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On the Construction of Pop Art
When American Pop Arrived in Stockholm in 1964

Annika Öhrner
It seems that there are chances that this can be made in 1964 already. We have seen a lot of the followers here and there is a risk that the whole “pop” thing will be misunderstood in Europe, if we see all the followers before we see the originals. (I would be glad if you could help us with these plans, and speak to the artists about them.)

Pontus Hultén to Richard Bellamy

Art historical accounts have often relied on the idea of American pop art arriving in Europe in a sudden, almost aggressive act with immediate impact on the local milieu. It has been described as a more or less effortless conquest of the European art scene, accomplished through the power of the strong images themselves, after the pop music and the film industry had paved the way. It was and often continues to be claimed that pop art’s way of bridging the gap between high and low culture, while incorporating images and symbols from American everyday life into art, as well as pop art’s role in the radical redrawing of the geography of the Western art world were important factors for this influence. Authors such as Irving Sandler, Serge Guilbault, and Catherine Dossier have relied on different historical models of explanation of how America conquered Europe with

Intriguing as they are, they have not sufficiently accounted for the necessary interaction between the European parties and Manhattan art life to make this happen, nor the full impact of the coinciding strategies of several very different positions at this spatio-chronological point. The first American Pop Art show in a European Museum, Moderna Museet’s *American Pop Art: 106 Forms of Love and Despair*, in early 1964, an impressive project in its aesthetic quality, impact and theoretical accuracy, even by today’s standards, is one case that sheds light on some of these circumstances. This essay intends to argue that what today appears as a given, almost self-evident, the choice of both the exhibition concept and the selection of artists for the show, was in fact the result of an intense series of negotiations within a rather open discourse that wasn’t settled until just before the opening. With the use of close readings of archival documents and secondary sources, it presents this exhibition project as a complex of a number of coinciding transnational strategies and intentions. The individual actors were *the institution*—the Stockholm museum, Pontus Hultén, and his working partner Billy Klüver—*the market*, in this case in particular Galerie Sonnabend and Green Gallery—but also *the avant-garde*, in the guise of some artists in New York, both Swedish and American. Other important positions were found among Swedish artists and the local art press in Stockholm, already well aware of or practising new pictorial discourses and using the “pop-word”. Interestingly, the very concept of pop art was actually formed during the process of realising this particular show, in the development of a discourse around “pop art” pending over the Atlantic, between New York and Stockholm, at the time.

---


In Swedish national art history, the American Pop Art show in Stockholm in 1964, together with other early shows at the Moderna Museet such as *Movement in Art*, has been described as the starting point of a decade of *Open Art*, where anything was possible. In his chapter, the Pop art show in Stockholm is put in a slightly different perspective—and presented as the very moment of consolidation and final establishment of American pop in the historical discourse, with normative intentions as regards what “the International” could to do for “the Local.”

The import of Pop Art to Stockholm
Moderna Museet and Pontus Hultén – the Institution

As opposed to many of the first American exhibition projects in Europe in the 1950s and early 1960s, the exhibitions at the Moderna Museet were not to any notable extent, the result of cooperation with official American interests. From the very start, the young curator of the museum since 1959, Pontus Hultén, had an ambition to develop the museum into a stage for international art. He didn’t formally become the Director until 1963, and at the time of the Pop show the following year, the Moderna Museet was still an institution under the auspices of the Nationalmuseum. The parent institution was firmly positioned in Friedrich August Stüler’s impressive building, symbolically guarding the bridge that leads from the centre of the capital to Skeppsholmen Island and the Moderna Museet. It was essential for Hultén and his staff, who were relying on state funding, to create art projects with great impact and value, projects that could however not be too scandalised or criticised within the larger audience or among art critics.

Pontus Hultén is today closely associated with the American art scene of the early 1960s, although he had been in New York just twice before the

---

Pop art show in 1964: during a short term visit in the autumn of 1959 and the spring of 1963. Before leaving for the São Paulo-Biennale in 1959 and a show of the Swedish painter Olle Bærtling that he had curated, Hultén contacted the electrical engineer and researcher at Bell Telephone Laboratories, Billy Klüver, whom he knew from their youth at the student film studio in Stockholm. This was the point of departure for a long and fruitful cooperation between the two, and their correspondence serves as an important source to understand the processes taking place around the museum building. Billy Klüver was essential in the development of new forms of cooperation between artists and engineers, starting with helping out the French artist Jean Tinguely in constructing Homage to New York in the garden of the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1961, an installation of mobile machine like sculptures. A few years later he founded E.A.T.: Experiments in Art and Technology, together with the artists Robert Rauschenberg and Robert Whitman, and engineer Fred Waldhauer. Klüver had his heart in Stockholm and would play a key role for the Moderna Museet in many of its early exhibitions, starting with Movement in Art (1961). Less known is that he was crucial for some very early pop-related exhibition projects in the U.S., which we will return to. Another important person in relation to the work with the international projects at the Moderna Museet, though with a lower profile than Hultén, was Anna-Lena Wibom, Hultén’s life partner and close collaborator. As she had studied in the United States during the years 1953 to 1955, she was acquainted with the experimental film scene in Manhattan, and had a con-


nection with to filmmakers such as Jonas and Adolfas Mekas and Robert Breer, contacts that were revitalised when the programme at Moderna Museet was constructed.\(^7\)

In his ambition to create an international position for Moderna Museet and profile himself in the European art world, early on Hultén sought to develop curatorial concepts of a transnational character. In a letter to Billy Klüver in April 1963, he states that the contacts across the Atlantic had been what nourished the art of the century, and continues: "Listen to a proposal: Let’s make a large exhibition here in Summer 1964, May–September, Europe-America and art in the twentieth century. Duchamp and the Armory show, etc., Mondrian, Max Ernst, leger, de Kooning, Matta, Riopelle, Tinguely, Nicki (sic), Calder, etc., etc., until the newest. Fahlström as well."\(^8\) It is interesting that he still, one year before the actual pop show, thought of a rather broad and heterogeneous presentation of new art, when it came to the artists’ national origins and artistic profiles. Although the large transatlantic exhibition drawn upon here never took place in Stockholm in the early 1960s, the exhibition concept reoccurred in Paris in the 1970s. As a result of his accomplishments in Stockholm, Hultén in 1974 became engaged in the creation of Centre Pompidou in Paris and one of his most profiling exhibition concepts was realised in the large transnational exhibitions Paris-New York (1977), Paris-Berlin (1978), and Paris-Moscow (1979).

Interestingly however, in contrast to this enthusiasm for American early modernism and contemporary art, other statements by Hultén bear witness to his ambivalence towards American pop. In September 1963 he summarised his impressions from his second New York visit in an article titled “About the painting in New York after Pollock, that is, ABOUT THE POP ART,” in the Danish publication Louisiana Revy.\(^9\) Here he refers to the established history of American art, where three or four movements or

\(^7\) Anna-Lena Wibom studied at Stephens College in Columbia, Missouri, 1953–54 and at University of Chicago the year after, with a Fulbright scholarship, and spent of plenty spare time on Manhattan. Anna-Lena Wibom interviewed by the author 17 March 2006.

\(^8\) Letter from P. Hultén to B. Klüver, undated, later inscription “April 1963,” Klüver-Martin Archive.

groups could be perceived after the war in New York, beginning with abstract expressionism and ending with the pop artists who, unlike the pre-pop artists Rauschenberg and Johns, seemed to “see the position of the artist and of the art in a much more simple-minded manner.” Hultén states that what he finds frightening in pop art is that it neither wants to be revolutionary nor beautiful. Instead, pop art is a matter of *desperate creation*, performed by an American generation that is unable to change its conditions of living and therefore, “in order to survive,” chooses to accept it:

Because this takes place in America, where they never have had autonomous art before, it is only natural that these artists choose America as the subject of their images. [...] But this is not seen ironically, rather in desperation, as if in an attempt to love without being loved back. They have a strong urge for self-expression and a need to be loved, but their emotions seem to be short-circuited, as if despite their efforts it is impossible to love this world of plastic and lacquered metal. Abstract expressionism is replaced by frustrated expressionism.10

Hultén states in his important Danish text, that the pop artist *turns away from* politics, from the problems of society, from religion and aesthetics, while turning to the soup can. In the statement he makes two important points—pop art is a way for artists to ventilate frustrated emotions and also, to distance themselves from politics and the society. This position would reoccur but in a much milder version in the marketing of the American pop art show in Stockholm the following spring and affect its reception. The statement is interesting as a mark in a process where concepts and ideas connected to pop art were still open and in flux.

The market

Pontus Hultén writes to Billy Klüver:

Shall we do a pop-exhibition this spring? Based in Oldenburg, Rosenquist, Segal and with pieces even by Wesselman (Scull’s) Lichtenstein (Leo’s Washington and the Flyer at Ileana’s) & Warhol (Öyvind?). Ileana is having a Segal-exhibition and thus has a good collection available in Europe. Leo would come there and I could talk with him then. Rosen-

10 Ibid.
The quote, along with several other letters from this period, illustrates the intense network with such diverse people as the art dealer Ileana Sonnabend, the Swedish king, and the Swedish ambassador in Rome. The correspondence also shows that the selection of artists for the “pop-exhibition” is not set. For example, Öyvind Fahlström is mentioned as a possibility. In October 1963, Hultén had met the art dealer Ileana Sonnabend in Paris, and their cooperation in the coming months would secure several artworks for the upcoming show. Ileana Sonnabend was a partner throughout the project and also helped with negotiating pieces that she did not own herself. She did the same thing for the large exhibition at ICA in London, *The Popular Image*, which preceded the Stockholm exhibition and thereby made it easier to acquire works from New York. Through the Hultén’s collaboration with Green Gallery’s Richard Bellamy, additional works were borrowed for the show to Stockholm.

For the art galleries it was important to establish a European market for American pop art at a moment when it had not yet been appreciated by...
important collectors on the upper east side of Manhattan. This was also the interest of Leo Castelli, who was powerful in this regard. Early on he was aware of the fact that American collectors did not buy new American art before it had been approved in Europe. Today it is an established fact that his incomparable success in promoting art in the European market paved way for the post-war art in the U.S., a market that initially was Europe-oriented and conservative. Sonnabend’s and Castelli’s cooperation with the Moderna Museet to create the very first museum exhibition of Pop art in Europe was very important in that process and was crucial for securing and strengthening the whole project as such.

A pop art field emerges in the U.S.
The first years of the 1960s, saw pop art as an artistic practice and theoretical discourse emerge on Manhattan. Among early manifestations we find Claes Oldenburg’s *The Store* in December 1961, where he presented objects made after consumer goods and foodstuff in a former grocery store on Lower East Side, as well as Jim Dines’ one-man exhibition in January 1962 at the Martha Jackson Gallery. James Rosenquist’s show at Green gallery and Roy Lichtenstein’s first exhibition of painting related to comics at Leo Castelli’s gallery were shown that same month. In the autumn of 1962, Andy Warhol showed paintings of Campbell’s soup cans, Coca-Cola bottles, Marilyn Monroe and Elvis Presley at Castelli’s. Simultaneously, the New Realists’ show at the Sidney Janis Gallery, with 28 young artists, both Europeans and Americans, including Warhol, Oldenburg, Segal, Rosenquist, and Lichtenstein, and the Swedes P.O. Ultvedt and Öyvind Fahlström. In the *New York Times* Brian O’Doherty declared,

---

14 Titia Hulst, “The Leo Castelli Gallery,” Archives of American Art Journal, Smithsonian, 2007, pp. 14f. In a letter to Alfred H. Barr, Jr., 26 October 1955, Leo Castelli wrote: “[T]he American public itself is often reluctant to give its full appreciation and support to U.S. artists who have not yet received the European stamp of approval; and, while many new arrivals from Europe—not infrequently watered-down versions of trends which have originated in this country—shown here by our museums and galleries meet with immediate success, parallel efforts to promote American art in Europe have had, at best, a succès d’estime.” Original in the Alfred Hamilton Barr papers, Museum of Modern Art (microfilm copy available at AAA, reel 218), quoted in Hulst, pp. 18f. See also Öhrner 2010, pp. 185–186, and Catherine Dossin, *The Rise and Fall of American Art, 1940s–1980s*, Taylor and Francis, 2016, pp. 164–168.
that pop art officially had arrived. The plans for a pop art show at the Moderna Museet took place in this same period.

One week before the opening of the celebrated pop show at the Sidney Janis Gallery, the Philadelphia YM/YWHA (Young Men’s and Young Women’s Hebrew Association) launched the exhibition *Art 1963 – A New Vocabulary* (25 October to 7 November 1962), where Billy Klüver served as a counsellor to the young member of the arts council of the association, Audrey Sabol, and her co-curators Joan Kron and Acey Wolgin. The exhibition was one of the first group exhibitions related to pop art. However, compared with the later canon of pop art, the selection of artists was much wider: George Brecht, Robert Breer, Jim Dine, Jasper Johns, Allan Kaprow, Marisol Escobar, Claes Oldenburg, Robert Rauschenberg, James Rosenquist, George Segal, Jean Tinguely, and Robert Watts participated. The exhibition catalogue for *Art 1963 – A New Vocabulary* was made as a kind of semantic mapping of the new phenomenon and is a very interesting document of the development of the vocabulary around pop at that moment. A column containing artists’ names, as well as certain concepts in art, were presented in alphabetical order. Klüver and Claes Oldenburg wrote entries that in a playful manner presented the rhetorical space “the new movement” was placed in. The label that was suggested for the new movement was *The Factualists*, a word that would survive into the catalogue of Moderna Museet’s pop art show just over one year later. In Philadelphia, “Factualism” was considered an art movement of American origin, and an expression of a factual, relaxed relationship to existence. In the context of the New Realist show at the Sidney Janis Gallery, the concept reoccurred. Sidney Janis himself wrote a text for the catalogue, in which he describes “the New Realist” as a kind of folk artist who takes his...

---


16 Billy Klüver, undated notes about *Art 1963 – A New Vocabulary*, and correspondence between Audrey Sabol and Klüver in the Klüver-Martin Archive, New Jersey. Audrey Sabol had made contact with Billy Klüver as she approached him to buy a drawing by his friend, the Swedish artist Hans Nordenström, for *The Village Voice*.

inspiration from urban culture. Billy Klüver’s use of the notion had had another connotation and referred to a certain attitude; to a “factual” approach to life as opposed to romanticism, academism, etc.18

After the above-mentioned gallery shows had established the idea of a new emerging art, American museum’s started to take interest in pop. Six Painters and the Object, curated by Lawrence Alloway, was shown at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in March to June 1963. The next large show was The Popular Image exhibition at the Washington Gallery of Modern Art in Washington, D.C. (18 April–2 June), where Klüver was involved. Alice Denney, the curator of the show, was in dialogue with him on the possibility of letting the whole show travel to Stockholm.19 It would include all the artists that were later in the actual American Pop Show in Stockholm, that is Roy Lichtenstein, Claes Oldenburg, James Rosenquist, Georg Segal, Andy Warhol, and Tom Wesselman, as well as four other artists: George Brecht, Robert Rauschenberg, Robert Watts, and John Wesley. The Popular Image exhibition was accompanied by a catalogue with a text by Alan Solomon titled “The New Art,” as well as of a 33.33 rpm phonograph record with interviews of the artists—produced by Billy Klüver.20 Alice Denney and Billy Klüver produced an ambitious dance programme with new acts by choreographers, dancers, and artists somewhat in connection with the Judson Dance Theater. Rauschenberg’s dance piece Pelican was one of them, performed with another Swedish artist, P. O. Ultvedt, the dancer Carolyn Brown, and Rauschenberg himself on roller

18 “Today’s Factual artist, and the work of these artists make up the present exhibition, belong to a new generation (age average about 30) whose reaction to Abstract Expressionism is still another manifestation in the evolution of art. […] He is attracted to abundant everyday ideas and facts which he gathers, for example, from the street, the store counter, the amusement arcade and the home.” Sidney Janis, “On the Theme of the Exhibition,” The New Realists, New York: Sidney Janis Gallery, 1962, n.p. Janis is referring as his source for the term The Factualists: “Term first published in the book Collage by Harriet Janis and Rudi Blesh, 1962. Other titles applied to artists with this point of view: Communists; Neo-Dadaists; Factualists; Artists of Pop Culture and Popular Realists.” The term was also present in William S. Burroughs novel Naked Lunch from 1959, where the Factualists are a political party in a dreamlike city called the Interzone.

19 In an undated letter from Alice Denney to B. Klüver she asks whether she can include Stockholm when applying for loans to the exhibition in Washington. Klüver-Hultén archive.

skates. The *Popular Image* show was to influence the upcoming Stockholm project.

The avant-garde

The opening in Washington was a large event and many artists went there from Manhattan, including the Swedish artists Barbro Östlihn and Öyvind Fahlström. The couple had arrived in Manhattan in 1961, and through the intermediation of Klüver moved into Rauschenberg’s former studio in 168, Front Street, a typical warehouse style building where they worked until it was demolished in 1967. They also played a part for the pop art show in Stockholm, and the selection of art works for that show. Öyvind Fahlström made images and objects with references to American comics and had a rising career in New York, and Östlihn, painting large-scale images of façades in Manhattan, exhibited at galleries such as Tibor de Nagy and Cordier & Ekstrom. Like Fahlström and Östlihn, James Rosenquist as well as Claes Oldenburg were of Swedish origin, and they united a close network of colleagues, all of whom were close friends with Robert Rauschenberg. At the time of the planning of the pop show in Stockholm, Claes and Pat Oldenburg also prepared his first solo exhibition, entitled *The Home*, at the Sidney Janis Gallery. Klüver, Öyvind Fahlström, and Barbro Östlihn took turns to convince the couple to spare good works for the Moderna Museet, which also resulted in the *Ping Pong Table* being in

---


22 Undated letter from B. Klüver to P. Hultén. Fahlström was in the process of leaving Cordier & Ekstrom, Inc., to start to work with Sidney Janis. In this letter, Klüver approach the matter whether his position as the museum’s advisor for acquisitions could become more formalised. In another letter he writes that “Öyvind and Barbro” are “up at Janis’ again to investigate different possibilities.” In the letter, he reports the status in different possible acquisitions of works by Warhol, Dine, Rosenquist, Segal, Oldenburg. In other letters from this spring, there are suggestions that works by David Smith, Robert Breer and Andy Warhol should be acquired. The museum also buys Robert Rauschenberg’s *Monogram*. Fahlström and Östlihn are mentioned as mediators of the purchase of *Ping Pong Table*, for instance in a letter dated 9 April 1964, where the piece finally was reserved for $2,250. The Klüver-Martin Archive.

23 See Öhrner 2010.

the Moderna Museet collection today. The intense work of these artists to contribute to the outcome of Moderna Museet’s exhibition was one of its prerequisites.

Alan Solomon stated in his text for the catalogue of *The Popular Image* exhibition that the new art “could not have been contrived; it has followed an organic course which makes it an absolute product of its time.” He underlines that the artists are not engaged politically and have no interest in cooperating in social and collective manifestations. Solomon’s text would soon be published in *Art International*, and be widely spread.\(^{25}\) Revised versions were published in the catalogues of *The Popular Image* at ICA, London (autumn 1963) as well as the pop art show at the Moderna Museet soon afterwards.\(^ {26}\) However, the very expression *Pop art* was just mentioned in passing by Solomon in the article, as one of several possible, alternative labels for the new art. Through its heavy emphasis on the determination of a development towards what art and what artist would become valid and important, it was a normative statement.

**Importing pop – the exhibition and its package**

In the communication from the museum about *American Pop Art – 106 Forms of Love and Despair*, pop art was framed as historically determined and autonomous. The ambivalence towards the very label of pop, was strongly reflected already in Hultén’s and Klüver’s correspondence in their preparations for the show: “Is it possible to find SOME OTHER NAME THAN POPOPOPOPOPOPOPOPOPOPOPOP?” Klüver writes in an undated letter, seemingly frustrated.\(^{27}\) For a time Pontus Hultén calls the instigators of the movement “The Vulgarians” as in a letter to Alan Solomon in November of 1963.\(^ {28}\) The term had been launched by Max Kozloff in *Art International* in March of 1962, in his article “‘Pop’ Culture, Metaphysical Disgust, and the New Vulgarians,” and it had also been at

---

27 Letter from B. Klüver to P. Hultén, Moderna Museet.
play in Klüver’s encyclopaedic travesty in Philadelphia later in 1962. 29 Kozloff’s choice of label was pejorative and presented in a text that is nothing less than a treacherous attack on the new phenomena. Therefore, in November 1963, Billy Klüver questions the use of the term vulgarians in Stockholm, which Pontus Hultén appears to have picked up:

About pop – PLEASE dear Pontus not the Vulgarians. No, no, please – Why not “New American art”, please? The vulgarians does not work. The pop comes in anyway, so that one can vomit – “New American art.” Please something like that. 30

Soon thereafter, in a letter to Leo Castelli, Hultén does call the show “New American Art.” 31 The pop art exhibition at Moderna Museet in Stockholm opened on 29 February 1964. Being the first exhibition ever in a European museum of American pop, the name of the show as well as its content had by that point been negotiated over a period of time, and the result was the somewhat odd title American Pop Art: 106 Forms of Love and Despair and a listing of seven core artists.

As much as the preparation of the show, as we have seen, had been one of negotiations regarding concept and content, the exhibition itself was framed as a matter of fact, or rather as a confrontation. It was launched, as for an example, in the Moderna Museets Vänner’s (“The Friends of the Moderna Museet”) Bulletinen, in a note formed as a telegram: “SWEDEN NEXT TO BE CONQUERED STOP ATTACK ON MUSEUM OF MODERN ART IN STOCKHOLM FEBRUARY 29TH STOP YOU’LL GET TO KNOW WHAT POP IS.” 32 The same tendency is found when studying the presentation and lay-out of the show itself.

The architecture of the former military training hall in which Moderna Museet was housed in the centre of Stockholm was open and light, with free standing walls dividing the space, and light flooded in through large

32 Meddelande till Moderna Museets vänner, no. 10, February 1964, p. 11.
windows (Figure 4.1–4.9). The visitors walked on a plain wooden floor. George Segal’s sculptures were presented without sockets; the figures were at eye level with the viewers. Audiences were greeted at the entrance by his *Man on a Bicycle* (1961), which was placed in front of James Rosenquist’s *Capillary Action No 11*, a painting with a free standing object, a tree, in front. Segal’s *Woman Painting Her Fingernails* (1961), featuring a female figure in a restaurant booth, had been fittingly installed by a window. Gottlieb’s *Wishing Well* (1963), Segal’s sculpture of a man playing pinball, was placed nearby, and the two installations together created an American diner setting. The two white plaster figures in *Lovers on a Bench* (1962) were placed in the centre of the room. From their bench they were viewing large size works such as Tom Wesselman’s *Great American Nude No. 44* (1961) and Andy Warhol’s large painting *Marilyn in Color* (1962). Oldenburg’s *Soft Good Humor*—one of the minor versions of the piece of furred popsicles—rested in front of his *U.S. Flag Fragment (Flag with Four Stars)* as well as *Roast*, both from 1961. Oldenburg’s *The Bride* (1961) towered in the room as a shapeless and threatening figure. Jim Dine’s *Black Tools in a Landscape* (1962), a painting with real carpenter’s tools heavily painted with thick, black colour, and some other of his paintings was presented. Roy Lichtenstein’s *Hot Dog* (1962) and the large *Okay, Hot Shot, Okay* (1961), a comic strip with a military pilot, were facing the visitors as they walked into the space, while *Hopeless* (1963) with a weeping woman, and the graphically reduced *Radio* (1962) were hung on a perpendicular wall. The three paintings had recently been on show in Ileana Sonnabend’s Lichtenstein exhibition in the spring of 1963. That gallery had also provided loans of a mixed series of Andy Warhol works, including the *Torn Campbell’s Soup Can* (1962) and other versions of the famous Can. The audience was also confronted with Warhol’s Marilyns, for example the huge *Marilyn in Color* (1962), and other large images.

---
featuring motifs from American media and popular culture, for example *Blue Electric Chair* (1963) and *Green Coca-Cola Bottles* (1963).

Okay, *Hot Dog, Okay* could be seen, via its provocative approach, together with Lichtenstein’s *Finger Pointing*, an image appropriated from early military campaign that was put on the cover of the catalogue and on the exhibition poster, as meta pieces for the exhibition as a whole; a show that was utterly scenically installed, with consciously arranged directions of gaze in-between the viewers and the pieces, and well defined relationships between objects in the foreground and larger paintings in the background. The installation photos testify about an exhibition designed to capture the visitor, inviting him or her to share the space with the objects.

The catalogue had a hybrid modern design, with pages in different colours as well as colour reproductions pasted in by hand. The main essay was written by Alan Solomon and followed by shorter contributions on the individual artists. Thus, the show was carefully packaged for the Swedish public, concerned with introducing pop art properly and in line with its acquired intentions. In the catalogue, there was a short text by Fahlström in the form of a telegram from New York: “Pop Art did not start with Schwitters” the telegram started and ended, “Pop art started with Johns, who began with Rauschenberg […] every day was equal to Americana. STOP THE POINT HAS BEEN LOST THE NEW IS NOT AMERICANA ART BUT LIFE ART.” Fahlström might have feared that criticism against American mass culture would also be directed against the...
exhibition, a fear that was probably not completely unfounded. Three days before the opening of the Moderna Museet’s pop art exhibition, Swedish National Radio broadcast a lecture called “Mass Culture is Dangerous,” by Theodor Adorno. In it Adorno describes the deadliness of the cultural industry and says that the mass culture was the genuine culture of the people. Unsurprisingly the theme would reoccur in parts of the reviews of the exhibition.

Pontus Hultén’s preface to the catalogue argues vehemently against any understanding of pop art as an ironic treatment of mass culture. The pop artists have no social awareness and no political intentions. Despite the fact that they turn from politics, as well as aesthetics, Hultén think that he they “despair in face of the realities of the world.” We saw earlier that Hultén regarded pop art as strong, frustrated, emotional reactions of love to a “world of plastic and metal.” After having negotiated several alternative labels, the subtitle of the final title was designed to put forward these emotions—the exhibition shows “106 Forms of Love and Despair.” The position that Hultén takes towards pop art reflects Alan Solomon’s article. His own development in regards to the new art in New York slowly developed towards a more positive one, which is also consistent as he is now presenting it in his own museum.

The Swedish situation

In early 1963, Pop art, as a notion and a concept, was already familiar among Swedish artists and critics via international art journals, not the least Art International. Certainly, pop-related works such as Barbro Östlihn’s New York paintings had not yet been exhibited in Sweden, but Öyvind Fahlström’s art had been disseminated and, in particular through his use of comic strips, associated with pop. In the spring of 1963, one year before the large American pop show, a show simply called POP was presented at Galleri Observatorium—an independent, non-commercial gallery. The curator, Ludvig Rasmusson, presented international pop art

37 Most likely it is “Résumé über die Kulturindustrie,” a lecture Adorno had broadcast on German radio on 28 March and 4 April the previous year
39 Hultén in Amerikansk Pop-konst: 106 former av kärlek och förtvivlan, p. 16.
further through an article in the journal *Rondo*, where he claimed that themes from popular culture defined pop art.\(^{40}\) This definition allowed him to include Swedish artists under the heading of pop art, even if, as he writes, none of them is a “full time popper.” Lars Hillersberg is described as the “until now most typical pop artist,” and Öyvind Fahlström as “the most famous.” What is important to mention here is that the concept of pop art seems to have been used inclusively and concerned image strategies, rather than the work of iconic (American) artists.

We will never know if *POP* was the exhibition Hultén had in mind when talking about Swedish followers of pop in the opening quotation of this chapter, but it could very well have been the case. In his letter to Green Gallery, he emphasises the importance to hasten the exposure of American pop artists (“the originals”), so that pop art will be properly understood in Sweden.

In the spring of 1964, a film called *Stockholm à l’heure du Pop* was produced by the Belgian artist Olivier Herdies who wrote the script and, at that time, had lived in Sweden for almost thirty years.\(^{41}\) The film, 33 minutes long, starts with long shots from urban life in Stockholm, the Swedish capital that had some 800,000 inhabitants at the time. The camera rests on the green underground trains, on people walking the street, and super good looking blonde girls. This is followed by cuts from the American pop art show at Moderna Museet, unlabelled, as well as by several images from the local art scene at local art galleries. The film displays a Swedish art scene with pop art expressions of its own, while pop art is interpreted as an artistic attitude rather than art by an established and well-defined group of American artists.

American Pop received wide exposure in Swedish press following the 1964 exhibition, which was more than a year before the American offensive in Vietnam that would strongly affect the Swedish cultural climate,


\(^{41}\) Olivier Herdies, *Stockholm à l’heure du pop* (Swedish title: *När popup kom till stan*), 1964, 16 mm, colour, 33 min. Reference Archive at the Filmform – the art film and video archive, Filmform Foundation, Stockholm.
resulting in a more negative image of American culture—as well as of Moderna Museet’s international work. When the pop show opened in 1964, it served as the basis for in-depth cultural criticism and discussions in several articles and journals. The attention in the news was extensive; in the newspapers, TV, radio, pop art in general and the Moderna exhibition in particular were discussed and debated.

The critic Ulf Linde’s defence of pop art in a television report of the exhibition—by pointing out patterns of abstraction on the surface of the image—was rather half-hearted, which the interviewer picked up on.42 The dialogue in the report was a version of a recurring theme in the Swedish context: pop art is poorly executed, if seen as painting. When Ulf Linde published four articles on pop art in Dagens Nyheter one year later, he formulated his critique in a more elaborate, theoretical manner. He argued that pop art lacked the capacity to create something new, something that was not already formulated in Arnold Schönberg, Wassily Kandinsky or Kurt Schwitters.43 Alas, the neo-avant-garde did not measure up to the “real avant-garde.”

Torsten Bergmark was the most prominent art critic in the largest Swedish daily paper, Dagens Nyheter. He made a rather in-depth introduction to pop art, based on American art press and interviews with the pop artists in Art News, among other sources.44 The most interesting aspect of pop art is, according to Bergmark, the very occupation of “this vulgar material, the ugliest and worst side of Americanism.” His objection against pop art targets its inner logic. Instead of elevating images from popular culture—“such as amateur painting, illustrations in weekly magazines and comics”—to art, the artists integrate the images in their own style, extending them with things considered vulgar or banal from the standpoint of high culture. In his second, extensive text on the American art show at the Moderna Museet, Bergmark examined the exhibition

itself. In it his contention is that the pop artists does not measure up to the proper standards expected of painters; they are failing as a result of the dullness of the work. Pop seems “in many of its forms be a relevant expression for the taste and the desires of the audience that is supporting it financially.” The art critic Torsten Ekbom would criticises Bergmark’s position, stating that arguments against pop art seems to be against the mass culture that pop art depicts rather than the works of art. He compares this attitude to Adorno’s lecture, which presented a fundamental divide between high and low culture. Pop art’s simple formalism and its trivial subject matter are conscious choices that open up the following question to the viewer: “To what extent should we accept mass culture?” When approaching the pop art exhibition, the antagonists Linde and Bergmark were united in a formalistic based critique of the artistic quality of the art works.

Andreas Huyssen, in his notable 1975 essay, offered an interpretation of how American pop art was understood in West Germany in relation to American popular culture in general. Interestingly, the youth movement in Germany read American pop art as a protest and a criticism of the affluent society, rather than a distanced approval of it. This was most probably the result of the extensive exposure to American culture, as well as a spirit of strong cultural criticism following the tradition of Adorno in Germany. The Swedish criticism ten years earlier, had quite a different notion of the art that was shown in Stockholm in 1964, discussing painterly qualities and ethical content. However, the emphasis on the non-commitment towards social reality among the artists had already been made in Hultén’s early texts on pop. His early ambivalence, which was slowly turned into enthusiasm in the marketing of the show, still shone through and was noticed by parts of the audience.

47 Torsten Ekbom, “Popkonsten och masskulturen,” Dagens Nyheter, 10 April 1964.
Pop art institutionalised

Lucy Lippard acknowledges five “hard core pop artists” in the first book on pop art, her *Pop Art* (1966)—and a couple of additional ones on the American West Coast and in Great Britain. The fact that many artists from both sides of the Atlantic painted in a similar manner was acknowledged in Lippard’s book; U.S.-based female painters, such as Rosalynn Drexler, Idelle Weber, and Marisol Escobar were also mentioned, as were Europeans like Niki de Saint Phalle. Recent research, such the one presented in this anthology, has of course acknowledged a much wider outreach of pop-related pictorial concepts in Europe and beyond.

The version of American pop art presented at the Moderna Museet was “owned” by a certain circle, namely Lippard’s “New York Five,” with the addition of Dine and Segal. The title, the conceptual frame of the show, and the selection were not fixed until the last minute, and different constellations of artists had been discussed along the way. Thus, seen from a transnational perspective, Moderna Museet’s pop art exhibition is early in the process of establishment of American Pop in Europe and the first museum to exhibit it in Europe. Nationally, in historical handbooks of the 1960s, it has been categorised as part of a group of shows that were a starting point for a new and open art practice.

However, if one understands the Stockholm pop exhibition in 1964 as a step in the development of a discourse around pop art, one that was based on transnational strategies of different figures, a different image emerges. Constance W. Glenn has read the development of pop art through ten important exhibitions, from an early prologue in 1960, to the moment that

---


50 Ibid., p. 69.

51 See e.g. *International Pop*, produced by Walker Art Center, Minneapolis and *The Ey Exhibition*, *The World Goes Pop*, Tate Gallery, London, both in 2015.
finally secured the international breakthrough of pop art.\textsuperscript{52} Glenn describes the 1964 Moderna Museet exhibition as a \textit{summary} and as the last in the line of the ten “high” pop shows. This show was:

\begin{quote}
The final exhibition, the Postscript, stands for summation, broad consensus and the end of the magical period when American Pop Art seemed neatly definable and readily accessible.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{quote}

Thus, seen in an American context, the Moderna Museet’s pop art show was in fact a proof that a canon had been established.\textsuperscript{54} The canon of artists that were included in the show, that had until the opening been sized down step by step as we have seen through the pop show in the U.S. that Klüver was involved in, would from then on be repeated in the art historical narratives.\textsuperscript{55} Pop art is here not a notion of a certain artistic style or pictorial concept but the launch of a core group of artists who until today have had a dominant position in art history. When the Moderna Museet introduced the new avant-garde, female artists were glaringly absent, as were Swedish and other non-American artists who used a pop art language. In Manhattan, there were several female artists with similar visual

\begin{footnotes}
\item[53] Ibid, p. 39.
\item[55] Patrik Lars Andersson has analysed the way some European artists felt that they needed to distance themselves from the American pop art discourse, for example Niki de Saint Phalle, Jean Tinguely, and Per Olof Ultvedt, and the art critic Ulf Linde. Patrik Lars Andersson, \textit{Euro-Pop: The Mechanical Bride Stripped Bare in Stockholm}, Even (diss.), Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 2001, p. 82–142.
\end{footnotes}
interests and sensibilities as the established names who did not come to Stockholm.56

In the Swedish art scene, we meet a complicated situation where, according to the art historical tradition, the pop art show at Moderna Museet in 1964 had a vital function to expand the concept of art, and the fixed separation of high and low culture. However, the very same exhibition can be seen in an oppositional way, as presenting a reduced, established and openly normative concept that excluded alternative selections during the process of consolidation—for example local versions of pop and female artists, both local and American. Barbro Östlihn’s art could, for example, not be more “right” with its pop art vocabulary and its close connection to the artists of “The New York Five.”

The 1964 show in Stockholm was not produced, as is very clear from the quotation of Hultén in the beginning of this essay, simply in order to present American pop art for a European or a Swedish audience, but rather to set up a model. It was produced as a result of the strategies of a number of interests both in Sweden and on the New York art scene, and to establish international art on the North European scene.
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