---

[82] See "Everything is Architecture: Hans Hollein's Media Assemblages" in Craig Buckley, *Graphic Assembly: Montage, Media, and Experimental Architecture in the 1960s*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019), 125–184. This citation: 144–145.

[83] Liane Lefaivre, "Everything is Architecture," *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 18 (Spring/Summer 2003): 3.

[84] *Bau* 1968, 1/2 (April): 1–32. In English: Ockman, 459–462. For commentary, see Jack Self, "Is Everything Architecture?" *The Architectural Review*, no. 1423 (September 2015): 18–20.

[85] Cladders believed that "The museum is the potential total work of art of the 20th century. It becomes such to the extent in which it succeeds in uniting the spatial claims of architecture with those of art." Reprinted in Heinrich Klotz, *New Museum buildings in the Federal Republic of Germany = Neue*

By 1972, Cladders had located a site on the edge of the old town, on a hillside formerly occupied by a Bendectine abbey (Abteiberg), and commissioned Hollein to design his new museum-cum-*Gesamtkunstverk*.[86] Hollein undermined the traditional, monumental model, by fragmenting the museum into a series of individual buildings that overlook the town park: a small office tower, a large gallery for temporary exhibitions, a block of zinc-clad galleries with skylights and a small block of glass and white marble that serves as the entrance pavilion. **[Fig. 4.79]** Hollein's strategy of collage allowed him to fit the building into the townscape, while also subverting any historical associations. In a symbolic gesture, he placed most of the spaces beneath a pedestrian plaza that allows the citizens to walk on the formerly sacred institution. Hollein extended his strategy to the three levels of exhibition spaces, which include enclosed galleries and open-plan areas, and become increasing labyrinthine as the visitor descends. **[Fig. 4.80]** Heinrich Klotz described this strategy as a breakthrough,

"Whereas a museum had, until then, been regarded as a building which could be subdivided to a greater or lesser degree, the concept 'building' would seem out of place in the case of Hollein's museum in Mönchengladbach. More suitable would be the term 'landscape of buildings.' Instead of a unified structural block, a wide range of different individual buildings are placed in complex relations to one another, producing a varied 'adventure playground' representing, both externally and internally, a kind of landscape of structures and space. […] Hollein's museum is in stark contrast to gigantic containers à la Centre Pompidou, which incorporate and 'level out' the various different functions of a museum under one, all-encompassing roof.

The intention is no longer the flexibility of the large hall with movable partitions in the sense of modern buildings but, rather, a wide variety of different room 'characters' which are specially suited to various different art objects. The result is a varied, complex whole characterized by a wide range of spatial individuality which, as an aesthetic environment, stands in fundamental opposition to traditional museums of art."[87]

Museumsbauten in der Bundesrepublic Deutschland, (New York: Rizzoli, 1985), 18–19. For the original source, see the exhibition catalog by Hans Hollein, Cladders and Celant, in the bibliography.

[86] See Klotz, 91–104. As well: Wolfgang Pehnt, *Hans Hollein, Museum in Mönchengladbach: Architektur als Collage* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1986). For images: Jonathan Glancey, "Museum, Mönchengladbach, West Germany," *The Architectural Review*, no. 1030, (December 1982): 60–73.

[87] Klotz, 16–18.

If Klotz had removed the identifying terms, he could have been describing Louisiana. But in contrast to Bo and Wohlert, Hollein abandoned any consistent approach and created a deliberate state of complexity. Pursuing a union of art and architecture, Hollein designed the three levels of exhibition space as a series of unique environments, so that individual artworks could become identified with specific galleries or zones. At the same time, he hoped to liberate visitors from a pre-determined route through the museum and, instead, create multiple paths through the exhibition spaces and between the various levels. In the architect's own words,

"Regarding the internal layout of the galleries, the museum in Mönchengladbach is best described as a three-dimensional matrix. It's not a museum with a fixed series of rooms; the visitor can take very different paths through it. I enter the building along a diagonal and have four options. […] This open arrangement of the galleries accommodates modern contemporary art with its rejection of chronological series. […] It lets each work of art find its place and gives the visitor the freedom to devise his or her own way through the exhibition."[88]

The dominant feature of Museum Abteiberg is the cluster of square galleries at the plaza level, which are covered with diagonal, saw-tooth skylights. Rather than connect the rooms in the traditional *enfilade*, Hollein opened the corners to create a network of possible paths. **[Figs. 4.81–4.82]** Where galleries meet, visitors find themselves at focal points that provide views into all of the adjacent spaces, including two, double-height galleries that serve as light wells to the level below. **[Fig. 4.83]** Five of the square galleries reoccur on the middle level of the museum, alongside an amorphous open-plan area that is shaped by the enclosed areas and the topographic incidents along the edges. On the lower level, the square galleries were subdivided with partitions, so that the distinction between enclosed and open-plan spaces disappears. **[Fig. 4.84]** The extraordinary variety of exhibition spaces was illuminated with an equally diverse range of lighting techniques; Hollein described the result as an example of "complex homogeneity."[89]

[88] Hans Ulrich Obrist, "In Conversation with Hans Hollein," *Journal #66*, October 2015; www.e-flux.com/journal/66/60777/in-conversation-hans-hollein. Accessed 27 February 2019.

[89] Jonathan Glancey, "Museum, Mönchengladbach, West Germany," *The Architectural Review*, no. 1030, (December 1982): 66.

In spite of Hollein's sincere concerns for both art and visitor, his intended union of art and architecture was undermined by the variety of the exhibition spaces and the overwhelming number of paths. **[Figs. 4.85–4.91]** In theory, one approach or the other might have liberating, but together they demand a constant state of awareness from the visitors, who are forced to navigate their journey though the museum. The clusters of square galleries that appear on all three levels were apparently intended as reference points, but the strategy of open corners undermined a sense of enclosure and the walls are experienced as freestanding objects. The state of confusion peaked on the lowest level, where the square galleries were subsumed into a continuous field of freestanding partitions. Where Hollein hoped to encourage wandering and a resulting sense of discovery, the experience was closer to being lost in a multi-level labyrinth.

***

Given the extraordinary amount of media coverage, James Stirling's Neue Staatsgalerie (1977–83), in Stuttgart, was probably the most widely recognized museum building of the 1980s. However, understanding Stirling's era-defining achievement requires locating that building in the context of his career. After an early period under the spell of Le Corbusier, Stirling turned to Russian Constructivism as a primary source of inspiration and became one of the pioneers of British "high-tech" architecture.[90] He achieved international fame with a trio of academic buildings (the Red Trilogy) that were designed with James Gowan and completed at the universities of Leicester, Cambridge and Oxford, during 1963–71.[91] All three buildings were plagued by technical and functional problems that can be traced to Stirling's devotion to spectacular forms over more prosaic concerns. As a result, his reputation in Britain was severely damaged and his practice crippled.[92]

[90] During the 1950s, Stirling was a member of the Independent Group, in London; Reyner Banham served as the secretary. Much like his contemporaries the Smithsons, Stirling hoped to revive the legacy of avant-garde modernism developed during the 1920s and 1930s, which the Smithsons called "the heroic period." While the Smithsons developed "New Brutalism," Stirling engaged in a form of technological expressionism. See Curtis, "Architecture and Anti-architecture in Britain," in *Modern Architecture Since 1900*, third ed. (London: Phaidon, 1996), 529–545. In depth: *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*, ed. David Robbins (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press).

[91] See Curtis, 534–538.

[92] Claire Zimmerman, "James Stirling Reassembled," *AA Files*, no. 56 (2007): 39.

The German museum competitions of the 1970s offered Stirling an opportunity to apply his remarkable talent for ingenious formal compositions and intricate circulation systems to a new building type, and revive his practice. In 1975, he and his partner Michael Wilford were invited to enter competitions in Düsseldorf, for the Nordrhine-Westphalia Museum; and Cologne, for the Wallraf–Richartz Museum. Neither of the entries was awarded a first-prize, but they contained many of the fundamental ideas for the winning scheme in Stuttgart, including the cylindrical courtyard that was originally projected for Düsseldorf.[93] In 1977, the state of Baden-Württemberg invited nine West German practices and four foreign practices – James Stirling and Michael Wilford, Philip Powell and Hidalgo Moya, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, and Pierre Zoelly and Georges-Jacques Haefeli – to submit designs for an extension to the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart.[94] The existing museum was a three-story, neoclassical building that was designed by Gottlob Georg Barth and opened in 1843; destroyed by Allied bombs in 1944; and reconstructed during 1958–63.[95]

The site for the extension, roughly 100 x 150 meters, was located between an urban highway (Konrad Adenauerstrasse) and a residential area to the east, 8 meters above the highway. The extremely detailed competition brief mandated that a two-story building be constructed on a 3-meter-high podium containing service areas and underground parking.[96] The lower level should include an entrance hall, auditorium, the usual public functions and a gallery for temporary exhibitions, while the upper level should provide 2500 square-meters of galleries for the permanent collection, illuminated by skylights. In addition, the program required a theater building at the south end of the site; open-air sculpture display; museum offices and a small library; rehearsal space for a nearby music school; and a public footpath across the site, which would be outside of the security zone and negotiate the 8-meter change in elevation.

[93] James Stirling, "The Monumental Tradition," *Perspecta*, no. 16 (1980): 32–49.

[94] The summary of the competition program by Peter Cannon-Brookes (see below) refers to thirteen competitors. Evidently, only eleven entries were submitted. The museum's registration of the entries, "Engerer Bauwettbewerb Erweiterung Staatsgalerie Stuttgart – Neubau Kammertheater," includes model photographs, site plans and programmatic summaries for the projects.

[95] Peter Cannon-Brookes "The Post-Modern Art Gallery Comes of Age: James Stirling and the Neue Staatsgallerie, Stuttgart" in *The International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship* (1984) no. 3: 159–181. Cannon-Brookes describes the history of the Alte Staatsgalerie, the site and program for the extension of the museum, and provides an assessment of Stirling's completed building.

[96] Ibid.

Stirling responded to the building program with a terraced block that is governed by a pair of symmetrical axes: with the east-west axis dominant on the upper level and the north-south axis dominant on the lower level. Where the axes cross, a cylindrical courtyard includes the public footpath. **[Figs. 4.92–4.93]** On the upper level, Stirling arranged the permanent collection galleries in a U-shaped formation that is centered on the cylindrical courtyard, and was partially inspired by the plan of Karl Friedrich Schinkel's Altes Museum, but enlarged roughly 20%. **[Fig. 4.94]** As a counterpoint to the bi-axial composition, Stirling decorated the body of the building with a series of historicist details and treated the entrance as a collage of architectural fragments. **[Fig. 4.95]** After reducing the eleven projects to three finalists; Stirling and Wilford, Bo and Wohlert, and the German team of Günter Behnisch, Hans Kammerer and Walter Belz; the jury unanimously awarded the first prize to Stirling and Wilford.[97] An analysis of the entire building exceeds the scope of this document, but a review of the galleries that exhibit the museum's collection of twentieth-century art provides a useful point of comparison with Louisiana's South Wing.[98]

In Stuttgart, Stirling created fifteen rooms with coved ceilings and glass laylights that are consistently 14-meters-wide, with varying depths and a typical ceiling height of 4.8 meters. The ceiling height increases to 6 meters in the first, last and two corner rooms.[99] Following neoclassical precedent, Stirling arranged his rooms *enfilade*; creating axes of circulation that run 50 meters on two sides and 95 meters behind the drum. At the midpoint of the longer axis, the line of galleries is interrupted by vestibule with a lower ceiling, which allows the pedestrian ramp to pass overhead and preserves the symmetrical composition. As a counterpoint to the monumental character of the galleries, Stirling used semi-transparent glass in the laylights; so that visitors are aware of the roof structure and concealed lighting, and decorated the rooms with ironic, intentionally discordant flourishes. The decorations include bright-

[97] The members of the jury are listed in the report "Engerer Bauwettbewerb Erweiterung Staatsgalerie – Neubau Kammertheater Stuttgart. Niederschrift Preisgerichtssitzung," which contains their comments for each project. The preliminary phase of judging arrived at four finalists: the three, eventual prizewinners and the scheme by Hermann Heckmann and Hans Peter Kristel, which was eliminated during the second phase of deliberation.

[98] Stirling's gallery for temporary exhibitions is a rectangular room on the lower level of the museum, which includes six, large concrete columns. The columns were necessitated by budget cuts while the building was under construction. In any event, the architect never considered the space as something more than a neutral box with artificial light. Cannon-Brooks, 172.

[99] Cannon-Brooks, 166.

green grids on the ceilings and the angled porches at either end of the sequence; abstract portals with large room numbers; and ornamental light fixtures modeled on a segment of a cornice. **[Fig. 4.96]**

Stirling described the Neue Staatsgalerie as "monumentally informal"; a deliberate collision of planning strategies and formal fragments drawn from neoclassicism and modernism that would create a rich and complex architectural experience appropriate to a democratic society.[100] While the building can be regarded as an ingenious composition, it can also be regarded another example of Stirling's devotion to spectacular forms above all other considerations. The arrangement of the collection galleries was entirely determined by the cylindrical courtyard and pedestrian ramp; with the exhibition spaces treated as urban *poché*. The informal decorations can hardly counteract the monumental scale of the individual galleries or the monotony that results from sequences of similar rooms unfolding along rigid axes, over vast distances. **[Figs. 4.97–4.98]** Even Stirling's supporter Peter Cook (formerly of Archigram); writing an otherwise ecstatic review of the building; could only remark:

"Fifteen rooms. In series. Simply arranged with a traditional opened-flank door space from one to the next. [...] There is little one can say about it. It should answer very directly the complaint made by many museum directors that prima donna architects impose too much upon the galleries."[101]

Moreover, Stirling's decision to provide uniformly neo-neoclassicist galleries for a collection of twentieth-century art that includes important groups of work by Henri Matisse, Oscar Schlemmer, Pablo Picasso and Joseph Beuys, which were permanently installed in the four highest galleries, indicates that the architect prioritized the formal effects of his work over the experience of the artworks. **[Fig. 4.99]**

---

[100] James Stirling, "The Monumentally Informal," in *Neue Staatsgalerie und Kammertheater Stuttgart*, (Stuttgart: Finanzministerium, 1984), 9-17. Stirling's inaugural address is reprinted, in both German and English.

[101] Peter Cook, "Stirling 3: Stuttgart," *The Architectural Review*, no. 1033 (March 1983): 37.

4.11 Bo and Wohlert in West Germany

As noted in Chapter 3, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert were awarded second prize in the competition for the Neue Staatsgalerie in Stuttgart.[102] The two architects enjoyed a significant reputation in West Germany, where the informal character of the 58-Building corresponded to the populist ethos that had developed during post-war, social reconstruction. As Heinrich Klotz remarked,

"Again and again, architects are urged to design museums that will not daunt the potential visitor, that will not withdraw into themselves with a gesture of rebuff, but which will appear to open their arms wide in welcome. The architects of the Louisiana Museum near Copenhagen took this challenge to heart with successful results."[103]

In 1962, Bo and Wohlert were invited to participate in a limited competition for the Römisch-Gemanisches Museum, an archaeological museum in Cologne. The new museum would be constructed over the ruins of a Roman dwelling that includes the very large and well-preserved Dionysos-Mosaic, alongside Cologne Cathedral. Their entry was not awarded a prize, but it was purchased; the prize-winning scheme designed by Heinz Röcke and Klaus Renner was completed in 1974.[104]

In Stuttgart, Bo and Wohlert based their scheme on two points: deference to the Alte Staatsgalerie and shelter from the urban highway. The new building would be pulled back from the edge of the podium, to emphasize the existing building. Moreover, the corner pavilion of the Alte Staatsgalerie provided a module that would be visible on the terrace and subdivided to order the new building. **[Fig. 4.100]** The majority of the new galleries would be located in a large wing parallel to the highway and form a bulwark against the traffic. The architects devoted much of the site to a sculpture courtyard that would be terraced along the east side, to resolve the change in elevation

---

[102] According to Alfred Homann, Vilhelm Wohlert's assistant at the time, Bo and his staff were largely responsible for the Stuttgart project, with Wohlert acting as a consultant. Homann worked on the competition drawings in the final days before the deadline; designing the glass stair tower that recalls the bulkhead in the 1978 scheme for an East Wing at Louisiana, and drawing the perspective vignettes. Alfred Homann, correspondence with the author, 25 February 2020. Thomas Kappel explained that neither architect preserved the competition drawings, due to their second-place prize (Master's Thesis, 163). In fact, Bo kept the drawings in his archive, which is now in the possession of Stig Løcke.

[103] Klotz, 14.

[104] Bo and Wohlert's project for Cologne is a something of a mystery. The only reference to the project of (which I am aware) appears in Wohlert's Weilbach entry and it seems that it was never published. Archival research has not yielded the original drawings, but the search will continue.

between the museum and the residential area above. **[Figs. 4.103–4.104]** A narrow wing at a right angle to the highway would contain additional galleries on the upper level, with offices and service spaces below. As mandated by the program, the chamber theater would occupy a separate building at the south end of the platform. The architects placed the public path in a gap between the two institutions, where it continued up the slope, along the terraces of the sculpture courtyard.

Bo and Wohlert's deference to the Alte Staatsgalerie was also evident in their use of asymmetry and treatment of materials. The architects divided the façade along the highway into a series of large panels, either stucco or stone, that could support frames (*espalier*) covered with ivy. The entrance was placed off-center and would register as an opening in a solid mass: reinforcing the symmetrical entrance court of the existing building. **[Fig. 4.105]** On the ground floor of the extension, a spacious lobby would provide immediate access to the auditorium and a double-height gallery for temporary exhibitions, recessed into the podium. To one side of the lobby, a wide concourse would provide the café and museum shop with views into the sculpture courtyard. Opposite the entrance, the stair to the permanent exhibition would occupy a narrow glass volume that extended into the courtyard and end in a reflecting pool, providing visitors with views of the sculptures and the trees. **[Fig. 4.102]**

Beyond their consideration for the setting, Bo and Wohlert's scheme was determined by the requirement of 2,500 square meters of exhibition space for the permanent collection. Aware of the museum's extremely diverse collection, they divided the galleries into two types: major and minor, both of which was based on a cubic module. The major galleries would provide 6-meter-high ceilings and a consistent width (roughly 16 m.), but varying lengths and a range of proportions. These large rooms were wide enough to be subdivided with partitions and separated from the circulation system, to limit foot traffic. The minor galleries were narrower (roughly 11 m.) and lower, with 4-meter-high ceilings, and would connect the public stair with the major galleries. Both types of gallery would receive daylight from grids of north-facing skylights, which corresponded to the two different modules and were derived from Bo's 1964 project for Louisiana. **[Fig. 4.101]**

Bo and Wohlert's project for Stuttgart has been the subject of considerable confusion. According to Thomas Kappel,

"It is typical that when a distinctive and monumental architecture is required, a temple if you will, Bo and Wohlert came up short. The judge's opinion from the competition for the Neue Nationalgalerie in Stuttgart reads as follows: 'A design that one can easily be called filigree, one can call it "anti-architecture".' Furthermore, Bo and Wohlert's project is called conventional and dated, because it does not pay proper attention to the urban planning aspects."[105]

In reality, the jury report did not describe any of the prize-winning schemes as "anti-architecture." Kappel made the error of accepting the interpretation of another author (Thorsten Rodiek) – who misunderstood a comment by a third author (Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani) – without examining the original source.[106] Reading the jury report, it becomes clear that the decision between the first and second prizes was very much, or entirely, a matter of form. The jury praised Bo and Wohlert's project for their deference to the existing building and response to the setting,

"The result is a noble composition [...] The classicistic attitude is unmistakable. [...] The design of the entire complex has a high rating that is appropriate for the urban space."[107]

Moreover, the jury commended Bo and Wohlert's sculpture court for the "beautiful spatial relations between inside and outside," even as some members apparently complained about the orientation of the public areas towards the courtyard, rather than the terrace along the highway. The report also praised the simple circulation system, the treatment of the galleries and the lighting, while criticizing the design of the theater building and wondering if the suggested strategy of cultivating ivy on the façade was an adequate means of architectural expression.

---

[105] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 163. As well: Thomas Kappel, "Et overblik, Om museumsarkitekterne Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlert," *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 130–131.

[106] Lampugnani commented on the project by the third-prize winners, which resembled a greenhouse and was virtually unchanged from their entry for the 1974 competition to extend the museum: "the deliberately unspectacular design by Behnisch, Kammerer and Belz, a delicately structured cuboid of glass and steel, elegantly designed technical, but not technocratic, filigree despite the name "museum machine;" a balanced, green anti-architecture." See Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani, "Monument oder Museumsmaschine?" *Deutsche Architekten- und Ingenieur-Zeitschschrift*, 1978, no. 1: 17. The article was reprinted as "'Stadtgestalt' oder Architektur?" *Werk-Archithese: Zeitschrift und Schriftenreihe für Architektur und Kunst*, vol. 66, no. 33–4 (1979): 57-58. Writing in defense of Stirling and Wilford's building, Thorsten Rodiek imagined Lampugnani's comments as a reference to Bo and Wohlert's project. See Rodiek, *James Stirling. Die Neue Staatsgalerie* (Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1984), 9.

[107] Jury comments for the three, prize-winning projects were published along with drawings and model photographs in *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977): 715–723.

Stirling and Wilford's project received equally high marks for the relationship to the existing building and the response to the setting. While the jury commented on the complexity of the circulation system and the disjunction between the two levels, their response to the galleries was unequivocal: "The actual exhibition area offers optimal conditions," and applauded the large number of glass doors between the galleries and the sculpture terrace. Evidently, the decisive factor was Stirling's exciting composition of contrasting forms and fragments,

"The clear architecture of the basic forms is increased on the one hand by annex buildings (confounding factors), on the other hand, these elements of the layout given a human scale. With its high architectural quality, the design meets the given task for the Staatsgalerie Stuttgart in a formal as well as an urbanistic sense."[108]

Comparing the two schemes, it appears that Bo and Wohlert designed the superior museum building, at least in terms of exhibition spaces, visitor orientation and circulation, and areas for art handling and storage. However, it is also apparent that Stirling designed the superior attraction: provocative rather than deferential and expressive rather than introspective.

We can safely assume that Stirling's masterstroke was using the public path as the organizing device for the entire scheme; a populist gesture that undoubtedly appealed to the jury, in the ethos of "arms wide in welcome" described by Heinrich Klotz. It is ironic that the least important part of the museum program would be the dominant factor in the composition: determining the design of the permanent collection galleries and reducing them to a supporting role around the central void. However, that irony was absolutely of the moment, as the continuing success of the post-war movement to attract new audiences for art – of which Louisiana was both a product and an agent – transformed museums into pilgrimage sites for cultural tourism. Despite the numerous benefits of Bo and Wohlert's scheme, it is highly unlikely that their project would have attracted the extraordinary level of media coverage that attended Stirling's building while it was still under construction, or the 1.6 million visitors who came to Neue Staatsgalerie in the six months after it opened.[109]

---

[108] Ibid.

[109] Galloway, 74.

Simultaneous with the competition in Stuttgart, Bo and Wohlert were also competing for a museum commission in Bochum, a medium-sized city in the Ruhr region. The new building would be an extension to the existing Museum Bochum, located in a historic villa on a wooded block. The site was a narrow parcel adjacent to the villa that faced Stadtpark Bochum, which lies on the far side of a busy road. After the first round of judging, Bo and Wohlert's entry was matched against a project submitted by Gottfried Böhm, and they were eventually awarded the commission at the insistence of the museum director, Peter Spielmann.[110] The site plan suggests a resemblance to the 58-Building, with a narrow connection back to the villa and an irregular footprint that meanders around old trees. **[Fig. 4.107]** However, the size of the building program made it impossible to maintain the primacy of the villa, as in Humlebæk. Instead, Bo and Wohlert designed a continuous, three-story building that mediates between the neighboring houses and the park, set on a concrete base that steps down to follow the road. The new building opened in 1983.[111]

While Bo was developing the competition entry for Stuttgart, Wohlert developed the scheme for Bochum using the same matrix, 60 x 60 x 60 centimeters, employed at Louisiana.[112] In Bochum, the matrix generated a framing module of 4.8 meters that roughly corresponds to the structural bays of the villa. In the new building, the module governs a structure of reinforced concrete columns and coffered slabs. An aerial view reveals the dual nature of the sophisticated massing strategy, which was at once a product of the irregular plot and a response to the basin in Stadtpark Bochum. **[Fig. 4.108]** Apart from the connection to the villa, which is set back from the road and screened by trees, the body of the building is nearly symmetrical. In the center, a two-story section projects out towards the park, providing a loggia around the entry and two levels of rooftop terraces for sculpture. The result is a subtle composition of masses that fuses the geometric abstraction common to both classicism and modernism, and unites the program with the setting.

---

[110] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 145. According to Kappel, Bo and Wohlert were the only foreign architects invited to compete against a field of West German practices. Kim Dirckinck-Holmfeld reported that seven practices were invited to compete; see the following note.

[111] Kim Dirckinck-Holmfeld, "Museum Bochum," *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3: 88–103.

[112] According to Alfred Homann, Wohlert took the lead in developing the scheme for Bochum. Conversation with Alfred Homann, 25 February 2020. Despite Wohlert's leading role, the competition drawings for Bochum were preserved in Bo's archive and are in Stig Løcke's possession.

As Thomas Kappel explained, Peter Spielmann fled Czechoslovakia in 1968, following the Soviet-led invasion.[113] After assuming his position in Bochum, in 1972, Spielmann worked to transform the museum into a social center for meeting and debates, in a way comparable to Knud W. Jensen's simultaneous efforts at Louisiana. As detailed in the 1977 competition program,

"In terms of its complex tasks, the museum should not be another place of specialization, but a place of communication and encounter. […] Therefore, the new building or extension should be a building that is not designed as a temple or a place of representation, but as a workshop-like house. It should be an open, variable and multifunctional space that is laid out around the various communication areas (café, forum/lecture room, foyer). […] The building should not be built for the art collection alone; to a certain extent around the art objects; but should make it possible for it to be presented and activated in connection with the respective exhibitions and activities."[114]

Following the wording of the program, it has become commonplace to describe Museum Bochum as "more workshop than temple."[115] However, a more precise analogy would be "more town hall than temple." The largest and most important space in Bo and Wohlert's building is the double-height assembly hall that reflects Spielmann's dedication to the social function of the museum. **[Fig. 4.109]** Located at the center of the building, this "Forum" faces the public park through a wall of windows: terminating the view along the basin and expressing the civic character of the institution. The large hall, roughly 14 x 24 meters, features a floor of nine, square segments that can be individually raised and lowered on hydraulic lifts, providing a modular stage for a wide range of events and performances. We can recognize Bo and Wohlert's central placement of the Forum in a nearly symmetrical building as an attempt to join the public meeting hall with the public space of Stadtpark Bochum.

As a result of Museum Bochum's focus on public assembly, the exhibition spaces wrap around the Forum, on two levels with different ceiling heights and a typical width of approximately 9 meters. Following the museum's program, the spaces were designed for subdivision with temporary partitions. At the entry level, the exhibition space is 3-meters high and receives daylight from west-facing windows. **[Fig. 4.111]**

[113] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 144.

[114] Ibid., 145.

[115] See Sack. As well, Dirckinck-Holmfeld, 89; Kappel, Master's Thesis, 164.

On the first level, a double-height space rises to a height of 6.6-meters and receives daylight from a grid of monumental skylights, 2.4 x 2.4 meters. **[Fig. 4.110]** These north-facing monitors finally realized Bo's scheme of truncated pyramids, originally developed for Louisiana and then projected for the building in Stuttgart. Initially, the exhibitions were undermined by an overreliance on partitions and by the length of the cords required to suspend the light fixtures at the correct height. Both problems were later remedied, following advances in lighting and installation techniques. **[Fig. 4.112]**

In terms of construction, we can regard Museum Bochum as an industrial building that was designed according to handicraft values. Aside from the clumsy concrete ramp; which was undoubtedly a response to the extremely narrow site; that strategy was generally successful. Throughout the building, the architects used prefabricated elements to reiterate the construction module, in a way that illustrates an important difference between handicraft and industrial design. In contrast to natural materials, which have innate variations, the uniform character of prefabricated elements tends to emphasize the part, rather than the whole. In Bochum, this tendency is visible in the coffered concrete ceilings, where the coffers are filled with gridded cassettes that conceal lighting and electrical installations. The relentless subdivisions of the module nearly overwhelm the continuity of space and suggest that Wohlert had succumbed to what P. V. Jensen-Klint called "the geometric cat's cradle." [1.4]

The detailing is more restrained on the exterior, where the architects employed a system of panels and horizontal louvers that were fabricated of Tobak, an inexpensive alloy based on copper. **[Figs. 4.113–4.114]** As intended, the material has developed a patina that harmonizes with the wooded block and counteracts the precision of the assembly. The height of the panels corresponds to the basic module of 60 centimeters, while the width allows for the expression of the columns, which are framed by channels that extend the full height of the building. The paneling system recalls Knud Holscher's use of Cor-Ten steel at Odense University (1966–76), but the more useful precedent is Arne Jacobsen's Danish National Bank (1961–71/1972–78), which prefigured Bo and Wohlert's distinction between body and podium, as well as the continuous expression of the columns in Odense and Bochum. All three buildings embody the distinctly Danish tendency to create multivalent modern architecture, by employing classical principles of repetition and proportion.

Comparing Bo and Wohlert's two competition schemes from the summer of 1977; with their urban sites, modular masses, paneled exteriors and grids of pyramidal skylights; we can understand them as two variations on a single set of architectural principles. At the same time, the distinct characters of the two schemes reflect the differences in the settings (highway vs. park), institutional agendas (exhibitions vs. public assembly) and requirements for the exhibition spaces (defined rooms vs. flexible spaces). In both cities, the architects were forced to confront the question of civic representation, which had never occurred in their work at Louisiana. In both schemes, they employed a strategy of repetitive panels that were derived from the construction module. While this strategy avoided references to historical styles, the vertical gaps between the panels produced a visual rhythm that recalls neoclassical public architecture, through an inversion of solid and void. As well, both sets of panels were intended to blend into their settings, either through plantings or patina.

The schemes for Stuttgart and Bochum demonstrate Bo and Wohlert's customary pursuit of unity. Rather than adopt a strategy of fragmentation intended to mimic the texture of traditional urbanism, or to merely create a spectacular attraction; the two architects engaged the much more difficult task of devising coherent and anonymous solutions for complex programs on prominent sites. In both schemes, they generated their contextually anonymous buildings using a geometric module derived from the structure of an existing building, in the hope of establishing a visible relationship between old and new phases of construction. As such, these two schemes not only reveal Bo and Wohlert's disregard for post-modern eclecticism, but provide additional examples of their fundamental practice: in which the application of geometry to the peculiarities of the setting yields a unique building that is a product of the place.

***

In 1979, Bo and Wohlert were invited to compete in a competition for a new art museum in Aachen, the hometown of the renowned art collector and chocolate baron Peter Ludwig.[116] Ludwig had offered to donate a significant amount of art to the municipality, but insisted that the city build an appropriate museum. The competition attracted 80 entries; Bo and Wohlert's entry was not recognized and the first-prize was awarded to Wilhelm Köcker. Prior to sending the drawings to Aachen, Viggo

---

[116] Stig Løcke, email to the author, 26 June 2020. Conversation with Viggo Grunnet, 30 June 2020.

Grunnet made a final presentation of the project to Bo and Wohlert. Afterward, Bo looked at Wohlert and exclaimed, "Well, Vilhelm, we might win!" Wohlert replied, "Yes – all that hassle."[117] It was an ironic remark, but also prophetic. Almost immediately, Kücker's scheme fell victim to disagreements between rival political parties, with the use of public funds as the primary issue. During 1980–86, Kücker revised his scheme several times, responding to a variety of demands from the city council and Peter Ludwig, until the project was finally abandoned.[118]

In the interest of historical accuracy, it is necessary to mention a museum building in Germany that has been incorrectly attributed to Bo and Wohlert. Located in Hamm, near Münster, the Gustav Lübcke Museum was completed in 1993.[119] According to Thomas Kappel, who focused on the project in his Master's Thesis, the commission came to Bo and Wohlert by direct invitation from the town council, in 1985.[120] Kappel correctly described the building as mixture of styles. The Lübcke Museum combines the pyramidal skylights and a number of interior devices that appear in Museum Bochum with materials and forms apparently drawn from a number of James Stirling's works in Stuttgart and London.[121] In place of a unitary approach to the construction and a coherent response to the setting, the building in Hamm is a collage of fragments that provide different exhibition spaces for the museum's diverse collections, in a way that is alien to Bo and Wohlert's joint works.

According to Bo's former assistant Stig Løcke, Bo was not involved in the project and he was not impressed by the result.[122] During 1984-90, Bo was preoccupied with a two-stage expansion of the Israel Museum, in Jerusalem.[123] After those buildings were completed, he effectively retired from practice, as described in Chapter 5. The published credits from the Lübcke Museum include Vilhelm Wohlert and various

---

[117] Løcke, 26 June 2020.

[118] Die Zeit, "Aachener Finten," no. 31, 1986. Available online at: www.zeit.de/1986/31/aachener-finten. Accessed 1 July 2020.

[119] "Gustav-Lübcke-Museum, Hamm," *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 134–145.

[120] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 158–163.

[121] Obvious tropes adopted from Stirling's buildings include the free-form curved façade, abstracted Doric columns and Pirelli rubber flooring found at the Neue Staatsgalerie, in Stuttgart; and the triangular bay windows from his addition to Tate Britain (1980–87), in London.

[122] Stig Løcke, email to the author, 26 June 2020.

[123] John Høwisch, "Udbygning af The Israel Museum, Jerusalem. The Sam Weisbord og The Nathan Cummings 20th Century Art Building," *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 146–151.

members of Wohlert Arkitekter, which was formed upon Wohlert's retirement, in 1991. According to Løcke, Wohlert developed the design with Kurt Cleff, who had been the project architect for Museum Bochum. As such, it appears that Wohlert accepted the commission for financial reasons with Bo's approval; developed the project with Cleff; and handed the project off to his partners when he exited the office. Curious readers are directed to Kappel's chapter on the museum in his thesis, his assessment of the building in *Arkitektur DK* and Poul Erik Skriver's puzzled commentary in the same issue.[124]

4.12 "Wanted: Qualified Utopias"

After his encounter with Hoff, Ussing and Østergaard's *Building Manifesto 1976* and the opening of Pontus Hultén's "platform of modern sensibilities", Knud W. Jensen retreated from his embrace of visionary architectural projects, at least in regard to exhibition buildings. As recorded in the Documentation, Jensen's dream of a glass festival hall at Louisiana persisted through 1978 and his fascination with glass buildings never left him, as will be seen in Chapter 5. In early January 1979, Jensen wrote a New Year's greeting to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert; thanking them for their work on the Master Plan, restating his commitment to *genius loci* and criticizing the emphasis on imagery practiced by "our publicity-minded contemporaries."[125] Later that year, Jensen returned to several of those topics in his address at the annual conference of the International Committee for Museums and Collections of Modern Art (CIMAM), which was held at Centre Pompidou and hosted by Pontus Hultén.[126]

Following the theme of the conference, *Towards an Architecture for Modern Art Museums*, Jensen titled his address "The Ideal Museum" and examined a wide range of architectural factors, including lighting, materials and furnishings.[127] He did not present Louisiana as an example of an ideal museum and only made one direct

[124] Kappel, "Om museumsarkitekterne Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlert," *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 131–132. Skriver, *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 134, 136.

[125] Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, 4 January 1979. Jensen reprinted the letter in his autobiography, as a public *mea culpa* for his actions during 1973–77. See MLL, 248–253.

[126] The themes and locations for CIMAN's annual conferences since 1962 can be found at: www.cimam.org. Accessed 15 October 2018.

[127] Knud W. Jensen, "The Ideal Museum," 1–13. The typewritten document is located in the Knud W. Jensen Archive, Folder 1, LMMA. Michael Brawne quoted from the document in his 1993 essay and compared Louisiana to Jensen's concept of a "third possibility." However, Brawne did not give any examples of how that might be so or explore the meaning of "Wanted: Qualified Utopias," which he mistakenly regarded as the title of the address. See Brawne, *Louisiana Museum, Humlebæk*, 10.

reference to his own museum, describing the variety of exhibition spaces as "low, high, long, deep."[128] Nonetheless, we can interpret Jensen's address as a personal statement that records the evolution of his thinking during the 1970s, as he struggled with the relationship between Louisiana's institutional and architectural identities. By 1979, he had abandoned his pursuit of ad-hoc exhibition buildings that were intended to symbolize Louisiana's progressive character, and returned to his post-1958 agenda of conventional exhibition spaces. Examining Jensen's thoughts requires an extended excerpt from the first section of his address and a brief excerpt from the conclusion.

Jensen began the address with a section titled "Wanted: Qualified Utopias", in which he criticized spectacular museum buildings that were conceived in isolation from their settings and compromise the experience of the artworks. Nonetheless, he recognized the desirability of distinctive buildings and proposed a pair of ideal models that would reconcile architecture with setting and function. As he explained,

"Genius loci was used in classical times to describe "the spirit of the place" in which a building was to be integrated. While earlier times' cultural buildings were incorporated into the whole as a consequence of the rural or urban landscape; whose lines or proportions they were to connect and complete; contemporary architecture seems to prefer to set its individual stamp on the surroundings, and thus give them a new and entirely different image. In this way, Guggenheim's dynamic silo is in contrast to the upward-thrusting rectangles of the neighboring skyscrapers, Pompidou's "tubistic" factory architecture is a shock for the bourgeois Marais quarter, the Nationalgalerie's elegant Mies' glass-house is a reaction against the Berlin Wall, and [I.M.] Pei's East Wing is an expressive sculpture in the centre of Washington's Neo-Classicism. **[Figs. 4.115–4.116]**

In all those locations the 'genius loci' has been torpedoed and thus radically altered. In this way architecture of our century is similar to art, which continually negates the immediate past and attempts to strangle it! And what strength in this emancipation, which seems, again and again, to be able to renew itself! These extremely individualistic buildings appeal to the fantasy and awaken a desire to investigate them. In this way, their individuality is an advantage, even though, sometimes, the art works can be experienced less well in some of these buildings. They tower up, in all their

[128] Knud W. Jensen, "The Ideal Museum," 10.

functional impossibility, as points of interest in the architecturally mediocre landscape – the cultural heritage that we are bequeathing to future generations.

The mental image we see with our inner eye, when we imagine 'a museum of modern art' is, on the one hand a picture of the Guggenheim with its illuminated inner festivitas, or the Nationalgallerie with its marvelous proportions, or the Pompidou centre with its dynamic and euphoric faces; but we also think of the best rooms in MoMA, Stedelijk and Basel; almost monasterially [monastically] stark areas, where the display of their works is so composed that a meaningful whole is formed. **[Fig. 4.117]** These are, true enough, neutral rooms with no particular architectural characteristics, containers of a high quality; but the peace surrounding the pictures, and the light – of whatever type it may be, (on Manhattan it is impossible to get ordinary daylight) is so beneficial to the whole that the lack of architectural quality is not felt as a direct loss.

Our best-known museums thus swing between two extremes, the architectonic, autonomous masterpiece, which is almost unsuitable for the arts, and the self-effacing architectonic envelope that protects and displays art in a friendly way. Could there be a third possibility lying somewhere between these two extremes? A place where both architecture and art are improved by their proximity, and where a new, intense – I am tempted to say musical – unity is created? This result can be sporadically experienced today in museums all over the world; but they are the exceptions, just individual rooms here and there. Museum building of the future should set its sights on a goal: that the best characteristics of the works of art can flourish within a framework of the highest architectonic quality, and that a new situation is created where there is an interplay between art and architecture. We must not abandon this dream, and – as a result of experiences with dominating architects – demand neutral, nondescript rooms of architectural nonentity.

But what conditions should we impose concerning the ideal interior of a museum? […] We know a great deal about the works of art, the public and the activities, which the architects, who possibly seldom or never have been previously concerned with museum architecture, cannot know. And they, for their part, have insight and architectural ethics, which we, as a result of our training, cannot complete against. It is a kind of Jacob's battle; I won't let you go before you have blessed me! It can lead to deadlock, but a dialogue is possible and museum building programmes should try to outline optimum demands for their interiors. But when, as previously mentioned,

museum people do not have the professional qualifications to visualize in three dimensions, we have to rely on drawings, perspectives, models, study-trips and other research – but in the last instance we have to trust our architects. We are certainly unable to build our own museums!"[129]

Delivered at Centre Pompidou, where the shortcomings of the exhibition spaces were already apparent; at the height of the German museum boom; Jensen's call for an alternative to spectacular, dysfunctional monuments was an explicit critique of contemporary trends in museum architecture. Despite Jensen's retreat from visionary exhibition buildings, his commitment to a visionary institutional policy remained intact. After a series of remarks concerning technical and practical subjects, he restated his commitment to an egalitarian program for art museums.

And yet, Jensen's text documents a retreat from the binary model of "Temple or Forum" that he had adopted during the mid 1970s, under the apparent influence of Pontus Hultén. Four years after declaring, "The museum is elitist, it does not function properly in time and as an institution is not sufficiently relevant to society", Jensen recognized the compatibility of aesthetic and social concerns. In essence, he returned to his original program for Louisiana [1.8], with the "artistic synthesis" recast as "a mini-universe of artistic endeavors" and supplemented by programs that would address subjects of public concern. Jensen titled his conclusion "The Museum as a Cultural Milieu" and explained,

"We cannot maintain an elitist attitude, when artists throughout the century have worked towards a democratization of our sensibility and creative talents. […] I would go so far as to demand that a museum should be a platform for discussion on some of the most important contemporary themes concerning cultural policies, science, and society in general. A museum has, whatever one thinks about it otherwise, considerable prestige in the public eye. We must therefore make sure that we do not only continue the tradition of the bourgeois and idealistic 19th Century, when museums were treasure houses and as such quite legitimate. We should not only be available for a special and limited circle (tourists plus schoolchildren): but through a pluralistic exhibition policy, publications and contributions to the debate, make the museum a living, cultural milieu."

---

[129] Ibid., 2–4.

"Let us tell the architects we work with, in connection with new buildings, extensions or alterations, that we have a dream of such a utopian museum, a mini-universe of artistic endeavors which reflect and illuminate each other; a new type of institution full of productive energy and with a profound effect on the surrounding society. We must formulate our needs to them and to ourselves in just such an immoderate and impassionate way."[130]

As indicated by the title of this dissertation, Jensen's address contains ideas that are fundamental to understanding Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana. Recognizing those ideas requires a careful analysis of Jensen's text, which begins by examining his multiple uses of the term *utopia*. Close reading indicates that Jensen was using *utopia* according to both meanings – the "good-place" and the "non-place" – as he had done in *Slaraffenland eller Utopia*, which is described in the Introduction. The fact that he discussed architecture and institutional policy in separate sections of his address indicates that he regarded them as distinct subjects. Reading the concluding section on institutional policy, it is evident that his concept of "a utopian museum" is rooted in a positive, social-utopian agenda.

The next step in the analysis is to unfold Jensen's use of *utopia* in relation to museum architecture. Among his four examples of "extremely individualistic buildings", only Centre Pompidou would typically be considered an example of utopian architecture, as a result of its futuristic character and/or populist program. However, his opposition between building and context indicates that he was using the negative meaning of utopia ("non-place"), and extending the definition of utopian architecture to include buildings that are alien to their settings. Nonetheless, he recognized the cultural value of distinctive architecture and its role in attracting museum visitors. As a result of Jensen's ambivalence towards spectacular architecture, we can define his "qualified utopia" as an extraordinary building in which the architect's creative vision has been moderated – or qualified – by concern for genius loci.

Jensen extended his criticism of placeless-utopian museum buildings to their interiors, faulting those buildings for the "functional impossibility" that resulted from the architect's uncompromising vision. This is evident in his dichotomy between "the architectonic, autonomous masterpiece, which is almost unsuitable for the arts" and

[130] Ibid., 12–13.

"the self-effacing architectonic envelope that protects and displays art in a friendly way." Between those two poles, he proposed a "third possibility" in which an outstanding work of architecture would provide sympathetic conditions for art and allow for a unity of container and contents. According to Jensen's terms, this ideal exhibition space is created through a process of negotiation, as the vision of the "dominating architect" is moderated – or qualified – by concern for the artworks. Apparently, he imagined the museum director as the instrument of that negotiation.

Considering Jensen's two processes of moderation and the common subject of an autonomous architectural vision, it is tempting to regard the Qualified Utopia and the Third Possibility as equivalents. However, those models were based on a distinction between exterior form and interior space, as seen in Jensen's dichotomy between the "masterpiece" and the "envelope." Following his negative reading of *utopia*, the Qualified Utopia is implicitly defined by its relationship with the setting. As Jensen's discussion shifted from setting to function, his concern for genius loci was replaced by concern for the artworks. While he imagined that "the best rooms" might (perhaps) benefit from distinctive architecture, he also imagined them in isolation from the setting. His isolated conception of the Third Possibility is evident in his references to "the ideal interior of the museum" and "optimum demands for their interiors." While the Qualified Utopia would reconcile architecture and setting, the Third Possibility would reconcile architecture and function. As the factors differ, so too the results: one is an ideal museum building, the other is an ideal exhibition space.

Jensen's omissions indicate that the Qualified Utopia and the Third Possibility were hypothetical models. He neglected to define the first term and did not provide examples of the second term; despite his assertion that such rooms exist "all over the world." And yet, he provided examples of the placeless-utopian buildings and neutral exhibition spaces that served as the poles of his models, indicating that his proposals were based in reality, even if the results were not. Furthermore, Jensen undermined his proposal for the Third Possibility, by asserting that a lack of architectural quality "is not felt as a direct loss" if it benefits the exhibition. In fact, he failed to recognize that his "best rooms" are all examples of the White Cube, as detached from their settings as the spectacular buildings that he criticized. As such, we can understand the Qualified Utopia and the Third Possibility as ideal propositions, most likely rooted in Jensen's dismay with Centre Pompidou, rather than veiled references to Louisiana.

After tracing Jensen's thoughts, we can recognize his vision of "The Ideal Museum" as an institution with a social-utopian program that occupies a Qualified Utopia, which provides the conditions for the Third Possibility.

Despite their hypothetical status, Jensen's concepts of the Qualified Utopia and the Third Possibility provide the foundation for nuanced interpretations of Louisiana's buildings. His concept of the Qualified Utopia situates Bo and Wohlert's work at the museum within the history of modernist exhibition space, which in fact originated in Utopian visions and was premised on the negation of place, in both the avant-garde and institutional versions. [2.7] From this historical perspective, we can recognize the contradiction between Jensen's social-utopian institutional agenda of popularizing art through the experience of the setting and his placeless-utopian program of generic exhibition spaces, even though he could not. As such, the concept of a Qualified Utopia also situates Bo and Wohlert's work within the context of the museum's institutional history, by identifying the fundamental schism between Jensen and his architects. Ultimately, an examination of that schism will illuminate the relationship between architecture and institution.

More immediately, Jensen's proposal for the Third Possibility identifies the central paradox of Bo and Wohlert's work; the distinctive character of their architecture was based on impersonal factors. In 1979, as Jensen was delivering his address in Paris, the most familiar example of a Third Possibility would have been Bo's scheme for the South Wing, which had recently taken its definitive form with L-shaped galleries. While Jensen imagined that architectural character and self-effacement were antithetical, Bo regarded them as indivisible. Rather than pursue self-expression, Bo employed the basic tools of space, proportion and materials, to create anonymous structures that united setting and the program. Following Jensen's insistence on a level floor covered in gray stone, the anonymous character of Bo's galleries would become even more pronounced. Nonetheless, the irregular spaces, varied proportions and articulated surfaces provided a profound contrast to the White Cubes that Jensen described in New York, Amsterdam and Basel.

In the South Wing, the interplay between architecture and art that defines Jensen's model of the Third Possibility is most apparent in the L-shaped galleries, where the variety of ceiling heights and wall sizes provide sympathetic conditions for an

extraordinary range of media and formats. Moreover, those galleries encourage visitors to wander and define their own paths through a progression of spaces that create a powerful architectural experience. Described in those terms, it becomes clear that Bo achieved Hans Hollein's goal of "complex homogeneity" and James Stirling's goal of "the monumentally informal." And yet, Bo achieved both of those paradoxical conditions without undermining the comfort of the visitor or their engagement with the art. Direct comparisons between Louisiana's L-shaped galleries and the main exhibition spaces in Museum Abteiberg and Neue Staatsgalerie illuminate the root of Bo's relative order and his measured variety.

• In Mönchengladbach, Hans Hollein pursued a union of art and architecture through an extraordinary variety of exhibition spaces, but the excess of architecture actually distracts visitors from the works of art. By contrast, Bo combined a typical floor plan with varied ceiling heights, producing a sequence of rooms with very different characters. The resulting array of walls, with their different sizes and proportions, allow the works of art to – in Hollein's words – "find their place" within galleries that are variations on a single type.

• In Stuttgart, James Stirling pursued a formal strategy of contradictions, but the playful decorations in his galleries do not counteract the monumental effect of repetitive volumes with nearly uniform ceiling heights. By virtue of their irregular plans, Bo's L-shaped galleries are informal. But the repetition of those galleries produces a sequential effect, even as the differences in ceiling height contradict the sense of regularity. The result is a progression of spaces that are individually informal and cumulatively monumental.

• Hollein hoped to free visitors from pre-determined paths, but the overwhelming number of choices creates the effect of a three-dimensional labyrinth. In Bo's L-shaped galleries, the irregular plans and "hidden" corners encourage wandering within each room. However, the galleries are connected with a clear path that prevents visitors from becoming disoriented. Beyond those galleries, the major and minor stairs allow visitors to choose their routes to-and-from the Panorama Room.

• Stirling reinforced the monumental character of his galleries by aligning the openings and creating axial vistas, which confront the visitors with their route and dominate the exhibition. Bo's staggered openings created a path with a dual character.

From one angle, a diagonal sightline joins the L-shaped galleries into a continuous sequence. From other angles, the openings provide views of artworks in adjacent galleries. The location of the path is never in doubt, but visitors are able to experience the exhibition without anxiety or a sense of coercion.

We can trace each point of contrast to the architects' ability, or willingness, to pursue two opposing ideas at the same time. Despite their rhetorical commitments to complexity and contradiction, Hollein and Stirling each adopted a univalent approach in which their galleries provide either variety or order, according to individual formal agenda. In contrast, Bo created a state of equilibrium that satisfies the visitor's need for variety *and* order. As revealed by the comparisons, his measured variety is a product of three factors: the L-shaped gallery-type; the diagonal arrangement of the openings; and the stepped ceiling heights. Each of these factors is an architectural response to the shape and slope of the terrain. As such, we can trace the multivalent character of Bo's galleries to his negotiation between geometry and topography. As in the 58-Building, the same module that reconciled the materials also provided a matrix for creating architectural space modeled on the terrain.

Through the comparisons with the post-modernist museums, it becomes clear that the South Wing realized Jensen's concept of Third Possibility in two ways. While the array of walls allows for the interplay of art and architecture, the equilibrium between variety and order allows the visitor to appreciate that interplay. Both of these intermediate states were produced through the negotiation between geometry and topography, such that we can understand the root of Bo's achievement. His realization of the Third Possibility was not the result of a "dominating architect" being subdued by the client. Rather, it resulted from an exchange of principles between a pair of thoughtful architects, whose combined principles produced a building that serves artwork and visitor in equal measure. As such, the South Wing is not only an example of the Third Possibility, but also a microcosm of Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana.

Following the Documentation, we can recognize the South Wing as an amalgamation of strategies, materials and elements from the 58-Building and the 71-Building, which Bo adapted to the terrain and his client's requirements. As such, the South Wing continued the process of architectural evolution that was based on the 58-Building and initiated with the 66-Building. The unique features in the South Wing are the

irregular volumes of the three, L-shaped galleries and the gray stone floor. In both cases, visitors experience the new feature within a set of referents established by the earlier buildings. While the irregular volumes are unusual, the familiar brick walls and floating ceilings ensure that the L-shaped galleries are experienced as more complex versions of the High Gallery and Long Gallery on the far side of the park.

A similar experience ensures that the gray limestone and white marble on the floors are understood as additions to the museum's palette of materials, rather than the result of a new architectural direction.[131] Jensen's requirement for monochrome paving was intended to distinguish the new wing from the older buildings, after twenty years of pursuing a contrast with "the old Louisiana." [3.3] And yet, the intended contrast is mitigated by the reappearance of the modern vernacular language and other features from previous buildings. In fact, the visitor's experience of any part of Louisiana is conditioned by their experience of other parts, in a way that mirrors the architects' expansion of the museum. As a result, differences between buildings are subsumed within larger systems of spaces, materials and elements, and the visitor arrives at the impression of a contingent whole.

We can regard the South Wing as an analog of the 58-Building that was intended to maintain the central role of the villa, by approximate symmetry. It takes very little imagination to recognize the major volumes of the South Wing as enclosed versions of the pavilions in the 58–Building, which were condensed into a single mass and framed by episodes of continuous space. As in the 58-Building, variations between the main exhibition spaces are a direct response to the terrain, in this case the natural slope that determined the increasing ceiling heights. Bo's attempt at equivalence between the two wings is explicit in the Park Passage, which provides a counterpart to the Tree Passage; and in the Panorama Room, which provides a counterpart to the cafeteria. We can recognize a further pursuit of equivalence in Bo's proposal for the Forest Passage, which would have been a stepped version of the Tree Passage. [4.7]

---

[131] Thomas Kappel recognized the South Wing as an analog to the 58–Building, but turned a blind eye to the evolutionary character of Bo's work. Kappel alluded to Jensen's desire for a monochrome floor, but took care to avoid any hint of conflict. Writing of 1970s "color Puritanism," he described the gray stone as "more a consequence of the architectural ideals of the time than an exact showdown with the 1960s brick floors." Comparing the white interior to contemporary examples by Henning Larsen and Dissing + Weitling, he concluded "The South Wing simply joins this style, and is thus a fine expression of the architecture of its period." Kappel, Master's Thesis, 70.

The clearest parallel between the South Wing and the 58-Building is the meandering path that begins in the villa and ends in a room with a panoramic view of the sea. In both buildings, visitors encounter a sequence of contrasting spaces formed by the topography and trees. While the 58–Building provides a long chain of spaces that alternate between transparency and enclosure, the sequence in the South Wing was compressed into the three segments of Park Passage, the exhibition spaces and the Panorama Room. But as the starting and ending points are equivalent, so too are the defining experiences of both buildings. As a result, we can recognize the continuing influence of the Italian School, which provided Bo and Wohlert with the essential model of a museum designed from the perspective of the visitor in motion. [2.6]

Observations

Knud W. Jensen embarked on his Alternative Era through the convergence of his own social-utopian agenda, his insecurity regarding Louisiana's continuing relevance and the example of Pontus Hultén, his friend and role model. [3.8] Jensen's temporary interest in Marxist rhetoric represented an expansion of Hultén's influence from artistic guidance, evident in Louisiana's revised collection, to ideological guidance. The anti-aesthetic that developed during the 1960s, which was based on salvaged materials and a strategy of *bricolage* [3.10], provided Jensen with an inexpensive means of signaling Louisiana's cultural currency, as well as a chance to design his own glass buildings; assisted by Ole Nørgaard. Evidently, Jensen was unable or unwilling to abandon his own artistic interests and autographic project. As a result, Louisiana's development during the 1970s was marked by aesthetic contrasts that reflected Jensen's position between two conflicting methods of popularizing art.

Following the opening of Centre Pompidou and the overture from Peter Augustinus, Jensen returned to his familiar, post-1958 agenda of generic exhibition spaces. And yet, Jensen's Alternative Era exerted a lasting influence on both his institutional and architectural agendas. Much as Jensen expanded his social-utopian program to include political events, his study of visionary schemes never left his imagination. The tension between the established and the alternative are evident in the two wings of the 1979 Master Plan. While the ivy-covered, concrete structure of East Wing approached anti-architecture; the South Wing represented Jensen's continued pursuit of conventional exhibition spaces that conformed to international standards. In both wings, Jensen's desire to construct as much exhibition space as possible represented the triumph of his ambition over his regard for genius loci.

Knud W. Jensen was responsible for the institutional scale and character of the South Wing, which completed his decade-long transformation of Louisiana into a museum with a collection of international art that was exhibited in neutral exhibition spaces. While Jensen's insistence on a gray stone floor can be interpreted as a response to the abstract character of the artworks, both the collection and the paving material were intended to establish a contrast with the older parts of the museum. Jensen's pursuit of generic galleries on the model of the White Cube is evident in his continuing prohibition against windows and his requirement of a level floor in the L-shaped

galleries. His insistence on the removal of the Forest Passage and then a pergola along on the eastern face of the building, in favor of a background for sculpture, records the enduring influence of Arnold Bode's example at *documenta II*. **[Fig. 3.65]**

Bo and Wohlert's 1977 competition projects for West German museums were remarkably consistent in their underlying principles and methods, even as the projects differed according to genius loci and the priorities of the institutions. As such, we can regard them as two variations on a single project for an urban museum that would be illuminated by skylights and required a representational character. The two schemes demonstrate the architects' ability to design different buildings based on the same set of principles, in a way that is analogous to their work at Louisiana. While the settings across the museum's grounds were fairly similar, Jensen's two architectural agendas, pre- and post-1958, were as distinct as the requirements for the galleries in Stuttgart and Bochum. Further, the West German schemes illustrate Bo and Wohlert's lack of interest in post-modernist eclecticism and simulated complexity.

The South Wing realized the potential of Bo and Wohlert's creative exchange, as Bo created a large, multi-part building that is simultaneously topographic and geometric. In doing so, he achieved the rhetorical goals of the post-modernist architects who advocated a rich and multivalent architecture, without descending into incoherence. The instrument of this negotiation was the module that unified space, materials and terrain into a complex and coherent structure that serves the art and the visitors in equal measure. As such, we can recognize Bo and Wohlert's principles as a set of tools for reconciling opposing factors, whether topography and geometry; space and form; individual artistry and public experience; or Jensen's demand for enclosed galleries and his architects' devotion to genius loci. Thus, it becomes clear that the complexity pursued by post-modernists was innate to Bo and Wohlert's methods.

Bo's design of the South Wing was fundamentally consistent with the earlier phases of construction at Louisiana. That consistency is evident in the topographic planning, modular conception of space, basic palette of materials, use of repetitive elements and meandering path derived from the terrain. In each of those regards, the South Wing continued a process of architectural evolution that Wohlert had initiated in the 66-Building, following the model of the 58-Building. As Bo combined elements of the 58-Building and the 71-Building, he created a new building that was specific to both

terrain and program. And yet, the continuities between all of the buildings ensure that the South Wing is experienced as a variation on familiar principles. Thus, the novel aspects of the South Wing are subsumed within larger systems of space, materials and elements, and the visitor arrives at the impression of a contingent whole.

While Jensen's models provide insight into Bo and Wohlert's work, the terms of those models provide insight into his own conception of architecture. The distinction between exterior and interior that is evident in Jensen's two dichotomies; setting vs. architecture, function vs. architecture; indicates that he imagined form and space as distinct, rather than reciprocal. This dualistic view is confirmed by his inability to recognize the dislocated character of "the best rooms" – even as he criticized a series of autonomous buildings for their disregard of genius loci. Jensen's reference to the "dominating architect" reveals his fanciful notion of museum architecture as a vehicle for self-expression. If he was not aware of the unions of institutional and architectural agenda that produced the other targets of his critique, he was certainly aware of the process that resulted in Centre Pompidou, through his friendship with Pontus Hultén. As such, we can understand Jensen's architectural tyrant as a figment of his imagination, a product of his autographic intentions for Louisiana and a symbol of his inability to recognize the selfless character of Bo and Wohlert's work.

Chapter 5
Earthwork: 1983–94

Earthwork: 1983–94

Documentation

Following the opening of the South Wing, in 1982, Knud W. Jensen continued to expand the museum and develop the landscape for nearly twenty years, with and without Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert. Most of Jensen's efforts were devoted to unfinished projects; the exhibition of sculpture in the landscape, the accommodation of children visiting the museum, the construction of an underground East Wing; but the familiar ideas would be realized in new forms. While the sculptures reflected changes in artistic practice, the new buildings reflected changes in the setting, with the park now framed by buildings. Rather than block the view to the sea, Jensen instructed his architects to set the new buildings into the slopes and below ground. The result was a series of additions that are mostly experienced as interior spaces, with galleries that are illuminated by artificial light. As the years passed, the decades-long relationship between Jensen, Bo, and Wohlert faded into history. While the East Wing created a continuous circuit of around the park, Jensen was unable to recognize Louisiana as a complete museum. Instead, he turned to other architects who might help him realize his unresolved ambitions and pursued new projects that provide further context for assessing Bo and Wohlert's work.

5.1 Site-specific

While the South Wing was under construction, Knud W. Jensen developed a plan to create additional "centers of gravity" in and around the park. Rather than acquiring existing sculptures and finding the right places for them, Jensen commissioned artists to create works for specific locations. This new method of placing sculpture reflected recent developments in contemporary art. During the late 1960s, a number of artists had rebelled against the customary understanding of art as a market commodity and created permanent installations that could not be moved without destroying the artwork.[1] One of the outcomes of this rebellion was the idea of the site-specific artwork that does not exist independently of its setting. By the end of the 1980s, Jensen had installed a half-dozen works that were conceived for a particular spot at

[1] See "Sculpture in the Expanded Field," in Rosalind E. Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985), 277–290.

the museum, including several murals.[2] Two of the sculptures, created by Richard Serra and by George Trakas, are embedded in their locations to such a degree that they are indivisible from the landscape. While both are dependent on the movement of the visitor, they explore the idea of sculpture-as-site in very different ways.

Jensen's program of site-specific commissions began in 1975, when he invited Serra to create a work for the beech-covered slope below the sculpture garden. By 1979, the planning for the South Wing had thrown the future of the entire area into question and Serra's proposal for the "sea slope" was abandoned.[3] Given an opportunity to choose another site on the museum grounds, Serra selected the ravine at the end of the fern-filled cleft, where the ancient streambed runs down to the lower level of the park.[4] **[Fig. 5.1]** By 1983, he had developed a sculpture that would heighten the visitors' experience of the place, by making them aware of their own movement through space. Serra marked the transition from the ravine to the coastal plain with two, rectangular steel plates, which were set into the slopes on either side of the natural opening. From the center of the footbridge above the work, the two plates appear to touch and form a solid barrier. **[Fig. 5.2]** As a visitor follows the twisting stair into the ravine, the plates appear to rotate and reveal a gap between them. **[Fig. 5.3]** Serra titled the sculpture, *The Gate in The Gorge* (1983–86).

The arrangement of the steel plates creates space within the sculpture, and in doing so, draws our attention to the landscape on either side. Where the plates emerge from the slopes, the visible portions illustrate the shape of each slope. At the same time, the flat surfaces and straight lines create a stark contrast with the surroundings, which sharpens our impressions of both nature and artifice.[5] Entering into the work; the distance between the plates become visible, the sculpture fills the field of vision and the sea comes into focus. In this way, Serra's sculpture creates a threshold and provides a sense of arrival as the visitor emerges from the ravine. The effect is comparable to arriving at the Calder Terrace, which heightens the experience of the

---

[2] MLL, 264–269.

[3] Knud W. Jensen, letter to Alexander von Berswordt-Wallrabe, 7 January 1980.

[4] Lynne Cooke, "Thinking on Your Feet: Richard Serra's Sculptures in Landscape," in *Richard Serra Sculpture: Forty Years*, ed. Kynaston McShine, et al. (New York: Museum of Modern Art; London: Thames & Hudson, 2007), 94.

[5] One of the most useful introductions to Serra's work in landscape is Krauss's chapter "Richard Serra, A Translation," in *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, 260–274. (Note 1)

sea, by creating a cluster of objects that break the horizon. However, Serra's work only exists within the context of its site. In fact, Calder's three sculptures could be moved to other locations without a loss of character, much as Henry Moore's works were placed in the Moore Garden and then relocated to the park. [4.3]

In contrast, Serra's sculpture is a product of the place in which it was constructed. While the thickness and height of the plates reflect the technical limits of the mill where they were fabricated, the differing lengths (34'- 3 1/2" and 39'- 4 1/2") reflect the angles of the two slopes. After studying the sculpture, it becomes apparent that the top edges of the plates are level. And yet, the northern slope is shallower than the southern slope, and required a longer plate to reach the same elevation. As the visitor approaches the gap, the top edges of the plates appear to move vertically: reversing position and illustrating movement in all three dimensions. The apparent changes in the locations of the edges and in the width of the gap between the plates (which is actually 896 centimeters) are the opposite of optical illusions. Instead, Serra's work helps us to grasp reality, by recognizing the fluid relationship between artwork, setting and observer that has always existed, regardless of time, place or material.

***

George Trakas's artistic practice contradicts the traditional conception of sculpture as an object. Instead, Trakas constructs elements – most often stairways, paths, and bridges – and inserts them into an existing setting, so that they create an extended promenade or a journey. His goal is a heightened awareness of movement and thus the self. While the constructed elements outline the route, the substance of Trakas's work is the experience of the visitor, who is transformed from an observer into a participant – a passenger – as he or she moves along the route and completes the work through movement. These sculptural experiences are both intellectual and deeply physical; at once understood and felt with the whole body – through walking, turning, climbing, stepping. The sculpture that Trakas created at Louisiana between 1986 and 1989 is one of the most nuanced works in the museum's collection, to such a degree that it is easy to overlook his installation on the slope below the South Wing.

Knud W. Jensen first encountered Trakas's work at *documenta 6*, the 1977 survey of contemporary art held in Kassel, West Germany. Five years later, Jensen was visiting *Fattoria di Celle*, a permanent installation of site-specific works on an old farm in

Tuscany, when he learned that Trakas was installing a work on the property. He found the artist on a steep slope, completing *Il Sentiero dell'amore* (The Pathway of Love), which would allow visitors to reach an otherwise inaccessible stream and follow it to a heart-shaped reservoir. The work is a 64-meter-long meditation on the relationship between wood and steel, which in Trakas's artistic practice represent the two poles of existence; organic and inorganic; male and female. The main elements of the pathway are two stairs – one of each material – that overlap and then intertwine along the route to the reservoir. By the time that Jensen left Tuscany, he had invited Trakas to create a sculpture at Louisiana.[6]

In Spetember 1982, Trakas arrived at Louisiana and found that his patron had a specific setting in mind. Jensen wanted visitors to range over the museum grounds and discover unexpected vistas. Much as he had established the Moore Garden with the goal of enticing visitors to the lower level of the park, he hoped that Trakas's sculpture would encourage visitors to explore the forested slope that runs down to the beach.[7] Trakas's response to the setting was immediate and he quickly arrived at a mental map of the journey. The artist's gestural site plan illustrates the fragmented nature of the installation. **[Fig. 5.4]** The dark mass denotes the Panorama Room; the curved wall of the grotto is visible on to the right; and the drawing includes a small switchback path that was never constructed. During the journey, visitors would experience changes of level, occasional obstacles and a heightened sense of their own movement, which might also produce an emotional response to the place.

In May 1986, Trakas moved into the small boathouse on the beach and began constructing the sculpture, inventing the forms and developing the details as he worked. His first intervention was a welded steel stair – just wide enough for one person – alongside the Panorama Room. Passengers follow the stair to a curving steel platform with multiple levels that prefigures the looping paths along the slope. **[Figs. 5.5–5.7]** At the bottom of the slope, Trakas created a fan-shaped platform of steel beams and timber planks that splays out towards the water and guides the eye to the horizon. **[Fig. 5.8]** The different levels of the platform, absence of railings and gaps

[6] George Trakas, letter to the author, 11 October 2016. Trakas explains his approach to materials in Hugh M. Davies and Sally E. Yard, *George Trakas, Log Mass: Mass Curve* (Amherst: University Gallery, 1980), 54.

[7] Trakas, letter to the author, 11 October 2016.

between the planks cause visitors to move with an extra measure of caution, so that they are fully engaged with the surroundings. Trakas has described the transformation of sculpture from object to experience, and the role of the visitor in completing the work, which he titled *Self Passage*,

"It is sculpture, in the traditional sense of being three-dimensional and figurative. Reversing the term 'sculpture in the round' to being the space around you – the observer – feeling one's self being directed into motion by the work through the landscape, with unexpected revelations of self in relationship with the space. You become the dancer in the choreographic score, where your figure in motion generates the art-in-experience. Your thoughts and associations in walking to discover what it is, redirects one's attention to one's unexpected behavior and consequential delight; a transport off the beaten path, away from the presumed experience of looking at art and then discovering it in one's self."[8]

5.2 The East Wing

While Richard Serra and George Trakas were constructing their site-specific processions through the landscape, Vilhelm Wohlert was developing another type of site-specific procession beneath the park. The construction of the South Wing had doubled Louisiana's exhibition capacity, but the museum was now split into two sections on either side of the villa. During cold weather or when it was raining, visitors to the South Wing had to retrace their steps along the Park Passage and thread their way through the villa to reach the other wings, the concert hall or the cafeteria. The only practical solution would be some type of connection between the South Wing and the 58-Building, as first envisioned in the 1979 Master Plan. Determined to create a continuous route through the museum, Jensen revived the idea of an underground East Wing.

The next (and presumably last) addition to Louisiana would be Vilhelm Wohlert's responsibility. Wohlert had been the architect for the first version of the East Wing, but aside from the idea of a Great Hall beneath the Calder Terrace, the earlier scheme was abandoned. With the completion of the South Wing, the upper level of the park was framed by buildings on three sides and experienced as an outdoor room that opened out to the sea. Constructing a new wing on either level of the park would have

[8] Ibid.

destroyed that experience. Instead, Jensen decided to preserve the landscape in an apparently natural state, regardless of the cost of construction. All of the new galleries would be buried beneath the upper level of the park or the plateau in front of the cafeteria. The only visible parts of the East Wing would be the entry structures next to the South Wing and the 58-Building.

The East Wing is the most complex building ever constructed at Louisiana; a chain of contrasting spaces enclosed by a variety of materials and construction techniques, including load-bearing brick walls, concrete boxes, concrete frames and steel frames covered with glass. As with all of Bo and Wohlert's previous buildings at Louisiana, the architecture was a direct response to the setting. In this case, the setting was a series of topographic conditions – next to the South Wing; along the slope; under the cleft; in front of the Basin Passage; beneath the Calder Terrace – that made it impossible to employ a single structural system or design a single type of gallery. As a result, Wohlert designed a chain of different exhibition spaces that were specific to each location, and used geometry and materials to unite the various segments into a continuous sequence.

Wohlert's initial proposal for the East Wing is dated September 1983, barely a year after the South Wing opened. **[Figs. 5.09–5.10]** However, the design process continued for another six years and Wohlert prepared alternative schemes in 1984, 1986, 1987, and 1988. The fundamental questions were the character of the exhibition spaces and whether Jensen could raise the vast sum necessary to construct the project. Another complication was the involvement of Jensen's curators, who had strong opinions about the exhibition spaces.[9] Over the years, the location of the entrance from the South Wing shifted back and forth, galleries were removed and restored, and the Great Hall took several different forms.

By mid 1989, Wohlert had arrived at a scheme that negotiated all of the twists and turns of the situation, topographic and otherwise, and was governed by a single module of 480 by 480 centimeters. **[Fig. 5.11]** At the corner of the South Wing, the entrance pavilion included a long stair to the lower level and an elevator that was treated as a freestanding cylinder. Beneath the park, Wohlert arranged three, rectangular galleries on a diagonal line roughly parallel to the edge of the slope.

---

[9] MLL (second edition, 1993), 414.

Where the slope changes direction and is split by the fern-filled cleft, Wohlert introduced a curved passage in the form of a quarter-circle, which provided a neutral link between two galleries with very different volumes and slightly different orientations. Next to the 58-Building, a pair of larger galleries follows the rotation of the cafeteria, and a foyer provides access to the surface, where a glass building replaced the pergola and served as an entrance. Jensen had hoped to enclose the pergola as early as 1976, when he wrote to his Board,

"Finally, underlying these construction and environmental concerns there is an old plan to which I keep returning: to transform the present summer pergola into a conservatory with heating and green plants, such that this area could be used all year round; then in the summer one can remove the glass walls and use the pergola more or less as now. But it is a pity that this splendid area stands empty and desolate nine months of the year, as is the case."[10]

After Jensen returned to this idea in 1988, Wohlert began designing a permanent winter garden with a glass roof that would allow daylight to reach the subterranean level. The plan followed the grid established by the 58-Building, but the design of the roof was open to debate and Wohlert sketched a wide range of options. By late 1989, Jensen had raised the 54 million Danish crowns required to construct the East Wing, by combining Louisiana's own funds with donations from a parade of foundations and individuals, including 20 million crowns from the Augustinus Foundation.[11] Heavy equipment began excavating the upper level of the park in December 1989, and the East Wing opened in March 1991.

At the South Wing, the entry structure was designed as a Conservatory. The long, narrow building reinforced the frame around the park, but it also reflected Wohlert's determination to expose visitors to daylight before they descended to the underground galleries. **[Fig. 5.12]** After Knud W. Jensen insisted on seating and greenery, Wohlert added planters and built-in benches.[12] The interior walls were covered with wooden latticework, to support climbing vines, and wires were suspended beneath the roof, to

---

[10] M3, 17.

[11] "Louisiana: Den nye grafikfløj. The New Graphics Wing," ed. Helle Crenzien, *Louisiana Revy*, vol. 32, no. 3 (September 1991).

[12] Jensen expressed his concern about a shortage of places to relax in his response to the 1961 design for a sculpture garden. (See Chapter 3, Note 14) His letters and memos during the design of the South Wing contain numerous suggestions regarding lounge seating in the galleries.

carry the same lamps used in the museum shop. **[Fig. 5.14]** While the whitewashed brickwork and red floor tiles extended Louisiana's standard palette of materials, the low glass vault announced the arrival of another type of architecture at the museum; closer in character to nineteenth-century British engineering than traditional Danish handicraft. From the park, the long, brick wall of the Conservatory complemented the solid walls of the South Wing and provided a background for sculpture. **[Fig. 5.13]**

Beneath the park, the root systems of the trees and the edge of the slope limited the footprint of the building, forcing Wohlert to design narrow galleries that were constructed inside of rectangular, concrete tubes. The diagonal arrangement ensures that visitors entering from the South Wing always encounter an end wall, before moving to the right and entering the next gallery. Moving in the opposite direction, visitors encounter a shallow niche that provides a focal point as they enter the gallery. All three galleries are paved with reddish-brown bricks that recall other parts of the museum and a stair in the second gallery lowers the floor to the depth required to pass beneath the fern-filled cleft. To prevent visitors from feeling confined, Wohlert used suspended surfaces and indirect lighting that make the galleries feel more spacious. The shallow vaults on the ceilings correspond to the direction of travel and conceal rows of lamps that provide ambient light. On the underside of the vaults, the rotating fixtures used in the 71-Building and South Wing illuminate the art walls. **[Fig. 5.15]**

Beyond the three rectangular galleries, visitors enter a curved passage that negotiates the 90° turn of the slope and also serves as a gallery. The width of the passage and the treatment of the ceiling are identical to the rectangular galleries, but Wohlert lowered the height to 3 meters, in order to pass beneath the fern-filled cleft. At the entrance to this Curved Passage, the paving changes to narrow bricks that follow the curve and reinforce the shape of the room. Rather than surveying the entire gallery at a glance, visitors experience a series of shorter sightlines that rotate as they move along the curve. As a result, the walls are experienced in segments, delaying the encounter with the artwork and encouraging visitors to slow their pace. While the concave wall provides an unfolding panorama, the convex wall functions in reverse, offering new discoveries every few steps. **[Figs. 5.16–5.17]**

After Wohlert threaded the building beneath the fern-filled cleft, he was able to design wider galleries, and the structure changes from concrete tubes to concrete boxes. On

the ceilings, the exposed roof beams divide the galleries into square bays that correspond to the architectural module, creating the union of space and structure that was the foundation of Wohlert's work, regardless of materials or technique. At the same time, the floor changes from narrow bricks to square, Höganäs tiles that repeat the pattern on the ceilings and reinforce the modular character of the galleries.

Emerging from the Curved Passage, visitors encounter a hall with four columns (roughly 14 by 14 meters and 3.6 meters high) that has the character of a square rotunda. **[Fig. 5.18]** Wohlert might have used a single, very thick column to carry the load from the terrace overhead, but he recognized the role of the gallery in organizing movement through the wing. The four columns align with the openings to the Curved Passage, the foyer to the Winter Garden and the Great Hall; creating an orderly relationship between three very different spaces and introducing a subtle sense of rotation that helps visitors find their way. The columns also guided the placement of temporary partitions, and the ceiling was equipped with rotating spotlights that would illuminate every possible configuration. In one corner of this Column Hall, the floor continues onto the balcony of the largest gallery in the entire museum.

By 1989, Jensen had been trying to construct some version of the Great Hall for twenty years: proposing a multi-use building in 1967 and the "culture bunker" in 1973. [4.1] After he assembled the funding for the East Wing, Wohlert designed a vast, column-free gallery, roughly 14 by 24 meters and 6 meters high. To achieve the required height, Wohlert placed the Great Hall approximately 3 meters below the Column Hall, and inserted an elevator and spiral stair at one end of a balcony. At the other end, glass doors provide an exit to the lower level of the park. The balcony is integral to the function of the room. While it provides low spaces for introductory material and small-scale works, it also allows visitors to survey the exhibitions and orient themselves before they descend. Beneath the steel handrail, a wooden parapet continues a tradition of delicate screens that began in the Lake Gallery. **[Fig. 5.19]**

The Great Hall supports the Calder Terrace on a grid of very deep, reinforced concrete beams. Exposing the beams allowed Wohlert to display the modular character of the space, while also answering Jensen's requirement for flexibility. The cavities between the beams were filled with painted wooden cassettes that provide an intermediate scale, conceal electrical cables and allow light fixtures to be placed

anywhere in the room. **[Fig. 5.20]** Despite the universal character of the space, the Great Hall is characteristic of Louisiana, by virtue of the modular construction, delicate detailing and typical paving. At the same time, the industrial scale of the hall reflects the degree to which contemporary art, as well as Louisiana's programming, had changed over three decades. **[Fig. 5.21]**

On the far side of the Column Hall, a foyer receives daylight through a round opening in the ceiling that accommodates a spiral stair. **[Fig. 5.24]** The stair and the elevator were designed as cylinders that resolve the 30° angle between the Winter Garden; which is aligned with the Basin Passage; and the Column Hall; which is aligned with the cafeteria. To reinforce the sense of rotation, Wohlert continued the white marble on the stair onto the floor, where the stone completes a circle that corresponds to the opening above. At the top of the stair, visitors emerge into the Winter Garden that serves as an entrance from the 58-Building and provides seating for the cafeteria.

Located in front of the Basin Passage, the Winter Garden was designed to be as transparent as possible, to preserve the view of the sea. **[Fig. 5.23]** Wohlert used a module of 360 by 360 centimeters and developed a square frame of slender steel tubes. The frame is the same height as the Passage and the steel tubes align with the wooden posts in the older building, providing some degree of continuity between the two different structures. On the south and west sides of the building, the framing was extended by one module and covered with wooden slats to create a new pergola. **[Fig. 5.22]** Above the framework, curved tubes divided the interior into three bays that were covered with glass barrel vaults. The Winter Garden was intended as an addition to the 58-Building and all of the steel framing was painted to match the whitewashed brick walls. The windows and sliding doors were constructed of teak, and the floor was covered with the square tiles used in the foyer, Column Hall and Great Hall.

The architecture of the East Wing is the product of many different factors – technical, institutional, personal – and the results are varied in character and quality. Below ground, the galleries are well-lit, well-proportioned spaces that were designed for both people and art. Wohlert's decision to treat each gallery as a distinct space – with a paving pattern, ceiling treatment and lighting arrangement that corresponds to its shape and its structure – ensures that they are experienced as a series of individual exhibition spaces, rather than generic containers. The Curved Passage was an inspired

invention; the Column Hall is an excellent setting for art and a masterful solution to joining three, very different spaces; and the Great Hall was a fitting conclusion to Wohlert's work at the museum. The variety of shapes, sizes and ceiling heights allows for an extraordinary range of artworks and installations, and the ability to control the lighting is indispensable.

Above ground, the results were less satisfactory. The Conservatory is an uneasy compromise between the glass vault of a greenhouse and the whitewashed brickwork that is typical of Louisiana. Nonetheless, the curve of the vault is sufficiently low enough and the brick wall sufficiently long that the Conservatory was seen as an addition to the South Wing. At the Winter Garden, the glass barrel vaults created a contrast against the background of flat surfaces and straight lines, to such a degree that the building appears as a freestanding object – rather than an addition to the 58-Building – and seemed out of place. **[Figs. 5.25–5.26]** The decisions to construct two types of glass roof in a setting notable for its simple architecture; and to employ barrel vaults on the Winter Garden, obscuring the lanterns on the 58-Building, are puzzling. Solutions to these puzzles are found in Jensen's autobiography.

Knud W. Jensen described the architecture of the East Wing as a reflection of its time and suggested that Wohlert was experimenting with "new stylistic features here and there."[13] In this way, Jensen implied that Wohlert had embraced the eclectic, "post-modern" approach that was popular during the 1980s. However, the actual source of the glass roofs on both of the pavilions was Jensen's preoccupation with nineteenth-century glass architecture, which developed during his Alternative Era in the 1970s. [4.4] While the low vault on the Conservatory recalls a palm house at Kew Garden, the barrel vaults on the Winter Garden were evidently inspired by Joseph Paxton's Crystal Palace. As Jensen explained; describing his habit during board meetings,

"While I followed the lengthy meeting procedure with half an ear, I drew little sketches for projects in Louisiana and hoped that one of them might be just as brilliant as the scheme of the Crystal Palace that Lord Paxton drew on a piece of blotting paper during a meeting."[14]

[13] MLL (second edition, 1993), 414.
[14] MLL, 87.

Moreover, Jensen's description of the East Wing records his satisfaction with the variety of the glass structures,

"I myself have always been fascinated by greenhouses and conservatories, and now we have one of each, where many of the visitors pause in between the art experiences."[15]

We can trace Jensen's dream of glass buildings at Louisiana to 1976; the year that he made his proposal to enclose the pergola with glass and also began to develop his schemes for a glass festival building, with Ole Nørgaard. **[Figs. 4.24–4.25]** Considering those drawings and Jensen's own statements, it is evident that he was responsible for the introduction of glass structures to the museum. It is also difficult to escape the conclusion that Jensen acted as a co-architect on the entry structures: suggesting roof forms to Wohlert and pushing him to add plantings to each of the glass buildings, including the small greenhouse that appeared at the exit from the Great Hall. **[Fig. 5.27]** As such, it is hardly surprising that the entry structures at the East Wing lacked the simplicity and sense of place that distinguish Wohlert's best work, and appear out of place. We might fault Wohlert for weakness in the face of Jensen's obsession with neo-Victorian glass structures, but it would be a mistake to fault him for introducing those structures to Louisiana.

5.3 Transitions

In 1991, at the age of seventy-five, Knud W. Jensen stepped down as director of Louisiana and was succeeded by Steingrim Laursen, a curator at the museum since the early 1970s. With a loyalist in the position, Jensen was able to remain active in Louisiana's direction, but devote his energy to the museum's building program.

Apparently, Jensen still regretted his rejection of Jørgen Bo's proposal for floor-to-ceiling windows in the Panorama Room. [4.8] In 1991, Jensen asked Bo to prepare sketches for a terrace that would wrap around the Panorama Room and allow visitors to experience the grandeur of the setting. By that point, Bo had entered into a partnership with his long-time associate Stig Løcke, and reduced his own work schedule to one day a week.[16] Bo and Løcke's early schemes envisioned a semi-circular observation deck and a stair that would provide outdoor seating. **[Figs. 5.28–**

[15] MLL (second edition, 1993), 413.

[16] Stig Løcke, e-mail to the author, 27 September 2016.

5.29] By 1992, Jensen had expanded the project to include underground galleries for exhibiting architecture, design and photography. At the same time, Bo and Løcke were renovating the museum shop and converting the former coach house into an entrance for members of the Louisiana Club. During 1992–93, Jensen ended most of the project meetings with a discussion of the Panorama Room, and the architects prepared at least five, different schemes.[17]

Simultaneously, Jensen began planning an entirely new building for the museum's youngest visitors, which he called the Children's House. The new building would provide an expanded version of the "children's museum" that had originated in the villa, but it would also include facilities for visiting school groups and Louisiana's new education department. With Bo's working capacity reduced, the responsibility for the Children's House fell on Vilhelm Wohlert. But after fourteen years of drawing some version of the East Wing, Wohlert declined to work on another expansion of the museum. Instead, he retired from practice and transferred ownership of his office to his three partners: Viggo Kanneworff, Niels Munk and his son Claus Wohlert, who had been the project architect on the East Wing. At Jensen's suggestion, Claus Wohlert assumed his father's role and began designing the Children's House.

Bo and Løcke's final project to extend the South Wing included new galleries that would support a series of sculpture terraces, and a double-height space inspired by the Lake Gallery that would provide daylight to the lower level. **[Fig. 5.30]** Jensen was sufficiently enthusiastic about the project to fund the construction of a model, but he was even more enthusiastic about constructing the Children's House. While that building was under construction, the local authorities extended the minimum distance between the coastline and new building projects, from 100 meters to 300 meters, as part of a larger planning process. As a result, any extension of the South Wing would be politically difficult and fraught with even more controversy than usual. As Bo and Løcke finished their work on the shop and the members' entrance, in 1994; Jensen turned his attention to a new project along the lakeshore and the project for the Panorama Room was abandoned.[18] Bo finally retired from practice and after thirty-eight years, the initial period of Louisiana's architectural history came to an end.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Løcke, e-mail to the author, 29 September 2016.

5.4 Epilogue

During the last eight years of Knud W. Jensen's tenure at Louisiana, 1992–2000, he pursued an eclectic series of projects with a variety of architects and artists. Those projects lie beyond the scope of this dissertation, but brief descriptions provide useful context for considering Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at the museum:

The only practical site for the Children's House was the 7-meter slope between the 58-Building and the lake, where the change in elevation allowed Claus Wohlert to construct a three-story building that was invisible from the park.[19] **[Figs. 5.31–5.32]** At the lowest level, he incorporated the basement of the Lake Gallery and created a large, multipurpose room with direct access to the lakeshore. **[Figs. 5.35–5.36]** Wohlert was determined to extend the character of the 58-Building, while also creating a playful atmosphere that would interest the children and encourage fantasy.[20] He found the solution to both goals in a serpentine wall of whitewashed brickwork, which is both a practical response to the setting and a source of spatial interest. **[Figs. 5.33–5.34]** Despite the sculptural treatment of space, his building was a sensitive addition to the 58-Building, which adapted Bo and Wohlert's strategies to a new setting and program. The Children's House opened in September 1994, with 500 square meters of workshops, classrooms and offices, and three days of festivities.

The development of the Children's House provided Knud W. Jensen with a rationale to revitalize the area around the lake, where a few remnants of the first Lake Garden remained in place. Jensen's plan was to create an updated version of Louisiana's first adventure-playground.[21] In 1994, he commissioned the artist Alfio Bonanno to create environmental sculptures of organic materials, which included a timber footbridge and several climbing structures. **[Fig. 5.37]** In 1998, Jensen invited Bonanno to create additional works and also suggested some sort of labyrinth, constructed of traditional, wooden eel traps. **[Figs. 5.38–5.39]** The resulting *Eel Box Labyrinth* reiterated the ad-hoc aesthetic of the 1970s and signaled Jensen's nostalgia for a period of greater energy and bolder plans. Over time, most of the works decayed and were removed.

---

[19] See my chapter "Børnehuset," in *Louisiana: Arkitektur og landskab*, 317–329.

[20] Claus Wohlert, conversation with the author, 18 October 2016.

[21] See my chapter "Søhaven II," in *Louisiana: Arkitektur og landskab*, 330–339.

As planning for the new playground advanced, Jensen decided that Susanne Ussing's *Seaweed Church* was not suited to the second version of the Lake Garden.[22] After a series of discussions with Ussing, they agreed that it would no longer be treated as an artwork and that Louisiana would assume responsibility for the structure. During the summer of 1994, Louisiana's carpenters removed the layers of seaweed, repaired and repainted the wooden framework and covered it in panels of plexiglass; creating another of the transparent pavilions that had fascinated Jensen since the 1970s. He referred to it as the "Glass House."[23] **[Figs. 5.40–5.41]** Over the next four years, the structure served as a satellite of the Children's House, until it was demolished and replaced by Alfio Bonnano's *Eel Box Labyrinth*, in 1998.

Following the completion of the Children's House, Jensen turned his attention to the museum shop. To alleviate overcrowding and allow for a wider selection of goods, Jensen commissioned Claus Wohlert to extend the shop, while also preserving the park.[24] Above ground, the architects were able to expand into the park by roughly 5 meters; employing the modern vernacular elements that Bo used in 1982 and creating a seamless extension of the South Wing. **[Fig. 5.43]** Below ground, the architects were able to carve out 1,000 square meters that includes sales and storage areas, restrooms and a large coatroom. Excavation began in the autumn of 1996 and the entire project was completed in time for Louisiana's fortieth anniversary in August 1998.

Jensen's final effort at Louisiana was an unrealized plan for a new building on the beach below the museum.[25] At first, Jensen imagined a conference center, but he abandoned that idea in favor of an exhibition building for architecture and design, which was designed by Jørn Utzon and included a 16-meter-high auditorium facing the sea.[26] **[Fig. 5.43]** Jensen referred to the project as the Utzon House and promoted it as a symbol of the new millennium. The publication of Utzon's scheme, in January

[22] Knud W. Jensen and Susanne Ussing, *The Seaweed Church: A Sculpture by Susanne Ussing, Louisiana 1979-1994* (Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 1994), unpaginated.

[23] Ibid. As Jensen explained, "The Glass House, which is what the Seaweed Church is called today, is not meant to last forever, but to function for a time with a specific purpose as an offshoot of the original project."

[24] Claus Wohlert, conversation with the author, 18 October 2016.

[25] Knud W. Jensen, Kim Utzon, and Carsten Thau, *Utzonhuset: Arkitektursamlingen på Louisiana* (Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum for Moderne Kunst, 1998).

[26] Jensen's memorandum to the Board of the Louisiana Foundation, "Notat om Utzonhuset: Arkitektursamlingen på Louisiana," 29 December 1998, 1-3. As well: Knud W. Jensen letter to Kim Utzon, 18 February 1999.

1999, engendered a firestorm of controversy, which was fueled by the widespread belief that Jensen was attempting to construct his own monument.[27] After Utzon withdrew from the project, Claus Wohlert created two, more contextual proposals, later in the year. Neither scheme was acceptable to the groups that opposed the project, which entered bureaucratic limbo in late 1999.

On 9 June 1999, at the peak of the controversy over Jensen's plan for an exhibition building on the beach, Jørgen Bo took his final breath. In a thoughtful tribute, Vilhelm Wohlert remembered his friend's penetrating intelligence, his rich imagination and the dedication to quality that distinguished all of his work, no matter the scale. He also referred to Bo's complex personality and wondered if his inner struggle between the poles of rationalism and lyricism – between Apollo and Dionysus – was the source of the illnesses that Bo had suffered in his final years.[28] It was Bo's pursuit of synthesis that produced the multivalent architecture at Louisiana, where the buildings serve as a record of his struggle and a living memorial to his talent.

During the last year of Knud W. Jensen's life, he remained committed to the building project on the beach and hopeful that a compromise could be arranged, even as his health declined. On 12 December 2000, a few days after Jensen's eighty-fourth birthday and forty-two years after he had inaugurated an idiosyncratic 1,500-square-meter exhibition of Danish painting, sculpture and applied art, he passed away; leaving behind a 12,600-square-meter institution that is Denmark's most visited museum and one of the leading outposts of international modern art in Europe. He was buried in the cemetery behind the museum, on the parcel that he had subdivided from Louisiana and donated to the parish in 1955.

Vilhelm Wohlert made his final visit to Louisiana on 21 June 2006, when he attended the opening of the exhibition *Poul Kjærholm – Møbelarkitekt*. Ten days later, he suffered the stroke that ended his life on 10 May 2007. While Bo worked to reconcile reason and intuition, Wohlert worked to unite past and present in the pursuit of cultural continuity. As such, he based his work on ageless principles – geometry, materials, and handicraft – that exist independently of time. Those principles provided the essential framework for Bo's visionary union of landscape and architectural space.

[27] See my chapter "Louisiana på stranden," in *Louisiana: Arkitektur og landskab*, 340–345.

[28] Vilhelm Wohlert, "Jørgen Bo 1919–1999," *Arkitekten* 1999, no. 20: 29-30.

Together, the two architects created a contingent whole that is now part of history, but holds valuable lessons for the future – not least, the rejection of false dichotomies.

During 1998, Knud W. Jensen participated in the selection of a new director for Louisiana: the cultural critic Poul Erik Tøjner, who assumed his position on 1 January 2000. Following Jensen's death, Louisiana withdrew the application for permission to construct a new building on the beach. Tøjner turned his attention to the existing buildings, most of which had been constructed with (or without) primitive systems for security and climate control. During 2003–06, Claus Wohlert and his partner at Wohlert Arkitekter, Thorben Schmidt, supervised a comprehensive renovation and reconstruction of the entire museum.[29]

In 2016, Tøjner and the Board of the Louisiana Foundation decided to rebuild the entry structures at the East Wing, in order to address the mistakes of the 1980s and improve circulation to the underground galleries. As Claus Wohlert had retired from practice, the responsibility fell to Thorben Schmidt and Line Loftheim, the partners at Wohlert Arkitekter who completed the reconstruction in 2018.

The Winter Garden was reconstructed with a flat roof, so that it is subordinate to the 58-Building and visitors are able to see the lanterns. **[Fig. 5.44]** Inside, the atmosphere is noticeably warmer, in both temperature and character, and echoes other parts of the museum, by virtue of the wooden ceiling, round skylights and the exposed roof beams that reveal the construction module. Most importantly, the elimination of the glass vaults; and all of the necessary apparatus for heating, shading and lighting; draws the eye towards the horizon and focuses attention on the setting. **[Fig. 5.45]** As part of the work, the architects constructed the connection from the Basin Passage that Wohlert had drawn in 1983. The new entrance allows visitors to enter the underground galleries without passing through the second Lantern Gallery, which became an extension of the cafeteria and is often crowded. As well, the architects removed the small greenhouse that had connected the Great Hall to the lower level of the park, simplifying the junction of retaining walls and landscape, and creating a terrace beneath the trees that is one of the more charming spots at the museum.

[29] Claus Wohlert, "Moderniseringen af Louisiana," in *Louisiana 2003-2006*, ed. Poul Erik Tøjner (Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 2006).

At the South Wing, Schmidt and Loftheim rebuilt the north wall of the Conservatory with a line of windows that allow visitors to see the park and orient themselves as they move to-and-from from the underground galleries. **[Fig. 5.46–5.47]** As part of that project, the architects reconstructed a number of the built-in benches that had been removed in the 1990s and simplified the lighting. The peculiar glass vault remains in place, but the new windows draw the visitor's eye to the setting. The total effect of the reconstruction was to remedy the most glaring problems with the glazed structures, in a way that is organic to the museum's development. As such, the 2018 renovations take their place among the other phases of construction, which were based on the same handful of strategies that had been established 60 years earlier, in the design of the 58-Building. The proof of Schmidt and Loftheim's success is that their renovations appear completely of their place and time, which is also a tribute to the contemporary character of Bo and Wohlert's buildings.

Analysis

The final phase of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at Louisiana was marked by the traces of Knud W. Jensen's Alternative Era. While Jensen no longer espoused radical rhetoric, many of his fascinations from the 1970s remained intact, as seen in most of Louisiana's later construction projects. Two examples of the 1990s, both described above, are the second version of the Lake Garden and the conversion of the seaweed-covered hut into a "glass house." Another, earlier example is the East Wing that has confounded observers and been described as an example of post-modernist architecture. A close study of the drawings reveals the source of the confusion. The architects' consistent approach is underscored by a comparison between Louisiana and another museum that was shaped by the open-air exhibitions of the post-war decade. Through their consistent devotion to the landscape, Bo and Wohlert realized Jensen's two ideal models of museum architecture, outlined in Chapter 4, by creating examples of the Third Possibility that constitute a Qualified Utopia.

5.5 Movement in Space

As previously discussed, Richard Serra's *The Gate in the Gorge* and George Trakas's *Self-Passage* were two of a group of sculptures that Knud W. Jensen commissioned during the early 1980s. The other sculptures were Dani Karavan's *Louisiana Square* (1982), an inverted stone ziggurat located next to the Panorama Room; Enzo Cucchi's *Africa* (1985), a bronze plateau in the lower level of the park; and Jean Dubuffet's *Manoir d' Essor* (1969/1981–82), a painted cement mass that occupies the clearing outside the Basin Passage [30] These commissions continued Jensen's decades-long practice of installing sculpture in the landscape, but their diverse characters signaled a change in direction. While Jensen had previously installed the work of his favorite artists, such as Calder and Moore, the sculptures in the park would now include the latest artistic developments and reflect Louisiana's new position as one of the leading European museums of contemporary art.

Two of Jensen's commissions were inspired by installations at Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, near Otterlo, the Netherlands. Serra's *The Gate in the Gorge* is closely related to the four-piece installation *Spin Out (for Bob Smithson)* (1972–73) that he created for a secluded clearing in the museum's woodland park.[31] **[Fig. 5.48]** We can infer that Jensen extended an invitation to Serra after a visit to Otterlo and that the artist's 1975 project for the sea-slope; abandoned due to the construction of the South Wing; was also related to *Spin Out*. Furthermore, Dubuffet's *Manoir d' Essor* was one of a series of monumental sculptures that the artist conceived during the late 1960s and exhibited in the form of scale models.[32] During the 1970s, several of the sculptures would be realized through museum commissions. They included *Jardin d' émail* (1968/1973–74), an undulating concrete platform of roughly 600 square meters with an 8-meter-high tower that was constructed at the Kröller-Müller.[33] **[Fig. 5.49]**

---

[30] MLL, 264–269.

[31] Lynne Cooke, "Thinking on Your Feet: Richard Serra's Sculptures in Landscape," in *Richard Serra Sculpture: Forty Years*, ed. Kynaston McShine, et al. (New York: Museum of Modern Art; London: Thames & Hudson, 2007), 90–91.

[32] *Ustensiles, Demeures, Escaliers*, Galerie Jeanne Bucher, Paris, 1967; *Edifices*, Musée des Arts décoratifs, Paris, 1968.

[33] Rudolf W. D. Oxenaar, Max Loreau. *Dubuffet, Jardin d'émail*. trans. Patricia Wardle. (Otterlo: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, 1974). As well: Leonard K. Eaton, "Growing a Museum: An Analysis of Holland's Kröller-Müller Museum and Sculpture Garden," *Landscape Architecture*, v. 72, no. 2 (1982): 90.

Considering Knud W. Jensen's negative opinion of the Kröller-Müller's sculpture park, in 1963 [3.9], it initially seems curious that he would turn to it as a source of inspiration. However, it is useful to distinguish artworks from exhibition practices. In 1963, Jensen criticized the groups of disparate sculptures, rather than the selection of sculptures. By the early 1970s, sculptural practices had shifted towards large-scale installations that demand individual settings; the 25 hectares around the Kröller-Müller provided ideal conditions for such works. Moreover, that museum had come to resemble Louisiana, in a way that surely elicited Jensen's admiration. In fact, the Kröller-Müller's development parallels Louisiana's growth in reverse: opening with enclosed galleries, adding an outdoor exhibition of sculpture and constructing an extension modeled on the 58-Building. A summary of the Kröller-Müller's history heightens our appreciation of Bo and Wohlert's expansion of Louisiana, both in terms of what they accomplished and what they avoided.

During 1908–22, Hélène Kröller-Müller; married to the industrialist Anton Kröller, created one of the great collections of early modern art, with a special focus on the work of Vincent van Gogh. As early as 1911, she planned to construct a villa on the couple's estate near The Hague, which would include an annex for displaying the collection.[34] After rejecting designs from Peter Behrens in 1911 and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe in 1912, she hired Hendrik Petrus Berlage in 1913. Berlage eventually resigned and was replaced by Henry van de Velde, who began construction of an elaborate museum on the couple's new estate near Otterlo, *Hoge Veluwe*, in 1922. But that building was never completed; the same financial crisis that afflicted Vilhelm Hansen and threatened his collection at Ordrupgaard [1.10] also crippled the Kröller-Müller's commercial empire. In 1928, the couple established a foundation to protect the collection. In 1935, the Kröller-Müller Foundation donated the collection to the Dutch State, which purchased Hoge Veluwe and converted it into a national park.

Following the terms of the donation, the Dutch government commissioned van de Velde to design a "temporary museum," which was completed in 1938 and remains in use today.[35] The centerpiece of the museum was the collection of van Gogh's work, installed in a ring of overlapping spaces that surround a cross-shaped courtyard.

[34] Rudolf W.D. Oxenaar, et.al., *Kröller-Müller Museum* (Haarlem: Joh. Enschedé, 1978), 11–22. Oxenaar provided the summary of the museum's genesis and architectural history that follows.

[35] Roberto Aloi, *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica* (Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962), 167–174.

Rather than acting as a lightwell, the courtyard symbolized Mrs. Kröller-Müller's veneration of St. Hubertus; the only opening was a pair of glass doors opposite the main entrance.[36] She and her artistic adviser H. P. Bremmer believed in a split between idealism and realism, and a corresponding distinction between culture and nature.[37] Van de Velde enforced that distinction by designing a building that was enclosed by unbroken brick walls and illuminated by skylights. **[Fig. 5.50-5.51]** After his patron died in 1939, Van de Velde designed an extension (1942–44) with an auditorium, additional painting galleries and a sculpture gallery with large windows, which was completed in 1953, under museum director A.M. (Bram) Hammacher.[38]

As documented in Chapter 1, Knud W. Jensen was probably aware of the first open-air exhibition in Arnhem, *Sonsbeek '49*, and undoubtedly aware of the following editions. If Jensen visited any of those exhibitions, he would also have visited the Kröller-Müller, which is only 15 kilometers from Arnhem. And yet, it is unlikely that the monumental museum would have influenced Jensen's planning for Louisiana during the 1950s; the galleries were isolated from the surroundings and the museum did not yet exhibit sculpture in the landscape. Much as the Middelheim Museum inspired Jensen, the open-air exhibitions in Arnhem provided a model for Bram Hammacher, who imagined an outdoor display of sculpture as a means of expanding the museum's collection in a new direction.[39] In 1951, he began acquiring sculptures for an installation in the wooded area next to the museum, which was part of the Hoge Veluwe National Park. His plans were delayed by extended negotiations with the State and the installation did not open until 1961.[40]

Hammacher's successor Rudolf Oxenaar, enlarged the sculpture park during 1963–66, but quickly became preoccupied with the building program. By that point, van de Velde's "temporary museum" had deteriorated to the point of threatening the collection, with a cracked foundation, a defective heating system and a myriad of

---

[36] Katherine M. Kuenzli, *Henri van de Velde: Designing Modernism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 166–167.

[37] Oxenaar, et.al., *Kröller-Müller Museum*, 32–33.

[38] See Note 36.

[39] Jaap Bremer, "Kröller-Müller Museum Otterlo – The Introduction of 20th-century International Sculpture in the Netherlands," in *The Art of Collecting: 20th-century Art in Dutch Museums*, ed. Els Barents (Ghent: Ludion, 1997), 39-42.

[40] Rudolf W. D. Oxenaar, et al., *Kröller-Müller, The First Hundred Years* (Haarlem: Joh. Enschedé en Zonen, 1989), 108–113.

other problems that would require a total renovation.[41] Beyond the renovation, the museum began planning a new, one-story building that would include a full range of public facilities, additional galleries and a variety of service spaces; effectively a second museum. The architect for the new building was Wim G. Quist (born 1930), then best known for a series of water purification plants and other industrial buildings. Quist began working on the project in 1969 and the two phases of construction were completed in 1972 and 1977.[42]

Quist placed the new building along the edge of the sculpture park, where it would provide a transition between the existing museum and the open-air exhibition. **[Figs. 5.52-5.54]** To improve access, the public entrance would be relocated from the end of the original building to the midpoint of the new building. **[Fig. 5.55]** As a contrast to van de Velde's symmetrical mass, Quist created an informal cluster of enclosed volumes joined by glass-walled passageways. He reinforced the contrast with a palette of industrial materials, using black steel columns and aluminum frames for the glass walls and off-white concrete brick for the enclosed spaces. **[Fig. 5.56]** The entire project was dimensioned using a module of 30 centimeters derived from the masonry, which was multiplied to arrive at a framing module of 270 centimeters.[43] The result is a constantly changing sequence of open and enclosed spaces that are realized in an anonymous architectural language and punctuated by elegant details.

Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller museum described Quist's building as a development of Dutch constructivist architecture that can be traced back to De Stijl.[44] The attribution is correct, but omits an important stage of development between the 1920s and the 1970s. Anyone familiar with Louisiana will recognize that Quist found his primary model in the 58-Building. The influence of Bo and Wohlert's work is evident in the meandering layout of Quist's building, which followed the contours of the terrain and preserved the trees; the contrast between glazed circulation spaces and enclosed volumes; and the monochromatic pairing of masonry and elements. Within, visitors encounter a fluid treatment of space and constant views of the setting; a cluster of

---

[41] Rudolf W. D. Oxenaar and Wim Quist, *Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller: Nieuwboux 1970–1977 = Extension 1970–1977*, trans. Patricia Wardle (Otterlo: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, 1978).

[42] Ibid. As well: Richard Padovan, "Art Gallery, Otterlo, Holland," *The Architectural Review*, vol. 163, no. 972 (February 1978): 74–82.

[43] Oxenaar and Quist, 20.

[44] Oxenaar, et al., *Kröller-Müller Museum* (Haarlem: Joh. Enschedé, 1978), 26.

galleries with interlocking brick walls and staggered openings; and a cafeteria defined by a low wall, which includes a change in level and opens onto a sunny terrace. **[Figs. 5.57–5.58]** Recognizing the impact of Louisiana's original exhibition building on the expansion of the Kröller-Müller does not diminish Quist's remarkable achievement, but it does invite a comparison between the spatial experiences at the two museums.

At the Kröller-Müller, Henry van de Velde designed the "temporary museum" using classical strategies of symmetry and hierarchy. The visitor's experience is structured by a central passage that provides exhibition space and is flanked by individual rooms aligned on cross-axes. Van de Velde continued this strategy in his 1953 extension, using the centerline of the auditorium as the cross-axis. While the space around the courtyard introduces diagonal movement, it is a closed loop that reinforces the importance of the central passage. Wim Quist's building includes a service wing with a central corridor, but the public spaces are consistently informal and indeterminate. As in the van de Velde building, the new galleries are illuminated with skylights, but the openings to the galleries are arranged on a diagonal, in a manner that recalls Louisiana's lantern galleries. **[Figs. 5.59–5.61]** Quite deliberately, Quist designed a building that has no center and encourages visitors to determine their own route.

Quist's building completed the transformation of the Kröller-Müller's identity that Bram Hammacher had initiated with his decision to create a sculpture park: from an obscure treasure house to a popular museum. The absolute contrast between the two buildings was undoubtedly a strategic decision that was intended to signal the new character of the institution. While that strategy was successful, it reduced the van de Velde building to a historical artifact. The result is a two-part museum divided by a series of polarities: monumental vs. informal, opaque vs. transparent, handicraft vs. industrial technique. The underlying polarity is in the architects' conception of space: van de Velde's bi-axial arrangement of rooms vs. Quist's loose arrangement of zones. Much as movement through Richard Serra's and George Trakas's installations at Louisiana alerts visitors to the natural setting, the varied experiences of movement at the Kröller-Müller heightens the distinction between the two sections of the museum.

Depending on their location, visitors to the Kröller-Müller either follow axial paths or wander through an open-plan. These contrasting experiences of movement separate the museum's original collection from the new building, both psychologically and

physically. As a result, visiting the installation of van Gogh's work involves an element of time travel, as visitors leave that part of the museum where they shop, eat and encounter contemporary art; and journey into a building from an earlier era that imposes limits on their movement and vision. In this way, the artworks in the van de Velde building are experienced as historical artifacts. The separation of her collection from the other parts of the museum would no doubt have pleased Hélène Kröller-Müller, but it is antithetical to the strategy of popularizing art by eroding the distinction between the exhibition and the flow of daily life.

At Louisiana, Bo and Wohlert's pursuit of continuity was the essence of their work. While Jensen hoped that additions to the museum would create "an absolute contrast with the old Louisiana" [3.3], the architects were able to avoid the schism between buildings that occurred at the Kröller-Müller. As a result, none of Bo and Wohlert's buildings is experienced as a time capsule, but instead as segments of a contingent whole that exists in the present and is defined by overlapping experiences of space, materials and movement. Searching for clues, a visitor can guess that the 58-Building is the oldest segment of the museum, due to the simple light fixtures and high level of handicraft, but the fluid treatment of space and neutral character of the construction provide a contemporary impression. The only truly historical building at Louisiana is the villa, which is partially restored to the present by its role as the entrance to the museum. Indeed, Bo and Wohlert's concern for continuity between Louisiana's buildings was evident as early as 1956, when they divided the 58-Building into pavilions, so that it would not overpower the villa. [2.3]

Beyond the modules, materials and elements, Bo and Wohlert's fundamental instrument of continuity was their informal treatment of space. The results were so consistent that it is more useful to identify the exceptions than the examples, which extend from the 58-Building to the East Wing, and are detailed in the Narrative. Aside from the 66-Building; where the Low Gallery and the extension of the High Gallery were intended to serve as an auditorium; the architects avoided alignments between exhibition spaces. Apart from the entrance to the Low Gallery, the only centered openings in the museum are located on two sides of the Column Hall, in the East Wing, where the square hall joins three, very different spaces. **[Figs. 5.11/5.18]** And yet, neither of those axial openings faces another opening; Wohlert placed the entrance to the Great Hall in a corner to encourage diagonal movement. Just as

deliberately, the main staircases in the 71–Building and the South Wing were divided into flights of unequal width, avoiding symmetries and providing an informal effect.

Through their informal treatment of space, Bo and Wohlert created the meandering paths that occur in each building; none of those paths were accidental. Instead, the architects worked to provide the visitor with a typical experience of movement, based on the model of the 58-Building. We can recognize the success of these efforts by comparing the promenade from the villa to the cafeteria with the circuitous, multi-level loop in the West Wing and the diagonal routes through the South Wing and the East Wing. Each path is specific to the building and the terrain, and yet all of the paths lead the visitor on a twisting journey through a sequence of diverse spaces. This typical experience unites all of the galleries and other parts of the museum into a continuum that includes the various exhibitions, as well as lunch, the shop, the park, etc. There are no time capsules at Louisiana and the artworks are encountered within a continuous present that corresponds to the visitor's real-time. In this way, Bo and Wohlert's pursuit of continuity between the buildings reinforced Louisiana's program of popularizing art through the union of art and daily experience.

5.6 Beneath the Surface

Among Louisiana's buildings, the East Wing has been the most resistant to insightful analysis, which is hardly surprising. Aside from the two entry structures and the small greenhouse, the building is an interior with no exterior form to critique, a wide variety of galleries and a host of unusual details. Even the eminent landscape historian Marc Treib – who was quite familiar with Louisiana – was confused by the character of the building and wondered at the identity of the architect. In an address that included a summary of the museum's development, he explained,

"The last major extensions, dating from the 1990s, were realized by other designers in a somewhat unfortunate post-modern style which jarred with the simple character of the original pavilions. Fortunately, much of this last phase was set below ground to preserve what remained of the museum's parkland and views over the strait that separates Denmark and Sweden."[45]

[45] Marc Treib, "Adding On" in *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 73, Symposium Papers L: A Modernist Museum in Perspective: The East Building, National Gallery of Art. (2009): 159.

Treib's reference to "post-modern style" points to the source of his confusion and provides the first step towards recognition. As the East Wing does not incorporate historicist fragments, he was apparently referring to the complexity of the building, imagining it as an example of post-modern eclecticism. [4.10] His reference to the character of "the original pavilions" suggests that he was particularly disturbed by the Winter Garden, but he also included the galleries – "fortunately […] set below ground" – in his assessment, as though they were an arbitrary composition along the lines of Hollein's museum in Mönchengladbach. Documentation of Bo and Wohlert's schemes for museums in Stuttgart and Bochum indicates that neither architect was interested in eclecticism. [4.11] Furthermore, as seen in the comparison between Bo's L-shaped galleries and the galleries in Mönchengladbach and Stuttgart, complexity is not necessarily the result of eclecticism. [4.12]

Treib was not alone in his confusion or consequent retreat to a stylistic interpretation. In his discussion of the East Wing, Thomas Kappel recognized the experience of moving through the three, rectangular galleries as reminiscent of earlier buildings.[46] But he was unable to grasp the intersection of topographic, structural and personal factors that produced the design. He had nothing to say about Knud W. Jensen's interest in glass architecture, despite his awareness of Jensen's designs for glass buildings.[47] Further, his exclusively formal conception of architecture blinded him to the consistencies between the individual buildings. Ultimately, he described the entire museum as a succession of stylistic exercises that record the development of modern Danish architecture, while employing historical analogies,

"Today, many refer to the museum as the cathedral of modern society. That is, a mental picture of our cultural self-perception, as the church was in the Middle Ages. And just like that, Bo and Wohlert have unabashedly changed Louisiana's style over the 35 years, so we have been given a cathedral of art and humanism that delicately tells the architectural history of Danish modernism, analogous to the cathedral's Roman crypt, Gothic choir and nave, and then Baroque and classicist chapels. In Humlebæk, the crypt was built in the end."[48]

---

[46] Kappel, Master's Thesis, 77, 79.

[47] Ibid., 93.

[48] Ibid., 85. As well: Kappel, "Louisianas grafikfløj," *Arkitektur DK* 1991, no. 7: 315.

Kappel did not elaborate on his concept of stylistic evolution. Considering his commentary on the South Wing [4.12], it is likely that he imagined a progression from Klint-style to Fisker-style to Henning Larsen-style to a post-modern festival of decorative forms and eccentric spaces. In any event, Kappel's imaginary progression illustrates the paradox of stylistic preoccupations, which simultaneously blind the observer to what is evident and lead him to see things that do not exist. Having examined each of Louisiana's buildings in the Narrative, we can recognize that each phase of construction at the museum was based on a handful of principles that were adapted to the topographic conditions and the program, both of which were in flux.

Kappel and Treib were mistaken in their belief that the architect(s) of the East Wing were working in a post-modern style, but Treib was correct in recognizing a degree of eclecticism in the East Wing. The agent of that eclecticism was Knud W. Jensen, whose documented fascination with glass buildings and autobiographical conception of Louisiana compelled Wohlert to introduce a new type of architecture to the museum. As such, we can understand the complexity of the East Wing as the result of two factors: the terrain and the client. The variable terrain resulted in a range of exhibition spaces, which necessitated different structural systems and unusual surface treatments. Jensen's involvement resulted in the three glass buildings, all of which necessitated steel structures and new types of details. Recognizing these factors and their consequences, it becomes clear that the East Wing consists of two, separate layers of construction, which Wohlert attempted to harmonize into a single building. In fact, the drawings that he produced during 1983–89 illustrate two, parallel design processes: above and below ground.

Below ground, the initial sketch project, dated September 1983, illustrates Wohlert's response to the varied terrain and includes most of the exhibition spaces that would be constructed, with the exception of the Column Hall. **[Fig. 5.10]** In the three rectangular galleries, curved surfaces around the root systems of large trees would transcribe landscape features in the exhibition spaces, similar to Bo's attempt at stepped floors in the South Wing. In 1987, the underground building was reduced to a series of passages that bridged the fern-filled cleft, most likely to reduce the construction cost. **[Fig. 5.62]** The projects of April–June 1988 are notable for an entrance to the Great Hall that would have destroyed the lower level of the park. **[Fig. 5.63]** By November 1988, Wohlert had established the final module and rationalized the scheme, but the

galleries along the slope remained in flux. **[Fig. 5.64]** Six weeks later, in January 1989, his final sketch project included all of the eventual exhibition spaces. **[Fig. 5.65]** The similarity between the projects of 1983 and 1989 suggests that the six-year-long design process was the result of Jensen's interest in alternatives, rather than Wohlert's inability to find a practical, organic solution.

Above ground, the design process was even more convoluted. In the 1983 sketch project, Wohlert proposed a glass bulkhead beneath the pergola, which was attached to the Basin Passage and contained the stair to the underground galleries. At the corner of the South Wing, a narrow structure with windows that recall the cafeteria would contain an elevator and a spiral stair. **[Fig. 5.9]** Those structures remained intact, even as the underground galleries underwent radical changes until April–May 1988, when Jensen enforced his demand for a glass building in place of the pergola. The scheme of June 1988 includes a square Winter Garden with six, barrel vaults. **[Fig. 5.66]** By autumn, Wohlert had reduced the number of vaults to three; to coincide with the structure; but he was evidently determined to avoid curved forms. His final sketch project, in January 1989, replaced the vaults with nine, glass pyramids, which would reduce the height of the roof and provide linear forms. **[Figs. 5.67–5.68]**

In March 1989, Wohlert prepared a series of colored sketches that depict various options for the roof. **[Figs. 5.69–5.71]** It is unlikely that he made the sketches for his own study; he had already arrived at his preferred solution of nine pyramids for a building he did not want to construct. Several months later, Louisiana published a booklet with a revised project for the East Wing, *Louisianas nye grafikfløjen*.[49] **[Figs. 5.72–5.74]** Evidently, Jensen had selected barrel vaults for the Winter Garden. In the pursuit of harmony, Wohlert covered the Conservatory with a barrel vault. By June 1989, Jensen had rejected that solution and Wohlert was developing the shallow vault that would finally be constructed. **[Fig. 5.75]** As Wohlert revised the scheme for the last time, he designed shallow vaulted ceilings for the three rectangular galleries and the Curved Passage, in an apparent attempt to unify the two levels of the East Wing. Simultaneously, the elevators were encased in cylinders, to complement the spiral stairs and produce a building characterized by cylinders and segments of cylinders.

[49] The text emphasized the practical need to accommodate the museum's new collection of copper prints and marked the first appearance of the term "Graphic Wing."

Despite Jensen's interference above ground, Wohlert was able to design an exhibition building that is generally consistent with the earlier buildings, in terms of planning, modularity, movement, and some of the materials and elements. As described in the Narrative, the design of the exhibition spaces was a direct result of the terrain, to a degree that recalls the 58-Building. In this case, Wohlert employed two, different modules: to coordinate the union of structure and space, and the union of new and existing buildings. Following the familiar practice, the galleries feature geometric elements that reveal their modular character, most notably the ceiling cassettes in the Great Hall and the rotating spotlights imported from the South Wing. As a result of the concrete structures, the use of organic materials was limited to the floors, where reddish-brown pavers correspond to the plan of each volume. In concert, those geometric spaces and fired clay pavers create a meandering path through the terrain.

Despite the inspired treatment of space and the unifying effect of the reddish-brown floors, the detailing in the galleries is uneven. The high point occurs on the balcony of the Great Hall, where the union of wooden parapet, steel handrail and concrete spiral stair provides an integrated and extremely elegant solution for moving visitors down to the main level. **[Fig. 5.19]** Unfortunately, the suspended ceilings and indirect lighting in the rectangular galleries and in the Curved Passage undermine the clarity of those volumes. Moreover, the constellation of spotlights in the Column Hall would have benefited from ceiling cassettes, as in the Great Hall. Wohlert recognized the weakness of the detailing and attributed the compromised character of the building to the schedule, which extended over many years and then suddenly accelerated. In an effort to construct the East Wing as quickly as possible and at the lowest cost, Jensen had entered into a "total-enterprise" agreement, in which the builder assumed control of the working drawings and completed the work for a guaranteed maximum price.[50] As Wohlert explained,

"The development has shifted the emphasis from the human aspects for which Klint advocated, to economically rational considerations, which obviously do not pay off in the longer term. It goes without saying that a task such as decorating Thiele's shop [1.7] will not come again. It also should not and cannot be used as a yardstick for current architectural duties.

[50] Wohlert insisted on a separate architectural contract with the museum, so that he would not be an employee of the contractor. Claus Wohlert, conversation with the author, 18 October 2016.

But when it comes down to it, the Graphic Wing of Louisiana does not contain as good examples of excellent craftsmanship as the previous stages. The primary explanation is to be found in the construction model, which only gave the studio three months to complete a 50 million-crown construction project [prepare the construction drawings] and a seven-month build time there. These are conditions that do not give life to the craft, and thus ultimately optimal opportunities to the sensory qualities.

As the future holds, architecture risks becoming a pursuit where only form counts. This will lead to solutions that become very, very quickly obsolete, with the danger that the understanding of architecture as a well-made form of applied art will be blurred. There is a need for depth, in order for the architectural design to achieve clarity and conviction."[51]

In reality, the future that Wohlert imagined had arrived some decades earlier, at Louisiana and elsewhere. However compromised by uneven detailing, the underground level of East Wing was a remarkable solution to an almost intractable problem and the arrangement of the exhibition spaces is inevitable. Considering the long and difficult gestation of the East Wing and Wohlert's disappointment with the result, it is neither coincidental nor surprising that the building marked the end of his work at Louisiana.

Bo was surely aware of Wohlert's trials, but returned to Louisiana, to renovate the museum shop and extend the Panorama Room. The final project for the extension displays his customary sensitivity to the landscape and inventive use of the modern vernacular language; it was a fitting conclusion to his work at the museum. Jensen's decision to construct the Children's House, rather than extend the South Wing, was equally characteristic, as he favored new buildings over renovations and pursued ambitions that could never be satisfied. His efforts to erect a fantastic building on the beach can be regarded as the final expression of those ambitions. As such, it is clear that all three men ended their time at Louisiana in a consistent manner.

[51] Eric Messerschmidt, "En samtale med Vilhelm Wohlert: Man skal være ydmyg i sit udgangspunkt" in *Arkitektur DK* 1991, no. 7: 338.

5.7 A Complete Museum

Through an intersection of ambition and principle, Louisiana is endowed with an extraordinary variety of exhibition spaces, as well as a concert hall, cinema, shop and cafeteria. Added together, the passages and two types of pavilion in the 58-Building; four galleries in the West Wing; passage and five galleries in the South Wing; and four types of gallery in the East Wing provide seventeen different combinations of plan, ceiling height, floor materials and atmospheres. As importantly, the lighting varies from natural daylight to diffused daylight to entirely artificial sources. Just as the extraordinary variety of walls in L-shaped galleries of the South Wing provides the curators with enormous flexibility, the variety of exhibition spaces across the museum allows them to match exhibitions with the spaces that are best suited for the artworks. As a result, Louisiana enjoys a degree of curatorial flexibility that is possibly unique for a museum devoted to modern art.

After examining each phase of construction, we can trace the variety of the exhibition spaces to two factors: Knud W. Jensen's inconsistent instructions to his architects, and the architects' consistent responses. As documented, Jensen's instructions to his architects changed from building to building, at times radically, based on variable degrees of personal ambition and concern for genius loci. While his instructions for the 58-Building, the 76-Building, and the East Wing reflected his concern for the setting; his instructions for the 66-Building, 71-Building and the South Wing were concerned with the maximize coverage of the site. However myopic his motivations, Jensen's insistence on skylights in the West Wing; a monochrome floor in the South Wing; and artificially-lit galleries in the East Wing were essential to the variety of Louisiana's exhibition spaces.

The other and even more decisive factor in the variety of Louisiana's exhibition spaces was Bo and Wohlert's commitment to the unity of building and landscape. As detailed in the Narrative, each of Bo and Wohlert's buildings is indivisible from the terrain, whether the bulwark that provided the armature for the 58-Building; the triangular plateau that determined the massing of the West Wing; the slope that guided the design of the South Wing; or the variety of features that formed the East Wing. In each building, the topographic conditions determined the arrangement of exhibition spaces, but also the character of those spaces: from the continuous interior

of the 58-Building, to the complex volumes in the West Wing and South Wing, to the individual chambers in the East Wing.

The corollary of Bo and Wohlert's commitment to genius loci was their rejection of any ideal or doctrinaire model of exhibition space. During their tenure at Louisiana, the prevailing models varied from universal volume, to flexible container, to a clearly defined room. The common denominator for these models was the rejection of genius loci. As documented in Chapter 2, the modernist conception of exhibition space was rooted in the visions of avant-garde artists and architects who pursued the erasure of local distinctions, in favor of universal space that would realize their metaphysical goals. [2.7] As this avant-garde conception of space became institutionalized, the negation of place continued, regardless of whether the spaces were enclosed by transparent screens, as in Mies's museums; or solid walls, as at Kunsthaus Zürich.

Following the apotheosis of open-plan exhibition space; at Centre Pompidou; the pendulum of architectural fashion returned to pre-modernist models. [4.10] In Stuttgart, Stirling's use of neoclassical precedent – as an element in an autonomous composition – underscores the fact that the monumental galleries of the nineteenth century were as isolated from their surroundings as the modernist spaces that were conceived in opposition. It is no coincidence that both Mies and Stirling regarded the work of Karl Friedrich Schinkel as a model, but with completely different intentions and degrees of sincerity. While European museum architecture underwent a radical transformed between 1830 and 1930; in both space and style; the underlying concept of a self-contained "world of art" remained intact.

In contrast, Bo and Wohlert created site-specific galleries that were derived from the landscape and defined by geometric assemblies of materials. As in the South Wing, each gallery embodies a state of relative order, in which the distinctive character of the space is a result of the topography, and the anonymous character of the space is a result of the construction. [4.12] As a result of the different topographic conditions, each set of galleries exhibits an inverse relationship between material presence and spatial definition. The extreme examples are the fluid spaces of the 58-Building, where the presence of the materials is most profound; and the distinct rooms of the East Wing, where gypsum board replaced brickwork and the use of organic materials is confined to the floors. In between those two extremes, the West Wing and South

Wing provide multivalent spaces with complex sections and plans. In both wings, the diffuse lighting subdues the texture of the brickwork, but the clay pavers and wooden borders at the ceilings imbue the galleries with material presence. Along this spectrum between materiality and spatial definition, each building resolves the polarity between character and neutrality that underlay Jensen's model of the Third Possibility, and provides the conditions for his ideal interplay between architecture and art.[52]

As Knud W. Jensen recognized in 1962, the galleries in the 58-Building are extremely accommodating for a wide variety of artworks. [3.8] The primary factors in that interplay are the unfolding sequence of surfaces that follow the outline of the bulwark; the regular divisions of space that provide scale for the artworks; and the inherent substance of the construction, which is reinforced by the units of material and density of joints. **[Figs. 5.76–5.77]** The same daylight that animates the materials also anchors the artworks in the setting. **[Fig. 5.78]**

In the West Wing, the galleries are experienced as complex spaces with two different ceiling heights. These overlapping spaces allow artworks to be viewed from multiple angles and distances, so that they are experienced in a dynamic way and become part of the architectural setting. This union of art and space is most acute in the Low and High galleries, which are perceived as a single volume. **[Figs. 5.79–5.80]** The effect continues in the Long Gallery, where the change in elevation leads the visitor to step down and into the exhibition at the far end of the gallery. **[Fig. 5.81]**

As detailed in the Narrative, the South Wing provides an extraordinary range of different walls, which allows precise pairings of surface and artwork. Beyond simple variety, the L-shaped galleries allow for unions of space and art in a way that recalls the West Wing. In place of complex sections, complex plans provide overlapping spaces that alternately conceal and reveal, in a manner that recalls the 58-Building. **[Figs. 5.82/5.84]** As well, Bo's diagonal path allows views from multiple distances and extends the interplay beyond a single volume to include adjacent galleries. **[Fig. 5.83]**

The East Wing includes a number of the most distinctive galleries at Louisiana, which play an active role in the installations, by virtue of their spatial definition. These stable, geometric volumes are especially sympathetic to amorphous or immaterial

[52] These examples of the Third Possibility include the concert hall in the 76-Building, where the acoustics that enrich the musical performances are a direct result of the architecture.

artworks that have no inherent form, by providing architectural context that fixes the artwork in the memory of the visitor. **[Figs. 5.85–5.86]** While the rectangular galleries have a uniform width and depth, Wohlert placed the required stair in the center gallery, to avoid a sequence of identical spaces and integrate them into the extended procession. **[Fig. 5.87]**

Paradoxically, Bo and Wohlert created these examples of Jensen's Third Possibility by rejecting his underlying assumption of a self-contained chamber that is isolated from the surroundings. According to Jensen's address "The Ideal Museum", his ideal of a Qualified Utopia was based on a harmonious relationship with the surroundings, while his ideal of a Third Possibility was based on a harmonious relationship with the art. [4.12] The two models share a common premise; i.e., the modification of an autonomous architectural vision; but they are distinguished by the schism between setting and program that Jensen pursued after 1958.

As Bo and Wohlert derived their exhibition spaces from the terrain, they collapsed the distinction between place and purpose that separated Jensen's ideal museum building from his ideal exhibition space. In that way, Bo and Wohlert not only provided Jensen with examples of his Third Possibility, but segments of his ideal museum building. While Bo and Wohlert's buildings were fundamentally incomplete, each resolved the opposition between architecture and genius loci that was the foundation of Jensen's Qualified Utopia. By virtue of their principled approach, the architects created a series of buildings that are united by a typical experience of movement through topographic exhibition spaces with overlapping systems of materials, modules and elements. The result was a unitary building that was constructed in phases over a period of thirty-five years and realized Jensen's concept of a Qualified Utopia.

Inadvertently, Heinrich Klotz provided an insightful description of Bo and Wohlert's unitary building, in reference to a post-modernist museum building that was designed to simulate variety. As documented in Chapter 4, Klotz regarded Hans Hollein's building in Mönchengladbach as a breakthrough in museum architecture. However, Klotz's description is equally or even more appropriate to Louisiana, due to the fact Bo and Wohlert subverted the traditional concept of the museum-as-monument, in both form and experience,

"Whereas a museum had, until then, been regarded as a building which could be subdivided to a greater or lesser degree, the concept 'building' would seem out of place […] More suitable would be the term 'landscape of buildings.' Instead of a unified structural block, a wide range of different individual buildings are placed in complex relations to one another, producing a varied 'adventure playground' representing, both externally and internally, a kind of landscape of structures and space.

The intention is no longer the flexibility of the large hall with movable partitions in the sense of modern buildings but, rather, a wide variety of different room 'characters' which are specially suited to various different art objects. The result is a varied, complex whole characterized by a wide range of spatial individuality which, as an aesthetic environment, stands in fundamental opposition to traditional museums of art."[53]

Jensen never recognized Louisiana as an example of his hypothetical Qualified Utopia, but the concept is fundamental to understanding Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana. With one provocative figure of speech, Jensen provided the theoretical key that reveals the relationship between architects and client; illuminates the significance of their work to Jensen's institution; provides a literal description of Bo and Wohlert's methodology; and locates their unitary building in a historical context. The results of these processes are summarized in the following observations and detailed in the four conclusions that complete this dissertation.

[53] Heinrich Klotz, *New Museum buildings in the Federal Republic of Germany = Neue Museumsbauten in der Bundesrepublic Deutschland*, (New York: Rizzoli, 1985), 16–18.

Observations

Knud W. Jensen was responsible for the complexity and the eclectic character of the East Wing, as he decided to construct an underground exhibition building and compelled Vilhelm Wohlert to design glass structures. Jensen's decision to bury the exhibition building reflected his concern for the character of the setting. However, his insistence on glass structures that were alien to the existing architecture indicates that his definition of genius loci at Louisiana did not include Bo and Wohlert's work. This narrow conception of genius loci contradicted the expansive use of the term he employed in his appeal for "qualified utopias", but it was consistent with his autobiographical conception of Louisiana. It follows that Jensen's insistence on glazed structures signaled his determination to complete Louisiana according to his own aesthetic impulses, which were rooted in his Alternative Era.

The autographical character of Jensen's glazed structures is confirmed by the summary of his later projects at Louisiana, which were also rooted in his visionary phase during the 1970s. Jensen's return to an ad-hoc aesthetic is evident in the second version of the Lake Garden and the conversion of the *Seaweed Church* into a "Glass House." Moreover, we can recognize his idea of an entire building for children as an extension of the same impulse that resulted in the exhibition *Children Are A People*, in 1978, which was the occasion for the construction of the original Lake Garden. Indeed, Jensen imagined the Children's House and the second Lake Garden as a single project. After 1982, having transformed the museum according to international standards; Jensen reverted to his fascinations of the 1970s, when Louisiana had provided an adventure-playground for his imagination.

In the East Wing, the underground exhibition building is fundamentally consistent with the strategies that Bo and Wohlert employed in the 58-Building. However, the subterranean location and resulting complexity of the galleries have obscured the commonalities with the other parts of Louisiana; the glazed structures only added to the confusion. Considering the costs of the excavation, underground construction and a Winter Garden, it is likely that the budget for finishing the galleries was inadequate. While Wohlert was unable to create poetry from gypsum board, the weakness of the detailing is a relatively minor concern compared to his assured treatment of space, which is simultaneously topographic and geometric. That treatment of space binds the

underground building to the rest of the museum, in both principle and experience. The disjunction between Wohlert's exhibition spaces and Jensen's glazed structures is confirmed by the 2018 renovation, which improved the visitor's experience of the East Wing without altering the exhibition spaces.

The disjunction between Wohlert's exhibition spaces and Jensen's glazed structures was the most dramatic example of a general pattern in Louisiana's expansion. Over time, as Jensen became more directly involved in Bo and Wohlert's work, it became increasingly difficult for the architects to accommodate his demands and yet maintain a coherent setting for his social-utopian institutional agenda. From 1959, whatever sensitivity Jensen had displayed during the design of the 58-Building was superseded by impulses that contradicted his original intentions. In the first stage, through 1982, he pursued exhibition spaces that were premised on the negation of genius loci. In the second stage, which began in the 1970s and continued after 1982, he pursued a series of impulses that were equally at odds with the character of the setting. Both agendas threatened the union of place and purpose that was Louisiana's founding principle.

At Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, Rudolf Oxenaar's strategy of a two-part museum was analogous to Jensen's desire for contrast between Louisiana's buildings, as he turned away from both the original collection and the 58-Building. Bo and Wohlert's commitment to continuity – most importantly, their consistently informal treatment of space – prevented Louisiana from developing into a multi-part museum. Their efforts were nearly undone in the East Wing, as a result of the subterranean location and Jensen's insistence on neo-Victorian glass structures. However, as seen at the Kröller-Müller, movement is fundamental to the visitor's experience of any museum. At Louisiana, the visitor's movement along a series of meandering paths unites Bo and Wohlert's various buildings into a continuum that is both spatial and temporal. As a result, a visitor to Louisiana experiences all of the exhibitions and other activities within a contemporary setting that grounds those experiences in the flow of daily life.

Knud W. Jensen's conception of architecture was based on dichotomies that were alien to Bo and Wohlert's practice. As is evident from his models of Qualified Utopia and the Third Possibility – both premised on the chimera of the "dominating architect" – Jensen regarded architecture as a vehicle for self-expression, which required moderation in order to harmonize with the place and serve the purpose of the

building. [4.12] This artistic conception of the architect's role led Jensen to imagine a series of dichotomies – form and space, setting and function, architecture and anonymity – that blinded him to the character of Louisiana's buildings. As Bo and Wohlert pursued the unity of building and landscape by collapsing those dichotomies, they not only provided Jensen with a myriad of Third Possibilities, but an incremental version of his Qualified Utopia that supported his social-utopian institutional agenda. In that way, Bo and Wohlert's work allowed Jensen to realize his vision of "The Ideal Museum", despite his inability to ever recognize it as such.

As detailed in the following conclusions, Jensen's myopic conception of architecture blinded him to the placeless-utopian character of the White Cube and, as a result, the implications of enclosed galleries at Louisiana. Through their pursuit of unity, Bo and Wohlert preserved Jensen's social-utopian agenda for Louisiana, in the face of his autographic impulses and resulting obsession with buildings that contradicted that agenda. In the process of constructing Jensen's Qualified Utopia, Bo and Wohlert adapted two distinct models of placeless-utopian exhibition space to Louisiana's landscape, initially by choice and later by necessity. As such, it is evident that Bo and Wohlert's unitary building was both an alternative model of museum architecture and one of the most profound works of Nordic Modernism.

Conclusions

This page intentionally blank.

Conclusions

Following the documentation and analysis, I have arrived at four conclusions that form a logical sequence and ultimately locate Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's work at Louisiana in a historical context. Each conclusion is presented as a paragraph, which is followed by a description of the sources; a set of numbered arguments that reiterate the evidence; and a summary of the preceding material.

1. Knud W. Jensen's Architectural Agendas

During his tenure at Louisiana, Knud W. Jensen pursued three architectural agendas that were antithetical and sometimes overlapped. As a result of Jensen's instructions, the six buildings that Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert completed at the museum vary in formal character, degree of enclosure and lighting technique. Jensen's most significant instruction was his demand for enclosed exhibition spaces, which was an impulsive decision that illuminates his other architectural agendas. Each agenda was rooted in Jensen's autobiographical conception of Louisiana and reflected his desire to construct the museum in his own self-image. Despite the varied building programs, he remained committed to an institutional agenda of popularizing art through contact with the landscape. His dedication to Louisiana's founding principle is recorded in the outdoor sculpture installations, even as the varied characters of the artworks reflect the museum's transformation. As a result of Jensen's autographic impulses, he was unable to recognize the conflicts between his consistent institutional agenda and his divergent architectural agendas.

***

This conclusion is based on primary sources and supported by analyses of Louisiana's origins and subsequent development, based on secondary sources. Knud W. Jensen's three architectural agendas are recorded in his autobiography, his instructions to Bo and Wohlert, and the memoranda that he addressed to the board of the Louisiana Foundation. The existing buildings and the drawings and models created by a variety of architects provide further evidence of Jensen's varied building programs, which is supported by statements from surviving participants. An examination of Louisiana's exhibition program and partners during the 1960s locates Jensen's instructions to Bo and Wohlert in an institutional context, which is reinforced by examining the change

in the character of the museum's collection during the 1970s. Jensen's statements also provide evidence of his single institutional agenda and the degree to which it was premised on the setting, which is confirmed by his evident knowledge of post-war, open-air sculpture exhibitions. The study of Louisiana's major outdoor installations of sculpture was supported by Jensen's autobiography and relied on archival material to reconstruct installations that no longer exist.

I. *During his tenure at Louisiana, Knud W. Jensen pursued three architectural agendas that were antithetical and sometimes overlapped.*

Knud W. Jensen's architectural agendas can be distilled to three paradigms: the Villa, the White Cube, and the Crystal Palace. During 1955–58, Jensen pursued an exhibition building with the character of a modernist villa, and constructed the 58-Building. [1.3, 2.1] Beginning in 1959, he pivoted to a program of enclosed galleries with overhead lighting that corresponded to the conventional model of the White Cube. [3.2] That agenda resulted in the West Wing; completed in 1971. Parallel to his program of conventional galleries, Jensen adopted an eclectic agenda that combined elements of anarchy, fantasy and nostalgia. During 1973–78, he sponsored ad-hoc installations; developed schemes for glass buildings that were inspired by Joseph Paxton's Crystal Palace; and commissioned a project for an anti-modernist wing of the museum. [4.4, 4.5] At the end of the decade, Jensen reverted to his program of White Cubes and constructed a new wing that followed international standards, in both container and contents. [4.8] After 1982, Jensen returned to his eclectic agenda of the 1970s, as seen in the glazed structures of the East Wing and the fantastic projects along the lakeshore. [5.4, 5.6]

II. *As a result of Jensen's instructions, the six buildings that Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert completed at the museum vary in formal character, degree of enclosure and lighting technique.*

Jensen was responsible for the varied characters of Bo and Wohlert's buildings, through instructions that determined the locations and became increasingly detailed over the decades. In 1956, Jensen hired Bo and Wohlert to design a building with a domestic character that would incorporate features of the setting, and also specified a combination of lighting techniques. [2.2] From 1959, Jensen directed the architects to design enclosed galleries with skylights that would create an "absolute contrast with

the old Louisiana.” [3.2] In the West Wing, he enforced his demand for “a world of art” by eliminating the clerestory window in the 66-Building and prohibiting openings in the 71-Building. [3.7] Jensen pursued an eclectic program in the 1979 Master Plan; instructing Bo to create conventional galleries and encouraging Wohlert to create “grass architecture”, a popular trope of the period. [4.7] In the South Wing, Jensen required a gray floor that would signal a break with the older parts of the museum and eliminated features that would have mediated between building and setting. [4.8] At the East Wing, Jensen compelled Wohlert to replace the pergola with a vaulted glass building and to design glazed structures at the South Wing and Great Hall. [5.2, 5.6]

III. *Jensen’s most significant instruction was his demand for enclosed exhibition spaces, which was an impulsive decision that illuminates his other architectural agendas.*

In 1959, Knud W. Jensen’s rejection of the 58-Building and corresponding pivot to conventional museum galleries introduced the paradigm that would guide Bo and Wohlert’s work at the museum for thirty years. Any suspicion that Jensen had already decided to transform Louisiana into another type of museum is discredited by his simultaneous rejection of the “great institution.” [3.2] He held that position until 1962, when he adopted the Stedelijk Museum as a programmatic model and imagined Louisiana as a regional arts center. [3.2] Jensen’s demand was not based on a new artistic direction or exhibition program. He remained committed to a collection of Danish art within the museum until the mid 1960s, even as he planned a collection of foreign sculpture in the park. [3.4] After studying the three institutions that supported Louisiana’s shift towards temporary exhibitions, it is evident that none of them provided a model for his Jensen’s new building program. [3.8] He would not arrive at a model until 1964, when he settled on the vast hall at Kunsthaus Zürich that he had previously dismissed as an “exhibition machine.” [3.8] After eliminating curatorial factors, it becomes clear that Jensen’s pivot to generic exhibition spaces was intended to neutralize Bo and Wohlert’s future contributions to the museum.

IV. *Each agenda was rooted in Jensen’s autobiographical conception of Louisiana and reflected his desire to construct the museum in his own self-image.*

Knud W. Jensen established Louisiana as an unconventional type of art museum that would be an extension of his own personality. Initially, he adopted the role of the

"country uncle" who welcomed guests to his ideal home for art and music, in a setting that recalled his family's property at Strandholm. [1.3, 2.2] Shortly after Louisiana opened, Jensen's desire for authorship led him to reject the 58-Building as a model for expansion. [3.8] However, he had not yet determined a new direction for the museum, as evidenced by his indecision during the early years of the Louisiana Project. [3.3] By 1963, he had settled into a new role as a colleague of Willem Sandberg and Pontus Hultén. [3.10] Following their examples, Jensen arrived at a curatorial direction that corresponded to his desire for enclosed galleries; gravitating to the large paintings of the CoBrA, Pop Art and Color Field artists that would form the core of Louisiana's revised collection. [3.6, 4.6] Jensen's eclectic agenda of the 1970s reflected his role as Hultén's fellow revolutionary and also provided him with a creative outlet. [4.9] The common factor in all three agendas was Jensen's autographic intention, which is confirmed by the reappearance of his eclectic agenda, after 1982.

V. *Despite the varied building programs, he remained committed to an institutional agenda of popularizing art through contact with the landscape.*

Amid his multiple architectural agendas, Jensen continued to promote the informal encounters with art that were inspired by the post-war, open-air sculpture exhibitions, with the Middelheim Museum as a known point of reference. [1.8] Jensen's alignment with that egalitarian cultural project is evident in his work with Art in the Workplace and his mission statement for Louisiana, which echoed the goals and methods of the open-air exhibitions. [1.3, 1.8] Further, Jensen's populist sympathies were a primary factor in Louisiana's evolution. During the 1960s, he transformed the museum's exhibition and collecting policies on the examples of the Stedelijk Museum and Moderna Museet; both were dedicated to an expanded social role for the art museum. [3.10] During the 1970s, Jensen attempted to transform Louisiana into a sociological workshop, through buildings, exhibitions and installations. [4.1, 4.4, 4.5] By the end of the decade, he had renounced revolutionary ideology, but his social commitment had only grown more expansive. [4.12]

VI. *His dedication to Louisiana's founding principle is recorded in the outdoor sculpture installations, even as the varied characters of the artworks reflect the museum's transformation.*

The most tangible signs of Jensen's institutional agenda are the installations of sculpture in the landscape that extended Louisiana's founding principle across four decades. In the beginning, Jensen installed single works; typically figures by Astrid Noack; following the conventions of the open-air exhibitions. [1.8] During the 1960s, he installed abstract works by Calder and Moore that reflected his evolving artistic interests. In 1964, the construction of the sculpture garden reiterated Jensen's original social-aesthetic impulse, even as it transcended any precedent. [3.4, 3.9] The multi-part installations of the 1970s represented a new version of that impulse that was achieved by reshaping the landscape, at a monumental scale that forecast Jensen's increasing ambitions for the museum. [4.3] During the 1980s, he installed and commissioned works based on the same international standards he pursued in the museum's revised collection and the galleries of the South Wing. [5.5] As such, the open-air installations provide a condensed record of Louisiana's evolution, in which the artistic focus shifted, but the original institutional agenda remained intact.

VII. *As a result of Jensen's autographic impulse, he was unable to recognize the conflict between his consistent institutional agenda and his divergent architectural agendas.*

The variety of Knud W. Jensen's architectural agendas contradicted his single institutional agenda. Jensen established Louisiana as an alternative to traditional museums, in which the experience of the landscape allowed visitors to encounter the art with an open mind. [1.8] His first architectural agenda was a direct extension of that principle, as he pursued an exhibition building with windows and natural daylight that would recall a private home. [1.10] His second agenda contradicted his founding principle, by requiring conventional galleries that would isolate the artworks from the setting. [3.2] His third agenda also contradicted his founding principle, by proposing fantastic attractions that would disrupt the visitor's experience of the setting. [4.4, 4.5] Considering Jensen's self-identification with Louisiana, it is understandable that he could not recognize the contradictions between his post-1958 architectural agendas and his institutional agenda of unifying art and landscape. In other words, the same desire for self-expression that led Jensen to establish Louisiana also led to impulses that threatened to undermine his original social-utopian institutional vision.

***

In summary, Knud W. Jensen pursued three architectural agendas that reflected his autobiographical conception of Louisiana. Jensen conceived Louisiana as an ideal, modernist version of his family's property, Strandholm. To that end, he purchased a coastal estate and instructed Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert to design an exhibition building with a domestic character. After Louisiana opened, Jensen pivoted to an agenda of enclosed galleries that was intended minimize the importance of Bo and Wohlert's future buildings to the museum's identity. By 1964, Jensen had envisioned a new version of Louisiana that combined aspects of the Stedelijk Museum, Moderna Museet and Kunsthaus Zürich. Over the next three decades, he enforced his agenda of the White Cube and constructed three new wings of galleries. During the 1970s, he pursued an eclectic agenda of fantastic structures that were diametrically opposed to Bo and Wohlert's buildings and provided him with a creative outlet. That agenda was largely unfulfilled during the 1970s, but Jensen returned to his unrealized visions in the 1980s and worked to complete the museum in his own self-image.

The identification of Knud W. Jensen's three architectural agendas is the foundation for any scholarly study of Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana. As described in the Introduction, the primary obstacle to any such study has been the absence of reasoned explanation for the variations between Louisiana's buildings. As documented, those variations were the result of the client's instructions, rather than the architects' fertile imaginations. And yet, Jensen's instructions do not explain how he arrived at such radically different building programs, which is essential knowledge for any general conclusion regarding the relationship between architecture and institution. That is to say, it is impossible to arrive at any meaningful assessment of the buildings without an understanding of institutional context. Identifying the origins of Jensen's diverse architectural agendas, by searching for correlations and/or contradictions with other aspects of Louisiana's development, advances our knowledge of Bo and Wohlert's work at the museum, in both the parts and the whole.

Any investigation of Jensen's three architectural agendas is complicated by the fact that those agendas sometimes coincided with his artistic interests and/or ambitions for Louisiana. For example: after 1966, Louisiana's collecting policies corresponded to Jensen's pursuit of conventional, modernist exhibition spaces. However, primary sources reveal the years that he arrived at each agenda, making it possible to compare his architectural, artistic and institutional goals at the time of conception. In 1955,

Jensen's agenda of the Villa corresponded to the character of his collection and his vision of Louisiana as an unconventional museum with a domestic character. In 1959, his new agenda of the White Cube preceded any new artistic direction or intention to transform Louisiana into another type of museum. In 1976, his alternative agenda of the Crystal Palace (which included a variety of fantastic projects) was antithetical to his project to re-direct Louisiana's collection and his ambition to elevate the museum to international stature, as well as his longstanding program of White Cubes. As such, it is evident that there was no consistent relationship between Jensen's architectural agendas; the character of the museum's collection; and his institutional ambitions. Instead, we find an initial correspondence between those three factors, followed by increasingly discordant impulses that reflected Jensen's conception of the museum as an extension of his personality.

Discovering the autographic character of Knud W. Jensen's architectural agendas locates Bo and Wohlert's work within the history of the institution. The key to that discovery is the rupture between Jensen's architectural and institutional agendas that occurred in 1959, as he rejected the building that embodied his founding principle, based on a personal impulse. That impulse illuminates Jensen's eclectic agenda of the 1970s, as he pursued another contrarian building program that was detached from the place, again for his own edification. As such, it is evident that Louisiana's expansion was an improvised process governed by Jensen's autonomous architectural agendas of the White Cube and the Crystal Palace. While Jensen pursued architectural variety, he also, unintentionally, contradicted his institutional agenda. That improvised process of expansion reveals the utility of Bo and Wohlert's principled approach, as they worked to maintain continuity with the setting, while satisfying Jensen's antithetical demands. The architects' ability to successfully negotiate that conflict reveals the relationship between their architecture and Jensen's institution, as detailed in Conclusion 3. More immediately, our understanding of Jensen's willful inconsistency provides the basis for a nuanced assessment of Bo and Wohlert's six buildings at Louisiana, allowing us to recognize what is sensed as well as seen, and realized through movement.

2. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's Unitary Building

The six buildings that Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert completed at Louisiana were based on a consistent set of principles and constitute a unitary building that was designed and constructed over a period of thirty-five years. The underlying principles were independent of any spatial model or architectural language, as is evident from a survey of the architects' pre-Louisiana works. Their collaboration began in California, where they visited buildings that provided partial models for Louisiana. Designing the 58-Building, the architects employed an anonymous architectural language to unite their individual principles. By fusing two, opposing approaches to museum design, they arrived at the principle of choreographed movement through the landscape. After Knud W. Jensen insisted on enclosed exhibition spaces, both architects extended their joint principles to create variations on the 58-Building. Their individual consistency was the result of a creative exchange, in which each adopted principles that the other had contributed to the 58-Building. The six phases of construction are neither independent structures nor unrelated fragments, but segments of a contingent whole. United by meandering paths, they constitute a single work of architecture that is realized through movement and completed by the visitor.

***

This conclusion is based on the detailed study of Bo and Wohlert's work that is presented in the Documentation and extended in the Analysis. By cross-referencing the architects' early production, their work at Louisiana, their subsequent joint works and their collaborations with other architects during the 1960s, it is evident that both architects employed a handful of principles that were innate to their conceptions of architecture. Further insight was gained by considering the architects' output within the contexts of Danish residential architecture during the 1950s; post-war museum design; and the general evolution of modern architecture, following lines of inquiry that were suggested by my conversations with Vilhelm Wohlert or discovered in Knud W. Jensen's autobiography.

I. *The six buildings that Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert completed at Louisiana were based on a consistent set of principles and constitute a unitary building that was designed and constructed over a period of thirty-five years.*

As documented, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert designed all of their buildings at Louisiana using a handful of principles, which can be summarized as Place, Modules, Materials, Elements and Movement. [3.8] In each building, the arrangement of space was derived from the topographic conditions, in both plan and section. All of the buildings were designed using a module of 60 by 60 centimeters that was based on the brickwork, or some multiple of that module as required by the use of industrial materials for wider spans and underground construction. Both architects employed materials as the primary source of architectural character, typically whitewashed brickwork, reddish-brown pavers and unfinished wood; the exceptions were mandated by the client or by the subterranean setting. Throughout the museum, the architects used repetitive elements to reveal the module and provide rhythmic divisions of space. In each phase of construction, the visitor follows an informal path through the galleries that is also a choreographed journey through the landscape.

II. *The underlying principles were independent of any spatial model or architectural language, as is evident from a survey of the architects' pre-Louisiana works.*

With the exception of choreographed movement, all of the principles that Bo and Wohlert employed at Louisiana can be found in their individual works of the 1940s and early 1950s, which encompass a variety of spatial and formal models. [1.4, 1.5, 1.7] As such, it is evident that the architects' principles were independent of any specific paradigm. Bo's use of terrain to guide the arrangement of architectural space is evident in the single-family houses that he designed for his parents (1947–48) and his own family (1953–54). Wohlert's use of the module to unite space and materials appeared as early as 1944, in his school project for an exhibition building. Mature examples include his project for a new Langelinie Pavilion (1953) and the shop for F. A. Thiele (1954–57). Both of those works exhibit Wohlert's reliance on materials for architectural character, as seen in the spruce cladding of the pavilion and the white oak lining of the shop; the ash interior at Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (1955–56) provides yet another example. Both architects used repetitive elements to avoid subjective compositions, as seen at Skoleparken (1951–55) and in all of Wohlert's output.

III. *Their collaboration began in California, where they visited buildings that provided partial models for Louisiana.*

In 1952, Bo and Wohlert made several architectural tours in California that had a profound effect on all of their later work. [1.6] Visiting buildings in Los Angeles and the San Francisco region, they discovered shared aesthetic interests that provided the foundation of their work at Louisiana. A number of the buildings that they visited resonated with their individual preoccupations; landscape, materials and construction; according to a modernist conception of space, and provided partial models for their work at Louisiana. Wohlert's slides from Los Angeles document a particular interest in the work of Richard Neutra, whose CSH #20 provided the prototype for Bo's own house and, thus, large segments of the 58-Building. [1.5] Other primary examples include Jack Hillmer's redwood-clad Ludekens House, which inspired the use of teak at Louisiana; Bernard Maybeck's church, which inspired the timber framing in the lantern galleries; and Rudolph Schindler's own house, which contributed a variety of strategies and structural devices to the 58-Building. [2.2]

IV. *Designing the 58-Building, Bo and Wohlert employed an anonymous architectural language to unite their individual principles.*

As they designed the 58-Building, Bo and Wohlert combined their individual principles and adopted an anonymous, elementary architectural language that was premised on the concept of universal space. [1.11] The roots of that language can be traced to the European avant-garde of the 1920s, particularly the exhibition structures designed by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe. During the 1940s, Richard Neutra adapted Mies's spatial model to the design of single-family houses, but substituted natural materials for industrial technology. Neutra's work provided a model for Jørn Utzon, whose 1952 house for his own family pioneered a Danish version of Constructivism that was based on traditional materials and craft practices. This "modern vernacular" language provided Bo and Wohlert with common ground for their different principles and preoccupations, notably Bo's pursuit of unity between building and landscape, and Wohlert's indivisible obsessions with modules and materials. Moreover, that language was derived from a number of buildings that they had visited in California, which provided them with a shared set of references.

V. *By fusing two, opposing approaches to museum design, they arrived at the principle of choreographed movement through the landscape.*

The turning point in Bo and Wohlert's work on the 58-Building was the tour of foreign museums they conducted with Knud W. Jensen, in autumn 1956. In Zürich, the travelers encountered the model of flexible exhibition space that had grown out of the avant-garde experiments of the 1920s and was premised on the negation of the surroundings. [2.7] In Italy, they encountered the opposite approach, in which the artworks were arranged in a precise sequence within an existing building. [2.6] Returning to Louisiana, they combined those two approaches and created flexible exhibition spaces that were derived from the setting. Bo developed the outlines of the building, by combining the Italian model of a choreographed exhibition with Mies van der Rohe's "garden display of sculpture." [2.9] Wohlert rationalized the scheme using a geometric matrix and developed the construction, by combining lessons from Kaare Klint and Carl Petersen with examples from California. [2.5] The result was a union of space and place, in which the building creates an informal, but precisely determined path between the characteristic features of the setting. [2.4]

VI. *After Knud W. Jensen insisted on enclosed exhibition spaces, both architects extended their joint principles to create variations on the 58-Building.*

Knud W. Jensen's rejection of the 58-Building prevented Bo and Wohlert from employing the modern vernacular language for future exhibition spaces. [3.8] In the pursuit of continuity, they applied the principles and materials of the 58-Building to the design of enclosed exhibition spaces, and created new elements as required. The 66–Building and the 71–Building are derivations of the 58–Building that reflect the shift to overhead lighting and create an informal loop of circulation. [3.11] The derivative character of the 76–Building is evident in Wohlert's re-use of the modern vernacular language, such that it is experienced as a seamless extension of the 58-Building. [4.2] The South Wing is a composite of the passages in the 58-Building and the galleries developed in the 71-Building. [4.8] As in the 58-Building, the exhibition spaces of the East Wing are a direct resulting of the setting. [5.2] Below ground, the deviations from standard practices and materials were the result of the location; above ground, the glazed structures were the result of Jensen's requirements. [5.6]

VII. *Their individual consistency was the result of a creative exchange, in which each adopted principles that the other had contributed to the 58-Building.*

While Bo and Wohlert took individual responsibility for the additions to the museum, both of them employed the full range of principles they developed in the 58-Building. The engine of their consistency was the creative exchange that resulted from their collaboration after 1958, as they applied the modern vernacular language to a series of single-family houses and a variety of other building types. [3.5] Though this exchange, each architect adopted principles that the other had contributed to the design of the 58-Building. The initial products of this exchange were the institutional buildings that Bo and Wohlert each designed with other architects, during 1961–62, which are so similar that they might be counted among Bo and Wohlert's joint works. [3.8] Further examples are found in the two competition entries for West German museums that Bo and Wohlert developed in 1977, with each leading the design of one scheme. [4.11] Both of the West German schemes record the architects' lack of interest in eclectic compositions, at the peak of the post-modernist era.

VIII. *The six phases of construction are neither independent structures nor unrelated fragments, but segments of a contingent whole.*

Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana is illuminated by comparisons with several other museums, which demonstrate that the six phases of construction are neither complete buildings nor unrelated fragments. A comparison with José Luis Sert's self-contained composition at the Maeght Foundation identifies the indeterminate character of the 58-Building. [3.9] Just as the 58-Building is an extension of the villa and has no autonomous function of formal character, each of the later buildings is either an extension of the villa or an extension of an extension. Examining Hans Hollein's museum in Mönchengladbach, we can recognize Bo and Wohlert's work as the antithesis of eclecticism. [4.10] While Hollein intentionally created a variety of exhibition spaces; Bo and Wohlert worked to join the variety of spaces mandated by the client into a contingent whole. The decisive factor is the topographic-geometric treatment of space that resulted from their union of principles, which provides the visitor with relative order and measured variety in each phase of construction. [4.12] Like the landscape from which it was derived, the interior of Bo and Wohlert's unitary building is at once continuous and ever changing.

IX. *United by a series of meandering paths, they constitute a single building that is realized through movement and completed by the visitor.*

Across Louisiana, Bo and Wohlert's informal treatment of space resulted in a typical experience of movement along a meandering, roughly diagonal path. As seen at Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, physical sensations can reinforce visual and spatial distinctions between phases of construction. [5.5] At Louisiana, the meandering paths provide the opposite effect: uniting six phases of construction with varied degrees of enclosure, lighting techniques and floor materials. As at any museum, a visitor to Louisiana will have periods of greater or lesser awareness of their surroundings, depending on their mental state. However, the physical sensations of strolling, turning, climbing and descending along a twisting route – which are as characteristic of Louisiana as the smooth, spiraling journey is of the Guggenheim Museum – are unavoidable and constitute the defining experience of the entire museum. That is to say that Bo and Wohlert's unitary building is a product of the visitor's full-body experience of the landscape, as he or she realizes the effect of the architects' pursuit of continuity. However fortuitous that might seem, it was entirely deliberate. The visitor's experience of moving through the landscape was the basis of the 58-Building and the guiding principle for all of the additions to the museum.

***

In summary, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's unitary building is the product of a three-stage process that began many years before they arrived in Humlebæk. Prior to 1956, the two architects accumulated most of the principles and models that would inform their work at Louisiana, through education, training, travel and publications. During 1956–58, Bo and Wohlert combined their individual principles and designed an exhibition building that was based on a model of continuous space and indivisible from the setting. During 1959–94, the architects applied the principles of the 58-Building to the design of enclosed exhibition spaces and a concert hall, completing five additions that reflected Knud W. Jensen's diverse architectural agendas. In place of independent structures, Bo and Wohlert created six phases of construction that are consistent in their treatment of space and provide a typical experience of movement through the landscape. As such, we can recognize their cumulative work as a single building that was designed and constructed over a period of thirty-five years.

Bo and Wohlert's unitary building confounds the conventional model of architectural analysis, which is premised on creative expression through the manipulation of form. (Cf. almost every treatise on Western architecture since Vasari, in 1550.) According to this remarkably durable model, formal variations between buildings are regarded as evidence of a stylistic shift – or perhaps a loss of creative integrity. While Bo and Wohlert's use of anonymous methods and materials to define architectural character contradicted the first premise; their subordination of form to the manipulation of space contradicted the second premise. Further, their habit of joint attribution for each phase of construction; no matter the responsible architect; rejected the notion of individual genius, and rightly so. Identifying their individual roles is essential to recognizing the union of principles that occurred in the 58-Building and the creative exchange that followed. However, the unitary building is a joint work that constitutes both architects' most significant contribution to Louisiana.

The unitary character of Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana is evident in their methods and confirmed by experience. The key discovery was the correlation in principles between the 58-Building and the architects' individual, pre-Louisiana works. Those works include traditional structures that pre-date the architects' travels in California, where they encountered modernist models of space and construction. As such, it is evident that all but one of the principles of the 58-Building were innate to Bo and Wohlert's practices and, thus, independent of any particular model of space. The missing link was the principle of choreographed movement, which can be traced to the architects' 1956 visit to Italy. Every one of those principles is evident in the later phases of construction, despite the variations that resulted from Knud W. Jensen's multiple architectural agendas. Amid the overlapping palettes of materials and elements, the topographic-geometric treatment of space produces a typical experience of movement during a continuous journey through the landscape.

The root of Bo and Wohlert's work was the union of principles and methods that began in 1956 and continued through 1994, with Bo's final project to extend the Panorama Room. The two architects shared general values and worked towards a common goal, but they approached the work from opposite points of departure that reflected their very different mentors and professional experiences. While Bo began with the terrain and worked towards the detail, Wohlert began with the smallest unit of material and worked towards the whole. As a result of the architects' distinct

practices, their collaboration resulted in a synthetic, multivalent architecture that encompassed multiple scales and levels of perception. The immediate product of this synthesis was the topographic-geometric treatment of space that defined the 58-Building and would determine the design of each later phase of construction. The ultimate product of that synthesis was a building that approximates the nuance and complex character of daily life, which is inherently contradictory and immediately reveals the reductive character of formal doctrines or dogmatic proscriptions.

Through their synthetic practice, Bo and Wohlert created an anonymous, topographic modern architecture that is capable of extension and variation in response to changing conditions. While Louisiana's unitary building is unique to the place, the architects' dedication to the visitor's experience; their reliance on principles, rather than a fixed model or idiom; and the resulting state of equilibrium between landscape and building are paradigmatic concepts for further development. Their principled approach was sufficiently resilient to withstand Knud W. Jensen's repeated attempts to construct some other type of museum. In the service of the visitor, Bo and Wohlert pursued continuity between each of phase of construction, so that the union of space and place established in the 58-Building would be extended to each of the later buildings. As a result, all of the exhibitions are experienced within the landscape, despite the different degrees of enclosure and varied details. By sustaining those efforts for thirty-five years, Bo and Wohlert sustained their client's original vision of a museum dedicated to the unity of art and daily life, as described in the following conclusion.

3. A Qualified Utopia

The concept of a Qualified Utopia provides the foundation for a historical assessment of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's unitary building. Knud W. Jensen's critique of autonomous museum buildings reveals the process by which Bo and Wohlert realized a Qualified Utopia at Louisiana. Designing the 58-Building, the architects adapted Mies van der Rohe's model of universal space to the landscape, to create a union of space and place. As the architects expanded Louisiana, they were compelled to adapt Jensen's universal architectural agendas to the setting. In doing so, they preserved his institutional agenda in the face of his contradictory building programs. Through those processes of qualification, the architects created a profound alternative to the two dominant paradigms of modernist museum architecture. Because each phase of construction at Louisiana embodies an adaption of universal space, the concept of a Qualified Utopia can be applied to other buildings designed by Bo and Wohlert, and their peers. The common use of landscape as the moderating factor suggests that the concept is relevant to the study of modern Nordic architecture.

***

This conclusion builds on the preceding conclusions to identify the role of Bo and Wohlert's unitary building in Louisiana's institutional development and locate that building within the history of modernist museum architecture. The foundation of both assessments is Knud W. Jensen's 1979 address "The Ideal Museum," as examined in Chapter 4. In the opening section of the address – "Wanted: Qualified Utopias" – Jensen criticized buildings that were alien to their location and ill suited to exhibiting art. In response, he proposed the ideal states of a "qualified utopia" and the "third possibility." The application of Jensen's hypothetical models to Bo and Wohlert's work is based on the historical summary of modernist exhibition practices that is assembled in Chapter 2, and supported by the detailed knowledge of each phase of construction established in Chapters 2–5. A series of comparisons with other museum buildings, in Chapter 2–5, locate Bo and Wohlert's Qualified Utopia within a broad historical context. The documentation of the architects' work beyond Louisiana, in Chapter 3, and the work of their generational peers, in Chapter 1, extends the meaning of a Qualified Utopia beyond Louisiana.

I. *The concept of a Qualified Utopia provides the foundation for a historical assessment of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's unitary building.*

At first reading, Knud W. Jensen's proposition of a "qualified utopia" seems only a provocative figure of speech, but it provides a literal and precise description of Bo and Wohlert's unitary building. Jensen neglected to define a Qualified Utopia, but the meaning can be deduced from his critique of modernist museum buildings. [4.12] His enigmatic headline – "Wanted: Qualified Utopias" – is illuminated by his description of the "autonomous masterpiece" that puts an "individual stamp on the surroundings, and thus give them a new and entirely different image." His sympathy for genius loci indicates that his ideal of a Qualified Utopia was a moderated version of the buildings that he critiqued. The fact that Jensen did not describe "the best rooms at MoMA, Stedelijk and Basel" in relation to genius loci, or as examples of utopian architecture; reveals the distinctions in his mind between form and space, setting and function, and his models of a Qualified Utopia and the Third Possibility. By negating all of those distinctions, Bo and Wohlert created a building in which each phase of construction provides the conditions for the Third Possibility. [5.7] While the Third Possibility refers to the galleries; a Qualified Utopia refers to the relationship with the setting that produced those galleries. The literal meaning of that term locates Bo and Wohlert's unitary building within architectural history, both regionally and internationally.

II. *Knud W. Jensen's critique of autonomous museum buildings reveals the process by which Bo and Wohlert realized a Qualified Utopia at Louisiana.*

Jensen's nuanced understanding of *utopia*, as both the good-place and the non-place, extended the definition of utopian architecture to include buildings that were conceived apart from their settings. [4.12] From a historical perspective, his critique of placeless-utopian buildings corresponds to the detached character of modernist exhibition space, in both the avant-garde and institutional versions. [2.7] While museum directors abandoned the metaphysical aspirations of the visionaries, the avant-garde model of universal space was ideally suited to a formalist conception of art, as well as a program of temporary exhibitions. Despite the differences in ambition and construction: Mies van der Rohe's German Pavilion; Goodwin and Stone's open-plan galleries at the Museum of Modern Art, in New York; and the Pfister brothers' vast hall at Kunsthaus Zürich were all variations on a single concept of space that was

detached from the surroundings. [2.7] As such, it is evident that Bo and Wohlert created a Qualified Utopia at Louisiana by adapting two models of placeless-utopian exhibition space to the landscape, initially by choice and later by necessity.

III. *Designing the 58-Building, the architects adapted Mies van der Rohe's model of universal space to the landscape, to create a union of space and place.*

During 1956–57, Bo and Wohlert adapted Mies van der Rohe's conception of a spatial continuum to a specific landscape, using Mies's German Pavilion and his House for a Childless Couple for inspiration and almost certainly relying on his *Museum for a Small City* as a partial model. [2.7] While Mies employed glass to reveal the infinite continuum of space-time, Bo and Wohlert reversed the effect and employed glass to import the surroundings to the interior of the 58-Building. They accomplished this inversion by processes of substitution and articulation. In the first case, the architects (in fact, Bo) adopted Mies's "garden display of sculpture," but replaced his generic views of nature with unique features of the place: from the nine-stemmed beech to the view of the sea running down to Vedbæk. [2.9] At the same time, they channeled Mies's model of continuous space into a meandering interior that provides a path through the landscape. Both of those procedures were based on the principle of choreographed movement that Bo and Wohlert adopted from the Italian School, which provided the defining experience of the 58-Building and the typical experience of the entire museum. [5.7]

IV. *As the architects expanded Louisiana, they were compelled to adapt Jensen's preferred model of universal space to the setting.*

After 1959, Knud W. Jensen's requirement for enclosed galleries compelled Bo and Wohlert to adapt the institutional model of universal space to Louisiana. [3.8] As in the 58-Building, the architects employed the features of the landscape to create exhibition spaces that are congruent with modernist practices, but are also unique to the setting. Throughout the later phases of construction, variations in plan and section refute the post-war ideal of a "flexible" box-like volume. Both architects employed the module as an instrument of spatial definition, rather than negation; for example, compare Bo's suspended ceilings to the Pfisters' infinite grid in Zürich. In each of the additions, the colors and textures of the materials counter the generic model of a smooth, featureless chamber. Cumulatively, these practices produced a series of

idiosyncratic galleries that could hardly be more distinct from the Bührle Wing in Zürich or the "best rooms at MoMA, Stedelijk and Basel." As a result, there are no White Cubes at Louisiana, detached from time and place. [5.7]

In doing so, they preserved Jensen's institutional agenda in the face of his contradictory architectural agendas.

V. As Bo and Wohlert qualified Jensen's architectural agenda of enclosed galleries, they preserved his institutional agenda of popularizing art through the experience of the landscape. Jensen's concept of a "world of art" was inspired by twentieth-century examples, but it was rooted in the eighteenth-century ideal of isolating art from daily existence. As Wilhelm Wackenroder explained in 1797, "Works of art in their essence fit as little in the common flow of life as the thought of God." [1.9] Despite Jensen's determination to construct generic exhibition spaces, Louisiana did not fracture into a multi-part museum along the lines of Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller. [5.5] Bo and Wohlert's consistent treatment of space and the typical experience of movement ensure that the landscape is never out of mind, even when it is out of sight. [5.7] As a result, all of the exhibitions are experienced within the landscape, either directly or indirectly, thus preserving Louisiana's founding principle. Further, the architects' refusal to embrace Jensen's eclectic agenda of the 1970s was crucial to maintaining the character of the place. [4.4] Eventually, Wohlert was forced to qualify Jensen's ideal of the Crystal Palace, and employed modules to integrate the glazed structures with the existing buildings, if not the character of the setting. [5.6]

Through those processes of qualification, the architects created a profound alternative to the two dominant paradigms of modernist museum architecture.

VI. The concept of a Qualified Utopia underscores the special position of Bo and Wohert's unitary building within the history of modernist museum architecture. Together, Jensen's four targets in "The Ideal Museum" and the comparative examples in Chapters 2–5 constitute a cross-section of museum buildings from the 1930s to the 1980s. With the exceptions of Gardella's pavilion in Milan and Quist's extension in Otterlo, those buildings are monuments that replaced their settings. The traditional paradigm was an ideal container of universal space, as in the buildings designed by van de Velde, Mies, the Pfister brothers, and Rogers and Piano. The alternative paradigm was a total work of art that provided idiosyncratic exhibition space, as in the

buildings created by Wright, Pei, Sert, and Hollein. Stirling employed both paradigms and created a total work of art that incorporated the original, neoclassical version of universal exhibition space. Those ideal compositions are as autonomous as the ideal containers, in that they were entirely determined by artistic decisions, even when the artist-architects decided to simulate disorder, during the 1970s. By rejecting both of these placeless paradigms in favor of topographic planning, Bo and Wohlert created a series of idiosyncratic exhibition spaces that are also anonymous. As such, their Qualified Utopia at Louisiana can be regard as an alternative paradigm: a site-specific museum building in which creative expression was subordinated to genius loci.

Because each phase of construction at Louisiana embodies an adaption of universal space, the concept of a Qualified Utopia can be applied to other buildings designed by Bo and Wohlert, and their peers.

VII. After documenting Bo and Wohlert's two processes of qualification, it is evident that each phase of construction at Louisiana is an example of a Qualified Utopia. Among those phases, the distinctive character of the 58-Building indicates that the concept is independent of location or program. The key to discovery is the consistent character of Bo and Wohlert's joint works beyond Louisiana during 1958–63, as they applied the modern vernacular language to other building types. [3.5] A number of the single-family houses are evidently examples of a Qualified Utopia, in that the architects adapted Mies's model of universal space to specific settings. The most obvious example is Piniehøj West, where all seven dwellings are variations on Mies's 1933 "House for a Childless Couple." [3.5] And yet, the "modern vernacular" did not originate at Louisiana, but in the single-family house that Jørn Utzon designed for his family, in a forest clearing near Hellebæk. [1.11] As such, we can regard the Utzon House as an example of a Qualified Utopia. Further, the varied degrees of enclosure at Louisiana indicate that a Qualified Utopia is not defined by the qualification of Mies's spatial model, which suggests a wider application of the concept.

The common use of landscape as the moderating factor suggests that the concept is relevant to the study of modern Nordic architecture.

VIII. Among the recognized examples of a Qualified Utopia, at Louisiana and in other places, the common denominator is the role of landscape as a modifier of universal space. As is widely recognized, the natural world provided a source of

creative invention to many Nordic modernist architects. Beyond the obvious exemplar of Alvar Aalto, other well-known creators of constructed landscapes include Kay Fisker and C. F. Møller, Erik Bryggman, Gunnar Asplund, Knut Knutsen and Ralph Erskine. Each architect pursued a unity of space and place, by adapting the ideals of the Modern Movement to local conditions. This common practice indicates that Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana was emblematic of a general tendency among their regional colleagues. The corollary of that finding is a suspicion that the concept of a Qualified Utopia provides a useful tool for the study of modern Nordic architecture.

***

In summary, Knud W. Jensen's 1979 address "The Ideal Museum" can be regarded as the Rosetta Stone of Louisiana's architectural history, because it allows a correlation of known and unknown terms that vastly expands our understanding of a previously mysterious topic. Discovering the meaning of a Qualified Utopia does not require an understanding of ancient Greek, but merely the history of modernist architecture and exhibition space. Applying that knowledge to Louisiana reveals the essence of Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert's decades-long project, as they adapted various models of placeless-utopian space to the setting. During 1956–57, the architects qualified Mies van der Rohe's universal model in the service of Jensen's social-utopian exhibition program. During 1959–91, they qualified Jensen's architectural agendas of the White Cube and the Crystal Palace, and preserved the experience of the place that was the foundation of his populist program. Beyond this institutional context, the concept of a Qualified Utopia locates Bo and Wohlert's work in the history of twentieth-century museum architecture, as an alternative to the paradigms of the ideal container and the ideal composition. Because each part of Louisiana is a Qualified Utopia, the concept can be extended to other buildings and considered for more general usage.

The paradox of this conclusion is that Jensen was able to recognize the shortcomings of autonomous museum buildings and imagine a solution, but unable to recognize that Bo and Wohlert had already realized that solution at Louisiana. The root of that paradox is found in Conclusion 1, which establishes Jensen's autographic intentions and allows a nuanced reading of his address "The Ideal Museum." His reference to the "dominating architect," who might bully an institution in the service of a personal vision, reveals his notion of architecture as a means of self-expression. Moreover, he

genuinely admired "the best rooms at MoMA, Stedelijk and Basel," which are as detached from their settings as the autonomous buildings that he criticized. Evidently, Jensen's ambitions blinded him to the placeless character of the exhibition spaces that he associated with institutional stature. In 1979, he could not recognize the West Wing as an example of a Qualified Utopia, it was Bo and Wohlert's creation; or appreciate the interplay of architecture and art, the galleries were only imperfect versions of "the best rooms" that he idealized. In fact, Jensen followed his address by restating his pursuit of the White Cube, as seen in his instructions for the South Wing.

Despite Knud W. Jensen's myopia, his proposition of a Qualified Utopia reveals the fundamental relationship between architecture and institution. There is no doubt that Jensen's decisions to expand Louisiana and revise the museum's artistic focus were consistent with his program of popularizing art; in fact, they were necessary. If he had not taken those steps, the dramatic shifts in artistic practices and social habits that occurred during the 1960s would almost certainly have reduced Louisiana to a time capsule from a bygone era. Certainly, the number of visitors would have declined, undermining the program of popularizing art. However, Jensen's autographic impulse blinded him to the selfless character of Bo and Wohlert's work, as early as 1959, and led him to pursue architectural agendas that contradicted his own social agenda. By qualifying those building programs, Bo and Wohlert made it possible for Jensen to transform Louisiana in his impulsive manner, without destroying the union of setting and exhibition that was the foundation of his populist program. Indeed, the architects' most significant contribution to Louisiana was the unitary building that preserved the experience of the landscape through movement, and thus the ethos of the institution.

The finding of institutional significance naturally leads to the question of architectural significance. The 58-Building is certainly the most nuanced phase of construction, and provides the visitor with the most complex and varied experience, through the contrast of glass and brickwork, the exposed structural elements, and the refined handicraft. However, once the architects began to extend the museum, the standard for assessing their work expanded to include both the parts and the whole. The parts include the delicate transition of the 66-Building; the terraced interior of the 71-Building; the exquisite concert hall of the 76-Building; the multivalent galleries of the South Wing; and the inevitable journey of the East Wing. Each is extraordinary in its handling of space and the resulting unity of place and purpose. That is not to suggest

that Bo's and Wohlert's qualifications of Jensen's contrarian agendas were entirely successful or that the results were ideal. And yet, their work resulted in six phases of construction that are excellent for both people and art; several are profound; and the whole is a model of modern architecture capable of growth and variation. As such, Bo and Wohlert's most significant architectural work at Louisiana is the unitary building; an imperfect masterwork that imparts yet another meaning to a Qualified Utopia.

The significance of Bo and Wohlert's Qualified Utopia extends beyond Louisiana, because it reveals the placeless character of most modernist museum buildings. As seen in Chapter 2, the avant-garde exhibitions of the 1920s were testing grounds for the Modern Movement. The basic premise was the use of technology to produce universal space, in the service of an artistic project to construct a new world. The contradiction between impersonal methods and personal vision resulted in a split between the partisans of technology and artistic expression, which led to the debate regarding the merits of rationalism vs. lyricism: or Apollo vs. Dionysus. That debate is documented in the two dominant paradigms of the modernist museum: the ideal container and the ideal composition. The examples are extremely diverse, but each is a monument to either technique or artistry. Rejecting both options, Bo and Wohlert created a non-monument that illuminates the field, by antithesis.

As Jensen's autographic impulses led him further and further from his initial architectural agenda, Bo and Wohlert's commitment to continuity led them deeper into the terrain that guided the design of the 58-Building. From their initial model of a journey between the villa and the plateau, they constructed a topographic interior that is an analog to the landscape. The basis of their work was the rejection of autonomous solutions, in favor of a site-specific approach that was premised on the visitor's simultaneous experience of the landscape and the exhibition. That is to say, Bo and Wohlert adopted Nature as a working model, rather than Utopia, and avoided the trap of orthodox modernism: the creation of the ideal requires the negation of the actual. In that regard, their work at Louisiana is emblematic of the alternative version of modernist architecture that developed in the Nordic countries after 1925, as imported models were adapted to local conditions. As such, it would seem that the concept of a Qualified Utopia is a useful tool for examining buildings that vary in character, but were evidently designed in concert with their settings. That possibility forms the basis for the final conclusion, which is open-ended rather than definitive.

4. The Regional Tradition

The theorem of the Qualified Utopia provides a framework for the study of Nordic Modernism during 1925–78. The critique of the Modern Movement that is intrinsic to a Qualified Utopia illuminates a fundamental schism within Nordic Modernism. That schism was evident from 1925, when many architects adopted Modernist doctrine without reservation and others pursued a site-specific adaptation. After 1945, both groups of architects employed new types of technology, but the schism remained intact. The theorem relates the corresponding examples of Nordic Modernism to the two previous eras of Nordic architecture. The common factor in all three eras was an ideal of environmental unity that originated in the study of vernacular buildings. As such, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia reveals a regional tradition that transcends styles and suggests new approaches to the study of Nordic architecture.

***

This conclusion is based on the knowledge presented in the previous conclusion and on the knowledge of Nordic architecture; in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland, that I have gathered during two decades of travel and study. Referring to historical developments in those countries, I will employ terms that follow the conventional divisions between stylistic eras. National Romanticism and Nordic Classicism are imperfect and sometimes contested, but they are generally understood. The more problematic term is Functionalism, which has been used as both a synonym for a set of principles and a metonym for a style derived from early works of Le Corbusier and *das Neue Bauen*. The stylistic meaning makes that term inadequate for a broad discussion of modernist architecture in the North, which was extremely diverse even in the early years. Given the pervasive and enduring influence of the Modern Movement, it is more accurate to employ the term Nordic Modernism, which accommodates a range of formal, materials and techniques.

Any broad discussion of Nordic architecture necessarily draws on the work of authors from across the region and beyond. Many of the points in this conclusion build on observations that are similar or overlap and appear in multiple sources, such that they are common knowledge. As a result, I have limited the citations to quotations and unique observations. My understanding of National Romanticism is particularly

indebted to the scholarship of Barbara Miller Lane and William J. R. Curtis. Similarly, my understanding of Nordic Classicism has been shaped by the writings of Henrik O. Andersson, Malcolm Quantrill, Asko Salokorpi, and Eva Eriksson. On Nordic Modernism, I am especially grateful for the work of Nils Ole-Lund, Eva Rudberg, Peter Blundell Jones, Richard Weston and Quantrill. Göran Schildt's three-volume opus on Alvar Aalto is an important resource for the study of all three eras. Each of those authors' work is listed in the bibliography; additional material for future researchers has been assembled under Suggested Reading.

Following the previous conclusion, the concept of a Qualified Utopia that originated in Knud W. Jensen's figure of speech is more accurately described as a theorem. That is to say, a logical proof that follows the intersection of two, self-evident statements: every building has a unique location and the Modern Movement was premised on the negation of location. As such, I refer to the theorem of the Qualified Utopia when describing the framework, and a Qualified Utopia when describing the buildings.

I. *The theorem of the Qualified Utopia provides a framework for the study of Nordic Modernism during 1925–78.*

At Louisiana, Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert created an example of a Qualified Utopia by adapting two models of universal space to the landscape; both models reflected the antipathy to location that was fundamental to the Modern Movement. The underlying premise of the movement was that industrial technology provided artist-architects with an anonymous means of expression that would liberate them from history and geography. As a result, many of the protagonists "expected a totally objective, uniform architecture to spread throughout the world." [Schildt 1986, 207] Designing buildings for actual locations would have undermined the artistic basis and the universal character of the project, which were indivisible. This doctrine was codified by 1923, when Walter Gropius reorganized the Bauhaus under the motto of "Art and Technology: A New Unity" – by combining his vision of industrialized construction with impulses from Le Corbusier, van Doesburg, and Moholy-Nagy. [Dickerman, 19–21] Recognizing the Modernist unity of space, form and technology, it follows that the universal model that provides the basis of a Qualified Utopia is the ideal of an autonomous object-building premised on industrial methods. As such, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia can be used to assess the multitude of buildings that

were designed and constructed in the North during 1925–78, under the influence of the Modern Movement. While 1925 corresponds to the general diffusion of Modernist doctrine, 1978 witnessed the completion of Jacobsen's National Bank of Denmark. By then, Nordic Modernism had faded into history, leaving only a few stalwarts, such as Bo, Wohlert and Utzon, to complete their final works.

II. *The critique of the Modern Movement that is intrinsic to a Qualified Utopia illuminates a fundamental schism within Nordic Modernism.*

One of the primary challenges to the study of Nordic Modernism is the diversity of the specimens, which not only vary in all of the usual ways; but in their fundamental conception of the relationship between architecture and environment. Many authors – including myself – have described Nordic Modernism as a special variant of modern architecture; connected to nature, rooted in tradition, devoted to human well-being and so on; using well-known examples designed by a small group of celebrated talents. That narrative is partly accurate, but it omits the greater number of antithetical examples that resulted from the determined and often skillful application of Modernist doctrine. In reality, Nordic Modernism includes both the Danish Radio House *and* Helsingborg Concert Hall; the Finnish National Pension Institute *and* Bergen Town Hall; the SAS Royal Hotel *and* the five slabs at Hötorget; Otaniemi *and* Vallingby; as well as the housing estates in each country that realized the Modernist vision of mass-produced dwellings. The theorem of the Qualified Utopia advances a complex and critical assessment of Nordic Modernism, by accommodating the full spectrum of examples and by recognizing the schism between Modernist ideology and the reality of place that produced that spectrum. As such, the theorem illuminates the doctrinaire works of Nordic Modernism, by antithesis, while identifying the common root of the Qualified Utopias that were created in two periods divided by the Second World War.

III. *That schism was evident from 1925, when many architects adopted Modernist doctrine without reservation and others pursued a site-specific adaptation.*

In 1925, following encounters with Le Corbusier's *Pavillon de l' Esprit Nouveau* at the International Exhibition in Paris, Lars Backer, Edvard Heiberg and Uno Åhrén published articles celebrating "funktionalistik" architecture. [Bibliography] They and many of their colleagues embraced the doctrine of the Modern Movement without reservation, in the service of social transformation. [Backström] But others accepted

modernism as yet another stage of cultural evolution and pursued the historical ideal of harmony between building and setting. As Gunnar Asplund had noted in 1916, "one forgets that it is more important to follow the style of the place than that of the time." [Eriksson, 47] At the 1930 Stockholm Exhibition, Asplund adapted the new formal vocabulary to the lakefront and created a union of nature and technology. The same impulse is evident in a number of buildings that might be mistaken for exercises in the new style when considered apart from their settings, as seen in the picturesque composition of Paimo Sanitarium (Alvar Aalto, 1929–33); the individualized blocks at the Heia estate (Nicolai Beer, 1930–33), in Oslo; or the seaside *siedlung* of the Bellavista flats (Arne Jacobsen, 1931–34). Contrary to Modernist orthodoxy, public buildings were often clad in traditional materials that blurred the distinction between form and environment, as seen at Aarhus University [1.5], Gothenburg Concert Hall (Nils Einar Eriksson, 1932–35), the Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, University of Oslo (Finn Bryn and Johan Ellefsen, 1932–37) and Tampere Station (Eero Seppälä and Otto Flodin, 1934–36). Each is a representative example of a Qualified Utopia.

IV. *After 1945, both groups of architects employed new types of technology, but the schism remained intact.*

After the Second World War, Nordic Modernism became increasingly pluralistic. While travel and journals provided a range of new impulses and examples, the new construction techniques widened the schism between the partisans of standardization and variation that had appeared in the 1930s. By 1950, architecture in the North was developing along two tracks: the creation of new, artificial zones and the elaboration of existing places. The second track produced an extraordinary variety of buildings that embody "the other tradition" of modern architecture [Wilson], as seen in a few examples that stand for a multitude. Facing the central challenge of the time, Aalto and his followers designed housing of every type and density that was derived from the location, as found in the terrace houses in Helsinki (Viljo Revell, 1953–55), high-rise flats in Helsingør (Jørn Utzon, 1954–66), low-rise flats in Helsinki (Aarne Ervi, 1959–61) and any number of works by Ralph Erskine. In public buildings, some architects employed craft practices to localize universal space, as at Otaniemi Chapel (Kaija and Heikki Siren, 1954–57), Lund Town Hall (Klas Anshelm, 1961–66) and the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art. Others employed technology to accomplish that same goal, as found at the Nordic Pavilion in Venice (Sverre Fehn, 1960–62), the

swimming hall in Gentofte (Karen and Ebbe Clemmensen, 1961–69), and the Viking Ship Museum at Roskilde (Erik Christian Sørensen, 1966–68). By the completion of Arne Jacobsen's most nuanced example of a Qualified Utopia, the National Bank of Denmark (1961–78), Nordic Modernism had collapsed under the pressure of social forces that included a backlash to thirty years of industrial-utopian construction. [4.4]

V. *The theorem relates the corresponding examples of Nordic Modernism to the two previous eras of Nordic architecture.*

The most profound works of Nordic Modernism incorporated practices from the eras of National Romanticism (1885–1920) and Nordic Classicism (1910–30). Nils-Ole Lund summarized this synthesis as "The materialism and regional inspiration of national romance, the orderly and holistic ideas of classicism as well as the morality of functionalism." [Lund 1995, 185] Lund was referring to Danish architecture, but his description is valid for each of the Nordic countries, where architects worked in the same sequence of styles for reasons that included shared aesthetic values and varied national interests. [Lane, 70–73; Andersson, 15–23] It has been recognized for many decades that the rational principles and geometric forms of Nordic Classicism provided the foundation for the rapid and widespread acceptance of the Modern Movement in the North. [Heiberg; Salokorpi, 14–17] Lund's crucial insight was that the unity of form and local materials that characterized National Romanticism and nearly disappeared in Nordic Classicism – when most architects preferred rendered surfaces to exposed masonry – reappeared in Nordic Modernism. Lund's insight leads to the recognition of another practice that links National Romanticism with Nordic Modernism: the pursuit of environmental unity that is intrinsic to a Qualified Utopia.

VI. *The common factor in all three eras was an ideal of environmental unity that originated in the study of vernacular buildings.*

The fascination among National Romantic architects with vernacular archetypes and historical monuments is well established. What has attracted less comment is that ancient farmhouses, churches and castles are indivisible from the settings that guided their placement and construction. The resulting ideal of environmental unity among the Romanticists is evident in buildings such as Saarinen, Gesellius and Lindgren's Hvittrask (1901–03), Wahlman's Engelbrekt Church (1906–14) and Nordhagen's Bergen Public Library (1907–1917). Comparable unions of building and setting are

found in numerous works of Nordic Classicism, as at Asplund's Woodland Chapel (1918–20), Blakstad and Munthe-Kaas's Haugesund Town Hall (1922–31) and Bryggman's Atrium block, in Turku (1922–27). While the Classicists rejected the medievalism of their Romanticist teachers, they also idealized vernacular buildings. Rather than trek to Dalarna or Karelia, they toured Italy and found their own models in the informal classicism of the countryside and hill towns. The literature refers to tours by, among others; Sigurd Lewerentz (1909), Gunnar Asplund (1913–14), Erik Bryggman and Hilding Ekelund (1920), Kay Fisker (1920), Nicolai Beer and Herman Munthe-Kaas (1920–21), Alvar Aalto (1924) and Arne Jacobsen (1925). Each of them worked in the classical style before shifting to Modernism and adapting the universal doctrine to the particularities of place. A number of their followers, including Utzon, the Siréns and Fehn, devoted their careers to that practice. In fact, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia illuminates the traditional pursuit of environmental unity among Nordic architects, during 1885–1978.

VII. *As such, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia reveals a regional tradition that transcends styles and suggests new approaches to the study of Nordic architecture.*

The theorem of the Qualified Utopia advances the study of Nordic Modernism in that it reveals a common trait among a variety of specimens that transcends formal distinctions. Moreover, it allows for the reappraisal of buildings that have been regarded as autonomous objects, but are more nuanced. In this way, the theorem provides a tool for revising the canon of celebrated buildings, to include examples that have been difficult to categorize or underestimated. In each of those regards, the study of Louisiana's buildings serves as a demonstration project. As with any framework, the theorem subordinates a universe of detail to a general order. However, some type of framework is the precondition for more detailed studies that include national variables such as cultural histories, political projects and social movements. This framework is expansive, rather than reductive, because it accommodates and illuminates the full range of specimens, from the triumphs of humanism to the humanitarian disasters. In addition, it allows for contradictions within an architect's production; any number of them created examples of both doctrinaire Modernism and a Qualified Utopia. By using the architect's response to the setting as an ideological litmus test, we arrive at a two-part or binary model of Nordic Modernism that can be challenged, refined and elaborated through further investigation.

More broadly, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia locates the corresponding works of Nordic Modernism within a regional history, by illuminating the dedication to place that preoccupied many architects during the eras of National Romanticism and Nordic Classicism. In turn, it becomes clear that the creation of Qualified Utopias during the Modernist era corresponded to earlier efforts to resist universal tendencies in favor of national conditions. National Romanticism was a response to a variety of cultural threats; foreign sovereignty in Norway and Finland, Denmark's imperial neighbor, mass emigration from Sweden; but the common threat was the loss of identity that follows industrialization. Nordic Classicism provided a rational language appropriate to modern democracies, but architects adapted the international style of neoclassicism using tropes from the previous era: Norwegian colors, Swedish proportions, Danish modules and Finnish materials. (The results could be termed National Neoclassicism.)

By identifying the pursuit of environmental unity in three successive eras of Nordic architecture, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia reveals the regional tradition that informed the most profound works of Nordic Modernism. As such, we might regard the three stylistic eras as stages of a continuous project that cultivated cultural identity through unions of building and setting. Whether that extremely simplistic conjecture holds up to scrutiny is uncertain and can only be known through further research. What is certain is that treating the relationship between building and setting as a basic characteristic or the first step in architectural analysis will reveal correlations between buildings that have been obscured by formal preoccupations and suggest new lines of inquiry. Thus, the theorem of a Qualified Utopia provides a useful tool for the study of Nordic architecture, which can be combined with other tools and methods to enrich our understanding of history, in the hope of discovering lessons for the future.

***

In summary, the theorem of the Qualified Utopia leads to an expanded understanding of Nordic Modernism, as both a singular era and a phase of a regional tradition. At an elementary level, the theorem provides a tool for assessing buildings produced under the influence of the Modern Movement, according to their adherence to the universal ideal. By identifying the Qualified Utopias and their antitheses; which I have declined to label; the theorem provides a basis for studying the contradictory strands of Nordic Modernism. At an advanced level, the pursuit of environmental unity by a number of

Nordic architects locates the Qualified Utopias in a tradition that originated in the era of National Romanticism, continued through the era of Nordic Classicism and informed the most profound works of Nordic Modernism. Building on the work of previous scholars who recognized common practices among the three eras, we can recognize the pursuit of environmental unity as a consistent practice that appears in all three eras. Whether there were other consistent practices is a question for future study, but it is evident that the Qualified Utopias of Nordic Modernism were rooted in the two, preceding eras of Nordic architecture.

Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert were born too late to have participated in National Romanticism and Nordic Classicism. But they were educated in historical values and practices, by mentors who had participated in one or both eras, as recorded in Chapter 1. Kaare Klint had been trained at the juncture of the two eras, by a father who was a champion of traditional building practices and by a pioneer of the neoclassical revival, Carl Petersen. Kay Fisker completed representative works in both eras – vernacular-inspired railroad stations on Bornholm designed with Aage Rafn and neoclassicist housing blocks in Copenhagen – before leading the shift to modernism in Denmark. C. Th. Sørensen participated in that same transition and later tutored Bo in the lessons of the Italian landscape; passing on knowledge that had long since fallen out of fashion. Through their mentors, Bo and Wohlert not only possessed a range of skills beyond the capability of a single architect, but also an appreciation of history that eluded most of their modernist peers. Recognizing the historical roots of Bo and Wohlert's work at Louisiana and the corresponding synthesis of materiality, order and ethics described by Nils-Ole Lund, we can regard their Qualified Utopia in Humlebæk as one of the emblematic works of Nordic Modernism.

As students of history, Bo and Wohlert rejected the avant-garde tenets of disruption and dislocation that resulted in the Modernist worship of Art and Technology, in favor of cultural continuity and singular experience. Rather than pursue autonomous formal statements, they limited their means of expression to the choice and assembly of materials. As such, they did not create a work of art, but a neutral framework that anchors works of personal expression in the shared reality of place. The corollary of this selfless approach was the use of technology as a tool, rather than a source of architectural character. Bo and Wohlert's work employed industrial materials, but the doctrine of "honest" construction was subordinated to spatial effects that advance the

union of art and daily life. Asplund's dictum regarding "the style of the place [rather] than that of the time" is a reminder that Bo and Wohlert's principled consistency not only spared Louisiana from the White Cube, but also various the movements that arose during the decades that the museum was under construction. Primary examples include the techno-utopianism of the 1960s that reiterated the faith of the 1920s, and the post-modernism of the 1970s that followed the disappointed hopes of the 1960s.

Rejecting avant-garde tenets, Bo and Wohlert and many of their Nordic peers arrived at the position that Kenneth Frampton labeled *arriére-garde*, in his essay "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance." [Bibliography] Frampton's underlying thesis was the incompatibility between "world culture" and a "universal civilization" made possible by modern technology. As an alternative, he posited the intermediate model of the "place-form" derived from local factors, such as climate, topography, light and tectonic form. The relevance of Frampton's thought to the study of Nordic Modernism is confirmed by his two examples of a place-form: Säynätsalo Town Hall (Alvar Aalto, 1948–52) and Bagsværd Church (Jørn Utzon, 1968–76). Both of those buildings are Qualified Utopias, in that they embody the adaptation of Modernist ideals to the particularity of place, whether a clearing in the Finnish forest or the cloud-covered landscape of suburban Copenhagen. Following the regional tradition previously described, both buildings evoke a vernacular model, either the hill towns of Northern Italy or the parish churches that punctuate the Danish countryside. And yet, Frampton's global perspective suggests that the theorem of the Qualified Utopia might be applied to cultures beyond the Nordic region that also produced alternative traditions of Modernist architecture; in fact, there were several.

***

As is undoubtedly clear to the reader, this dissertation evolved far beyond the original scope of research, as documentation led to discoveries that required analysis and led to further discoveries; which in turn provided the basis for reasoned deductions based on existing scholarship. In fact, it has been an extraordinary intellectual journey for the author and I hope that the reader has shared some of that adventure. While this dissertation is the first, in-depth examination of Louisiana's buildings and landscape, it is hardly the final word on those subjects and also provides supporting material for studying other aspects of the museum's history. Further, I have established multiple links between a unique architectural achievement and a general area of study that will perhaps assist others in their own research. In that way, I have achieved my goal of contributing to the open-ended processes of investigation and intellectual exchange that are the essence of scholarship. From start to finish, the guiding thread through the theoretical labyrinth has been Vilhelm Wohlert's long-ago instruction; that it is impossible to understand Louisiana's buildings apart from the landscape. And so, I end this dissertation as I began; with profound thanks to Arkitekt Wohlert and all of the other witnesses to Louisiana's construction who shared their memories with me. Their generosity, and the assistance of many others, led to discoveries that I could not have imagined at the onset of this work.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Sources

1. Primary Sources

The primary sources that provided the foundation of this dissertation can be grouped into four categories: individuals who were involved in Louisiana's development during 1956–94; unpublished correspondence and texts; architectural drawings; and archival photographs, maps and prints. The following lists of primary sources include notes that might assist future researchers in locating materials.

A. Interviews with Participants

• Vilhelm Wohlert, architect at Louisiana, 1956–91.

• Kirsten Strømstad, financial and administrative director at Louisiana, 1959–73.

• Mogens Prip-Buus, architect and assistant to Vilhlem Wohlert, 1956–57.

• Stig Løcke, architect and assistant to Jørgen Bo, 1978–94.

• Claus Wohlert, son of Vilhelm Wohlert and architect at Louisiana, 1991–2014.

• Lea Nørgaard, landscape architect, daughter of E. and O. Nørgaard, successor at Louisiana, 1980–2016.

• Vibeke Holscher, landscape architect at Louisiana, since 1980.

• Carsten Hoff, architect and co-creator of *Building Manifesto 1976*.

• Morten Bo, photographer and son of Jørgen Bo.

• Elisabeth Munck, collaborator with the artist Viktor IV on *Ebbe Munck* (1977).

• Alfio Bonanno, artist and creator of Lake Garden II, 1994–98.

• George Trakas, artist and creator of *Self-Passage* (1986–89).

• Annelise Bjørner, architect and assistant to Vilhlem Wohlert, 1957–59.

• Niels Halby, architect and assistant to Jørgen Bo, 1979–83.

• Alfred Homann, architect and assistant to Vilhelm Wohlert, 1976–79.

B. Unpublished Texts and Correspondence

• Knud W. Jensen. The fundamental source of written information regarding Louisiana's is the archive of Knud W. Jensen's papers that is located at the museum. The archive consists of twenty binders that include his letters and memoranda to Bo and Wohlert, and the six, unpublished memoranda, "Målsætning Redegørelse" that

Jensen addressed to the Board of the Louisiana Foundation between 1973 and 1985. These statements were fundamental to my research, because they contain Jensen's thoughts on the permanent collection and his institutional agenda for Louisiana, alongside his plans to develop the physical setting. Other important contents include Jensen's 1957 mission statement for Louisiana, his 1976 text "Towards a New Museum," and his 1979 address "The Ideal Museum."

• Vilhelm Wohlert. Wohlert's correspondence regarding his work at Louisiana is extremely limited, but can be found in the archive at Wohlert Arkitekter. It appears that Wohlert rarely committed his personal feelings or strong opinions to paper, and the written record of his work at Louisiana is focused on mundane matters. His family retains possession of various personal papers, which include several unpublished lectures describing the 58-Building.

• Jørgen Bo. The surviving correspondence from Bo's office is currently in the possession of Stig Løcke. That material includes letters and meeting minutes, mostly concerning the design and construction of the South Wing. Similarly to Wohlert, Bo apparently communicated personal feelings through telephone calls or meetings, with his 1976 letter to Knud W. Jensen [4.4] a rare exception.

• Ole Nørgaard. What remains of the archive from Ole and Edith Nørgaard's office is divided between Lea Nørgaard (the couple's daughter) and Vibeke Holscher, who continues to work for Louisiana and possesses the material related to the museum.

C. Architectural Drawings

Due to the fact that Bo and Wohlert maintained separate practices, the drawings of Louisiana and other joint works are divided among several archives.

• Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, Humlebæk. The director of facilities at the museum holds two binders of duplicate drawings for the 58-Building and the 66-Building, as well as a number of original ink drawings for the 1958-Building.

• Architectural Drawings Collection, Danish National Art Library, Copenhagen. Most of the drawings from Jørgen Bo's office were donated to the collection in 1994. They include the crucial early site plans for Louisiana and a great deal of material related to Bo and Wohlert's work beyond Louisiana, including the residential projects.

• Stig Løcke, Hørve. The portion of Jørgen Bo's archive in Løcke's possession consists mostly of working drawings for the South Wing, along with sketches and design drawings for the proposed expansion of the Panorama Room, 1991-93. Notably, Løcke has the competition drawings for the museums in Stuttgart and Bochum. It is expected that this material will be transferred to the Danish National Art Library.

• Wohlert Arkitekter, Copenhagen. Vilhelm Wohlert's drawings for Louisiana and other works with Jørgen Bo are stored in the drawing office that continues his practice. This archive includes the very first drawings for the museum, crucial processes sketches and most of the unrealized schemes for expanding Louisiana. It is expected that this material will be transferred to the Danish National Art Library.

• Vibeke Holscher Landskab Arkitekter, Vanløse. The archive of Edith and Ole Nørgaard's work at Louisiana includes drawings and sketches for the Sculpture Garden, the Calder Terrace, the Moore Garden and the Lake Garden. The archive also includes a small number of drawings that Agnete Petersen made during 1955–58.

D. Photographs, Maps and Prints

Reconstructing the history of the landscape and the eventual museum required material from every period under investigation, which was gathered from many sources, in Denmark and abroad. A list of sources appears in the acknowledgments, specific sources are noted in the list of illustrations and the most important sources are summarized below.

• Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, Humlebæk. The museum holds a large collection of archival photos, including installation views of exhibitions, as well as color transparencies by a variety of photographers, from various eras. During 1957–59, Jesper Høm acted as the museum's photographer. Høm's negatives were lost at the time of his death, in 1999, but Louisiana's archive contains prints of his photos. Høm's successor at the museum was Jørn Freddie; who photographed a number of exhibitions in the 1960s. During 1968–81, Louis Schnakenburg served as the unofficial museum photographer, but Louisiana only has a handful of his prints. Schnakenburg's negative archive is held by his professional successor Erik Brahl, in

Birkerød. After 1982, Jens Frederiksen became Louisiana's primary architectural photographer and the museum's image archive includes his color transparencies.

• Antonio Wohlert, Randkløve, Bornholm. Antonio Wohlert is one of Vilhelm Wohlert's sons and worked as an architectural photographer during the 1970s. He was also a close friend of Jesper Høm, who was Louisiana's unofficial photographer in the early years and also photographed a number of Vilhelm Wohlert's early works. As such, Antonio Wohlert possesses the only-known collection of Høm's prints outside of Louisiana.

• Wohlert Family. The family possesses Vilhelm Wohlert's collection of travel photos and slides; including more than 500 Kodachrome transparencies that Wohlert made during his time in California, 1951-53.

• Vibeke Holscher Landskab Arkitekter, Vanløse. The archival material in Vibeke Holscher's possession contains 191 color slides of Louisiana's landscape, which span the period 1964-91, along with black-and-white images depicting the sculpture garden in 1964 and 1966.

2. Secondary Sources

Beyond the primary sources, my research relies on a wide variety of published material, all of which are cited in the footnotes and listed in the bibliography. Four of those sources are essential reading to anyone researching the history of museum architecture. Roberto Aloi's *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*. (Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962) offers an international survey of post-war museum architecture, with a special focus on the works of the Italian School, most of which no longer exist. Aloi's volume provided the model for Michael Brawne's *The New Museum: Architecture and Display* (New York: Praeger, 1966). Brawne's essay examines post-war changes in the museum experience, followed by forty-one examples around the world that include a number of lesser-known buildings. Richard Paul Lohse's *New Design in Exhibitions*. (Zürich: Verlag für Architektur, 1953) is an invaluable resource that also includes historical material. Lohse's volume provided the model for Klaus Franck's *Exhibitions* (New York: Praeger, 1961), which also offers a compendium of post-war exhibitions, with remarkably little overlap.

Appendix 2: Bibliography (Works Cited)

This bibliography is limited to the works that are cited in the dissertation, and a brief list of obscure works that deserve a wider readership. While the books and journals are widely available, newspaper archives are increasing difficult to locate and access. The archive at the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art includes perhaps 80 elephant-sized folios with newspaper clippings from 1956 until the late 1990s, as well as a single folio that contains Knud W. Jensen's collection of clippings. To assist future researchers, I have divided this bibliography into sections that cover specialized areas of study, which are further divided by publication type:

1. Knud W. Jensen and Louisiana.
2. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert
3. Diverse Museums
4. Art History and Exhibition Practices
5. Nordic Architectural History
6. International Architectural History
7. Some Further Reading

1. Knud W. Jensen and Louisiana.

A. Books and Chapters

Bertelsen, Christian H. "Louisianas træer." In *Louisiana 1958 Årbog*. Ed. Knud W. Jensen and Ole Wivel. København: Gyldendal, 1958.

Christensen, Anton. "Brun, Alexander." In *Dansk Biografisk Leksikon*. Ed. Povl Engelstoft and Svend Dahl. København: J. H. Schultz, 1932–44.

Hjort, Øystein, Knud W. Jensen and Kjeld Kjeldsen, ed. The *Creation of a Collection. Donations from the New Carlsberg Foundation to the Louisiana Museum.* Trans. Jean Olsen. Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 1975.

Jensen, Knud W., Kim Utzon, and Carsten Thau. *Utzonhuset: Arkitektursamlingen på Louisiana*. Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum for Moderne Kunst, 1998.

Jensen, Knud W., and Susanne Ussing, *The Seaweed Church: A Sculpture by Susanne Ussing, Louisiana 1979-1994*. Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 1994.

Jensen, Knud W., ed. *Louisianas nye grafikfløjen*. Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum for Moderne Kunst, 1989.

Jensen, Knud W. *Mit Louisiana-liv*. København: Gyldendal, 1985. Second edition, 1993.

Jensen, Knud W., ed. *Louisiana udbygningsplan, Forprojekt 25.01.1979*. Humlebæk: Louisiana, 1979.

Jensen, Knud W. *Slaraffenland eller Utopia*. København: Gyldendal, 1966.

Jensen, Knud W. "Samfundet og Kunsten." In *Kulturelle strømninger i Danmark, nu og snart*. Ed. Mogens Pihl. København: Forlaget Fremad, 1962.

Jensen, Knud W. ed. *Kunst på Arbejdspladsen Katalog Nr. 1*. København: Foreningen Kunst på Arbejdspladsen, 1960.

Jespersen, Jørgen. "Asminderød sogn, Krogerup 1660-1801." (www.olischer.dk/Byskirv/stat.html.)

Lübecker, Pierre, ed. *Katalog over Louisiana – Samling af nutidskunst og kunsthåndværk*. Humlebæk: Louisiana, 1958.

Schmelling, Asger. *Humlebæk Fiskerleie.* Frederiksborg: Frederiksborg Amts Historiske Samfund, 1971.

Sheridan, Michael. *Louisiana – Architecture and Landscape*. Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Stensgaard, Pernille. *When Louisiana Stole the Picture*. Trans. John Kendal. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2008.

Treib, Marc. "Adding On" in *Studies in the History of Art*, vol. 73, Symposium Papers L: A Modernist Museum in Perspective: The East Building, National Gallery of Art. (2009): 159.

Wivel, Ole. *Lyset og market: Mit venskab med Knud W. Jensen*. Herning: Poul Kristensens Forlag, 1994.

Wohlert, Claus. "Moderniseringen af Louisiana." In *Louisiana 2003-2006*, Ed. Poul Erik Tøjner. Humlebæk: Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, 2006.

B. Periodicals and Newspapers

Bruun-Møller, Povl. "Haven ved Louisiana." *Politiken*, 25 April 1959.

Cornelius, Knud. "Louisianas udbygning til kulturcentrum for Ørestad ligger klar," *Frederiksborg Amts Avis*, 1 January 1970.

Handberg, Kristian. "The Shock of the Contemporary: documenta II and the Louisiana Museum." *Oncurating*, no. 23 (June 2017): 34. (www.on-curating.org/issue-9.html)

Holscher, Vibeke. "Søhaven på Louisiana." *Arkitekten* 1995, no. 2: 69.

Jensen, Knud W. "Indtryk fra Documenta." In *Louisiana 1959 Årbog*. Ed. Knud W. Jensen. København: Gyldendal, 1959.

Jensen, Knud W. "Om Louisianas græske samling." In *Louisiana 1958 Årbog*. Ed. Knud W. Jensen and Ole Wivel. København: Gyldendal, 1958.

Jensen, Knud W. "Jo vist skal vi have kunst til arbejdet." *Politiken*, 5 December 1954.

Jespersen, Gunnar. "En samling bliver til." In *Louisiana.* [Reprint of *Kunst*, no. 5, January 1957]

Jensen, Knud W. "Mod en ny museumstype." *Louisiana klubben*, no. 1 (October 1978): 3–7.

Kjeldsen, Kjeld, ed. "Louisiana at 40: The Collection Today." *Louisiana Revy*, vol. 38, no.3. [Entire issue]

Larsen, Bene. "Tre gange gift med Louise." *Berlingske Aftenavis*, 2 August 1958.

Lübecker, Pierre. "En perle af en kunstsamling." *Politiken*, 14 August 1958.

Lübecker, Pierre. "Museet skal ikke være en kirkegaard for kunst." *Politiken*, 27 July 1958.

Møller, Svend Erik. "En samlers store gave til dansk kulturliv." *Politiken*, 14 August 1958.

Nielsen, Johan Møller. ”Kunstmuseet er et kunstværk." *Social-Demokraten*, 14 August 1958.

Nørgaard, Ole. “The Louisiana Sculpture Garden.” *Mobilia*, no. 116 (March 1965): unpaginated.

Nørgaard, Ole. “Louisianas skulpturhave.” *Louisiana Revy* 5, no. 17 (September 1964): 12-13.

Skriver, Poul Erik. “Louisiana skulpturhave.” *Arkitektur* 1966, no. 5: 210–215.

Thomassen, Ole. “Mirakelet i Humlebæk.” *Information*, 14 August 1958.

Weschler, Lawrence. “Profiles: Louisiana in Denmark.” *The New Yorker*, August 30 1982: 36–61.

Unknown writer. [Jørgen Bo’s initial project for the 71-Building] *Berlingske Tidende*, 18 May 1969.

Unknown writer. “Louisiana udvides til det dobbelte.” *B.T.*, 6 May 1964.

Unknown writer. “Louisiana-tingene.” *Berlinske Aftenavis*, 25 November 1959.

Unknown writer. “Louisiana.” *Helsingør Dagblad*, 18 August 1958.

Unknown writer. “Peter Jensen Ost er solgt for 10 Mill. Kroner.” *Børsen*, no date (late July or early August 1956).

C. Unpublished Papers and Correspondence [Knud W. Jensen Archive, LMMA.]

Knud W. Jensen, “Louisiana: En Redgørelse.” [no date, presumably late 1957.]

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, “Bemærkninger om udvidelserne på Louisiana,” 20 July 1959.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, “Responsum om Louisiana’s byggeri, Juli 1962. Udstillingsbygningen. Projektet af 1961.”

Knud W. Jensen to Ole Nørgaard, 5 December 1963.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, “Rejsenotat 21. – 25. maj 1963.”

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, 24 February 1964.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, “Notat, Funktionsanalyse for Louisianas udstillingsbygning,” 31 January 1967.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, 17 April 1967.

Knud W. Jensen, “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 1,” August 1973.

Knud W. Jensen, “Notater om samtaler vedr. Salen; Salens akustik m.v., Samtale den 19.11 [1973] med Børge Wagner.”

Knud W. Jensen to H. Maaløe Jespersen, 24 July 1974.

Knud W. Jensen, “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 2,” September 1975.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 9 December 1975.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 10 February 1976.

Knud W. Jensen, “Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 3,” July 1976.

Knud W. Jensen, “Dagbogsnotater om byggeriet, Nerja, Oktober 1977.”

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 23 December 1977.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 7 February 1978.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 24 February 1978.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert and Ole Nørgaard, 11 April 1978.

Knud W. Jensen, "Udbygning af Louisiana. Samarbejde mellem Augustinus-Fonden og Louisiana," 2 June 1978.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert, 18 June 1978.

Knud W. Jensen, "Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 4," November 1978.

Knud W. Jensen to Jørgen Bo, "Notat om diverse uløste problemer vedrørende byggeriet, " November 1978.

Knud W. Jensen to Alexander von Berswordt-Wallrabe, 7 January 1980.

Knud W. Jensen, "Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 5," August 1980.

Knud W. Jensen, "Louisianas målsætning Redegørelse nr. 6," December 1985.

Knud W. Jensen, "Notat om Utzonhuset: Arkitektursamlingen på Louisiana," 29 December 1998.

Knud W. Jensen to Kim Utzon, 18 February 1999.

2. Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert

A. Books and Chapters

Bo, Jørgen, and Vilhelm Wohlert, "Om Bygingen." In *Katalog over Louisiana – Samling af nutidskunst og kunsthåndværk*. Ed. Pierre Lübecker. Humlebæk: Louisiana, 1958.

Brawne, Michael, and Jens Frederiksen. *Jørgen Bo, Vilhelm Wohlert: Louisiana Museum, Humlebæk*. Berlin: Wasmuth, 1993.

Brawne, Michael. *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*. New York: Praeger, 1966. (79–83)

Kappel, Thomas. "Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlerts Museumsarkitektur 1958–91." Master's thesis, University of Copenhagen, 1992.

Pardey, John. *Louisiana and Beyond: The Work of Vilhelm Wohlert*. Hellerup: Edition Bløndal, 2007.

Schultz, Ole. "A Brief Introduction to the Architect Vilhelm Wohlert." In Pardey, *Louisiana and Beyond.*

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Vilhelm Wohlert." In *Weilbachs kunstnerleksikon*, fourth ed. Ed. Sys Hartmann, et al. København: Munksgaard/Rosinante, 1994–2000.

Mollerup, Jens. "Jørgen Bo." In *Weilbachs kunstnerleksikon*, fourth ed. Ed. Sys Hartmann, et al. København: Munksgaard/Rosinante, 1994–2000.

Wohlert, Vilhelm. *Selections. Tekster og skitser af Vilhelm Wohlert*. København: Anders Nyborg Private Edition, 1987.

B. Periodicals

Bo, Jørgen. "Skoleparken i Gladsaxe." *Arkitekten* (M) 1956, no. 8/9: 126–133.

Bo, Jørgen. "Elementhusene i Hjortekær." *Arkitekten* (M) 1953, no. 11/12: 187–192.

Bo, Jørgen. "Projekteret boligbebyggelse i Bagsværd." *Arkitekten* (U) 1952, no. 20: 154–158.

Bo, Jørgen, and Karen and Ebbe Clemmensen, "Blågaard Seminarium og Enghavegård Skole." *Arkitektur* 1969, no. 2: 54–65.

Bo, Jørgen, and Vilhelm Wohlert. "Arkitekter i 25 år." Louisiana Revy 1983, vol. 24, no. 1: 69–81.

Bo, Jørgen, and Vilhelm Wohlert. "Louisiana, kunstmuseum i Humlebæk." *Arkitektur* 1982, no. 7: 253–273.

Bo, Jørgen, and Vilhelm Wohlert. [Competition entry for Neue Staatsgalerie] *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977): 715–723

Bo, Jørgen and Vilhelm Wohlert, "Lyrik und Mathematik," *Magnum. Zeitschrift für das moderne Leben*, no. 38 (October 1961): 42.

Bo, Jørgen, and Vilhelm Wohlert, "Ønskehuset," *Arkitekten* 1959, no. 11: 216–217.

Dirckinck-Holmfeld, Kim. "Museum Bochum," *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3: 88–103.

Fisker, Kay. "Louisiana," *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8: 145–148.

Fisker, Steffan. "Ægyptisk kunst på Louisiana." *Arkitekten* 1962, no. 11: 240–242.

Høwisch, John. "Udbygning af The Israel Museum, Jerusalem. The Sam Weisbord og The Nathan Cummings 20th Century Art Building." *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 146–151.

Jørgensen, Lisbet Balslev. "Louisiana, Humlebæk, 1958–82." *Arkitektur DK* 1989, no. 4: 185.

Kappel, Thomas. "Arkitekt Jørgen Bo og kælderens indretning 1966–73." *Meddelelser fra Thorvaldsens Museum* (København: Thorvaldsens Museum, 1998): 186-194.

Kappel, Thomas. "Et overblik, Om museumsarkitekterne Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlert." "Gustav Lübcke Museet, Hamm." "Udbygning af The Israel Museum, Jerusalem." *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 129-133, 134-145, 146-151.

Kappel, Thomas. "Vilhelm Wohlerts Museumsarkitektur." "Louisianas Grafikfløj." "Arbejder af Vilhelm Wohlert's Tegnestue." *Arkitektur DK* 1991, no. 7: 305-308, 309-319, 320-337.

Langberg, Harald. "Nationalmuseets middelaldersamling." [Bo] *Arkitektur DK* 1981, no. 6: 210–216.

Lund, Nils-Ole. "Stengård Kirke." *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 4: 144–154.

Messerschmidt, Eric. "En samtale med Vilhelm Wohlert: Man skal være ydmyg i sit udgangspunkt." *Arkitektur DK* 1991, no. 7: 337–339.

Møller, Svend Erik, and Jesper Høm. *Mobilia,* no. 38 (September 1958). [Entire issue]

Sestoft, Jørgen. "Musikhistorisk Museum." *Arkitektur* 1968, no. 1: 45–49.

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Gustav-Lübcke-Museum, Hamm." *Arkitektur DK* 1994, no. 3: 134, 136.

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Nordisk villaer." *Arkitekten* 1964, no. 17: 341–357.

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Arbejder af Jørgen Bo og Vilhelm Wohlert." *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 5: 161–200.

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Et Ønskehus." *Arkitektur* 1959, no. 3: 100–103.

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Butik for optikerfirmæt F. A. Thiele," *Arkitektur* 1957, no. 3: 82–88.

Skriver, Poul Erik. "Hus i Hjortekær." *Arkitektur* 1957, no. 3: 91–97.

Thomsen, Edvard. "Konkurrencen om en ny Langeliniepavillon." *Arkitekten* (U) 1954: 61–67.

Wohlert, Vilhelm . "Jørgen Bo 1919–1999." *Arkitekten* 1999, no. 20: 28–30.

Wohlert, Vilhelm. "Light Has to Fall on the Object You Want to See," *NYT* 1998, no. 557: 14.

Wohlert, Vilhelm. "Louisianas koncertsal og teater, Humlebæk." *Arkitektur* 1978, no. 6: 242–248.

Wohlert, Vilhelm. “En tilbygning.” *Arkitektur* 1960, no. 1: 18–24.

Wohlert, Vilhelm. “En Amerikansk arkitektskole,” *Arkitekten* (U) 1954, no. 24: 189–193.

Wohlert, Vilhelm, and Jørgen Bo. “Snedkerskole i Monastir, Tunesien.” “Børrebakken, plejehjem og kollektivboliger, Lyngby.” *Arkitektur DK* 1973, no. 6: 227–230, 239–241.

Wohlert, Vilhelm, and Rolf Graae. “Margrethekirken, København.” *Arkitektur* 1973, no. 6: 256–260.

Wohlert, Vilhelm, and Rolf Graae. “Margrethekirken I Vigerslev sogn, Konkurrenceprojekt.” *Arkitekten* 1959, no. 15: 284–285.

C. Unpublished Papers and Correspondence

Jørgen Bo to Knud W. Jensen, 23 March 1976.

D. Lecture Transcripts

Vilhelm Wohlert. “Louisiana – Memories of Working Together.” Lecture to celebrate Knud W. Jensen’s eightieth birthday, Louisiana, December 1996. Reprinted in John Pardey, *Louisiana and Beyond: The Work of Vilhelm Wohlert*. Trans. James Manley. Hellerup, Edition Bløndal, 2007.

Vilhelm Wohlert. “Kaare Klint.” Lecture to celebrate the centennial of Klint’s birth, Kunstindustrimuseet, November 1988. Reprinted in *De gamle mestre – Carl Petersen, Ivar Bentsen, Kaj Gottlob, Kaare Klint, Kay Fisker*. Ed. Jørgen Hegner Christiansen, Karen Zahle and Finn Monies. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2000.

Jørgen Bo. “Lecture on Louisiana.” Lecture at TU Delft, the Netherlands, 12 December 1985. Reprinted in John Pardey, *Louisiana and Beyond: The Work of Vilhelm Wohlert*. Hellerup, Edition Bløndal, 2007.

Vilhelm Wohlert, “Untitled.” Lecture on Wohlert’s work delivered to the Copenhagen chapter of Rotary International, 26 August 1959. Courtesy of Claus Wohlert.

Vilhelm Wohlert, “Lecture on Louisiana.” English-language lecture prepared for foreign audience, n.d. Courtesy of Claus Wohlert.

3. Diverse Museums

A. Kunsthaus Zürich.

Aloi, Roberto. *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962. (83–91)

Baumann, Felix. “Alt Kunsthausdirektor René Wehrli gestorben.” *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 16 December 2005.

Huber, Benedikt, Max Huggler and René Wehrli, “Auststellungsflügel des Kunsthauses Zürich.” *Werk*, vol. 46 (February 1959): 37–44.

Pfister, Hans, and Peter Pfister, “Das Erweiterungsprojekt für das Zürcher Kunsthaus.” *Werk*, vol. 42, September 1955: 280–282.

Roth, Alfred. “Die projektierte zweite Erweiterun des Zürcher Kunsthauses.” *Werk*, vol. 31, September 1944: 283–292.

B. Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam.

Aloi, Roberto. *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962. (131–136)

Brawne, Michael. *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*. New York: Praeger, 1966. (67–71)

Kempers, Paul. *Binnen was buiten: de Sandbergvleugel Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 2010.

Petersen, Ad. *Sandberg, Designer and Director of the Stedelijk*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2004.

Sandberg, Willem. "Museum at the Crossroads," Herbert Read Lecture, Institute of Contemporary Art, London, 22 September 1973. Published in *Museum in Motion? The Modern Art Museum at Issue*, ed. Carel Blotkamp, et al. (Den Haag, Staatsuitgevrij, 1979), 329.

C. Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, Otterlo, the Netherlands.

Aloi, Roberto. *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962. (167–174)

Bremer, Jaap. "Kröller-Müller Museum Otterlo – The Introduction of 20th-century International Sculpture in the Netherlands." Trans. Ted Alkins. In *The Art of Collecting: 20th-century Art in Dutch Museums*. Ed. Els Barents. Ghent: Ludion, 1997.

Eaton, Leonard K. "Growing a Museum: An Analysis of Holland's Kröller-Müller Museum and Sculpture Garden." *Landscape Architecture*, v. 72, no. 2 (1982): 86–90.

Oxenaar, Rudolf W. D., ed. *Kröller-Müller, The First Hundred Years*. Trans. Patricia Griffiths. Haarlem: Joh. Enschedé en Zonen, 1989.

Oxenaar, Rudolf W. D., and Wim Quist, *Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller: Nieuwboux 1970–1977 = Extension 1970–1977*. Trans. Patricia Wardle. Otterlo: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, 1978.

Oxenaar, Rudolf W.D., ed. *Kröller-Müller Museum*. Trans. Patricia Griffiths. Haarlem: Joh. Enschedé, 1978.

Oxenaar, Rudolf W. D. and Max Loreau. *Dubuffet, Jardin d'émail*. Trans. Patricia Wardle. Otterlo: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, 1974.

Padovan, Richard. "Art Gallery, Otterlo, Holland," *The Architectural Review*, vol. 163, no. 972 (February 1978): 74–82.

D. Middelheim Museum, Antwerp.

Bentein-Stoelen, Marie-Rose. *Middelheim: Katalogus van de Verzamel*. Antwerpen: Openluchtmuseum voor Beeldhouwkunst, 1969.

Pas, Johan. *The Middelheim Collection*. Trans. Annabel Howland. Brussels: Ludion, 2010.

Exposition internationale en plein air de sculpture, 1900-1950: Parc Middelheim, juillet-septembre 1950, Ville d'Anvers. [S.l.] : Nederlandsche Boekhandel, [1950]

Exposition inaugurale du Musée communal de sculpture en plein air: Middelheim, 8 septembre - 31 octobre 1951. [S.l.: s.n., 1951]

2e Biennale de la sculpture, Parc Middelheim: 20 juin - 30 septembre 1953. Anvers: Esseo, 1953.

E. Pavilion of Contemporary Art, Milan.

Aloi, Roberto. *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962. (159–166)

Brawne, Michael. *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*. New York: Praeger, 1966. (36–37)

Ciarcia, Saverio. *Il Padiglione di arte contemporanea di Milano* Naples: Clean, 2002.

Fogh, Frederik. "Museum for Moderne Kunst, Milano." *Arkitekten* (U) 1956, vol. 58, no. 26 (26 June 1956): 193-200.

F. Moderna Museet, Stockholm.

Andersson, Patrik. “The Inner and Outer Space. Rethinking movement in art.” Trans. Gabriella Berggren. In *Pontus Hultén and Moderna Museet: The Formative Years*. Ed. Anna Tellgren, Stockholm: Moderna Museet; London: Koenig Books, 2017.

Antille, Benoît. “’Hon – en kathedral’: Behind Pontus Hultén’s Theatre of Inclusiveness.” *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Inquiry*, Issue 32 (Spring 2013): 72–81.

Tomkins, Calvin. “A Good Monster.” [Profile: Pontus Hultén] *The New Yorker*, 16 January 1978: 37–67.

Unknown editors. “Fragments of a Conversation with Ron Hunt.” *Bricks from the Kiln*, no. 1 (December 2015). (www.b-f-t-k.info)

G. Foundation Maeght, St. Paul-de-Vence, France.

Bastlund, Knud, ed. *José Luis Sert; Architecture, City Planning, Urban Design*. New York: Praeger, 1967.

Birksted, Jan K. *Modernism and the Mediterranean: The Maeght Foundation*. Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004.

Brawne, Michael. *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*. New York: Praeger, 1966. (99–102)

Rovira, Josep M. *Sert. Half a Century of Architecture: 1928-1979. Complete Work*. Barcelona: Fundació Joan Miró, 2005.

Sert, José Luis, and Fernand Léger and Sigfried Giedion, “Nine Points on Monumentality.” In Gideon, Sigfried. *Architecture, You and Me*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958. Reprinted with commentary in Ockman, Joan, ed. *Architecture Culture, 1943–1968: A Documentary Anthology*. New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation; Rizzoli, 1993.

H. Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris.

Banham, Reyner. “The Pompidolium.” *The Architectural Review*, vol. 161, no. 963 (May 1977): 271–294.

Dal Co, Francesco. *Centre Pompidou – Renzo Piano, Richard Rogers and the Making of a Modern Monument*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2016.

Holden, Susan. “Possible Pompidous.” *AA Files*, no. 70 (2015): 34–45.

Tomkins, Calvin. “A Good Monster.” [Profile: Pontus Hultén] *The New Yorker*, 16 January 1978: 37–67.

I. Museum Abteiberg, Mönchengladbach, Germany.

Glancey, Jonathan. “Museum, Mönchengladbach, West Germany,” *The Architectural Review*, no. 1030, (December 1982): 60–73.

Hollein, Hans, Johannes Cladders and Germano Celant. *Städtisches Museum Abteiberg Mönchengladbach: Entwurf des Neubaus von Architekt Prof. Hans Hollein:Aspekte der musealen Aktivität unter Leitung von Dr. Johannes Cladders*. Wien: Galerie Ulysses, 1979.

Obrist, Hans Ulrich. “In Conversation with Hans Hollein.” *Journal #66*, October 2015. (www.e-flux.com/journal/66/60777/in-conversation-hans-hollein)

Pehnt, Wolfgang. *Hans Hollein, Museum in Mönchengladbach: Architektur als Collage*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1986.

J. Neue Staatsgallerie, Stuttgart, Germany.

Baratelli, Alberto. *James Stirling: La Galleria di Stato di Stoccarda*. Firenze: Alinea, 2002.

Cannon-Brookes, Peter. "The Post-Modern Art Gallery Comes of Age: James Stirling and the Neue Staatsgallerie, Stuttgart." *The International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship* (1984) no. 3: 159–181.

Cook, Peter. "Stirling 3: Stuttgart." *The Architectural Review*, no. 1033 (March 1983): 30–41.

Magnano Lampugnani, Vittorio. "Monument oder Museumsmaschine?" *Deutsche Architekten- und Ingenieur-Zeitschschrift*, 1978, no. 1: 17. The article was reprinted as "'Stadtgestalt' oder Architektur?" *Werk-Archithese: Zeitschrift und Schriftenreihe für Architektur und Kunst*, vol. 66, no. 33–4 (1979): 57–58.

Rodiek, Thorsten. *James Stirling. Die Neue Staatsgalerie*. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1984.

Staatsgalerie Stuttgart. "Engerer Bauwettbewerb Erweiterung Staatsgalerie – Neubau Kammertheater Stuttgart. Niederschrift Preisgerichtssitzung."

Stirling, James. "The Monumentally Informal," In *Neue Staatsgalerie und Kammertheater Stuttgart*. Stuttgart: Finanzministerium, 1984.

Stirling, James. "The Monumental Tradition." *Perspecta*, no. 16 (1980): 32–49.

Zimmerman, Claire. "James Stirling Reassembled." *AA Files*, no. 56 (2007): 30–41.

4. Art History and Exhibition Practices

A. Books and Chapters

Alloway, Lawrence. *The Venice Biennale, 1895-1968; from Salon to Goldfish Bowl*. Greenwich, Conn.: New York Graphic Society, 1968.

Aloi, Roberto. *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962.

Altshuler, Bruce. *Salon to Biennial: Exhibitions That Made Art History. Volume 1, 1863–1959*. London: Phaidon, 2008.

Buchloh, Benjamin. "1960a." [Nouveau Réalisme] In *1945 to the Present*. Vol. 2 of *Art Since 1900. Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism.* Ed. Hal Foster. New York: Thames & Hudson, 2004. (434–438)

Burstow, Robert. "Modern Sculpture in the Public Park: A Socialist Experiment in Open-Air 'Cultured Leisure'." In *Sculpture and the Garden*. Ed. Patrick Eyres and Fiona Russell. London: Ashgate, 2006.

Cabanas, Kaira M. *The Myth of Nouveau Realisme: Art and the Performative in Postwar France*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Cooke, Lynne. "Thinking on Your Feet: Richard Serra's Sculptures in Landscape." In *Richard Serra Sculpture: Forty Years*. Ed. Kynaston McShine, et al. New York: Museum of Modern Art; London: Thames & Hudson, 2007.

Davies, Hugh M. and Sally E. Yard. *George Trakas, Log Mass: Mass Curve*. Amherst: University Gallery, 1980.

Fletcher, Valerie J. *Dreams and Nightmares, Utopian Visions in Modern Art*. Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1983.

Franck, Klaus. *Exhibitions*. New York: Praeger, 1961.

Hultén, Pontus. *Jean Tinguely, A Magic Stronger than Death*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1987.

Hultén, Pontus. *Niki de Saint Phalle*. Stuttgart: Gerd Hatje, 1992.

Joachimides, Alexis. *Die Museumsreformbewung in Deutschland und die Entstehung des modernen Museums 1880–194.0* Dresden: Verlag der Kunst, 2001

Krauss, Rosalind E. *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985.

Lamartine, Alphonse de. *A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Comprising Recollections, Sketches and Reflections Made During a Tour in the East, in 1832–33*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1836), 78.

Lohse, Richard Paul. *Neue Ausstellungsgestaltung. Nouvelles conceptions de l′ exposition. New Design in Exhibitions*. Trans. The English Institute, Zurich. Erlenbach–Zürich: Verlag für Architektur, 1953.

Maeght, Isabelle. *The Maeght Family: A Passion for Modern Art*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2007.

Meier, Nikolaus. *Kunstmuseum Basel: Die Architektur*. Basel: Verein der Freunde des Kunstmuseums und des Museums für Gegenwartskunst, 2003.

Munck, Ida. *Viktor IV: An American in Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Foundation Viktor IV, 2013.

Newhouse, Victoria. *Towards A New Museum*. Second edition. New York: Monacelli: 2006.

O'Doherty, Brian. *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986.

Restany, Pierre. *60/90: Trente ans de Nouveau Réalisme*. Paris: La Différence, 1990.

Staniszewski, Mary Anne. *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1998.

B. Periodicals

Cone, Michèle C. "Pierre Restany and the Nouveaux Réalistes," *Yale French Studies*, no. 98, *The French Fifties*. Ed. Susan Weiner (2000): 50–65.

Galloway, David. "The New German Museums." *Art in America*, vol. 73, July 1985: 74–89.

Gardiner, Michael. "Utopia and Everyday Life in French Social Thought." *Utopian Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1995): 90–123.

Grasskamp, Walter. "The White Wall – On the Prehistory of the 'White Cube'." *On Curating,* no. 9 (2011): 78–90. (www.on-curating.org/issue-9.html.)

Joachimides, Alexis. "The 'Efficient Museum' in Resistance to The 'Dictatorship of the Wall.' The Discourse of a New Museum Reform in Western Europe after the Second World War." *Kunstgeschichte – Open Peer Reviewed Journal, 2020*. (www.kunstgeschichte-ejournal.net)

Meyric Hughes, Henry. "The Promotion and Reception of British Sculpture Abroad, 1948–1960: Herbert Read, Henry Moore, Barbara Hepworth, and the 'Young British Sculptors'." *British Art Studies*, Issue 3 (July 2016). (www.britishartstudies.ac.uk/issues/issue-index/issue-3.)

Mitchell, Dolores. "Art Patronage by the London County Council (L.C.C.) 1948–1965." *Leonardo*, vol. 10, no. 3 (summer 1977): 207.

Mondrian, Piet. "The Realization of Neoplasticism in the Distant Future and in Architecture Today" (1922). See Hans L. C. Jaffé, *De Stijl* (New York: Abrams, 1971), 168.

Restany, Pierre. "Kunsten som leg." *Louisiana Revy*, vol. 98, no. 3 (December 1967): 30–32.

Restany, Pierre. “Ou en sont les musees dans le monde? Per un museografia moderna.” *Domus* no. 453 (August 1967): 45.

Restany, Pierre. “Le Palais des Beaux-arts de Bruxelles.” *Domus*, no. 453 (August 1967): 46-50.

Restany, Pierre. “Le Stedelijk Museum de Amsterdam, Establissement Pilote, Laboratoire n. 1 de la Museographie Dynamique.” *Domus*, no. 454 (September 1967): 53-57.

Restany, Pierre. “Le Moderna Museet de Stockholm, Le Musee-Miracle, Triomphe d’un Homme et d’une Equipe.” *Domus*, no. 459 (February 1968): 52-56.

Restany, Pierre. “Le Musée de Lodz, L’index d’un Humanisme sans Frontière.” *Domus*, no. 461 (April 1968): 50-54.

Riccioti, Dominic. “The Building of the Museum of Modern Art: The Goodwin-Stone Collaboration,” *American Art Journal*, vol. 17, no. 3 (1985): 50–76.

Rostrup, Haavard. *Histoire du Musée d’Ordrupgaard 1918–78, D’après des documents inédits*. Trans. Janet Rønje. Copenhague: Musée d’Ordrupgaard, 1981.

Salvini, Roberto “Sistemazione di alcune sale della Galleria degli Uffizi.” *Casabella Continuità* 1957, no. 214: 23–24.

Veasey, Melanie. “The Open Air Exhibition of Sculpture at Battersea Park, 1948: A Prelude to Sculpture Parks.” *Garden History-Journal of the Garden Trust*, vol. 44, no. 1 (summer 2016): 135–146.

C. Exhibition Catalogs

Open Air Exhibition of Sculpture At Battersea Park May–September 1948. London: London County Council, 1948.

Sculpture – An Open Air Exhibition at Battersea Park May to September 1951. London: London County Council, 1951.

Sonsbeek ’49, Europese Beeldhouwkunst in de Open Lucht. Arnhem: Stichting Sonsbeek ’49, 1949.

Sonsbeek ’52, Internationale Tentoonstelling Beeldhouwkunst Arnhem 30 Mei – 15 September 1952. Arnhem: Stichting Sonsbeek ’49, 1952.

Arman, Dufrêne, Hains, Yves Klein, Villeglé, Tinguely. Milano: Galerie Apollinaire, 1960.

Ustensiles, Demeures, Escaliers. [Jean Dubuffet] Paris: Galerie Jeanne Bucher, 1967.

Edifices. [Jean Dubuffet] Paris: Musée des Arts décoratifs, 1968.

5. Nordic Architectural History

A. Books and Chapters

Andersen, Michael Asgaard, ed. *Nordic Architects Write*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Anderson, Lawrence B. “Fornyelse af en tradition.” Trans. Inge Hagen. In *Kay Fisker*. Ed. Tobias Faber, et al. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1995.

Anderson, Rigmor. *Kaare Klint Møbler*. København: Kunstakademiet, 1979.

Andersson, Henrik O. “Modern Classicism in Norden, 1910–1930.” Trans. English Centre. In *Nordisk Klassicism/Nordic Classicism 1910–1930*. Ed. Simo Paavilainen. Helsinki: Museum of Finnish Architecture, 1982.

Andersson, Sven-Ingvar, and Steen Høyer. *C. Th. Sørensen – en havekunstner*. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2001.

Åhrén, Uno. “Brytningar.” In *Svensk Slöjdföreningens Årsskrift 1925*. Stockholm: Svensk Slöjdföreningens, 1925. Reprinted as “Turning Points” in *Nordic Architects Write*. Trans. David Jones. Ed. Michael Asgaard Andersen.

Blundell Jones, Peter. *Erik Gunnar Asplund*. London: Phaidon, 2006.

Brown, Iben. “Halldor Gunnløgsson.” In *Weilbachs kunstnerleksikon*, fourth ed. Ed. Sys Hartmann, et al. København: Munksgaard/Rosinante, 1994–2000.

Creagh, Lucy. “Asger Jorn and the “Apollo and Dionysus Debate” 1946–48.” In *Architecture + Art: New Visions, New Strategies*. Ed. Eeva-Liisa Pelkonen and Esa Laaksonen. Helsinki: Alvar Aalto Akatemia, 2007.

Curtis, William J. R. “National Myths and Classical Transformations.” In *Modern Architecture Since 1900*. Third ed. London: Phaidon, 1996.

Egelius, Mats. *Ralph Erskine, architect*. Stockholm: Byggförlaget, 1990.

Eriksson, Eva. “Rationalism and Classicism 1915–1930.” Trans. Jeremy Franks and John Krause. In *20th- Century Architecture, Sweden*. Ed. Claes Caldenby, Jöran Lindvall and Wilfred Wang. Munich; New York: Prestel, 1998.

Faber, Tobias. “Jørn Utzon.” In *Weilbachs kunstnerleksikon*, fourth ed. Ed. Sys Hartmann, et al. København: Munksgaard/Rosinante, 1994–2000.

Ferrer Forés, Jaime J. *Jørn Utzon, Works and Projects*. Trans. Paul Hammond and Anna Puyuelo. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, 2006.

Hansen, Johannes Hedel. *Eva og Nils Koppel*. København: Strandberg Publishing, 2017.

Harkær, Gorm. *Kaare Klint*. Copenhagen: Klintiana, 2010.

Harlang, Christoffer. “Negotiating with the Surrounding Society.” Trans. Dan Marmorstein. In *Nordic Architects Write*. Ed. Michael Asgaard Andersen. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Hauxner, Malene. *Open to the Sky*. Trans. Marion Frandsen and Margot Blanchard. Copenhagen: Danish Architectural Press, 2003.

Hiort, Esbjørn. *Housing in Denmark Since 1930*. Trans. Eva M. Wendt. Copenhagen; London: Julius Gjellerups Forlag; The Architectural Press, 1952.

Item, Urs. “Kravet om et anonymt arkitetursprog.” In *Architectura 15: Kay Fisker 1893–1993*. Ed. Hanne Raabyemagle and Jørgen Sestoft. København: Selskabet for Arkitekturhistorie, 1993.

Jensen, Thomas Bo. *P. V. Jensen-Klint: The Headstrong Master Builder*. Trans. Martha Gaber Abrahamsen. The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, 2009.

Jørgensen, Lisbet Balsev. *Arkitekten Mogens Lassen, en biografi*. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1989.

Karlsen, Arne. *En linie i dansk arkitektur og brugskunst.* Aarhus: Arkitektskolen Aarhus, 1985. Reprinted in: Karlsen, Arne. *Krydsklip i en arkitekts dagbog 1950 – 2000*. København: Christian Ejlers Forlag, 2002.

Karlsen, Arne. *Danish Furniture Design in the 20th Century*. Trans. Martha Gaber Abrahamsen. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers Forlag/Dansk Møbelkunst, 2007.

Lane, Barbara Miller. *National Romanticism and Modern Architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian Countries*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Langkilde, Hans Erling. *Arkitekten Kay Fisker.* København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1960.

Lund, Nils-Ole. *Nordic Architecture*. Trans. James Manley. Copenhagen: Danish Architectural Press, 2008.

Lund, Nils-Ole. "Den funktionelle tradition." In *Kay Fisker*. Ed. Tobias Faber, et al. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1995.

Lundahl, Gunilla, ed. *Nordisk Funktionalism*. Stockholm: Arkitektur Förlag AB, 1980.

Mollerup, Jens. *Skal De bygge eget hus, 32 nye enfamiliehuse og bygherrevejledning med materialoversigt*. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1953.

Monies, Finn. "Erik Christian Sørensen." In *Weilbachs kunstnerleksikon*, fourth ed. Ed. Sys Hartmann, et al. København: Munksgaard/Rosinante, 1994–2000.

Monies, Finn, and Karen Zahle, ed. *Tiden i Stockholm*. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1999.

Møller, Svend Erik. *Enfamilehuse af Idag*. København: Høst & Søn Forlag, 1952.

Møller, Svend Erik. *Enfamilehuse af Idag, Ny Samling*. København: Høst & Søn Forlag, 1955.

Møller, Vibeke Anderson. *Arkitekten Frits Schlegel*. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2004.

Norberg-Schulz, Christian. *Modern Norwegian Architecture*. Olso: Universitetsforlag, 1986.

Paavilainen, Simo. *Nordisk Klassicism/Nordic Classicism 1910–1930*. Multiple translators. Helsinki: Museum of Finnish Architecture, 1982.

Quantrill, Malcolm. *Finnish Architecture and the Modernist Tradition*. London: E & FN Spon, 1995.

Rudberg, Eva. "Building the Welfare of the Folkhemmet 1940–1960." Trans. Jeremy Franks and John Krause. In *20th- Century Architecture, Sweden*. Ed. Claes Caldenby, Jöran Lindvall and Wilfred Wang. Munich; New York: Prestel, 1998.

Salokorpi, Asko. *Modern Architecture in Finland*. New York: Praeger, 1970.

Schildt, Göran. *Alvar Aalto, The Early Years*. Trans. Timothy Binham. New York: Rizzoli, 1984.

Schildt, Göran. *Alvar Aalto, The Decisive Years*. Trans. Timothy Binham. New York: Rizzoli, 1986.

Schildt, Göran. *Alvar Aalto, The Mature Years*. Trans. Timothy Binham. New York: Rizzoli, 1991.

Sheridan, Michael. *Mesterværker – Enfamiliehuset i dansk arkitekturs guldalder*. Trans. Knud Michelsen. København: Strandberg Publishing, 2011.

Sheridan, Michael. *The Furniture of Poul Kjærholm: Catalogue Raisonné*. New York: Gregory R. Miller, 2007.

Stephensen, Hakon. *Arkitekten Carl Petersen: det tegnede Faaborg museum og skabte en epoke i dansk bygningkunst*. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 1979.

Sørensen, Christian Th. *Parkpolitik i sogn og købstad*. København: Gyldendal, 1931.

Ussing, Susanne, and Carsten Hoff. *Om organisk bigger: Huse for mennesker* København: Forlaget Beboertryk, 1977.

Weston, Richard. *Utzon: Inspiration, Vision, Architecture*. Hellerup: Edition Bløndal, 2001.

Wohlert, Vilhelm. "Kaare Klint." In *De gamle mestre – Carl Petersen, Ivar Bentsen, Kaj Gottlob, Kaare Klint, Kay Fisker*. Ed. Jørgen Hegner Christiansen, Karen Zahle and Finn Monies. København: Arkitektens Forlag, 2000.

B. Periodicals

Backer, Lars. “Vor holdningsløse arkitektur.” *Byggekunst*, vol. 7, no. 11 (November 1925): 173–175.

Backström, Sven. “A Swede Looks at Sweden.” *The Architectural Review*, vol. 94 (September 1943): 80.

Biilmann Petersen, Gunnar. “Kaare Klint, Traditionen, naturen og kunstneren.” *Arkitekten* (M) 1956, no. 7: 97–101.

Fisker, Kay. “Den Klintske skole, P.V. Jensen Klint, Ivar Bentsen, Kaare Klint.” *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 2: 37–80.

Fisker, Kay. “The History of Domestic Architecture in Denmark.” *The Architectural Review*, vol. 104, (November 1948): 219–226. Reprinted in *The Architecture of Denmark*. London: The Architectural Press, 1949.

Fisker, Kay. “Funktionalismens Moral.” *A5*, no. 4 (1947): 7–14. An English translation was published as “The Moral of Functionalism,” *Magazine of Art*, no. 2, 1950: 62–67; and reprinted in Andersen, *Nordic Architects Write.*

Fisker, Kay. “Svensk Bygningskunst,” *Arkitekten* (U) 1945, no. 7: 31

Gunnløgsson, Halldor, “Eget hus i Vedbæk,” *Arkitekten* (M) 1953, no. 1: 5–7.

Gunnløgsson, Halldor. “Richard J. Neutra,” *Arkitekten* (U) 1948, no. 48: 210–211.

Heiberg, Edvard. "Forsvar for Klassicismen." *Kritisk Revy* 1926, no. 2 (October): 27–29.

Heiberg, Edvard. “Utstillingen for decorative kunst, Paris.” *Byggekunst*, vol. 7, no. 12 (December 1925): 177–184.

Klint, Kaare. “Undervisning i møbeltegning ved Kunstakademiet,” *Arkitekten* (M) 1930: 193-224.

Petersen, Tom E. “Boligerne skal leve og gro.” *Villabyernes Blad*, 6 July 1977.

Unknown editor. “Resultatet af konkurrencen om en centralkirkegård med tilhørende kapelanlæg for Lyngby-Taarbæk kommune.” [Ole Nørgaard] *Arkitekten* (U) 1952, no. 19: 145–151.

Ussing, Susanne and Carsten Hoff. “Læs husene.” *Louisiana Revy* 17, no. 3, June 1977, 45-47.

Utzon, Jørn. “Eget hus.” *Byggekunst* 1952, no. 5: 80.

Woudstra, Jan. “Danish Landscape Design in the Modern Era (1920–1970).” *Garden History* vol. 23, no. 2 (Winter 1995): 236–237.

6. International Architectural History

A. Books and Chapters

Amerika Bygger. Utställning 14 Juni–15 Augusti av Amerikansk Arkitektur. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1944.

Alofsin, Anthony. “Frank Lloyd Wright and Modernism.” In *Frank Lloyd Wright, Architect*. Ed. Terence Riley and Peter Reed. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1994.

Beltramini, Guido and Italo Zannier, ed. *Carlo Scarpa: Architecture and Design*. New York: Rizzoli, 2007.

Bergdoll, Barry. "Walk-In Collage: Mies van der Rohe's Design of His 1947 Exhibition at MoMA." In *Mies van der Rohe, Collage: Montage*. Ed. Andreas F. Beitlin, Wolf Eiermann and Brigitte Franzen. London: Koenig Books, 2017.

Bo, Jørgen, and Børge Glahn, *En Amerikansk Arkitekt, Thomas Jefferson*. København: Det Schønbergske Forlag, 1953.

Boesinger, Willy, ed. *Richard Neutra. Buildings and Projects*. Trans. Werner Czapski. Zurich: Girsbirger, 1950.

Bogner, Dieter. "Kiesler and The European Avant-garde." In *Frederick Kielser*. Ed. Lisa Phillips. New York: Whitney Museum, 1989.

Brawne, Michael. *The New Museum: Architecture and Display*. New York: Praeger, 1966.

Bucci, Federico. *Franco Albini.* Trans. Translating.eu. Milan: Mondadori Electa, 2009.

Buckley, Craig. "The Echo of Utopia." In *Utopie: Texts and Projects, 1967–1978*. Ed. Craig Buckley and Jean-Louis Violeau. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e); Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2011.

Buckley, Craig. "Everything is Architecture: Hans Hollein's Media Assemblages." In *Graphic Assembly: Montage, Media, and Experimental Architecture in the 1960s*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019.

Büchel, Lena. "Between Reality and Ideal: The Function of Collage in Mies van der Rohe's Oeuvre in Relation to the Design Context." In *Mies van der Rohe, Collage: Montage*. Ed. Andreas F. Beitlin, Wolf Eiermann and Brigitte Franzen. London: Koenig Books, 2017.

Cohen, Jean-Louis. *Ludwig Mies van der Rohe*, second ed. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2007.

Cook, Peter, ed. *Archigram*. New York: Praeger, 1973.

Cook, Peter, ed. *Experimental Architecture.* New York: Universe Books, 1970.

Curtis, William J. R. "Cubism, De Stijl and New Conceptions of Space." In *Modern Architecture Since 1900*. Third ed. London: Phaidon, 1996.

Curtis, William J. R. "Pluralism in the 1970s." In *Modern Architecture Since 1900*. Third ed. London: Phaidon, 1996.

Dickerman, Leah. "Bauhaus Fundaments." In *Bauhaus 1919–1933: Workshops for Modernity*. Ed. Barry Bergdoll. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2009.

Drexler, Arthur. *Transformations in Modern Architecture*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1979.

Ford, Edward R. "Richard Neutra and the Architecture of Surface: 1933–1952." In *The Details of Modern Architecture – Volume 2: 1928–1988*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1996.

Frampton, Kenneth. "Mies van der Rohe: Avant-Garde and Continuity." In *Studies in Tectonic Culture*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1995.

Frampton, Kenneth. "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance." In *The Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. Port Townsend, Wash.: Bay Press, 1983.

Frampton, Kenneth. "Neoplasticism and Architecture: Formation and Transformation." In *De Stijl: 1917–1931: Visions of Utopia*. Ed. Mildred Friedman. New York: Abbeville Press, 1982.

Gebhard, David. *Schindler*. San Francisco: William Stout Publishers, 1997.

Gropius, Walter. *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*. Trans. P. Morton Shand. London: Faber and Faber, 1935.

Hines, Thomas S. *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture*. Oxford; New York: University of California Press, 1982.

Hollein, Hans. "Alles ist Arkitektur." *Bau* 1968, 1/2 (April): 1–32.

Jellicoe, Geoffrey. *The Landscape of Man*. Third ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 1995.

Johnson, Philip C. *Mies van der Rohe*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1947.

Koss, Juliet. *Modernism After Wagner*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Klotz, Heinrich. *New Museum Buildings in the Federal Republic of Germany = Neue Museumsbauten in der Bundesrepublic Deutschland*. New York: Rizzoli, 1985.

Kuenzli, Katherine M. *Henri van de Velde: Designing Modernism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Küper, Marijke and Ida van Zijl, *Gerrit Th. Rietveld: The Complete Works 1888–1964*. Utrecht: Centrl Museum, 1992.

Lambert, Phyllis, ed. *Mies in America*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001.

Le Corbusier. *Towards a New Architecture*. Trans. Frederick Etchells. New York: Dover Publications, 1986.

Lefaivre, Liane. "Everything is Architecture." *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 18 (Spring/Summer 2003): 3.

Lodder, Christina. "Constructivist Visions of Utopia." In *Utopia 1900–1940, Visions of a New World*. Ed. Doris Wintgens Hötte. Rotterdam: nai010, 2013.

Mathews, Stanley. *From Agit-Prop to Free Space: The Architecture of Cedric Price*. London: Black Dog Architecture, 2007.

McCoy, Esther. *Blueprints for Modern Living: History and Legacy of the Case Study Houses*. Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989.

McQuaid, Matilda. *Lilly Reich, Designer and Architect*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996.

Mertins, Detlef. *Mies*. London: Phaidon, 2014.

Mertins, Detlef. "Architectures of Becoming: Mies van der Rohe and the Avant-Garde." In *Mies in Berlin*. Ed. Terence Riley and Barry Bergdoll. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001.

Miller, Wallis. "Mies and Exhibitions." In *Mies in Berlin*. Ed. Terence Riley and Barry Bergdoll. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001.

Montaner, Josep Maria, and Jordi Oliveras. *The Museums of the Last Generation*. Stuttgart; Zürich: Karl Krämer Verlag, 1987.

Murphy, Richard. *Carlo Scarpa and the Castelvecchio*. London; Boston: Butterworth Architecture, 1990.

Neumeyer, Fritz.*The Artless Word: Mies van der Rohe on the Building Art*. Trans. Mark Jarzombek. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.

Norberg-Schulz, Christian. *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli, 1979.

Ockman, Joan, ed. *Architecture Culture, 1943–1968: A Documentary Anthology*. New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation; Rizzoli, 1993.

Petranzan, Margherita. *Gae Aulenti*. New York: Rizzoli, 1996.

Phillips, Lisa. “Architect of Endless Innovation.” In *Frederick Kiesler*. Ed. Lisa Phillips. New York: Whitney Museum, 1989.

Robbins, David, ed. *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.

Sadler, Simon. *Archigram: Architecture without Architecture*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005.

Schulze, Franz, and Edward Windhorst. *Mies van der Rohe, A Critical Biography*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Sudjic, Deyan. *Norman Foster, Richard Rogers, James Stirling: New Directions in British Architecture*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1986.

Sweeney, Robert, and Judith Sheine. *Schindler, Kings Road, and Southern California Modernism*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 2012.

Tegethoff, Wolf. “Catching the Spirit: Mies’s Early Work and the ‘Prussian Style.’ ” In *Mies in Berlin*. Ed. Terence Riley and Barry Bergdoll. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2001.

Weston, Richard. *Key Buildings of the Twentieth Century: Plans, Sections, and Elevations*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2004.

Whitely, Nigel. *Reyner Banham: Historian of the Immediate Future*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2002.

Wilson, Colin St. John. *The Other Tradition of Modern Architecture: The Uncompleted Project*. London: Academy Editions, 1995.

B. Periodicals

Entenza, John. ”Case Study House #20.” *Arts & Architecture*, vol. 65 (December 1948): 32–41, 56–57.

Fisker, Kay. “Den funktionelle tradition – Spredte indtryk af amerikansk arkitektur.” *Arkitekten* (M) 1950, no. 5-6: 69–100.

Hess, Alan. “Jack Hillmer’s Ludekens House.” *Fine Homebuilding*, no. 30 (December 1985/January 1986): 18–23.

Kuenzli, Katherine M. “The Birth of the Modernist Art Museum: The Folkwang as Gesamtkunstwerk.” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 72, no. 4 (December 2013): 522–524.

Lanzarini, Orietta. “Scarpa.” *The Architectural Review*, no. 1427 (January 2016): 47–53.

Mies van der Rohe, Ludwig, and George Danforth. “Museum.” *Architectural Forum*, vol. 78, May 1943: 84–85.

Sack, Manfred. “Mere værksted end temple. Museer i Tyskland.” *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3: 81–87.

Self, Jack. “Is Everything Architecture?” *The Architectural Review*, no. 1423 (September 2015): 18–20.

Schindler, Rudolph M. “A Cooperative Dwelling.” *T-Square* no. 2 (February 1932): 20–23. Reprinted in Smith, Kathryn. *Schindler House*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001.

Seling, Helmut. “The Genesis of the Museum.” *The Architectural Review*, vol. 141 (February 1967): 103–114.

Sugden, Derek. “Concert Hall, Snape, Suffolk.” *The Architectural Review*, vol. 142 (September 1967): 202–207.

7. Some Further Reading

A. Books and Chapters

Adams, Nicholas. *Gunnar Asplund's Gothenburg. The Transformation of Public Architecture in Interwar Europe*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014.

Ahlberg, Hakon, *Swedish Architecture of the Twentieth Century*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1925.

Abrahamsen, Povl. *Den danske enkelhed. Et samfund og dets arkitektur*. København: Christian Ejlers Forlag, 1994.

Altshuler, Bruce. *Biennials and Beyond: Exhibitions That Made Art History. 1962–2002*. London: Phaidon Press, 2013.

Andersson, Henrik O. and Frederic Bedoire. *Svensk Arkitektur. Ritningar 1640–1970*. Stockholm: Byggförlaget, 1986.

Bergdoll, Barry. "Bauhaus Multiplied: Paradoxes of Architecture and Design In and After the Bauhaus." In *Bauhaus 1919–1933: Workshops for Modernity*. Ed. Barry Bergdoll. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2009.

Burckhardt, Lucius. *The Werkbund: History and Ideology 1907–1933*. New York: Barron's Educational Series, 1980.

Creagh, Lucy, Helene Kåberg and Barbara Miller Lane, eds. *Modern Swedish Design: Founding Texts*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2008.

Crone, Johan Casper and Peter Hancke. *Arkitekten Palle Suenson*. København: Christian Ejlers Forlag, 1987.

Donnelly, Marian C. *Architecture in the Scandinavian Countries*. Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 1992.

Engfors, Christina. *E. G. Asplund. Architect, friend and colleague*. Stockholm: Arkitektur Förlag, 1990.

Fisker, Kay and F. R. Yerbury, eds. *Modern Danish Architecture*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

Harlang, Christoffer. *Nordic Spaces*. Barcelona: Elisava Editions, 2001.

Hitchcock, Jr., Henry-Russell. *Early Museum Architecture, 1770-1850*. Hartford: Wadsworth Atheneum, 1934.

Holmdahl, Gustav, and Sven Ivar Lind, Kjell Ödeen, eds. *Gunnar Asplund, Architect 1885–1940. Plans, sketches and photographs*. Trans. Dorothy Grubbström. Stockholm: Byggförlaget, 1981. Facsimile reprint of 1950 edition, published by Svenska Arkitekters Riksförbund.

Jacobson, Th. Plænge, and Sven Silow, eds. *Ten Lectures on Swedish Architecture*. Trans. William Cameron. Stockholm: Svenska Arkitekters Riksförbund, 1949.

Joachimides, Alexis. "The 'Efficient Museum' in Resistance to The 'Dictatorship of the Wall.' The Discourse of a New Museum Reform in Western Europe after the Second World War," *Kunstgeschichte – Open Peer Reviewed Journal, 2020.* (www.kunstgeschichte-ejournal.net)

Klonk, Charlotte. *Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800 to 2000*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Linn, Bjørn. "Building a Country." Trans. Jeremy Franks and John Krause. In *20th- Century Architecture, Sweden*. Ed. Claes Caldenby, Jöran Lindvall and Wilfred Wang. Munich; New York: Prestel, 1998.

Millech, Knud and Kay Fisker, ed., *Danske arkitekturstrømninger 1850-1950. En arkitekturhistorisk undersøgelse*. København: Egmont H. Petersen/Østifternes Kreditforening, 1951. Reprinted by Arkitektskolen Aarhus, 1977.

Møller, Vibeke Andersson, *Farver i Funktionalismen*, Humlebæk: Forlaget Rhodos, 2009.

Noordegraaf, Julia. *Strategies of Display. Museum Presentation in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Visual Culture*. Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2004.

Paulsson, Thomas. *Scandinavian Architecture: Buildings and Society in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden for the Iron Age Until Today*. London: L. Hill, 1958.

Ringbom, Sixten. *Stone, Style and Truth: The Vogue for Natural Stone in Nordic Architecture 1880–1910*. Helsinki: Finnish Association of Ancient Monuments, 1987.

Rudberg, Eva. *The Stockholm Exhibition 1930: Modernism's Breakthrough in Swedish Architecture*. Trans. Paul Britten Austin and Frances Lucas. Stockholm: Stockholmia Förlag, 1999.

Sheridan, Michael. "Fra guldalder til modernisme. Carl Petersen og nordisk arkitektur." Trans. Julie Top-Nørgaard. In *I Skøn forening*. Ed. Gertrud Hvidberg-Hansen and Gry Hedin. København: Strandberg Publishing, 2015.

Sheridan, Michael. *Room 606 – The SAS House and The Work of Arne Jacobsen*. Copenhagen: Strandberg Publishing, 2023.

Smith, Elizabeth A. T. *Blueprints for Modern Living: History and Legacy of the Case Study Houses*. Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989.

Sørensen, Leif Leer. *Edvard Heiberg og dansk funktionalisme, En arkitkekt og hans samtid, 1897–1958*. København: Arkitektens Forlag: 2000.

Thau, Carsten, and Kjeld Vindum. *Arne Jacobsen*. Copenhagen: Danish Architectural Press, 1998.

Wedebruun, Ola, ed. *Modern Movement Scandinavia – Vision and Reality*. Aarhus: DOCOMOMO Scandinavia; Fonden til Udgivelse af Arkitekturtidsskrift B, 1998.

Widenheim, Cecilia, ed. *Utopia & Reality: Modernity in Sweden 1900–1960*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002.

Woollen, Malcom. *Erik Gunnar Asplund, Landscapes and Buildings*. London: Routledge, 2018.

Wrede, Stuart. *The Architecture of Erik Gunnar Asplund*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1980.

B. Periodicals

Asplund, Gunnar. "Konst och Teknik." *Bryggmästaren* 1936: 166–171.

Asplund, Gunnar. "Vår Arkitektoniska Rumsuppfattning." *Byggmästaren* 1931: 203–210. Reprinted as "Our Architectonic Conception of Space" in *Nordic Architects Write*. Trans. David Jones. Ed. Michael Asgaard Andersen. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Brawne, Michael. "Object on View." *The Architectural Review*, vol. 126 (November 1959): 242–253

Brawne, Michael. "The Picture Wall." *The Architectural Review*, vol. 125 (May 1959): 314–325.

Frampton, Kenneth. "Prospects for a Critical Regionalism." *Perspecta*, vol. 20 (1983): 147–162.

Knutsen, Knud. "Et Fritidshus." *Byggekunst* 1952, no. 8: 127.

Otero-Pailos, Jorge. "Photo[historio]graphy: Christian Norberg-Schulz's Demotion of Textual History." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, vol. 66, no. 2 (June 2007): 220–241.

Rasmussen, Ib. "Italienske Museer." *Arkitekten* 1958, no. 18: 289–298.

Appendix 3: List of Illustrations

The illustration numbers correspond to the material in Volume 3 and are also identified by a brief designation, to prevent confusion. In the case of architectural drawings or artworks, the name of the architect, delineator or artist is indicated. In the case of images, the name of the photographer is provided wherever possible. In all cases, the name is followed by the source. Many of the illustrations were drawn from three sources that have been abbreviated for the sake of brevity: the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art (LMMA); the Architectural Drawings Collection of the National Art Library (NAL) within the Royal Danish Library (RDL); and the Edith and Ole Nørgaard Archive (EONA), currently held by Vibeke Holscher. Entries for material reproduced from publications indicate the name of the author and title, or the name and date of the journal; full citations are provided in the bibliography.

1. Chapter 1

1.1 Diedrich Adolph von der Recke, Map of Kraagerup Manor, 1805. Danish Geodata Agency.

1.2 Ernst Melchior Leschly, Map of Humlebæk Harbor Construction, 1814. Danish National Archives.

1.3 Heimsen, Map of Kraagerup Manor, 1810. Danish Geodata Agency.

1.4 Leschly, Map of the Properties at Humlebæk Harbor, 1861. Danish National Archives.

1.5 Unknown artist, Louisiana 1867. Unknown artist. © LMMA.

1.6 Schneider, Map of Kraagerup Manor Properties, 1860. Danish Geodata Agency.

1.7 Harald Schumacher, *Louisiana*, 1875. Reproduction courtesy of Caspar Koch.

1.8 Louisiana, 1958. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

1.9 Villa after 1939. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

1.10 Strandholm, circa 1950. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

1.11 Typical exhibition. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

1.12 Louisiana, 1949. Photographer Sylvest Jensen/RDL.

1.13 Agnete Petersen, site plan. © LMMA.

1.14 Knud W. Jensen, sketch plan. © LMMA.

1.15 Kaare Klint drawing. NAL-RDL.

1.16 Kaare Klint drawing. NAL-RDL.

1.17 Kaare Klint drawing. NAL-RDL.

1.18 Vilhelm Wohlert, project for an exhibition building. NAL-RDL.

1.19 Vilhelm Wohlert, project for an exhibition building. NAL-RDL.

1.20 Vilhelm Wohlert, project for an exhibition building. NAL-RDL.

1.21 Vilhelm Wohlert, project for an exhibition building. NAL-RDL.

1.22 Grønningen exhibition building. Photographer unknown. © Museum of Copenhagen.

1.23 Model of Aarhus University. Photographer unknown/© RDL.

1.24 Aarhus University. Photographer unknown/RDL.

1.25 Stengaardsparken. Aage Strüwing/© Jørgen Strüwing/RDL.

1.26 Jørgen Bo, site plan of Alf and Anne Bo House. NAL-RDL.

1.27 Alf and Anne Bo House. Photographer Aage Strüwing/© Jørgen Strüwing/RDL.

1.28 Skoleparken model. Photographer Aage Strüwing/© Jørgen Strüwing/RDL.

1.29 Skoleparken. Photographer Aage Strüwing/© Jørgen Strüwing/RDL.

1.30 Skoleparken. Photographer Aage Strüwing/© Jørgen Strüwing/RDL.

1.31 First Church of Christ, Scientist. Photographer Roy Flamm/© Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

1.32 Ludekens House. Photographer R. Flamm/© Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

1.33 Ludekens House. Photographer R. Flamm/© Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

1.34 Storer House. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.35 Lovell House. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.36 Sturges House. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.37 CSH #8. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.38 Treweek House. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.39 Kun House II. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.40 1950 CSH. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

1.41 Schindler-Chace House. Photographer Peter Cook/© View Pictures.

1.42 Schindler-Chace House. Photographer Tim Street-Porter/© Tim Street-Porter Studio.

1.43 Plan drawing of Schindler-Chace House. © Michael Sheridan.

1.44 CSH #20. Photographer Julius Shulman/Julius Shulman Photography Archive (2004.R.10), Getty Research Institute. © J. Paul Getty Trust.

1.45 Plan drawing of CSH #20. © Michael Sheridan.

1.46 CSH #20. Photographer Julius Shulman/Julius Shulman Photography Archive (2004.R.10), Getty Research Institute. © J. Paul Getty Trust.

1.47 CSH #20. Photographer Julius Shulman/Julius Shulman Photography Archive (2004.R.10), Getty Research Institute. © J. Paul Getty Trust.

1.48 Jørgen Bo, site plan of Jørgen and Gerda Bo House. NAL-DNL.

1.49 Plan drawing of Bo House. © Michael Sheridan.

1.50 Jørgen and Gerda Bo House. Photographer Else Tholstrup/© RDL.

1.51 Jørgen and Gerda Bo House. Photographer Else Tholstrup/© RDL.

1.52 Vilhelm Wohlert, competition entry for Langelinie Pavilion. © Claus Wohlert.

1.53 Vilhelm Wohlert, sketches for Degas Gallery. © Claus Wohlert.

1.54 Degas Gallery. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Antonio Wohlert.

1.55 F. A. Thiele drawings. From *Arkitektur* 1957, no. 3.

1.56 F. A. Thiele interior. Photographer Jesper Høm/© Antonio Wohlert.

1.57 F. A. Thiele interior. Photographer Jesper Høm/© Antonio Wohlert.

1.58 Plan drawing of Bohr House. © Michael Sheridan.

1.59 Bohr House. Photographer Jesper Høm/© Antonio Wohlert.

1.60 Battersea Park. Photographer unknown/© London Metropolitan Archives.

1.61 Sonsbeek Park. Photographer unknown/© Gelders Archive (NL-AhGldA_1523_269-0016).

1.62 *Sonsbeek '52*. Photographer unknown/© National Archive of the Netherlands.

1.63 Secord Biennial. Photographer unknown/© Middelheim Museum Library.

1.64 Third Biennial. Photographer unknown/© Middelheim Museum Library.

1.65 *Anna Ancher*. Photographer unknown/© Middelheim Museum Library.

1.66 Carl Brummer, Danish Pavilion, Venice. NAL-RDL.

1.67 Carl Brummer, Danish Pavilion, Venice. NAL-RDL.

1.68 Ordrupgaard. Photographer unknown/© Ordurpgaardsamlingen.

1.69 Gotfred Tvede, Ordrupgaard. NAL-RDL.

1.70 Gotfred Tvede, Ordrupgaard. NAL-RDL.

1.71 Ordrupgaard, 1960. Photographer unknown. From Haavard Rostrup, *Histoire du Musée d'Ordrupgaard 1918–78*.

1.72 Jørgensen House. Photographer unknown/© RDL.

1.73 Hansen House. Photographer Erik Hansen/© RDL.

1.74 Plan drawing of Utzon House. © Michael Sheridan.

1.75 Utzon House. Photographer Erik Hansen/© RDL.

1.76 Utzon House. Photographer Erik Hansen/© RDL.

1.77 Villa Østerstrand. Photographer Else Tholstrup/© RDL.

1.78 Sørensen House-Studio. Photographer Else Tholstrup/© RDL.

1.79 Sørensen House-Studio. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© RDL.

1.80 Plan drawing of Gunnløgsson House. © Michael Sheridan.

1.81 Gunnløgsson House. Photographer Aage Strüwing/ © Jørgen Strüwing/RDL.

1.82 Lytting House. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© Jan Helmer-Petersen/RDL.

1.83 Johannson House-Studio, plan. From Svend Erik Møller, *Enfamilehuse af Idag*.

1.84 Johannson House-Studio. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© Jan Helmer-Petersen/RDL.

1.85 Johannson House-Studio. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© Jan Helmer-Petersen/RDL.

1.86 Frank Lloyd Wright, Wasmuth Portfolio, Plate XXV. © Marriott Library, University of Utah.

1.87 Kazimir Malevich, *Suprematist Composition*, 1916. From Valerie Fletcher, *Dreams and Nightmares*.

1.88 Theo van Doesburg and Cornelius van Eesteren, *Contra-Construction* 1923. © 2023, Digital image, The Museum of Modern Art, New York/Scala, Florence.

1.89 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Project for a Brick Country House. © Kunsthalle Mannheim.

1.90 German Pavilion. Bauhaus-Archive, Inv. Nr. 4691 © VG Bild-Kunst Bonn.

1.91 German Pavilion. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

1.92 Pope House. Photographer unknown/H.A.B.S. United States Department of the Interior.

1.93 Kaufmann Desert House plan. From Willy Boesinger, *Richard Neutra. Buildings and Projects*.

1.94 Kaufmann Desert House. Photographer Julius Shulman/Julius Shulman Photography Archive (2004.R.10), Getty Research Institute. © J. Paul Getty Trust.

2. Chapter 2

2.1 Works from the permanent collection. © LMMA and the artists.

2.2 Bo and Wohlert, site plan. NAL-RDL

2.3 Bo and Wohlert, gallery study. NAL-RDL.

2.4 Bo and Wohlert, undated site plan. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

2.5 Jørgen Bo, Option A. NAL-RDL.

2.6 Jørgen Bo, Option B. NAL-RDL.

2.7 Jørgen Bo, Option C. NAL-RDL.

2.8 Bo and Wohlert, Luisiana I. NAL-RDL.

2.9 Bo and Wohlert, Luisiana II. NAL-RDL.

2.10 Uffizi. Photographer Paolo Monti/© Archivio Storico Gardella. Courtesy of Jacobo Gardella.

2.11 Milan. Photographer Clari/© Archivio Storico Gardella. Courtesy of Jacobo Gardella.

2.12 Milan. Photographer Clari/© Archivio Storico Gardella. Courtesy of Jacobo Gardella.

2.13 Bo and Wohlert, site plan and studies. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

2.14 Bo and Wohlert, study with cleft. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

2.15 Bo and Wohlert, library sketch. NAL-RDL.

2.16 Bo and Wohlert, library sketch with piano. NAL-RDL.

2.17 Architectural model. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.18 Drawing of typical sections. © Michael Sheridan.

2.19 Voltelen diagram. From *Arkitektur* 1958, no. 8.

2.20 Architectural model. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.21 Jørgen Bo, site plan, 1957. EONA.

2.22 Vilhelm Wohlert, watercolor study. © NAL-RDL.

2.23 Plan drawing with modules. © Michael Sheridan.

2.24 Villa. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.25 Cemetery view. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.26 Basin Passage. Photographer Aage Strüwing/© RDL.

2.27 Entrance. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.28 Beech tree. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.29 Tree Passage. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.30 Night view. Photographer Mogens von Haven/© LMMA.

2.31 Nikko fir. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA

2.32 *Kneeling Figure*. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.33 Lake Gallery. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.34 Cleft Passage. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.35 *Standing Woman*. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.36 First Lantern Gallery. Hakon Nielsen/© Scanpix.

2.37 Basin. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.38 Second Lantern Gallery. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.39 View to library. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.40 Upper Level. Photographer Ivar Myrhøj/© Scanpix.

2.41 Lower Level. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.42 Pergola. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.43 Bo and Wohlert. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.44 Aerial view. Photographer Sylvest Jensen/RDL.

2.45 Lantern Galleries. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.46 First Lantern Gallery. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.47 Terrace. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

2.48 Brickwork. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.49 Second Lantern Gallery. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.50 Typical corner. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.51 Ceiling detail. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

2.52 Reading corner. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.53 Door hardware. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.54 Copper lamp. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.55 Fireplace. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.56 Cleft Passage. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.57 Concrete wall. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

2.58 Marble detail. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.59 Intersection. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.60 Stepped brickwork. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.61 Roof beams. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.62 Screen detail. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.63 Lake gallery. Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

2.64 Mogens's Wall. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

2.65 Shadows. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

2.66 Brickwork detail. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© RDL.

2.67 Palermo. Photographer Václav Sedy. From Guido Beltramini and Italo Zannier, *Carlo Scarpa: Architecture and Design*.

2.68 Palermo. Photographer Václav Sedy. From *Carlo Scarpa: Architecture and Design*.

2.69 Palmero. Photographer Václav Sedy. From *Carlo Scarpa: Architecture and Design*.

2.70 Uffizi Sala 2. Photographer Paolo Monti. From *Casabella Continuità* 1957, no. 214.

2.71 Uffizi passage. Photographer Paolo Monti. From *Casabella Continuità* 1957, no. 214.

2.72 Uffizi slot. Photographer Paolo Monti. From *Casabella Continuità* 1957, no. 214.

2.73 Milan plans. From Michael Brawne, *The New Museum*.

2.74 Milan mezzanine. From *The New Museum*.

2.75 Milan hall. From *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica* (Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1962).

2.76 Sforzesco Room 15. Photographer Fotogramma s.r.l. From *The New Museum*.

2.77 Sforzesco detail. Photographer Fotogramma s.r.l. From *The New Museum*.

2.78 Sforzesco Room 8. Photographer Fotogramma s.r.l. From *The New Museum*.

2.79 Sforzesco Room 11. Photographer Fotogramma s.r.l. From *The New Museum*.

2.80 Zürich model. Photographer Bernhard Moosbrugger. From *Werk* vol. 42, September 1955.

2.81 Hans and Peter Pfister, Zürich section. From *Werk* vol. 42, September 1955.

2.82 Hans and Peter Pfister, Zürich sketch. From *Werk* vol. 42, September 1955.

2.83 Bührle collection. Photographer unknown/© Kunsthaus Zürich.

2.84 Museum Folkwang Essen. Photographer Albert Renger-Patzsch. © Albert Renger-Patzsch - Archive Ann and Jürgen Wilde, Zülpich/VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2018.

2.85 *Art in Our Time*. Photographer Soichi Sunami/© The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

2.86 *Collage*. Photographer Soichi Sunami/© The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

2.87 Vienna 1924. Photographer unknown. From Lisa Phillips, *Frederick Kielser*.

2.88 Paris 1925. Photographer unknown. From *Frederick Kielser*.

2.89 Stuttgart 1929. Photographer unknown. From Mary Anne Staniszewski, *The Power of Display.*

2.90 Milan 1936. Photographer unknown. From Richard Paul Lohse, *New Design in Exhibitions*.

2.91 Rietveld chairs. Photographers unknown. From Marijke Küper and Ida van Zijl, *Gerrit Th. Rietveld: The Complete Works 1888–1964*.

2.92 Theo van Doesbrug, *Rhythm of a Russian Dancer* (1918). © Museum of Modern Art, New York.

2.93 Piet Mondrian, *Lozenge Composition with Yellow, Black, Blue, Red, and Gray* (1921). Courtesy of The Art Institute of Chicago. Gift of Miss Peggy Guggenheim.

2.94 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Project for a Brick Country House. © Kunsthalle Mannheim.

2.95 Velvet and Silk Café. Photographer unknown. From Philip C. Johnson, *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.96 Plate-Glass Hall. Photographer unknown. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.97 Unknown delineator, plan of German Pavilion. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.98 German pavilion interior. Photographer Berliner Bild-Bericht. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.99 Unknown delineator, plan of 1931 exhibition house. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.100 1931 exhibition house. Photographer Berliner Bild-Bericht. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.101 Mies/George Danforth, plan of Museum for a Small City. From *The New Museum*.

2.102 Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, elevation sketch. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.103 Mies/George Danforth, collage. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.104 Mies/George Danforth, collage. From *Mies van der Rohe*.

2.105 Carl Petersen, Grønningen drawing. NAL-RDL.

2.106 First Lantern Gallery. Hakon Nielsen/© Scanpix.

2.107 Henie-Onstad 1961. Photographer Jørn Freddie/© LMMA.

2.108 Henry Moore 1961. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

2.109 *5000 Years*. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.110 Partitions. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

2.111 King and Queen. Photographer Per Pejstrup/© LMMA.

2.112 Tree Passage. Photographer unknown/Private collection.

2.113 Jørgen Bo, plan sketch of Tree Passage. NAL-RDL.

2.114 Vilhelm Wohlert, watercolor of cleft passage. © Claus Wohlert.

2.115 Terrace view. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

2.116 Lake Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.117 Lake Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.118 Lake Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.119 Lake Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.120 Lake Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.121 First Lantern Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.122 Second Lantern Gallery. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

2.123 Photographers unknown/Private collection/© LMMA.

3. Chapter 3

3.1 Jazz Night. Photographer Unknown/© LMMA.

3.2 Flemming Flindt. Photographer Mogens von Haven/© LMMA.

3.3 Robert Jacobsen. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

3.4 Bo and Wohlert, interior sketch. NAL-RDL.

3.5 Bo and Wohlert, cafeteria plan. NAL-RDL.

3.6 Knud W. Jensen, sketch for concert hall. © LMMA.

3.7 Bo and Wohlert, Plan A. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.8 Bo and Wohlert, Plan B. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.9 Shadows. Photographer Jesper Høm/© LMMA.

3.10 Bo and Wohlert, September 1959. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.11 Bo and Wohlert, March 1961. NAL-RDL.

3.12 Bo and Wohlert, August 1961. NAL-RDL.

3.13 Bo and Wohlert, interior sketch. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.14 Bo and Wohlert, interior sketch. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.15 *Vitality in Art.* Photographer Jørn Freddie/© LMMA.

3.16 *Mexican Masterworks.* Photographer Jørn Freddie/© LMMA.

3.17 Dream House. Photographer Jesper Høm/© Antonio Wohlert.

3.18 Jørgen Bo and Ole Nørgaard, May 1963. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.19 Basin Garden. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.20 Plan drawing of sculpture garden. © Michael Sheridan.

3.21 Ole Nørgaard, section. EONA.

3.22 Photographer Hans Pedersen/© Scanpix.

3.23 Photographer Roald Pay/© LMMA.

3.24 Entrance. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.25 Heerup Garden. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.26 Middle Terrace. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.27 Upper Terrace. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.28 Sculpture corner. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.29 Clearing. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.30 Observation deck. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.31 Sculpture garden 1975. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

3.32 Jensen Addition. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

3.33 Drawing of Jensen Addition site plan. © Michael Sheridan.

3.34 Old house. Photographer Jesper Høm/© Antonio Wohlert.

3.35 Vestibule. Photographer Jesper Høm/© Antonio Wohlert.

3.36 Palsby House. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

3.37 Overgaard House. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

3.38 Kirstineparken. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

3.39 Piniehøj. Photographer Vilhelm Wohlert/© Claus Wohlert.

3.40 Piniehøj plan. From *Arkitektur* 1962, no. 5.

3.41 Bo and Wohlert, Gyldendal warehouse elevation and section. NAL-RDL.

3.42 Packing hall. Photographer Erik O. Holst. From *Arkitektur* 1962, no. 5.

3.43 Jørgen Bo, 1964 sketch. NAL-RDL.

3.44 Photographer Tage Nielsen/© Scanpix.

3.45 Photographer Tage Nielsen/© Scanpix.

3.46 Vilhelm Wohlert, 1964 plan. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.47 Vilhelm Wohlert, 1964 section. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

3.48 66-Building. Photographer Morten Bo/© LMMA.

3.49 Drawings of 66-Building plan and section. © Michael Sheridan.

3.50 Permanent collection. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

3.51 High Gallery. Photographer Per Pejstrup. From Louisiana *billedreportage og katalog*, 1968.

3.52 Photographer Roald Pay/© LMMA.

3.53 *F-111*. Photographer Asger Sessinge/© LMMA.

3.54 Jørgen Bo, perspective sketch. NAL-RDL.

3.55 Jørgen Bo, perspective section. NAL-RDL.

3.56 Jørgen Bo, plan of lower level. NAL-RDL.

3.57 Drawings of 71-Building plan and sections. © Michael Sheridan.

3.58 High Gallery. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.59 Long Gallery, upper. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.60 Long Gallery, lower. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.61 Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

3.62 Photographer Bent Næsby/© LMMA.

3.63 Fridericianum. Photographer Günther Becker. From Klaus Franck, *Exhibitions*.

3.64 Karlsaue Park. Photographer Günther Becker/© documenta arkiv.

3.65 *The Bathers*. Photographer Günther Becker. From Klaus Franck, *Exhibitions*.

3.66 Aerial view. Photographer Unknown/© Stedelijk Museum.

3.67 Sandberg Wing. Photographer Unknown/© Stedelijk Museum.

3.68 Installation view. Photographer Unknown/© Stedelijk Museum.

3.69 *Movement in Art*. Photographer Unknown/© Moderna Museet.

3.70 *American Pop Art*. Photographer Unknown/© Moderna Museet.

3.71 *Kunst der Mexikaner*. Photographer Unknown/© Kunsthaus Zürich.

3.72 Bo and Wohlert, Haus Pesch. NAL-RDL.

3.73 Stengaard Church. Photographer Jesper Høm. From *Arkitektur* 1963, no. 4.

3.74 Blågaard Seminarium. Photographer Morten Bo. From *Arkitektur* 1969, no. 2.

3.75 Louisiana, 1956. Photographer Unknown. From *Kunst*, no. 5, January 1957.

3.76 *Anna Ancher*. Photographer Unknown. Vintage postcard.

3.77 Ole Nørgaard, Lyngby Chapel. From Malene Hauxner, *Med himlen som loft*.

3.78 Kalundborg parterre. From Sven-Ingvar Andersson and Steen Høyer, *C.Th. Sørensen – en havekunstner*.

3.79 Labyrinth. Photographer unknown. © Foundation Maeght.

3.80 José Luis Sert, site plan. From Knud Bastlund, *José Luis Sert; Architecture, City Planning, Urban Design*.

3.81 Model photo. Photographer unknown. From Knud Bastlund, *José Luis Sert; Architecture, City Planning, Urban Design*.

3.82 Model from below. Expansion scheme. Photographer unknown. From Jan Birksted, *Modernism and the Mediterranean*.

3.83 Main entrance. Photographer unknown. From Birksted, *Modernism and the Mediterranean*.

3.84 Town Hall. Photographer unknown. From Isabelle Maeght, *The Maeght Family: A Passion for Modern Art*.

3.85 Main gallery. Photographer unknown. From *Maeght Family: A Passion for Modern Art*.

3.86 Expansion scheme. Photographer unknown. From Birksted, *Modernism and the Mediterranean*.

3.87 Arman, *Le Plein*, 1960. Photographers Harry Shunk and Janos Kender/Shunk-Kender Archive (2014.R.20) Getty Research Institute. © J. Paul Getty Trust. From Kaira M. Cabanas, *The Myth of Nouveau Realisme: Art and the Performative in Postwar France*.

3.88 Niki de Saint Phalle and friends at Impasse Ronsin. Photographers Harry Shunk and Janos Kender/Shunk-Kender Archive (2014.R.20) Getty Research Institute. © J. Paul Getty Trust. From Pontus Hultén, *Niki de Saint Phalle*.

3.89 Christo, *Wall of Barrels*, 1961–62. Photographer Jean-Dominique Lajoux. From Foster et al., *Art Since 1900*, vol. 2.

3.90 Niki de Saint Phalle, Jean Tinguely and Per Olof Ultvedt, *SHE – A Cathedral, 1966*. Photographer Hans Hammarskjöld/© Moderna Museet.

3.91 Peter Cook, *Plug-in City*. © The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

3.92 Superstudio, *Supersurface, The Happy Island*, 1966. From Craig Buckley, *Graphic Assembly*.

3.93 Groupe Utopie, *Dyodon, Habitation Pneumatique Experimentale*, From Craig Buckley, *Graphic Assembly*.

3.94 Cedric Price, *Fun Palace*, 1962–65. © The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

3.95 Jean Tinguely, *Study for an End of the World No. 1* (1961). Photographer Jørn Freddie/© LMMA.

3.96 Low Gallery. Photographer Morten Bo/© LMMA.

3.97 *Projections*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.98 *Arman*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.99 Long Gallery 1971. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

3.100 Long Gallery 1991. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.

3.101 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.102 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.103 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.104 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.105 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.106 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

3.107 *Warhol*. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© Brahl Fotografi.

4. Chapter 4

4.1 Vilhelm Wohlert, Great Hall perspective. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.2 Vilhelm Wohlert, Great Hall section. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.3 76-Building. Photographer Poul Pedersen/© Scanpix.

4.4 Vilhelm Wohlert, Great Hall section. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.5 Vilhelm Wohlert, Ejby elevation. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.6 Vilhelm Wohlert, Ejby plan. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.7 Vilhelm Wohlert, Ejby plan. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.8 Snape Maltings. Photographer unknown/© Arup Associates.

4.9 Concert hall. Photographer Antonio Wohlert/© Antonio Wohlert.

4.10 Drawings of 76-Building plan and section. © Michael Sheridan.

4.11 Seating area. Photographer Antonio Wohlert/© Antonio Wohlert.

4.12 Concert hall. Photographer Antonio Wohlert/© Antonio Wohlert.

4.13 View of the sea. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.14 *Slender Ribs*. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

4.15 Calder's Olympus. Photographer Pedro E. Guerrero/© Dixie Guerrero.

4.16 Calder Terrace. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

4.17 Henry Moore. Photographer Unknown/© LMMA.

4.18 Ole Nørgaard, section through Moore Garden. EONA.

4.19 Working model. Photographer Ole Nørgaard/EONA.

4.20 Moore Garden. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

4.21 Moore Garden. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

4.22 Winter view. Photographer unknown/Courtesy of Claus Wohlert.

4.23 Ole Nørgaard, 1975 site plan. EONA.

4.24 Knud W. Jensen and Ole Nørgaard, Glass Hall. EONA.

4.25 Knud W. Jensen and Ole Nørgaard, Scheme 11. EONA.

4.26 Thylejren. Photographer Flemming Østergaard/Courtesy of Carsten Hoff.

4.27 *Building Manifesto '76*. Photographer Carsten Hoff/© Carsten Hoff.

4.28 *Building Manifesto '76*. Photographer Carsten Hoff/© Carsten Hoff.

4.29 Alternative Architecture. Photographer Marianne Grøndahl/© LMMA.

4.30 *Boligkulisse*. Photographer Lennart Larsen/© LMMA.

4.31 Viktor IV. Photographer unknown/© Stichting Viktor IV.

4.32 Passengers. Photographer unknown/EONA.

4.33 *Children Are A People*. Photographer Ellen Bangsbo/© LMMA.

4.34 *Bil*. Photographer Ellen Bangsbo/© LMMA.

4.35 *To Svaner*. Photographer Ellen Bangsbo/© LMMA.

4.36 Flying chair. Photographer unknown/EONA.

4.37 Plan drawing of Lake Garden. © Michael Sheridan.

4.38 Seaweed Church 1983. Photographer Carsten Hoff/© Carsten Hoff.

4.39 Seaweed Church 1989. Photographer Carsten Hoff/© Carsten Hoff.

4.40 Artworks from Louisiana's permanent collection. © LMMA and the artists.

4.41 Vilhelm Wohlert, Calder Hall. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.42 Vilhelm Wohlert, Glass Rotunda. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.43 Vilhelm Wohlert, Sculpture Terraces. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

4.44 Jørgen Bo, study for the South Wing. NAL-RDL.

4.45 Jørgen Bo, "sliced bread" plan. NAL-RDL.

4.46 Jørgen Bo, "sliced bread" section. NAL-RDL.

4.47 Jørgen Bo, L-shaped galleries. NAL-RDL.

4.48 Jørgen Bo, May 1978 plan. NAL-RDL.

4.49 Jørgen Bo, stepped passage. NAL-RDL.

4.50 Overhead view of model. Photographer Antonio Wohlert/© LMMA.

4.51 Oblique view of model. Photographer Antonio Wohlert/© LMMA.

4.52 South Wing model. Photographer Louis Schnakenburg/© LMMA.

4.53 Jørgen Bo, section through South Wing. From *Arkitektur* 1982, no. 7.

4.54 Plan drawing of South Wing. © Michael Sheridan.

4.55 Museum shop. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.56 Meeting corner. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.57 Park Passage. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.58 First L-shaped Gallery. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.59 Second L-shaped Gallery. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.60 View into inside corner. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.61 View from inside corner. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.62 Diagonal path. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

4.63 Third L-shaped gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

4.64 Upper gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./ © LMMA.

4.65 Upper gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

4.66 Stair hall. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.67 Reading room. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.68 Panorama Room exterior. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.69 Panorama Room from water. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

4.70 Forest view. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.71 Middle Terrace. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

4.72 Lower Terrace. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.73 Lower Terrace. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.74 Gammel Strandvej. Photographer Keld Helmer-Petersen/© LMMA.

4.75 Richard Rogers and Renzo Piano, competition montage. From Dal Co, *Centre Pompidou*.

4.76 Archigram, *Living City*, 1963. From Peter Cook, *Archigram*.

4.77 Archigram, *Instant City*, 1968–69. From Peter Cook, *Archigram*.

4.78 Centre Pomipdou. Photographer unknown. From Dal Co, *Centre Pompidou*.

4.79 Museum Abteiberg. Photographer unknown. From *The Architectural Review*, no. 1030, December 1982.

4.80 Architectural model. Photographer unknown. From Heinrich Klotz, *New Museum Buildings in the Federal Republic of Germany*.

4.81 Hans Hollein, plan diagram. From Klotz, *New Museum Buildings …*

4.82 Square gallery. Photographer unknown. From Klotz, *New Museum Buildings…*

4.83 Double-height gallery. Photographer unknown. From Klotz, *New Museum Buildings…*

4.84 Open-plan gallery. Photographer unknown. From Klotz, *New Museum Buildings …*

4.85–4.91 Exhibition spaces. Photographer unknown. From *The Architectural Review*, no. 1030, December 1982.

4.92 Competition model. Photographer Adalbert Helwig. From Alberto Baratelli, *James Stirling: La Galleria di Stato di Stoccarda*.

4.93 Entry level plan. From Richard Weston, *Key Buildings of the Twentieth Century*.

4.94 Upper level plan. From *Key Buildings of the Twentieth Century*.

4.95 View of terrace. Photographer Richard Bryant. From Deyan Sudjic, *Norman Foster, Richard Rogers, James Stirling: New Directions in British Architecture.*

4.96 Schlemmer Gallery. Photographer unknown. From Klotz, *New Museum Buildings …*

4.97 James Stirling and Michael Wilford, section-perspective. From Thomas Muirhead, *James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates, Buildings & Projects, 1975–1992*.

4.98 Room 39. Photographer Richard Bryant. From Sudjic, *Norman Foster, Richard Rogers, James Stirling: New Directions in British Architecture.*

4.99 Room 30. Photographer unknown. From Klotz, *New Museum Buildings …*

4.100 Competition model. Photographer Adalbert Helwig. From Alberto Baratelli, *James Stirling: La Galleria di Stato di Stoccarda*.

4.101 Bo and Wohlert, perspective. From *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977).

4.102 Bo and Wohlert, perspective. From *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977).

4.103 Bo and Wohlert, upper level plan. From *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977).

4.104 Bo and Wohlert, entry level plan. From *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977).

4.105 Bo and Wohlert, elevation. From *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977).

4.106 Bo and Wohlert, section. From *Wettbewerbe Aktuell*, vol. 7, no. 5/6 (December 1977).

4.107 Aerial view. Photographer unknown. From Pardey, *Louisiana and Beyond*.

4.108 Bo and Wohlert, Bochum site plan. From *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3.

4.109 Bo and Wohlert, Bochum plans and section. From *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3.

4.110 Double-height space. Photographer unknown. From *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3.

4.111 Lobby. Photographer Unknown. From *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3.

4.112 2019 exhibition. Photographer unknown/© Museum Bochum.

4.113 Exterior 1983. Photographer unknown. From *Arkitektur DK* 1984, no. 3.

4.114 Exterior 2018. Photographer unknown/© Museum Bochum.

4.115 Neue Nationalgalerie. Unknown amateur photographer.

4.116 National Gallery of Art. Unknown amateur photographer.

4.117 Kunstmuseum Basel. Photographer unknown. From Nikolaus Meier, *Kunstmuseum Basel: Die Architektur.*

5. Chapter 5

5.1 Louisiana, 1986. Photographer unknown/EONA.

5.2 Richard Serra. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

5.3 *The Gate in the Gorge*. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

5.4 George Trakas, site sketch for *Self Passage*. © LMMA and the artist.

5.5 Platform. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

5.6 Path. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

5.7 Steps. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

5.8 Deck. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

5.9 Vilhelm Wohlert, 11 September 1983. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.10 Vilhelm Wohlert, 11 September 1983. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.11 Plan drawing of East Wing. © Michael Sheridan.

5.12 Conservatory. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

5.13 Lower Terrace. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.

5.14 Conservatory. Photographer Bent Næsby/© LMMA.
5.15 Second Rectangular gallery. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.16 Curved Passage. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.17 Curved Passage. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.18 Column Hall. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.19 Mezzanine. Photographer Keld-Helmer Petersen/© LMMA.
5.20 Great Hall. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.21 *Mother and Child*. Photographer Poul Buchard for Strüwing/© LMMA.
5.22 Winter Garden. Photographer Bent Næsby/© LMMA.
5.23 Winter Garden. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.24 Spiral stair. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.25 Fern-filled cleft. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.26 Footbridge. Photographer unknown/EONA.
5.27 Greenhouse. Photographer Keld-Helmer Petersen/© LMMA.
5.28 Jørgen Bo and Stig Løcke, June 1991. © Stig Løcke.
5.29 Jørgen Bo and Stig Løcke, August 1991. © Stig Løcke.
5.30 June 1993. Photographer Aage Strüwing/© LMMA.
5.31 Model. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.
5.32 Children's House. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.33 Upper level. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.34 Serpentine stair. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.35 View to the lake. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.36 Winter view. Photographer Poul Buchard for Strüwing/© LMMA.
5.37 *Bro over Humlebæken*. Photographer Poul Buchard for Strüwing/© LMMA.
5.38 *Snegletunneln*. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.39 *Hyttefadslabyrinten*. Photographer Peter Leth-Larsen/© the photographer.
5.40 The Glass House. Photographer Poul Buchard for Strüwing/© LMMA.
5.41 Interior. Photographer unknown/© LMMA.
5.42 Shop expansion. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.43 Exhibition building. Photographer Jens Frederiksen/© LMMA.
5.44 Winter Garden 2018. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.
5.45 Interior 2018. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.
5.46 Interior 2018. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.
5.47 Conservatory 2018. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.
5.48 Richard Serra. Photographer J. Brokerhof. From Oxenaar, *Kröller-Müller Museum*.
5.49 Jean Dubuffet. Photographer J. Brokerhof. From *Kröller-Müller Museum*.
5.50 Aerial view. Photographer NL Aerocartio. From Aloi, *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*.
5.51 Central passage. Photographer Hans Sibbelee. From *Musei: Architettura – Tecnica*.
5.52 R. M. J. M. Hoefsloot (delineator), site plan. From *Kröller-Müller Museum*, 1978.
5.53 Wim Quist, museum plan. From *Kröller-Müller Museum*, 1978.
5.54 Aerial view 1977. Photographer NL Aerocartio. From Oxenaar, *Nieuwbouw 1970–1977*.
5.55 Entrance. Photographer Jan en Fridtjof. From *Nieuwbouw 1970–1977*.

5.56 Dan Flavin. Photographer J. Brokerhof. From *Kröller-Müller Museum*.

5.57 Passage. Photographer Mathilde E. Jurrissen. From *Kröller-Müller Museum*.

5.58 Restaurant. Photographer Jan en Fridtjof. From *Nieuwbouw 1970–1977*.

5.59 Gallery. Photographer unknown. From *Nieuwbouw 1970–1977*.

5.60 Gallery. Photographer unknown. From *Nieuwbouw 1970–1977*.

5.61 Sculpture gallery. Photographer Mathilde E. Jurrissen. From *Kröller-Müller Museum*.

5.62 Vilhelm Wohlert, 14 April 1987. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.63 Vilhelm Wohlert, 17 April 1988. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.64 Vilhelm Wohlert, 27 November 1988. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.65 Vilhelm Wohlert, 15 January 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.66 Vilhelm Wohlert, 5 June 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.67 Vilhelm Wohlert, 22 January 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.68 Vilhelm Wohlert, 15 January 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.69 Vilhelm Wohlert, March 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.70 Vilhelm Wohlert, March 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.71 Vilhelm Wohlert, March 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.72 Vilhelm Wohlert, section. From Knud W. Jensen, *Louisianas nye grafikfløjen*.

5.73 Vilhelm Wohlert, gallery perspective. From *Louisianas nye grafikfløjen*.

5.74 Vilhelm Wohlert, study for Conservatory. From *Louisianas nye grafikfløjen*.

5.75 Vilhelm Wohlert, study for Conservatory, 29 June 1989. March 1989. © Wohlert Arkitekter.

5.76 First Lantern Gallery, 2014. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA

5.77 First Lantern Gallery, 2015. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA

5.78 Lake Gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.79 Low Gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.80 Low Gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.81 Long Gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.82 Second L-shaped gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.83 Third L-shaped gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.84 Second L-shaped gallery. Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.85 Pamela Rosenkranz, *Anamazon* (2017). Photographer Anders Sune Berg/© LMMA.

5.86 Candace Breitz, *Working Class Hero* (2006). Photographer Poul Buchard for Brøndum & Co./© LMMA.

5.87 First rectangular gallery. Photographer Kim Hansen/© LMMA.

6. Folded Site Plans

Louisiana 1956. Axel Paludan. © LMMA.

Louisiana 1958. © Michael Sheridan.

Louisiana 1971. © Michael Sheridan.

Louisiana 1982. © Michael Sheridan.

Louisiana 1991/98. © Michael Sheridan.

Finis