DAVID HOFFMAN MOMA HISTORY INTERVIEWS

INTERVIEW WITH:	**RICHARD OLDENBURG (RO)[1]**
INTERVIEWERS:	**CARL COLBY (CC); HARVEY ARDMAN (HA); RUTH CUMMINGS (RC)**
LOCATION:	**THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART**
DATE:	**1983**
TRANSCRIBER:	**JANET CROWLEY, TRANSCRIPTION COMPLETED JULY 11, 2018**

CC: If you could talk about, in the film, the future direction of the Museum and, rather than make too broad of a question, maybe give us an explanation for why did you expand, or why are you expanding. What is the philosophy behind that and why was it a necessity; or was it a question of economic survival?

RO: Well, one of the problems here is the question of whither goes the Museum in the future and so on, it doesn't make terribly good copy. The fact that there isn't any great answer, but in other words, we are now shifting direction and it's all going to be a whole new world and the whole Museum's going to be very different, so I don't see [INAUDIBLE: 0:00:43] that they will be happy. I think there's going to be differences in part shaped by the differences of our time and the society. Different demands will range from the reasonably boring, obvious ones, to the age in audience and leisure time and all of those questions and the kind of [INAUDIBLE: 0:00:59] expectations with museums. A lot of those things. Plus obviously, the ultimate determinant for any museum is the state of the arts and what has happened. We have one great advantage in that area because our scope is so broad. We take in all of these areas, and sometimes we have a fallow period in painting and sculpture, [INAUDIBLE: 0:01:20] photography or film. So I have no doubt that there will be plenty of food for the Museum to feed on, but that is exactly what the Museum really is shaped by, is what happens in art. And if suddenly the artists effectively decided that they never wanted to show in a museum [INAUDIBLE: 0:01:36] show there, then the Museum's shape would be somewhat different than the decision if they all went back to

[1] Also present, Luisa Kreisberg (LK), the MoMA Director of Public Information (Press Office).

[INAUDIBLE: 0:01:42]. [Laughter] So I think that the pre-planned [INAUDIBLE: 0:01:45] that isn't very difficult to do, plus I think that we have been doing a pretty good job. To answer the question about the expansion, the financial consideration is completely secondary. What it was was a means of accomplishing what we desperately needed and recognized that we needed back when the last expansion took place. As you probably have heard from Dick Koch or any of these others, when that last expansion in '64 was done, the hope had been to have another kind of [INAUDIBLE: 0:02:18]. When the financial crush started getting tighter, we had to give up that plan, and we were left with a museum that, thank god, was substantially larger than it had been, but was still inadequate even then, for the collections that we had. And so through this whole time, it's been [necessary] to find the space for all of these areas, not only showing the collection but additional exhibition space, which, the equivalent of exhibition space for the Film Department is another auditorium, which we've got. The study centers were too small in relation to the students that we were handling. Even the public areas were notably too small when people came on weekends and so the crush in the elevators would be impossible at Christmas time. So all of those things, that was what we began with, and the expansion plan project as such grew out of, simply, how could we accomplish that at a time when we were running major deficits and no one could really responsibly do this. And we've been doing few plans before my time, and all kinds of plans on how the building could be added on: building over the Garden Wing, or building under the Garden, was one. All of them founded simply on the expectation that if we raised the money and still couldn't run the place without some of the income. So, this all grew out of it and largely through Dick Koch's—because Dick was the person who kept evolving these different plans, all through [INAUDIBLE: 0:03:50].

CC: Yes, and we were intrigued by that and we actually think that, condensed into a short little nugget, I think the rationale for why it was built—because you can't end a film and suddenly show, oh well, by the way, here's the new museum and that tower is part of an apartment and it is part of the—I mean you would have to [INAUDIBLE: 0:04:06].

HA: Yes.

RO: The rationale is, how do you create a new income stream? If the city at that time had been willing to give us the money, absolutely straight, well, we would have been delighted with that. And this way it turned out to be an interesting—and I know now from, every time I go to a conference, it's been enormously effective. There are—some terrible mistakes are going to be made as a result of—everybody in Denver wants to build over that crazy museum. [Laughter]

LK: Philippe de Montebello, said to me, one day, when I had lunch up there, at the invitation of [INAUDIBLE: 0:04:40], and Mr. Montebello was invited, and we were talking about publicity and how much publicity the Met certainly gets, and that MoMA gets its share. And I said, "But it's an interesting time and everybody is competing for space, and everyone wants to be highly visible, and we worry about that." And he says, "But everybody doesn't have an apartment building on top." [Laughter] And I hadn't thought about that and I said, "You know, you're right." Incidentally, that's true.

HA: That's only now but later...

CC: There are also some basic things that people—you already know it so you may even forget it, but, well, you might not forget this, but, the public doesn't know, for instance, that most museums are supported by the city or state in which they're in, and you are a private institution. That's part of the novelty, really.

LK: It's a shock to a lot of people.

HA: Yes it is.

CC: It's also a question of—I'm sure 50 percent of the people who still come through your doors, when they pay the admission they think, well, $1.70 or $1.50 or $2.00, or whatever it is, they pay the money and then they think, well, the other two bucks is coming from the Rockefellers. It's ingrained in their minds that there are these extremely wealthy two or three people out there who are feeding them.

RO: Certainly, we also struggle with, in another sense, this irrational expectation that museums should be free, basically. Whereas the same people think nothing about the opera or a concert, which are all subsidized in one way or another, but the idea that we should be paying at the door for museums somehow—

CC: Well, Washington is the reason for that, I think. Washington D.C. is the—people get used to—

HA: The Smithsonian.

RO: Now it's changing somewhat, but obviously the experience when you go to Europe there are state museums and all of this. But even the smaller ones, for example, in Washington, Armand Hammer makes it possible for the Corcoran to be free, as though that were the normal thing. So we have [INAUDIBLE: 0:06:23] there. The other problem that we've got as I've discovered recently is that even my colleagues, the art museum directors, there isn't *anybody* I talk to who doesn't think that we are the owners of this building selling the apartments. People came up to me last night at the Met and say, "You know, I've persuaded some friends of ours to buy an apartment in your building. I hope you're pleased." I said, "Thank you, Scarlet [INAUDIBLE: 0:06:42]." [Laughter] It's such a bizarre thing that we can't get that across.

HA: Well, it's The Museum Tower.

RO: They ask you, how are the apartments selling? [Laughter]

CC: I guess they expect that, as they go up, Kynaston McShine will be showing apartments on the 9th floor; Bill Rubin will be showing them on the 16th floor, but you'll be showing them on the whatever—the top floor.

RO: The first question is, how are they doing; the second question is, are you going to take an apartment there. [Laughter]

LK: Everybody asks you that. And then they ask, is the Museum taking an apartment there? And I say, "No."

CC: One of the questions that we've come up with is, and some people call it a false question, really, is that, you go back to the old Gertrude Stein thing, how can you have a museum that is modern at [the] same time?

RO: I'm very tired of that question. It's boring.

CC: It's very, very tired, and a lot of people have said that, you were once so—

HA: But it's only tiresome to people who have heard it so many times. To the audience outside there, it's a new idea.

CC: Well, put it this way—

RO: Bill Rubin has a wonderful casuistical analysis of that that says it's completely different from what they intended at the outset.

LK: Oh really?

CC: Let's swing it around a little bit. It used to be that in old [Alfred] Barr's day there were articles that would be coming in calling the shows paintings by maniacs, and people would go through the galleries and [say], oh my god, look at that, and all of that fun [interruption while RO receives a message]. What I'm asking about is, if, in some people's minds, the battle is won—The [Museum of] Modern Art set out [as] the early Christians and now you went to the show last night, it's not here, but in a way, you know, this is the Vatican. So, how has that changed things? You became institutionalized probably not in the—beyond the formal sense but in a larger sense, after the War, when you were building more staff, [Nelson] Rockefeller came in, things—what's the status now? How do you feel about that? Has it lost its missionary zeal, and how do you—? What do you replace that with?

RO: There are several answers to it. In part, there is a certain misunderstanding about how the Museum was conceived, because it was never Alfred Barr's intention that it be a gallery, in that sense, constantly presenting the new. And again, our—you've probably gotten these quotes repeated so many times about Alfred. What was said that—what he really—he was interested in two things. He was interested in having critical judgments made on what was happening, and he thought that the Museum, in a famous quote, should "stay a few steps behind" and analyze. And that, I still think, is one of the most important functions, and oddly enough, you could argue, in many ways, a still more important function than it used to be. I mean, we're not introducing something absolutely new. But we're choosing from this huge universe of what our curators rightly or wrongly think is of particular importance or interest and so forth. People look to the Museum for that [tape break]. And also, it was always Alfred's plan that we would be presenting this backdrop of a collection, and to some extent, that is

different from what people's idea was that it was always going to be the fresh and new. It began, in the beginning, with this battle to get the Trustees to accept the fact that what he wanted was a place where people could come and see the history of modern art and how it developed as a *backdrop* to whatever he was putting on.

HA: I see.

RO: And he felt that both of those, unless juxtaposed, would suffer. That the classic art would not be seen in relation to what was happening now, and he thought that was a very important role for the Museum, to get people to *understand* what was happening now. And vice versa, that if you couldn't see the—if you saw only the classical art, you'd be out of touch with the present. And it's one of the reasons, going back to your original point, that expansion is of particular significance for this museum, because the whole concept of the collection, it is harder for us to winnow down the collection and decide that we'll only have this on view, because what we're purporting to do—and again, a word you'll hear a lot from people—is to present a synoptic view. And we don't have the choice to excise a whole portion of the history of modern art and say, 'Well those pictures aren't as great as these, so we're not going to do them.' And so the collection has been built on the effort to get the absolutely prime, best examples of movements or particular artists of all the sort of—at some point you need the gallery space to present that view, or you're distorting the very history you're doing. That's just as true in some of the other areas as it is in painting and sculpture. And so it's really incumbent on the Museum to [INAUDIBLE: 0:11:10]. The only way the Museum could otherwise cease to grow would be if it stopped and decided, okay, [INAUDIBLE: 0:11:15]. Going back to the other question, you talked about the Alfred thing, the business of, I think, you have an obligation, obviously, to the whole history of modern art, which is a hundred years old, which is after all, 50 years more than it was when Alfred started the place and there was no other city for it. And it is, thanks to Alfred's timing, it is the Vatican, it is the greatest place—there is no place in the world where you can go and see that. And that's not a value to be despised. That's not something you say, 'Gee, you're only that.' [Laughter] Because to be that, [INAUDIBLE: 0:11:49].

HA: That would be quite sufficient, yes.

RO: And so I think people take that aspect for granted, and then they look and say, 'Well, where's the rest of it?' And there I would like to believe, partly with greater space, possibly—because I think there's been some distorted view of that, the fact that we haven't had the space, with showing historic collections, there's too little space for contemporary, and there's been too little gallery space to show it. I think the old argument that Alfred had is still particularly valid; you want to juxtapose the two. Because even though the battle may be won in the sense that there is no sophisticated person now who will not pretend to accept anything that has happened in modern art—

CC: [Laughs] [INAUDIBLE: 0:12:29].

RO: Well, that's a healthy attitude. The thing is that, in fact, what you've got, is a public that continues, on a very sophisticated level, to be often very puzzled, not only by the brand new, but going back to [INAUDIBLE: 0:12:44].

HA: Yes, that's right.

RO: And we certainly see it here with the corporate people, and obviously it's not an intelligence test, it's a question of really wanting a better understanding, and they look to the Museum to do that, because there's no reason why they can expect that on a gallery jaunt downtown. They look to the Museum to give them some help to make the selection that they don't feel confident to make. And in fact, that's a danger for the Museum, because what you get into is a kind of validation where the expectation that anything that's shown at the Museum is the greatest thing since sliced bread, which isn't the intention of the curators. What they're in effect saying is, we think this is interesting; we think this is worth attention; or we think this is something that will help you to understand. It doesn't mean we think this is the greatest art [INAUDIBLE: 0:13:30].

CC: Do you think it's better or worse or so very different to be running the Museum now, in 1983, contending as you have to with, not simply funding from trustees, but from government and from grants and capital campaigns, et cetera, as it was, let's say, for Barr in 1930, when really he was depending on the largesse of a few wealthy people? And then go back a hundred years from [INAUDIBLE: 0:13:57] back, and it would be—

RO: Well, in Barr's case—and there's such a difference of scale, all you have to do is look back in the history and you'll see that Alfred was going mad because he knew where some of the greatest works could be had for $14.00 and he only had $11.00. [Laughter] It didn't change. What was that wonderful thing? When I think that Alfred was given $500 or something to go off to Europe and came back with [INAUDIBLE: 0:14:22]. It was just scope. Alfred had exactly the same worries. He needed space for the collection. He was always begging for that from the Trustees. He needed acquisitions funds, which they were not very prepared to do, and ironically, the greatest patron of this Museum was someone who was never a trustee, Mrs. Simon Guggenheim. [She was] much more generous than any of the Trustees, which is why Alfred dedicated the book of painting and sculpture in the collection to her. [INAUDIBLE: 0:14:52] [laughter]. And so space, money. Also, he did all the great quotes about the courage and rise to the occasion. Alfred had an uphill fight for a lot of the purchases. What he did have in the shows were a lot of people who wanted him to be quite conservative. In fact, the opening show [*Cezanne, Gauguin, Seurat, Van Gogh*] was not really what Alfred had in mind.

CC: We saw a terrific letter in the Archives from Mrs. [Abby Aldrich] Rockefeller from Seal Harbor to Alfred Barr explaining why she felt their opening show should be French.

HA: So gently; she was so gentle about it.

CC: It was so terrific. Her reasons were so good. One, she felt that—

HA: Well, there were other American artists who—

CC: There was already an American artist show in the same building, of more current ones, so why incur the wrath—why, number one, appear to be behind them. Number two, why incur the wrath immediately of the American audience; we're going to have to tend with that later anyway. She says that we'll have to get to [that] anyway; let's present the best we have first. It was terrific, because in a way, it's probably a primer on trustee-art museum director relationships. It's a terrific letter.

RO: I think it's all scale, because there was just as much irritation over a $6,000 deficit then as over a million dollar deficit now. There is different—obviously, it's a different world that this museum never enjoyed, the world of the Metropolitan, in those days, and the Morgan and the Frick, where there really was no—no one thought they had any problems and the last thing they wanted was support from any other source.

RC: Right.

HA: Well, 30 years from now, your successor or your successor's successor, will he be struggling with the same—? Will he be also thinking, how can we expand? How can we find another income stream?

RO: I'm afraid so; I fully expect so.

HA: I wonder about that because now paintings are so expensive to acquire, I cannot see the collection explosively expanding.

RO: Well, the [INAUDIBLE: 0:16:55] atmosphere, the expensiveness of old masters in our field is preposterous. On the other hand, there again, you're dealing in Monopoly money because the values have risen. We—a great many of our pictures, as you know, were acquired by exchange, by trading off other works.

HA: Yes.

RO: Now we are almost—there aren't too many we can spare any more, so that's what's been bringing it to an end. But while it lasted, while we still had some pictures in the collection that we could trade off, the same picture that was at this level is now at this level, so—much more limiting, however, is the fact that pictures of that quality just don't come on the market any more. If the National Gallery—

RC: Individuals get them now? Are you saying that?

HA: They're in a museum.

RO: They're rapidly moving into public institutions.

HA: Right.

RO: And the ones that—and they tend to do that—even the ones that are in private collections, most of the great pictures are either promised or—

CC: Not too many [Georges] Seurats [INAUDIBLE: 0:17:50].

HA: So I can't see another quadrupling of Museum gallery space in 30 years. I don't see why it would be necessary.

RO: No but the question will come up more—

CC: The other budgets?

RO: No, of contemporary work and collecting, I suppose. But there, you're going to go through the same process of refining what we've gone through, and so you acquire, again, as Alfred Barr said somewhat too modestly; he questioned whether more than a tenth of what they were acquiring would stand the test of time. But we have been acquiring a great deal more than—less than Alfred did, because it's much more expensive now, but at the same time, there's no question it'll be winnowed out. On the other hand, time, every decade, brings [INAUDIBLE: 0:18:32] showing the work. The reason I don't really project the kind of expansion with any particular joy, is that I think, just offhand, I really don't like huge museums, and I think that the fact that this museum is now hemmed in may prove ultimately to be an advantage. I can't see anyone ever, I hope, building over the Garden really, and we can't physically move in other directions because the Museum [INAUDIBLE: 0:19:01]. So, I think if this Museum did find itself expanding, the direction in which it would expand, if other people would want us to do it right now, would be a satellite museum in Soho or something, which would show particularly contemporary work in the collection. We've had discussions of the like, and it's a possibility. It's one, however, that I don't want to take the risk of blurring our focus at the moment. We're going to have difficulty when the Museum opens because, of all of the talk about expansion, expanded as it is, it will not be perceived as being enough, because with the attempt to put out greater depth in all the other collection areas, we will still be visibly restricted on the space for contemporary work. And these artists will be very disappointed. They would have hoped that as soon as this building opened—

HA: This is their big chance; now they'll have a show.

CC: Like the family who moves into their new apartment and everybody's [INAUDIBLE: 0:19:54].

HA: And they still don't get a room. [Laughing] Right.

RO: The only way which you can—

CC: The kid still doesn't get his own room.

LK: You'll always fill up all the space.

RO: Yes. Well, the only way in which we'd be able to answer that is, and we will attempt to, unlike a lot of the rest of the collection, we will, even in the collection areas, expect to rotate a great deal of the contemporary work.

LK: And certainly circulate [INAUDIBLE: 0:20:15].

CC: If you can think of maybe a couple of people who we may not have mentioned who might be able to speak intelligently about the Museum from the earliest days on, or even an outside person who might comment on, let's say, the role of the Rockefellers or someone—we're just concerned that if we get to certain areas—for instance, if we speak to David Rockefeller and/or say Blanchette and Philip Johnson, but that nobody, let's say, really fills the bill, if nobody speaks about them.

RC: Evokes the Rockefeller story.

CC: With that overview, people have mentioned Tom Braden, maybe knew him, or someone who knew Nelson Rockefeller. If you can think of anybody on the outside who could comment well, it might be helpful to us.

RO: Well, the best person however and the one who—I mean, she really is the greatest of all, is Eliza Parkinson. Eliza on the subject of Nelson is just terrific.

CC: Okay.

HA: Good.

RO: But as far as somebody more distant, there are others, but I'd have to just think about it. We've been over that list many times, but...

LK: We're going to make you a list of what they have already, the people they've seen.

CC: We'll give you a checklist of who we've seen.

LK: And some that they're suggesting to see, so you can respond to it on a piece of paper. I think it's hard to [INAUDIBLE: 0:21:28] very preliminary anyway.

HA: It sounds to me like the problems that you're dealing with today are the ones that you were dealing with from the first moment that you were sitting in this chair.

RO: [Laughs] Oh yes.

HA: It hasn't changed a bit, and doesn't look like it's ever going to change, really.

RO: No, well, that's I think, to some extent, that's true. Only, the same problems just come back in slightly different guises. And the reason, as I said—and if you really get to making this film I can crank myself up to make great, optimistic statements [laughter] but the truth of the matter is that I really—you know, it's hard for me when some foundation wants some great magic projection of a new future. I don't really believe that the changes are going to be that great, and the changes that I really think are significant are the ones that you can't predict. They're going to be changes in the art scene.

HA: Changes in the content.

RO: Changes in the content, the direction.

LK: It is certainly happening in lots of those—a couple of things here that I somewhat—you'll be having a lot more time with Dick, but our market research. If you remember, I did some market research to establish for ourselves our advertising bases; yielded the information that most people expect, from this expansion, more of everything. It'll be bigger and it'll be better. Those were the key words.

RC: Superlatives.

LK: To be bigger and better. They're accustomed to—

HA: It's not? [Laughing]

LK: Yes, of course [laughter]. [INAUDIBLE: 0:22:57].

HA: It's not going to bigger, it's not going to be better, just expanded.

LK: I mean, to give you some sense. They've always—it was a very positive feeling toward, in the past, that it was great, so that there was something dynamic happening. They're going to expect that to intensify, that experience. Now, hopefully, it will. I don't know if it will or won't, but they certainly, by spreading out and showing more of everything, I think the experience of this new museum will be—

RO: Well, I haven't touched on the excitement of this. I really do believe that, when I said I could crank myself up for the visionary stuff, it's only because I find that harder.

LK: But the whole experience—

RO: But what we're really trying to accomplish here, I think it's going to be fantastic [INAUDIBLE: 0:23:35] watching the history and develop the layout of the works in the galleries, the spaces should be exciting, and the whole [INAUDIBLE: 0:23:44].

HA: Well, the average visitor to the Museum—let's say the person who came here after the last expansion who walked through the Museum in, let's say, 1964, how is his experience going to be different in 1984?

RO: Well, the example that—take one change, that in '64—I'm pretty sure it was the first time that some of the collections like Architecture and Design weren't visible at all. Those collections just weren't visible. Now you can take Architecture and Design and just explode into—

LK: A whole floor.

RO: A whole floor, and the collections will be on view.

CC: That's terrific.

HA: Yes, I like that, too.

RC: You don't have to squash—

RO: As you know, that collection is becoming—it's kind of mediated because it's something that most people can relate to very easily.

HA: That's right.

RO: Because we're dealing with objects and they are familiar in many cases. So it's a wonderful kind of introduction to the Museum [INAUDIBLE: 0:24:35].

CC: And Photography, too will be a huge—

RO: Photography, the same. I mean, all of those areas, there's always a tendency to over-focus on painting and sculpture, as though that were the only novel thing in the Museum's—

RC: That sense you've got now, when you walk through Painting and Sculpture, and there's these little outcroppings. How does that relate to—?

RO: Well, this has been one of the big perceptions was that when the '64 [building] opened, you in fact sort of stumbled on the Architecture and Design [INAUDIBLE: 0:25:01]. We were so conscious of that in the new plan of the building, that quite aside from allocating the space, what we wanted to complete was immediately evident, and you can see it on the plans. You come up to these landings, and immediately you're right on—the second landing is photographers' books, but you see right there to the end of Painting and Sculpture. The same thing is true of Prints and Drawings on the next level, and Architecture and Design goes right up to that so that it will be much clearer that what was such a remarkable concept for this place has been followed through.

LK: The very physical—

RO: I understand that's true of Film; I'm sure Mary Lea [Bandy] could talk about that. We'll now be able to juggle both special programs and classic [INAUDIBLE: 0:25:38] at the same time, the balancing act that we—

HA: That's a good answer. It sounds to me like it's going to be a very different experience for a person, over that 20 year period, to come and see the new Museum.

CC: [INAUDIBLE: 0:25:47] picture because this film will be coming out just about the time of the premiere of the building.

LK: The opening.

CC: So it should be very much a part of it.

RC: It gives it the perspective—

RO: Oh, there are a lot of aspects of this; I think it's a mistake to—and that might be a useful tack for you to take with some of the people—it's not simply bigger, because there are thought-out changes in plans for things that we haven't been able to do that we want to do. And I think the experience will be—at the same time, we've been quite concerned to hold on to some of the things that are special about this place: that it isn't too huge and that it has some kind of feeling [INAUDIBLE: 0:26:20].

LK: The multi-dimensional, the multi-medium concept itself of the curatorial departments will be very clear in the new configuration. It was harder for people to understand that in the past.

HA: I think that sounds like a distinct improvement for the visitor.

RO: That's going to be a major thing that's also going to—we'd like to think it's going to have the further effect of people coming here knowing that there's always something new, not simply the exhibitions. The plan will be to, in the areas, for example, of more so [INAUDIBLE: 0:26:51] plus some painting and sculpture, but even there, the contemporary scene will be [INAUDIBLE: 0:26:54], but in Photography and Drawings and Prints, that we'll be circulating things.

HA: So there's rotation everywhere, throughout the Museum.

LK: All throughout the Museum, constantly.

RO: In fact, we'll be running shows all over. You will not feel that you've gone and seen [INAUDIBLE: 0:27:06].

HA: Mm-hm.

LK: In summing up, just let me say that, because I didn't belong here but next time I won't interfere, but [laughter] I think it's important to know about Dick, that Dick himself, as you know, has been here 10 years, but it's sort of providential that you are the son of a diplomat, brother of an artist [Claes Oldenburg], you might have been, really wanted to be, [RO laughs] [INAUDIBLE: 0:27:34], no, no, for

sitting in this chair at this time. And he'll be modest about it, but it's a lot harder, really, he says, because the responsibility is far greater than anyone can realize.

HA: When I read about the directors of the past and what they've gone through, I realize how hard that chair has to be. [Laughing] To have lived through it is amazing.

LK: If you can sense what you're getting from doing all of these interviews, you can imagine how it all centers on one figure here who has to deal in every day with what are becoming gigantic responsibilities. It's not a joke just to put this thing up; it's hard work.

RC: But that's how you get through it, right? By joking. [Laughter]

LK: He's amazingly diplomatic, which, I wouldn't be so polite most of the time. But Dick manages people very remarkably, and it's a hard one. And I think getting this thing done is putting a lot of stress—this is one of the things we talk about internally a lot, we're all under a lot of stress to get it done. And that's the worst kind of stress, I suppose, for a director, is that thing that goes on internally with people who need to be creative and keep doing their thing.

HA: Is it all on schedule, reasonably? I mean, is it going to happen when you think?

RO: No, it's predictably off schedule. [Laughter] It's what we know we're [INAUDIBLE: 0:28:50] IBM or AT&T but we are later than we would have liked.

LK: But it will be good for the film now, we'll have it at the same time

RC: One last—this is a screen test. [Laughter]

RO: Okay.