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Introduction

In 1929, a small French art press previously unknown to audiences in the United States published a portfolio of thirty plates entitled *Kiowa Indian Art*. This was the most elegant and meticulous publication on American Indian art ever offered for sale. Its publication came at a time when American Indian art of the West and Southwest was prominent in the public imagination. Of particular interest to the art world in that decade were the new watercolors being made by Kiowa and Pueblo artists; a place was being made for their display within the realm of the American “fine arts” traditions in museums and art galleries all over the country.

*Kiowa Indian Art* and the five successive portfolios published by l’Edition d’Art C. Szwedzicki are now precious volumes, sequestered in the rare book departments of museum and university libraries.1 Their publication in digital format makes them accessible to a new generation of students,

1 An internet search of rare book dealers reveals that some of these original volumes are still available for purchase today, though usually at a cost exceeding $3000 per volume. *Pueblo Indian Painting* is rather rare, and the 1950 and 1952 portfolios are almost never offered for sale. The inventory of Volume II of *Pueblo Indian Pottery* is said to have been destroyed in a warehouse during World War II, and thus is the rarest of all volumes today. (Jonathan Batkin, personal communication, June 14, 2005).
some of whom may not be aware that theirs is not the first generation to express a keen appreciation for Native American art.

This essay briefly examines the emergence of a tradition of painting on paper among Native artists in the first quarter of the 20th century, and its American and international reception over the succeeding decades. The publications of l'Édition d'Art C. Szwedzicki from 1929-1952 are a premiere example of the widespread interest in Native artists and their work. After an overview that places this art in its cultural milieu, I shall discuss each portfolio, including its authors, artists and subject matter, in chronological order. My essay ends with some remarks about intercultural endeavors such as these, and the changes brewing in Native American art by 1952, the year of the publication of the final Szwedzicki portfolio.

Native American painting as modern art. No precisely fixed date marks the genesis of modern Native American painting. In the 1870s, in St. Augustine Florida, some young Cheyenne and Kiowa men made drawings for a white audience depicting both traditional and contemporary themes. A decade later, Amos Bad Heart Bull began his epic pictorial history of the
Lakota (discussed further under *Sioux Indian Painting*, below). In 1900, Jesse Fewkes commissioned Hopi men to paint depictions of Kachina ceremonies for inclusion in his publication, a new use for Hopi sacred imagery. These events can be seen as prologues to the modern painting traditions that would develop on the Plains and in New Mexico starting in the 19-teens.

In 1917, Pueblo painters began signing their names on their watercolors, and Edgar Lee Hewett (anthropologist and director of the School of American Research in Santa Fe) bought the first paintings done by San Ildefonso artist Crescencio Martinez. A number of other Pueblo artists

---


4 J.J. Brody, *Pueblo Indian Painting: Tradition and Modernism in New Mexico, 1900-1930*, Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1997, pp. 50-55, and passim. See also Dorothy Dunn's version of these events in Dunn,
began to sell their works in Santa Fe, too, and by 1922 Hewett wrote about their work in the popular magazine *Art and Archaeology*. So this is a convenient, albeit imprecise, starting date for a movement in modern Native painting that would grow and transform during the entire 20th century, though the publication of the final portfolio in the Szwedzicki series in 1952 can be seen as the coda for one type of art, as other movements and genres were taking shape (see conclusion to this essay, below.)

The early decades of the Twentieth century marked an intense interest in Native artistry and individuality on the part of a small group of anthropologists, most of them students of Franz Boas. Pueblo pottery, Navajo weaving, and California basket-making, for example, all came under scholarly scrutiny. In these studies, the role of the individual artist was a new subject—for individual agency had never been part of what

---


anthropologists had studied. But concurrent with these traditional genres such as pottery and basket-making, a new wave was taking hold. Indian men, and a small number of women, began to paint and draw both narrative and abstract scenes on paper—original, one of a kind works of art that were signed, sold to white patrons, exhibited in art museums, and acclaimed by international art authorities.

These experiments with pictorial narrative had little precedent in their artistic traditions. Some of the artists were motivated by the same sort of auto-ethnographic impulse that Plains ledger artists had worked under in the 1870s and '80s, seeking to depict and describe the unique features of their culture that some feared were in danger of disappearing. Hopi artist Fred Kabotie, for example, repeatedly painted the Snake Dance, a performance that fascinated outsiders and attracted many tourists. Pueblo artists made small watercolor paintings for sale, sometimes under the sponsorship of local museums, anthropologists, and artists.

On the Southern Plains, starting in 1914, a small group of young men learned painting at St. Patrick's Mission School in Anadarko, Oklahoma. Their first teachers were Sr. Olivia Taylor, a Choctaw nun, and then Susan Peters,
who was Field Matron at the Kiowa Agency. By the next decade such students, by then known as 'The Kiowa Five', were studying at the University of Oklahoma (as discussed below in the section on the 1929 Kiowa Indian Art portfolio.) In New Mexico, several painters, such as Fred Kabotie and Awa Tsireh, were working on their own, or with casual encouragement from people such as Edgar Lee Hewett and Alice Corbin Henderson long before any formal institutional program was put in place in the 1930s.

Those who wrote about this new Native painting in the southwest in the 1920s saw it primarily in romantic terms, as a "pure" expression of indigenous identity, despite the fact that Pueblo painters were working in an era after almost 400 years of continuous contact with non-Indian peoples. Artists such as Marsden Hartley and John Sloan championed this work. The first exhibit of Pueblo paintings took place at the Museum of Fine Arts in Santa Fe in 1919. Mabel Dodge Stearnes (an influential member of the literary community, newly arrived in New Mexico) bought every work exhibited.8


8 Brody 1997, p. 4, p. 102.
The following year, across the continent, The Society of Independent Artists in New York City exhibited a selection of the works she had purchased, along with some that John Sloan borrowed from Edgar Lee Hewitt at the Museum of New Mexico. Mabel Stearne (later Luhan, when she married Tony Luhan of Taos Pueblo in 1923) had interested Sloan in this new artistic genre when he first visited Santa Fe in 1919.\(^9\) Sloan was so enthusiastic about the work that he wrote to Hewett that this is "the only 100% American art produced in this country."

Southwestern Indian paintings garnered much praise in this exhibit; they continued to be included in this influential venue for the next two years.\(^{10}\) Other museums and commercial galleries became interested in this new work, too. The Arts Club in Chicago held an exhibition in 1920, and Denver artist Anne Evan’s collection of watercolors (see below) was exhibited at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, in 1929.\(^{11}\) In 1922, Elizabeth Brody

---


White (who was to become a prominent player in the Santa Fe scene) opened the first Indian art gallery in New York City, “Ishauu” on Madison Avenue, later to be called the Gallery of American Indian Art.\(^\text{12}\) (For more on White, see below).

Such venues expanded the universe—and the audience for—Indian painting far beyond the anthropological contexts in which Indian objects were normally found in those days. In 1922, the first South West Indian Fair occurred in Santa Fe, a precursor to the Indian Market still held every summer. Scholar J. J. Brody has skillfully mapped in elaborate detail the complex cultural choreography taking place in that decade among artists, intellectuals, anthropologists, and Pueblo painters; it was a group of competing interests where the modernist art camp sometimes warred with

\(^{12}\text{Gregor Stark and E. Catherine Rayne, El Delirio: The Santa Fe World of Elizabeth White. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, 1998. White’s estate, called ‘El Delirio,’ was a salon for artists, anthropologists and writers. It later became the campus for the School of American Research, which had been established as the School of American Archaeology in 1907.}\)
the ethnological camp, but both supported the sale and exhibition of Pueblo paintings.\textsuperscript{13}

Numerous forward-thinking individuals, many of them artists themselves, collected these works. Brief profiles of a few, all of them women, will suffice to give the flavor of the times, and to demonstrate that interest in modern Native painting in the 1920s and 30s was a national phenomenon, not limited merely to those who lived in Santa Fe. As Ed Wade and Katherin Chase have pointed out,

It was no coincidence that this period also marked the appearance of young American women as a dynamic new class of collectors. These were the "new women," well educated and, in many cases, daughters of wealth and social position. Unlike their mothers and grandmothers before them, they tended to take visible public roles, actively involving themselves in building a better society through participatory social reform.\textsuperscript{14}


Among the most influential collectors and promoters was Amelia Elizabeth White (1878-1972). Born in New York, she spent a great deal of time in Santa Fe after World War I. As mentioned above, she opened a Native art gallery in Manhattan in 1922—perhaps the first anywhere devoted to Indian art as art, rather than as artifact or curio. White worked tirelessly to promote Native art and artists, exhibiting her collections in Spain in 1929, in Paris in 1930, at the Brooklyn Museum in 1930, and in New York City in 1931. There, both the influential Exposition of Indian Tribal Arts and the International Antiques Exposition featured her paintings and other objects. Having amassed a huge collection, she distributed her paintings, pottery, textiles, and jewelry among a number of American art museums in the 1930s; perhaps she realized that the best tactic for having this material widely recognized as art was to have it prominently displayed in the permanent collections of art museums. Her gifts enriched the Cincinnati

Art Museum, the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Detroit Institute of Arts, the Corcoran Gallery, the Newark Museum, and others.¹⁶

Anne Evans (1871-1941) was a Denver artist and philanthropist who traveled widely in the Southwest and collected Native art. Among the many gifts she gave to the fledgling Denver Art Museum was her substantial collection of Native American watercolors (some of which had been shown there in 1927, as well as at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and were featured in the 1932 portfolio, Pueblo Indian Painting, discussed below). One hundred and ten of these were accessioned into the museum in 1932, the same year the portfolio was published.¹⁷


Ima Hogg (1882-1975) was a Texas philanthropist and art collector whose taste ranged from American decorative arts and post-Impressionist paintings, to Pueblo watercolors. She gave 81 Native watercolors to the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston in 1944,\(^1\) the results of her nearly annual summer trips to Santa Fe in the late 1920s and 1930s. Indeed, in 1928 she bought a Fred Kabotie painting of a Hopi Corn Dance for $100 from the Spanish and Indian Trading Post in Santa Fe, her first such painting purchased.\(^1\)

Leslie Van Ness Denman (1867-1959), a prominent San Franciscan married to a Federal judge, traveled to the Southwest virtually every summer between 1919 and the early 1950s, collecting paintings and visiting Indian artists with whom she had long-standing friendships. Eighty-four of the Denmans' Indian paintings were exhibited at the DeYoung Museum in 1934; 107 were displayed at the San Francisco Museum of Art two years


\(^{19}\) This data derives from notes prepared in 1994 by Anne Louise Schaffer, former Curator, Museum of Fine Arts Houston, and given to me by current Curator of American Art Emily Neff.
later. The collection is now owned by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board in Washington D.C.\(^{20}\)

No one has mapped the complex history of women artists and art philanthropists across the United States in the years before World War II, but there were many overlapping circles: some collected Native arts and championed Native causes; others focused on folk and decorative arts, or on European and American modernism. Some embraced all these causes, for all were part of a modernist cosmopolitan, liberal impulse that was sweeping the intellectual classes.\(^{21}\)

Many American art museums collected modern Native paintings in the 1920s and 1930s too. Some, like the St. Louis Art Museum, purchased works, while others were the beneficiaries of gifts from collectors such as White and Evans, as mentioned above. Although efforts were unsuccessful in the

---


1930s to place substantial gifts of Pueblo watercolors at the Metropolitan Museum and the Art Institute of Chicago, the Whitney did buy a Tonita Peña painting, “Basket Dance,” in 1932, paying $225, which Brody terms “the highest price paid to that time for a Pueblo painting.” (Most sold for $2 to $25). By the mid-1940s, the list of American art museums that had acquired collections or hosted traveling exhibitions of contemporary Native painting included the San Francisco Museum of Art, the Stanford University Museum of Art, the Art Institute of Chicago, the Brooklyn Museum, the Whitney, the Philbrook Art Center, the Joslyn Museum, the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston, the Detroit Institute of Arts, the Corcoran Gallery, and the St. Louis, Cleveland, and Cincinnati Art Museums.

One common denominator in the interest in Native art and folk art in the 1920s and 30s was a belief in the essential 'Americanness' of these objects. Europe, weakened after the devastation of World War I, seemed to Americans to be in cultural decline. American artists and intellectuals, in particular, were in search of a home-grown idiom. As art critic Thomas Craven wrote, “...I have exhorted our artists to remain at home in a familiar

---

22 Brody, Pueblo Indian Painting, 1997, p. 180, 182. In the Appendix (pp.193-212), Brody lists the prices paid for the paintings in the School of American Research Collection, where known. These range from 15 cents to $100.
land, to enter into strong nativist tendencies, to have done with alien cultural fetishes.” Holger Cahill wrote that during those years people were asking “What is American? Is there anything recognizably American aside from Indian material?”

The 1920s was the era of the colonial revival—another way of focusing on what was intrinsically American, rather than European. While an analysis of this movement is beyond the scope of this essay, a few nodes of connection are noteworthy. In 1926, John D. Rockefeller Jr. put his philanthropic dollars to work restoring Colonial Williamsburg, in Virginia, which would later house so much of his wife Abby Aldrich Rockefeller’s collection of folk art. In 1929, Edith Halpert opened the American Folk Art Gallery in New York City, which she described as “carrying works chosen because of their definite relationship to vital elements in contemporary American art,” the same impulse that lay behind Elizabeth White’s nearby Indian art gallery.

During the 1930s, influential writers, curators, and arts administrators continued to advance the cause of both Native American art

---


and folk art as aspects of an indigenous, populist Americanism. Elizabeth White demonstrated to sophisticated New Yorkers that Indian art had a place in a colonial revival interior in her display at the International Antiques Exposition of 1931. That same year, White and John Sloan were the chief organizers of the Exposition of Indian Tribal Art at the Grand Central Galleries in New York. Works from Abby Aldrich Rockefeller's collection were included in this Exposition; her definition of folk art included the contemporary Native painting movement. The Rockefellers had financed the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe; she also gave the first Pueblo painting to the Museum of Modern Art's Collection in the 1930s—a work by Awa Tsireh.25

The 1931 Exposition, sponsored by the College Art Association, subsequently toured both American and European cities, even showing at the Venice Biennale, according to Dorothy Dunn.26 CAA's president wrote that although America had never written an aesthetic Declaration of Independence, "...the battle for American aesthetic expression has now been won. But it has not been won by our typical foreign-trained man with his ill-

25 Brody, Pueblo Indian Painting, pp. 180-182.

digested Parisian artist *table-d’hote.*" He proclaimed that America had "an artistic treasury not only older but fresher and purer than anything Europe has to offer."27

Art critics in *The New York Times* and *Art News* were laudatory, calling the exhibit, "American art, and of the most important kind," and welcoming the Indian artist into the "American brotherhood of the arts."28

One critic for *Art Digest,* commenting on the "commotion" caused in New York City by the show, observed "probably never before has an exhibition been given so much space in the newspapers and periodicals."29

---


29 As quoted by W. Jackson Rushing, in *Native American Art and the New York Avante-Garde,* p. 102. See also 97-103.
About the Indian paintings that captivated their New York audience, novelist and Native art impresario Oliver LaFarge wrote, “it is strange that so little attention has been paid to an artistic movement devoid of any direct European influence, alive, vigorous, and very modern, going on under our noses.” He goes on to say that these paintings “find more recognition in France and Germany,” and singles out “the group of Kiowa artists so much praised in Paris.”

Another critic concurred: “Speak of American Indian art to a Frenchman, Austrian, or Italian, and the conversation will immediately swing to water colors....International recognition was given to the Indian water-color artists before they were known to any but a select group of people in this country.”

They were referring, of course, to the great acclaim for these works exhibited in Paris and at the International Arts Congress in Prague in 1928, as well as to the *Kiowa Indian Art* portfolio portfolio

---


published in Nice, France in 1929 by a little known fine arts publisher C. Szwedzicki.

In the 1930s, several initiatives focused on Native American art and design. A project recording American Indian Design was supervised by Frederick Douglas at the Denver Art Museum from 1932-38, employing artists to draw examples of fine Native designs. Design motifs and brief explanation on 130 sheets were published at 5 cents apiece, and collected in a folio for sale to schools and libraries. In an announcement of the series in 1933, Douglas wrote:

It is evident that there is a growing need for large cheap plates of authentic Indian designs. To supply this need, the Indian Art Department of the Denver Art Museum began last summer the preparation of a very extensive series of master plates showing representative designs of all types of Indian art. To date, nearly 1000 such plates have been made, each one faithful in color and line to the original. [...] The master plates are copied from fine examples of Indian work in the collections of museums or private collections. Thus the pottery plates are derived from the collections of the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe and of the Denver Art Museum.


A more famous and more encyclopedic initiative of this sort was the *Index of American Design* (1935-41), in which Indian design was not included because the Denver Project was already ongoing.\(^{34}\) (For more on the Index, see the section on the portfolio *Pueblo Indian Pottery*).

Meanwhile, in Santa Fe, the production of Indian painting had become institutionalized in a new setting, the Santa Fe Indian School, where in 1932, the Studio School was established. Under its founder, Dorothy Dunn, who taught there for five years, and her Native successor, Geronima Cruz Montoya (discussed below in *American Indian Painters*, 1950), students were encouraged to derive their inspiration from the pottery, rock art, and basketry forms that were their heritage. This resulted in a large body of work that, although widely celebrated, was rather uniform in its decorative, two-dimensional approach to genre scenes. The Studio School was later criticized for its fossilization of Indian art within narrow stylistic parameters; nonetheless, for its era it was a remarkable experiment, promulgating what was seen as an "authentically Indian" way to paint,

principally derived from decorative designs in indigenous arts like pottery and basketry.\textsuperscript{35}

In Oklahoma, an “Art Lodge” was dedicated at Bacone College in 1932, due to the persistence of art professor Ataloa McLendon (Chickasaw). In it, students were exposed to the finest of Native artistic traditions, and art classes were held there. Native artist Acee Blue Eagle was the first chair of the newly established Art Department in 1935, followed by Woody Crumbo, and Dick West (see below, section on \textit{American Indian Painters}, for information on Blue Eagle and West). All were distinguished artists, and taught several generations of Native painters.\textsuperscript{36} During these same years, many Oklahoma Indian painters worked on both local and national mural projects, bringing further acclaim to Native painters.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{35} Interviews conducted with students from the Studio School and their relatives for one project reveal overwhelmingly positive comments. See Seymour, \textit{When the Rainbow Touches Down}, pp. 47-53, 90-95, 146-169, 242-259. Dorothy Dunn provides a detailed history of her own involvement, and that of others in \textit{American Indian Painting}, 1968, Chapter 9.

\end{flushright}
Indian art displays at the 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition in San Francisco were seen by over a million visitors. In 1941, the Museum of Modern Art in New York gave over its entire three floors to 'Indian Art of the United States," setting the definitive seal of art world approval on Native American art. Traditional works were presented in austere, modern installations, masterminded by Rene d'Harnoncourt. Indian paintings were displayed conspicuously on the first floor (some of them produced at the Studio School in Santa Fe, others at the University of Oklahoma and Bacone College in Muscogee, Oklahoma). D'Harnoncourt expressed the hope that 'the down-town galleries will swing into line and accompany our exhibit with sales exhibits that should create a new steady market for Indian paintings in the east."  

My recounting of these events of the 1920s, 30s and 40s provide the social backdrop for understanding the launching of the portfolios of American Indian art published in Europe.

---


38 Rene d'Harnoncourt letter, 23 December, 1941, as quoted by W. Jackson Rushing, "Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern: Rene d'Harnoncourt and 'Indian art of the United States,'" in Berlo, ed. The Early Years of Native American Art History, 1992, p. 214.
The Publisher: l’Edition d’Art C. Szwedzicki

A deeper understanding of how these pivotal volumes in the history of Native American art came to be published in France eludes our research efforts. Indeed, even the publisher’s first name remains unknown. His surname is Polish, and he lived in Nice, where the prints were published. Though his publishing concern had several different street addresses in Nice from 1929-1952, it is not listed in the principal history of French publishing.\(^{39}\) In addition to the five volumes under consideration here, I have only been able to find a record of one other work published by Szwedzicki’s firm, a 1939 volume on Polish peasant costumes, a topic which prefigures the 1952 portfolio, *North American Indian Costumes*.\(^{40}\)

---

\(^{39}\) On the 1929 portfolio, the address was listed as Villa les Chenes, Au Piol, Nice, France; on the 1932 portfolio, it was 98, Rue de France, Nice; in 1950, 22, Rue Louis-de-Coppet, 22 Nice. The reference work that makes no mention of this publisher is *Histoire de l’Edition francaise*, Paris: Promodis, 1983, Vol 4: “Le livre concurrence, 1900-1950,” though it mentions more than a dozen publishers in Nice.

\(^{40}\) Zofia Lubanska Stryjenska and Tadeusz Seweryn, *Polish Peasant Costumes*, Nice, France: C. Szwedzicki, 1939, published in an edition of 400. As mentioned, an interest in Native American art and culture was part of a widespread interest in folk art and culture, both in the U.S. and abroad. And if Szwedzicki were Polish, as his name and the scant information handed down seem to indicate, his interest in this topic makes sense.
Given the highly specialized technique of *pochoir* printing employed in the first volume commissioned by Jacobson, it is likely that *l'Édition d'Art C. Szwedzicki* was a small firm that specialized in this technique that was so popular in France in the first third of the 20th century for printing art plates of the highest quality. (See section explaining the *pochoir* process below).

It is said that the work on the portfolios was interrupted when Szwedzicki, a Polish Jew, was extradited to Poland at the beginning of World War II. David Bell, the publisher of the 1979 reprint of these portfolios, wrote that after Szwedzicki was sent to Poland by the Nazis,

---

His business in Nice was confiscated and the unsold copies of the first three portfolios, along with unassembled plates and bindings, was destroyed. . . After the war, with difficulty, Jacobson located Szwedzicki in Nice, where the publisher, broken in health and finances, was attempting to salvage something of his business. The collaboration resumed, resulting in the publication in 1950 of "American Indian Painters". . . Like the other portfolios, "American Indian Painters" was financed in part by the sale of individual prints. Mrs. Sheppard recalls that the printer himself was named Gamello. It was presumably he who delayed publication of the last portfolio, "North American Indian Costumes," illustrated by Oscar Howe. The portfolio bears the publication date 1952; but because of unpaid bills, the material was not released by the printer until Jacobson went to France in 1956 and settled the account. He then brought the printed material to this country, had the cases made here, and distributed the portfolio the same year. . . Szwedzicki died in Paris about 1959.42

The tardy 1956 publication date does seem likely, for the only review I found of this portfolio was published in that year (see below, under discussion of American Indian Costumes.)

**Kiowa Indian Art, 1929**

*Kiowa Indian Art,* the inaugural volume of this important series, was published in 1929, with an introduction by Oscar Jacobson, printed in both French and English. This portfolio of 30 plates was issued in an edition of

---

42 David Bell, Bell Editions prospectus, 1979.
750, and sold for the astronomical price of $35.43 Printed on several
different shades of paper, it included reproductions of paintings by Spencer
Asah (1), Jack Hokeah (7), Steve Mopope (16), Monroe Tsa-to-ke (5 and
cover), and Bou-ge-tah Smokey (1), chosen from the collection of Jacobson
himself. In quality, these prints are technically the finest of all the
portfolios, for they were produced in the labor-intensive technique of
*pochoir* (see below),

While later volumes included individual descriptions of the plates, only
titles were provided in the 1929 volume. Most of the introductory essay
consists of generalizations about Native American cultures, as well as a
brief introduction to the Kiowa (who numbered some 1300 people in 1929).

Jacobson’s text does not escape the very dated language of its era; the

---

43 To put this, and the prices of subsequent volumes in perspective, in 1931
the Chicago Tribune reported that the average businesswoman earned
$1500 a year, while the college-educated businesswoman earned $1,700, or
$32 a week. See “Business Woman Earns Average Salary of $1,500,” *Chicago
Daily Tribune*, March 1, 1931, pg. G4. Five years later, the New York Times
reported $5,620 as the average annual salary of men 15 years out of
Princeton. ($108 a week). “Average Pay of Princeton Class of 1921 Reported

44 These were later sold to the Heye Foundation and are now part of the
collection of the National Museum of the American Indian. See David
Fawcett and Lee Callander, *Native American Painting: Selections from the
Museum of the American Indian*, New York: Museum of the American Indian,
author situates the makers of these images ("the red man") in a romantic rhetoric: “it is the work of pure Indians, only one generation removed from the hunting grounds and the war path” (Introduction, p. 7). As is common in much of the literature of this era, words such as “instinctive” are often used to describe the artists’ mastery of their craft: “they seem to possess instinctively the things it takes the white art students years to acquire” (p. 10). Yet Jacobson does grant them a certain modernity: “They live in houses, they drive cars, they buy modern farm machinery, but the women still dress their hair in braids and wear the bright colored shawls of tradition. On festival days, beaded buckskins and feathered head dresses are donned” (p. 3).

With the hindsight of 75 years, people sometimes think of this portfolio as the means for introducing the world to this art form but, as discussed above, the portfolio was actually the result of an intense interest worldwide in these artists. Jacobson writes: “Collections of their paintings have been exhibited in many of the art museums of the country, and a large number of the paintings have found homes among art collectors” (p. 8).

The Author. Oscar Brousse Jacobson (1892-1966) was born in Sweden; his family emigrated to Kansas when he was a child. In 1915 he
arrived in Oklahoma to serve as the head of the Art Department at the University of Oklahoma. The following year he earned an MFA in painting from Yale. The OU Art Department later became the School of Art, which he directed until 1945.\(^{45}\) He was a prolific painter, and later was the Director of the University of Oklahoma Art Museum. But outside of Norman, Oklahoma, he is best known for a side project which concerned him in the late 1920s: his mentoring of a handful of Kiowa artists who came to the university as "special students," and who were catapulted to international recognition through his efforts. He was adopted as a member of the Kiowa tribe due to his work with these artists.\(^{46}\)

In his essay, Jacobson says that these students came to his attention in 1928 (p. 8). But actually the four male students (Asah, Hokeah, Mopope, and Tsa-to-ke) arrived at the University in the Spring of 1927, and returned in January of 1928, joined by Lois Smokey.\(^ {47}\) The art students were supported by their families, by money they made in competitive


\(^{46}\) "Indian Tribe Adopts Artist as Member," *Christian Science Monitor*, Aug. 22, 1928.

dancing, and by the generosity of a local philanthropist (Lew H. Wentz of Ponca City, whom Jacobson credits on p.8). This allowed them to work full time at their art, and eventually to make money from it. Lydia Wyckoff wrote that six months after their arrival at the university, a traveling sales exhibition was organized. Within a year, after an exhibition at the Denver Art Museum, so many works were sold that the collection had to be ‘replenished and increased’ before it could continue. A mere eighteen months after he came to know the artists, Jacobson arranged for thirty-five watercolors to be exhibited at the International Art Congress in Prague, Czechoslovakia.48

After that, *Kiowa Indian Art* was published, and the works exhibited at the 1931 Exposition of Indian Tribal Art in New York City, discussed above. This portfolio was reprinted in a facsimile edition of 750 by Bell Editions of Santa Fe in 1979, with an introduction by Jamake Highwater.49

48 Wyckoff, *Visions and Voices*, p. 25.

49 Jamake Highwater (c. 1930-200) was an individual of mysterious background, and alleged Native ancestry, as well as several aliases and personas who was at the height of his public popularity at that time as a spokesperson for American Indian art. He wrote numerous popular books on Native art and culture in the 1970s and 80s.

The original prospectus seems to suggest that all six portfolios would be republished; to my knowledge, only this and *Pueblo Indian Painting* were issued. See David Bell, Bell Editions prospectus, 1979. See Arthur Silberman. Review of Kiowa Indian Art, Bell Edition, 1979, *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*, vol 60, Winter 1982-83, pp. 489-91, which criticized Highwater’s inaccuracies and his use of “previously published material which,
The Subject Matter and the Artists. On the portfolio cover is a painting of a man and woman entitled “The Love Call” by Monroe Tsatoke (1904-1937). The man plays a flute, while his partner stands slightly behind his right shoulder. This cover exemplifies the style of painting presented within: opaque watercolor thickly applied to the paper with little modeling. Detail is expressed through line and dot, to great decorative effect.

Tsatoke’s other works in the portfolio depict dancers (Plates 26 – 29) and warriors (Plate 30). The artist was himself a singer, who died young, of tuberculosis. Many of his other works depict participants and paraphernalia of the Native American Church. A portrait of Tsatoke painted by Oscar Howe based on a photo taken by Jacobson is included in the 1952 portfolio North American Indian Costumes (Plate 43).

unattributed and without quotation marks, surfaces now and again with little or no alteration” (p. 490). See also Maybelle Mann, “Kiowa Indian Art, A Pochoir Portfolio,” American Art and Antiques, Vol.2, no. 1 (January 1979), pp. 58-65, which seems to be advance publicity for the re-issue.

Stephen Mopope (1898-1974) is represented by the largest number of works in the portfolio. His sixteen images (Plates 10-25) encompass portraits of families (Plates 11, 16), warriors (Plate 15) and peyotists (Plates 12, 13), among other subjects. He was, himself, a successful competitive dancer, and some of his strongest works are those depicting dancers (for example, Plates 10, 17). Later in life, Mopope recalled that his artistic training began by watching his older male relatives, including Oheltoint and Silver Horn, paint. (See discussion of Silver Horn in Sioux Indian Painting section, below). As a teenager, he attended St. Patrick’s Mission School where he was taught the rudiments of drawing by Sister Olivia Taylor.51

Like Mopope, Jack Hokeah (1902-1969) was a dancer. His work appears in Plates 1-7. He depicts frontal, profile, rear, and combined views of dancers and religious practitioners with great eloquence. Plate 6, “Greeting of the Moon God,” is a strong composition of two standing and one seated figure, seen from the rear.

Spencer Asah (c. 1905-1954) is represented by only one work: a self portrait, dancing (Plate 8). He is in profile, kneeling on his left leg. Asah has

paid careful attention to the details of his fine feather embellishments.

Bou-ge-tah (Lois) Smokey (1907-1981) studied at OU, and exhibited with these men in the early years. Her one work included here (Plate 9, “Kiowa Family”) is awkward but evinces great interest in and knowledge of women’s bead-working traditions.

The men featured here came to be known as “The Kiowa Five”, with the addition of James Auchiah (1906-1974), who did not arrive at the University of Oklahoma until a few months after the others--too late for inclusion in this portfolio. All of the Kiowa Five participated in the WPA mural projects that were so popular in the 1930s and 40s. Hokeah worked with some Pueblo artists on murals at the Santa Fe Indian School cafeteria. Auchiah, Mopope, Asah, and Tsatoke painted murals in a number of civic buildings throughout Oklahoma. At the new Department of the Interior Building in Washington D.C., which housed the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Mopope and Auchiah each designed and executed a fifty-foot-long mural in the cafeteria in 1939.52

The Pochoir Technique. The 1929 portfolio was the only one in the series in which the prints were produced by the laborious technique known as pochoir. Although this is simply the French term for stencil, pochoir is actually the most complex of all processes in which stencils are used to make multiple reproductions of an image. While similar to a silkscreen or serigraph, it is not a mechanized process, but one that requires exactly trained craftspeople involved in all steps of the process of stencil-cutting and hand-coloring images.

A nineteenth century French technique, pochoir is only occasionally used today, generally for small editions of illustrated or hand-made books. Its height of popularity and expertise was in early twentieth century France. In Paris as well as in several provincial centers, pochoir workshops translated original artists' works into prints, often for books or portfolios. While the editions were often relatively large (500-750), they were still limited editions in which every print was hand-colored. Pochoir reached its apogee


54 Works by Chagall, Cezanne, William Blake, Leon Bakst, and others were widely disseminated through pochoir prints. Moreover, pochoir plates were
during the Art Deco movement in France; after 1935 the labor-intensive process gave way to cheaper types of photo-mechanical color printing.\textsuperscript{55}

In the French workshop, the specialist known as the \textit{découpeur} would cut the stencils. These were generally made of thin sheets of zinc, copper, or brass, especially if an edition as large as 750 was being printed (as in the Kiowa portfolio). A stencil made of a less durable material would simply wear out during so many re-uses. The next team to work on the print were the \textit{coloristes}, who manipulated the stencils and applied the pigments with brushes.\textsuperscript{56}

A \textit{pochoir} print requires a stencil for each color applied. One color is applied at a time, by hand. It was an excellent choice for reproducing the

---


\textsuperscript{56} Martha Berrien, a \textit{pochoiriste} still at work when the Smithsonian mounted a \textit{pochoir} exhibit in 1977, recalled her early days in a New York City \textit{pochoir} “sweatshop” in the 1920s. As a colorist, she was paid 50 cents for coloring a thousand sheets using a stencil. See Elizabeth Harris, \textit{Pochoir}, Washington, D.C. Smithsonian Institution Press, 1979, p. 4.
Kiowa paintings, in which flat, unmodulated areas of color, with no shading, were prevalent. Because of its painstaking process, and the fact that each color uses a separate stencil, pochoir requires that each sheet of paper be handled, and paint applied to a stencil, numerous times. In some early 20th century European pochoir prints, a palette of thirty to fifty colors was not uncommon. In contrast, the Kiowa paintings were relatively “simple,” generally having a range of eight to twelve different colors. So the Kiowa portfolio of thirty prints, each requiring an average of ten colors (10 x 30 = 300), was produced in an edition of 750 portfolios (750 x 300 = 225,000).

Therefore, nearly a quarter of a million acts of applying paint to stencil (on 22,500 sheets of paper) were needed for this one edition. This required a considerable workforce. Some of the famous Parisian ateliers had as many as 600 craftspeople working on prints; certainly the Kiowa portfolio took dozens of workers some months to produce. Though its $35 price tag was an extraordinary one in the year of the American stock market crash, it is readily apparent that no one got rich in this enterprise.

Plates 1 and 2 of Kiowa Indian Art depict dance figures painted by Jack Hokeah. Each print uses ten colors, some matte and others glossy. Plate 1 has a lot of minute detail, especially in the painted staffs, beaded belts,
and feathered headgear of the male dancers. Some of these details seem to have been added by a quick stippling with a tiny pointed brush, rather than by stencil. Plate 12, Stephen Mopope’s rendering of three seated singers in front of a ceremonial fire, uses twelve colors (gray, black, peach, brown, orange, red, yellow, dark blue, lavender, cinnabar, forest green, light green, loive green, mustard, tan, and plum). All of the works were printed on different shades of cold-rolled rag paper, of approximately 100 weight.57

A pochoir print closely approximates the original work of art. This is especially true when the original was rendered in gouache (opaque watercolor), as the Kiowa paintings were.58 In both pochoir and gouache, the paint lays thickly on the surface of the paper. (In contrast to gouache, a

57 My thanks to Bradley D. Gale, who was trained as a rare book binder and print conservator, and who examined the portfolio at the University of Rochester library with me in July of 2005, for providing this information.

58 There is a great deal of confusion in the scholarly literature on American Indian painting, in terms of paint mediums. Pueblo and Plains artists in the first half of the 20th century used gouache, casein, and tempera. All of these are similar to the eye, and differ principally in the binder that is mixed with the pigment to adhere the paint to the paper. Gouache is a heavy, opaque watercolor paint that uses arabic gum as a binder. Casein is also an opaque watercolor that dries to a matte finish, but uses a milk protein as its binder. Tempera is a pigment bound with an egg yolk emulsion; egg tempera, in use since the Middle Ages, is waterproof and durable. But the situation is made more confusing by the fact that in the United States the term tempera is used colloquially for simple “poster paints.” See http://www.artlex.com/ and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tempera
more watered-down watercolor would sink into the surface of the paper). So a pochoir may easily be mistaken for an original work of art. For this reason, copyright notices are generally found on the back of the prints. Each Kiowa print in the portfolio, for example, was stamped “Copyright by C. Szwedzicki, 1929.”

While no manufacturing records are known to have survived concerning the Szwedzicki portfolios, it is likely that Oscar Jacobson, an artist himself, chose a small art press in France because of the acclaim the French were receiving in the 1920s for their expertise in this process. Moreover, by doing so, he was aligning the work of the Kiowa artists with other well-known modern art movements, such as Art Deco, that were all the rage. He understood that the audience for these modern American Indian art prints was the same audience that appreciated the Art Moderne on display at the Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes held in Paris in 1925.59

The British art journal *The Studio* carried an article on *pochoir* in 1926. The University of Oklahoma Library had a full run of this journal since its inception, so perhaps Jacobson was interested to read about the popularity of this medium in France, and its applicability to the Kiowa art work he was fostering. The article extols *pochoir* for reproducing "a watercolor having some forty distinct tones or more," and praises "the plates thus obtained, which give an exact facsimile of an artist's watercolour or gouache in all its freshness and tone quality."\(^{60}\)

**Pueblo Indian Painting, 1932**

The second volume, *Pueblo Indian Painting*, was issued in 1932, with an introduction by Hartley Burr Alexander. Fifty prints were published in this $50 portfolio, in an edition of 500, smaller than the edition of 750 just three years earlier. It features work by seven artists from San Ildefonso and one from Sia Pueblo (today spelled Zia).\(^{61}\) Julian Martinez (1897-1943, 1


\(^{61}\) The list that precedes the explanatory captions makes it looks like there are ten artists, but Alfonso Roybal and Awa Tsireh are the same person (as Alexander clearly states in the text of plate 17), and no work by Louis Roybal is included, though his name is listed on the front page.
work), Encarnacion Peña (1902-1979, 3 works), Abel Sanchez (also called
Oqwa-Pi, 1899-1971, 2 works), Romando Vigil (1902-1978, 2 works), Richard
Martinez (1904-1987, 16 works plus cover), Alfonso Roybal/Awa Tsireh
(1898-1955, 17 works), Miguel Martinez (dates unknown, 62 4 works), and
Louis Gonzalez (or Luis Gonzales, or Wo-Peen, 1907-c. 1990, 2 works) are
from San Ildefonso; Velino Herrera (also called Ma-Pe-Wi, 1902-1973, 3
works) is from Sia. 63

Alexander writes that this collection was brought together by Anne
Evans of Denver (p. 11). As mentioned earlier in my essay, Evans was a major
patron of the Denver Art Museum; these were among the first works of that
museum's permanent collection of Native art, a gift from her in 1932. The

62 In his Introduction, Alexander says he is the son of Crescensio Martinez
(p. 10).

63 Most of these artists have work in other important collections. See, for
example, Bernstein, Bruce and W. Jackson Rushing. *Modern by Tradition:*
*American Indian Painting in the Studio Style*, Santa Fe: Museum of New
Mexico Press, 1995; J.J. Brody, *Pueblo Indian Painting*, 1997; Wyckoff,
*Visions and Voices*, 1996; Tryntje Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches
Down*, 1988 (documenting the Denman Collection of the Indian Arts and
listing of exhibits and books containing the works of most of these artists.
three plates by Velino Herrera (Plates 48-50) are the exception, apparently coming from some other source (see Alexander's Introduction, p. 11).

Like Jacobson's Introduction to the 1929 Kiowa portfolio, Alexander's essay focuses on the land and the people, as much as the artwork itself. But he does give credit to the traditional painterly arts of the Pueblos for laying the groundwork upon which the easel painting tradition was built:

But for the Pueblo Indian of the Southwest, the sky with its sun and cloud and lightnings and rainbows, and the earth with its responding green, give the mood and meaning of the art that is shown chiefly in the decoration of vase and altar.

Essentially this art of the Pueblo Indian is that of the decorator of earthen surfaces, of pottery and of the smoothed and coated walls of ceremonial chambers (p. 7).

As was customary in the narratives on Native art in that era, Alexander maintains the fiction that this is a nearly pristine manifestation of Native work: “It is notable that the influence of the white man's technique and modes of conception is almost negligible in Pueblo Indian art” (p. 9). He goes on to say that only the watercolors and the paper come from the marketplace. Yet Alice Corbin Henderson, one of the patrons of these artists, had said in 1925 that she shared with Awa Tsireh “a book of original Japanese prints, which we thought would interest him as being more closely allied to his own art than anything in Occidental painting. He turned the
pages thoughtfully, and finally, brushing his hand lovingly over a page, said
simply, 'Made good.'

but in 1932, those who wrote about these works were
invested in seeing them as an "authentic" (i.e. unsullied) tribal manifestation,
rather than as a fascinating creative result of an inter-cultural
collaboration, as many might view them today. (See below, section on
Collaboration, Patronage, etc.)

The Author. Hartley Burr Alexander (1873-1939) is identified on the
title page of the portfolio as "Professor in Scripps College, Lecturer in the
School of American Research." He was born in Lincoln, Nebraska, and
earned his Ph.D. in philosophy at Columbia University in 1901. He was first a
professor of philosophy at the University of Nebraska (1908-27) before
becoming Professor of Philosophy at Scripps College in Claremont, California


65 The School of American Research, in Santa Fe, recently renamed the School of Advanced Research, was founded in 1907 as the School of American Archaeology, and has been very influential in scholarly work about archaeology, anthropology, and the American southwest, in particular. See Nancy Lewis and Kay Hagen, A Peculiar Alchemy: A Centennial History of SAR 1907-2007, Santa Fe: SAR Press, 2008 and Douglas Schwartz, et al., Legacy: Southwestern Indian Art at the School of American Research, Santa Fe: SAR Press, 1999.
until his death in 1939. A polymath who published on topics in philosophy, literature and ethics, Alexander is remembered today primarily as an expert on Native American literature, philosophy and aesthetics. In 1925 he lectured on these topics at the Sorbonne (published in French as *L'Art et la philosophie des Indiens de l'Amerique Nord*), and in 1927 he gave the Cooke-Daniels Lectures at the Denver Art Museum. He also introduced the portfolio, *Sioux Indian Painting*, 1938, discussed below.

**The Subject Matter and the Artists.** Alexander strove to include a number of distinct individuals' styles and types of imagery prevalent in Pueblo painting at the time. In the representation of figures, the style

---


ranges from the simple hieratic frieze of Peña's female Basket Dancers  
(Plate 3), to the sophisticated movement in space of paired figures in Awa  
Tsireh's Snake Dance (Plate 28). In terms of abstraction and representation,  
the paintings range from flat, abstracted forms pleasingly arranged in space  
(Richard Martinez's Avanyu or Plumed Serpent, Plate 26), to images that  
combine two-dimensional patterned forms with more naturalistic animals  
(Awa Tsireh's series of animals and rainbows, Plates 38, 39, 40), to the  
relatively straightforward depiction of a rider on horseback (Plate 49, Velino  
Herrera). The last, both in style and subject matter, would be equally at  
home in the 1929 Kiowa portfolio. Here I choose to look at the work of just  
two of the artists in the portfolio, those with the most works published:  
Richard Martinez and the artist who signed his name both Alfonso Roybal  
and Awa Tsireh. I will refer to him by the latter name.

Awa Tsireh was one of the most celebrated Native painters of the  
early 20th century. In the caption to Plate 27, Alexander calls him "perhaps  
the most famous of the Pueblo Indian painters." He was noteworthy in being  
the sole artist featured in a New York Times article in 1925. There, Alice  
Corbin Henderson (a prominent figure in the Santa Fe literary community,  
and one of the earliest collectors of Pueblo painting) calls him the "leader"
of the painting movement, and says his drawings are “as precise and sophisticated as a Persian miniature.” She goes on to talk about his work in evaluative terms that could be used for any artist in the world, without a hint of paternalism: “There is a precision and a surety, both in conception and in intimate detail, which marks his work as that of an artist who loves his medium. And his mastery of that medium has constantly developed and increased.”

A prolific and innovative artist, he was particularly adept at melding diverse pictorial influences into a coherent style. Born in San Ildefonso in 1898, and baptized as Alfonso Roybal, he later signed his work with his Indian name, Awa Tsireh, meaning Cattail Bird. His maternal uncle, Crescensio Martinez, was the first San Ildefonso artist to make watercolors of ritual dancers, and they worked together for a brief period. Awa Tsireh had made drawings as a child, and came to the attention of the Santa Fe art world in 1917. In that year, Henderson and her husband William, a

---


69 All biographical data on Awa Tsireh is drawn from Brody, Pueblo Indian Painting, 1997, especially chapter 4. See also Dunn, American Indian Painting, 1968, pp. 198-207 on Crescencio Martinez and Awa Tsireh.
painter, befriended Awa Tsireh and began to buy his works. In their home he examined books on Japanese prints, as mentioned above, as well as modern art, Persian miniature painting, and Egyptian art. In 1920, Edgar Lee Hewitt commissioned the artist, along with Fred Kabotie and several other men to paint pictures.

In her history of American Indian painting, Dorothy Dunn writes with insight into Awa Tsireh's works, illustrating her discussion with the painting from the Denver Art Museum on which Plate 39 is based:

One of Awa Tsireh's favorite arrangements combines figures of human beings or animals with plants and abstract forms under a wide-arching rainbow above which, at either side, cloud terraces extend. The animation in life forms—the loping deer, the arch-tailed skunks, or the puppet-like dancers—presents a striking contrast to the formal, static beauty of the rainbow-cloud backdrop, giving a true theatrical effect. In these paintings, the spaces frequently appear to be mechanically measured and the arcs seem to be described by a compass, yet upon examination, slight variations can be found to prove that the pottery decorator's skill is responsible for the precision.

Awa Tsireh's drawing is usually two-dimensional and flat although at times it shows that foreshortening is no problem to him. He occasionally combines three-dimensional with two-dimensional effects without clash, and often he uses accurate foreshortening together with an unusual kind of his own, producing a two-dimensional appearance. His line quality is extremely sure and exquisitely clean.70

70 Dunn, American Indian Painting, 1968, p. 206 and figure 82.
Moreover, his work reveals his wide-ranging examination of world art forms. Sometimes he uses Egyptian-like outlining of eyes and Art Deco-like abstraction of forms and use of color. More than many of his peers, Awa Tsireh successfully merged the symbolic vocabulary of indigenous Pueblo art and the eclectic international style of early modernism. The Hawk (Plate 42) is a marvelous example, combining decorative abstractions with close observation of a bird of prey. The tree stump, talons, and aspects of the bird’s head are highly realistic. Yet the body is segmented like a Pueblo pot or kiva mural, with fanciful coloring and decorative patterning.

Awa Tsireh’s Harvest Dance (Plate 27), at first glance strikingly different from Plate 42, is in fact a similar combination of realism and abstract decorative patterning. A dense circle of forty-three standing women combines the repetition of arms, jewelry, and white legs, with the variation of striped, checked, and patterned shawls. It is realistic in its attention to ethnographic detail (the harvest vegetables laid out on the cloth, the baskets of ground meal at each of the cardinal directions), yet decorative in its rhythmic patterning.
Less is known about the life of Richard Martinez, and far less has been written about his work, though he went on to study at the Studio School in 1932, and worked on mural projects there. His Plates 12, 13, and 14 are similar in layout to Awa Tsireh’s Plates 38, 39, and 40, in that they balance the abstraction of the setting with the realism of the characters’ place in that setting. His dancers (Plates 16, 17, 18, 19) do not perform in the recognizable space of the dance plaza, but in a space demarcated by abstract religious symbols.

The work of both of these artists was prominently on display in the 1931 Exposition of Indian Tribal Arts. Awa Tsireh’s extraordinary watercolor, *Koshare Climbing the Rainbow*, was on the front cover of the catalogue, while Richard Martinez (called Ma-Pe-Wi in that catalogue) was featured in Plate I, the fronticepiece. It displays his characteristic use of sky and rain symbols above and a geometric earth band below, yet in the center of the image is a hunting scene in which a dozen buffalo are pursued by four riders. This is far more complex than any of his paintings featured.

---

in the Szwedzicki portfolio. Both of these works were also featured in a lengthy review of the exhibit, where they were lauded for their imagination and versatility.  

No women were included in this portfolio, although Tonita Peña was known, and her work exhibited at the 1931 Exposition of Tribal Arts. Indeed, Anne Evans even owned one, though it was not selected for the portfolio.  

In the 1950 portfolio, in contrast, Pueblo artists Tonita Peña, Pablita Velarde, Pop Chalee, Eva Mirabal, and Geronima Cruz Montoya were all featured (see below).

**Pueblo Indian Pottery, 1933, 1936**

*Pueblo Indian Pottery*, issued in a two-volume set in 1933 and 1936, contained 50 hand-colored photo-lithographs in each volume, drawn by Kenneth Chapman himself after vessels in the collection of the Indian Arts


73 Denver Art Museum accession file # 1932.149; See also Plate II in Sloan and Lafarge, *Introduction to American Indian Art*, 1931.
Fund at the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe. Each volume cost $35, and was issued in an edition of 750. The text is in both English and French. Volume I focuses on Taos, Picuris, San Juan, Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, Tesuque, Cochiti, Santo Domingo, and Santa Ana, while Volume II surveys Zia, Acoma, Zuni, and Hopi.

A review of Volume I states, "It was originally intended to bring out all of this material in a single volume that should contain 100 plates; but division subsequently appeared more feasible. The first half of a decidedly praiseworthy undertaking has been accomplished, and the second portfolio, Mr. Chapman informs us, will be brought out in the Autumn, or later."

This project was distinctly different from the portfolios that preceded it. The 1929 and 1932 portfolios depicted, respectively, the watercolors of Kiowa and Pueblo artists themselves. The works in those

---

74 For a history of the Indian Arts Fund, see (anon.), *Quiet Triumph: Forty Years With the Indian Arts Fund*, Fort Worth, Texas: The Amon Carter Museum, 1966.

75 As mentioned in footnote 42, the inventory of Volume II of *Pueblo Indian Pottery* is said to have been destroyed in a warehouse during World War II, making it the rarest of all volumes today. (Jonathan Batkin, personal communication, June 14, 2005).

portfolios were only one step removed from the original (from artist's hand
to the French pochoir printer's hand, in the 1929 volume, and from artist's
hand to lithographer in the 1932 volume). Here there is one further level of
remove: the three-dimensional painted pot was fashioned by one or more
artists (and some of them were painted by a person other than the shaper
of the vessel). Then Chapman's painted interpretation of these three-
dimensional forms was the basis for the lithographed and hand-colored print.
In this regard, *Pueblo Indian Pottery* has more in common with another
ambitious American enterprise of the 1930s: the already mentioned Index
of American Design.\(^7\) The Index was an ambitious WPA project that ran
from 1935-1942. Not only did it give work to hundreds of artists and
illustrators, but it created a pictorial archive of more than 18,000
watercolors of important pieces of American folk and decorative art—quilts,
ceramics, woodcarving, furniture and the like. At a time before color
photography, these impeccable watercolor representations of America’s folk
art heritage provided a substantial record of the past. It is noteworthy that
they were intended to be published as a series of portfolios---much like the

\(^7\) See Virginia Clayton, et al., *Drawing on America's Past: Folk Art,
Szwedzicki portfolios, but this proved too costly. Instead they were simply archived at the National Gallery of Art, and a more modest volume of representative samples was published in 1950.78

The Author. Kenneth M. Chapman (1875-1968) was born in Indiana, and went west to New Mexico in 1899, after having served as an apprentice artist in several engraving shops throughout the mid-west. He made New Mexico his home for most of the remaining sixty-nine years of his life. As a commercial artist and art instructor at the Las Vegas (New Mexico) Normal School, he became intrigued by the design elements on ancient, historic and contemporary Pueblo pottery. Under the directorship of Edgar Lee Hewett in 1909, Chapman was one of the founding members of the staff of the Museum of New Mexico and the School of American Archaeology.79 There he worked at diverse tasks, including staff artist, cartographer, recording secretary, and exhibition designer. He studied archaeological pottery at museum excavations at Frijoles Canyon and Chaco Canyon, and he painted

78 For plans for portfolios of these works, see Erika Doss, “American Folk Art’s 'Distinctive Character': The Index of American Design and New Deal Notions of Cultural Nationalism,” in Clayton, Drawing on America’s Past, p. 63. The original publication was Erwin Christensen, The Index of American Design. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

79 See footnote 65 on SAA/SAR.
murals for the museum’s Fine Arts building. He also worked closely with San Ildefonso watercolor painter and pottery painter Julian Martinez, who was at that time a janitor at the museum; Martinez and his more famous wife Maria also gave pottery demonstrations in the museum’s courtyard. (See Pueblo Indian Painting, Plate 1.)

Though he had no college degree, Chapman taught the first anthropology class at the University of New Mexico, and he taught at the Santa Fe Indian School, where he transmitted his knowledge of Pueblo pottery design to several generations of Native students. By the time of his selection as author of the 1933 and 1936 portfolios, Chapman had been studying and sketching Pueblo pottery for nearly twenty years. The title page of the volume identifies him as “Curator of the Indian Arts Fund and the Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe (New Mexico).”


81 The Laboratory of Anthropology was founded in Santa Fe in 1927. Today, as the Museum of Indian Art and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology it is one of the holdings of the museums of New Mexico, and maintains its own museum and research archive.
Building on the Szwedzicki portfolios, Chapman published *The Pottery of Santo Domingo Pueblo* in 1936. *The Pottery of San Ildefonso Pueblo* was published posthumously in 1970.\(^8^2\) He also had prepared many drawings for similar volumes on Cochiti, Santa Ana, and other Pueblos, but these were never completed.\(^8^3\)

**The Subject Matter.** In the introductory essay to Volume 1, Chapman explains the reason for the choices of vessels illustrated in the portfolio:

Until recently, no comprehensive collection of the pottery of each Pueblo has been available, for the great museums of America had concentrated upon material from the excavation of ancient burial sites, overlooking the fact that the ware of the early post-Spanish period is the rarest of all….It remained, therefore for the Indian Arts Fund to bridge the gap. Organized in 1932, the founders began immediately to search for specimens exemplifying the progress of Pueblo pottery making throughout each century of the post-Spanish period. Through the activity of this organization, now affiliated with the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, a superb collection numbering well over nineteen hundred specimens is now available, not alone for the enjoyment of our own race, but also for the inspiration and guidance of future generations of Indian artists and craftsmen. (p. 9).

---


Chapman also gives a brief history of Pueblo pottery and its techniques of manufacture, and includes a few examples of archaeological vessels (Vol. 1, Plates 1-4). He illustrates pots that are merely slipped and burnished (see, for example, Plates 6-13), as well as vessels painted with design motifs. He also includes plates that show a dozen or more comparative examples of typical designs: Plate 25 (San Ildefonso), Plate 31 (Tesoque), Plate 37 (Cochiti), Plate 45 (Santo Domingo), and Plate 50 (Santa Ana).

Volume 2 includes the more westerly communities of Tsia (today spelled Zia), Acoma, Zuni and Hopi. As in the first volume, several plates are devoted to multiple design motifs characteristic of individual Pueblos: Plate 59 (Tsia), Plate 77 (Acoma), Plate 90 (Zuni), and Plate 100 (Hopi).

Despite the fact that Chapman was writing at a time of a great pottery renaissance in the Southwest, he does not focus on contemporary pottery. Nor does he feature named artists, such as Maria Martinez, who were then achieving such acclaim. (Plate 24, of Volume 1 features “typical new pottery” of San Ildefonso, but the makers are not identified.) In the 100 plates of the two portfolios, he names only one artist: Nampeo (today
spelled Nampeyo) of Hano, a Hopi-Tewa village (captions to Plates 98, 99, in Volume 2).

As a graphic artist himself, Chapman was fascinated by the interplay of realism and abstraction in the painted designs on Pueblo pottery and other related wares in the southwest, such as ancient Mimbres and Casas Grandes pottery. Their graphic design systems often fostered the paring down of the representational forms from one or two recognizable elements—the curving horn of a horned serpent, or the crooked beak and long tail of the parrot—within a seemingly abstract graphic design field of rectangular or triangular forms. (See for example, Pueblo Indian Pottery, Plate 4 and Pueblo Indian Pottery, Plate 100.)

In an early article on this topic, Chapman observed, "A certain degree of realism was deliberately sacrificed to symbolism, and the ability to depict the characteristic features of the eagle, the quail, or any other bird or animal, was applied to the decorative arrangement of an all important symbolism."

In 1924 and 1925, Columbia University graduate student Ruth Bunzel had spent the summers working with Pueblo potters, resulting in her

---

dissertation and book *The Pueblo Potter*. As an anthropologist she was looking to understand

the manner in which an individual operates within the limits of an established style, or finding that impossible, creates new values and wins for them social recognition. It is an attempt to enter fully into the mind of primitive artists; to see their technique and style, not as they appear objectively to students of museum collections, but as they appear to the artists themselves, who are seeking in this field of behavior a satisfactory and intelligible technique of individual expression.85

Through interviews with potters, through her own attempts at pottery-making, and through her many illustrations of painted pottery designs, Bunzel sought to discover the individuality of the artist. In his work, Chapman was not interested in the work of the individual, though he easily could have produced a portfolio with the finest works by well-known contemporary potters and pottery painters of the early Twentieth century, among them Maria and Julian Martinez of San Ildefonso, and Nampeyo of

---

Hopi. It was in Pueblo pottery that first arose, in North American Indian art, the notion of the named artist, the signed pot.\textsuperscript{86}

\textbf{Sioux Indian Painting, 1938}

Hartley Burr Alexander, the author of the 1932 \textit{Pueblo Indian Painting}, also authored \textit{Sioux Indian Painting} of 1938, a two-volume set, each portfolio consisting of 25 plates. Only 400 copies were issued--fewer than any of the previous offerings. I have been unable to find the price of this set. Part I is subtitled "Paintings of the Sioux and other tribes of the Great Plains" while Part II is called "The Art of Amos Bad Heart Buffalo."

The Subject Matter and the Artists. Despite its title, this work is not limited to work by Sioux artists, and unlike the first two volumes in the series, neither is it limited to paintings on paper. Paintings on hide and muslin, both from the Peabody Museum at Harvard, open the first portfolio (\textit{Plates 1 and 2}). Plate 1 depicts a famous early Mandan hide painting that was brought back from the west by Lewis and Clark.

Four Shoshone hide paintings are included. One is by an unknown artist (Plate 20), one by Chief Wakashie (Plate 14), and one by his son Charles Wakashie (Plate 19). Paintings on elk skin by Katsikodi, (c. 1865-1912, sometimes spelled Cadzi Cody) are illustrated in plates 15, 16, 17, 18.

Alexander observes that these “can hardly fail to recall to mind the famous bison of the cave of Altamira” (Introduction, p. 8).87

The celebrated Kiowa artist Silver Horn88 (1860-1940) is represented by five plates of four of his finest hide paintings (Plates 21-25; Plate 25 is detail of Plate 24). Plates 21-23 are three of the four pictorial narratives of the Medicine Lodge (the Kiowa term for the Sun Dance) that Silver Horn produced while working at the Smithsonian for anthropologist James Mooney in 1902.89

87 For another hide painting by this artist, very much like the one in Plate 15, see Duane Anderson, ed., Legacy: Southwest Indian Art at the School of American Research, Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1999, p. 210-211.

88 Alexander calls him Silverhorn, but in recent years this has been standardized as Silver Horn (two words). See Greene,

89 Candace Greene’s extraordinary study of Silver Horn and his art considers this at length. See Candace Greene, Silver Horn, Master Illustrator of the Kiowas, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001, pp. 110-119. My interpretive details come from her discussion of these works, pp. 110-119, and captions for Plates 18-22.
Alexander does not present them in sequential order, however. If he did, Plate 22 would be first. James Mooney titled this “the Camp Circle—Measuring the Pole”; it depicts four episodes concerning cutting the tree and preparing the Sun Dance Pole. Plate 21 follows, titled by Mooney “Building the Medicine Lodge.” It shows horses and riders dragging the felled trees and constructing the ceremonial enclosure. Plate 23 is more episodic, consisting of vignettes from two ceremonies. Mooney’s title for this was “the Sun Dance and the Peyote Ceremony.” Plate 24, from the collection at Claremont College where Alexander taught, is a veritable artist’s sampler from Kiowa history and religion. These superb works of Kiowa art were produced for the St. Louis World’s Fair of 1904, where they were seen by millions.90 Their publication in the 1938 Szwedzicki portfolio re-introduced them to a new generation.

The Lakota artist Kills Two (1869-1927) is best known today for the ten paintings in this portfolio (Plates 3 – 11, plus portfolio cover image), as well as his redrawing and interpretation of the Big Missouri Winter Count.91

90 Greene, Silver Horn, p. 117.
91 A winter-count is a Lakota historical and calendrical painting recording pictographic aides-memoire for the retelling of tribal history. The Big Missouri Winter Count records annual pictographs from 1796–1926. See
Kills Two rendered a number of scenes of traditional hunting and war-making of the sort practiced by his father's generation (Plates 3-7, 11). One depicts Custer and Crazy Horse (10). Kills Two draws horses with grace and fluency. His most handsome painting is “An Indian Horse Dance” (Plate 9), of four riders and their elegant overlapping horses, their bodies painted for ceremony. The rider in the foreground wears the regalia of (or has been transformed into) a Thunder Being, the sacred figure that bring summer’s powerful storms. His horse is painted with hail emblems.92

Volume II consists entirely of the work of Lakota artist Amos Bad Heart Buffalo (today know as Bad Heart Bull, 1869-1913), who is also

______________________________


The paintings by Kills Two, from the author’s own collection, are housed today in the Hartley Burr Alexander Collection of American Indian Art Work at Denison Library, Scripps College, Claremont, California (accession # D1943.3). One other drawing by Kills Two is in the Burke museum at the University of Washington (accession # 2.4E167). Their records say it was made circa 1925.

featured in Plates 12 and 13 in Volume I.  

Alexander was introduced to the extraordinary work of Bad Heart Buffalo in 1927 by Helen Blish, a graduate student in Anthropology at the University of Nebraska. She had discovered it on the Pine Ridge Reservation the previous year, and had begun to write a Master’s thesis on it. The more than 400 renderings of Lakota history by this artist were drawn within the pages of a ledger book, 7 1/2 x 12”. (The images are enlarged in the portfolio.)

Though the artist had died over a decade before, his epic pictorial history was in the hands of his sister, Dollie Pretty Cloud, who allowed Blish to “rent” the book for various periods of time for study. During one of these rental periods, Hartley Alexander paid for photography of the entire book.

---

93 In this publication, Alexander calls him Bad Heart Buffalo; Helen Blish calls him Bad Heart Bull. The editor’s note at the end of her text says “the artist’s name has been changed herein to “Bad Heart Bull” to conform with the translation carried on government rolls, and because that is the name by which the family is commonly known.” Blish, A Pictographic History of the Oglala Sioux, 1967, p. 529.

These photographs are the only remaining record of the book, which was
interred with Mrs. Pretty Cloud upon her death in 1947.95

Bad Heart Buffalo’s book of drawings was a work of enormous scope
and imagination. His pictures ranged from the early history of the Lakota
and their traditional ceremonialism (Vol. 2, Plates 20-24) to the Battle of
Little Big Horn (Vol. 2, Plates 2-17), the Ghost Dance, the murder of Crazy
Horse (Vol. 2, Plate 18), and the massacre at Wounded Knee (Vol. 2, Plate
19). He rendered a panoptic view of Lakota life, carefully conveying details
both visually and via inscriptions written in Lakota (with an occasional name
in English). This pictorial history was not made at the behest of any
anthropologist or art collector. It was a personal achievement that satisfied
Bad Heart Buffalo’s own vision of what it meant to be an artist and historian
of his culture. He moved easily from sweeping scenes of warfare to
miniature, map-like renderings (Vol. 2, Plate 1), to intimate depictions of
courtship and ceremony. He chronicled warfare between the Lakota and
Crow peoples during the 1850s-70s, as well as their adaptation to farming
and ranching in the 1880s and 90s (Vol. 2, Plate 25). Bad Heart Buffalo

95 See “Publisher’s Preface” in Helen H. Blish, A Pictographic History of the
experimented with new modes of representation, fearlessly tackling three-dimensionality, back and three-quarter views, and aerial perspective (Vol. 1, Plate 13). His dynamic and vigorous opus stands as an unparalleled achievement in Native American art.

Alexander was intrigued with the drawing book, and recognized its great artistic and historical significance. In his Introduction to Volume 2, Alexander calls Bad Heart Buffalo an artistic “master not only of his own race but in a world sense” (p. 5), and his images “without rival in American Indian art” (p. 6). He helped Blish obtain two grants from the Carnegie Institution of Washington to finance her study of the manuscript.96 Concurrently, Alexander published a few images from it himself. It was undoubtedly he who arranged for the book to be part of the Exposition of Indian Tribal Arts in New York in 1931, and he wrote an article on it in 1932 as well.97 So it was logical that Alexander would devote the whole second

96 Blish’s M.A. was completed in 1928, and in 1934 she presented an amplified three-volume report on the ledger book to the Carnegie Institution. Blish died in 1941, and her report was posthumously published by the University of Nebraska Press.

volume of *Sioux Indian Painting* to twenty-two images from this artist’s remarkable *oeuvre* (the other three of the 25 plates are details). It is due to the efforts of Hartley Burr Alexander that we have a visual record of this remarkable drawing book today.

**American Indian Painters, 1950**

The two volume *American Indian Painters* was issued in 1950 at a price of $100. Unlike the previous works, the print run is not listed in this portfolio. Volume I contains thirty-six plates, while volume II has forty-one, most of them works of art made since 1920. Oscar Jacobson and his French wife, Jeanne d’Ucel collaborated on this project. Little is known about her; Jacobson is discussed under the first portfolio, *Kiowa Indian Art*, above.

---


98 The preface to Blish’s book states that in the early 1930s Alexander “had some thirty enlargements made and colored by hand after the original drawings.” (viii). Thirty-two color plates were included in the Blish volume.

99 Many of the images by Katsikodi, Kills Two, and Bad Heart Bull were reproduced in color in Leslie Tillet, *Wind on the Buffalo Grass*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1976.
In a review of the subsequent volume, *American Indian Costumes* of 1952, the reviewer makes reference to *American Indian Painters*: “This work created an artistic sensation in Europe and America. It was snatched up by museums, libraries, and by discriminating collectors, so that it is now out of print.”

Jacobson and d’Ucel wrote a substantial introduction to the topic of American Indian painting, covering topics from petroglyphs and Pueblo pottery and mural painting to Navajo sandpainting and Plains hide painting. The only areas slighted are the Pacific Northwest and the East. They also provided lengthy, and very personal notes in the captions to the plates. Jacobson, by 1950, was perhaps feeling the need to set down his recollections of more than twenty years of associating with some of these artists, and offers personal anecdotes as well as some biographical information that, at that point, had not yet been published elsewhere.

In general, the commentaries on the artists and their work reflect quite a different viewpoint from that put forth some twenty years earlier by Alexander; the United States --and the role of Native people in it—had changed considerably by 1950. In the captions are remarks about Bachelor's

---

degrees, experiences in the Second World War, and even a Guggenheim fellowship for Fred Kabotie. No longer could a fiction of “untouched Indians” be maintained.

Some of the works from Jacobson’s personal collection that appear in this portfolio are now in the National Museum of the American Indian; others are in the collection of the Fred Jones Jr. Museum at the University of Oklahoma. Most of the works illustrated in Volume I not owned by Jacobson were already in the OU collections, except for the Navajo sandpainting (Plate 3), from the Navajo House of Ceremonial Art (now the Wheelwright Museum in Santa Fe).

The Subject Matter and the Artists. In Volume I, the first three plates provide a historic context for the contemporary work: a reproduction of rock art (Plate 1), a hide-painting by American Horse (Plate 2) of the type published by Alexander in Sioux Indian Painting some years earlier. Plate 3, while contemporary with the other paintings in these portfolios, is different in many respects. It is a replica of a ceremonial sandpainting used in healing.

While the name of the ceremonial practitioner who specialized in this chant is unrecorded, the name of the woman who actually replicated his drawing is not: she was Franc Newcomb (1887-1970), who made this painting
in 1937; in the original her signature and the date can be clearly seen. She and her husband owned a trading post, and Franc became a student of Navajo ceremonial art, eventually recording more than 700 sandpainting images, and writing about her work with Navajo ceremonialists.\footnote{See, for example, Franc Newcomb, \textit{Hosteen Klah: Navajo Medicine Man and Sandpainter}, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964; Franc Newcomb and Gladys Reichard, \textit{Sandpaintings of the Navajo Shooting Chant}, New York: Dover Publications, 1975 [original 1937].} This is an image from the Water Chant, depicting water monsters and the four sacred plants of the Navajo, surrounded by a rainbow. At the top, an otter and beaver guard the entrance to the ceremonial enclosure.\footnote{Mary Cabot Wheelwright, \textit{Hail Chant and Water Chant}, Navajo Religion Series Volume II, Santa Fe: Museum of Navajo Ceremonial Art, 1946, p. 199.} The relationship between the non-Native recorders of this imagery and the Navajo practitioners is an interesting one; I shall return to it below, in “Collaboration, Patronage, Mentorship and Entrepreneurship.”

Plates 4 to 36 feature work by thirty-one contemporary artists from the Woodlands and Plains. All of the artists in the 1929 Kiowa portfolio are represented here, as well as James Auchiah, the other member of the Kiowa Five. Having discussed the Kiowa painters earlier, I will confine my remarks here to a sampling of the other artists. Most are represented by only one
painting, except for Acee Blue Eagle (Plates 4 and 5) and Monroe Tsatoke (Plates 34 and 35; Inexplicably, a third work by Tsasoke is the last plate, number 77, of Volume 2.)

In his work in the 1930s and 40s, Acee Blue Eagle (1909-1959) clearly was experimenting with the variety of styles he had observed in recent Pueblo and Kiowa painting. Some of his works borrow the ground lines, rainbows, and cloud symbols of Awa Tsireh’s and Richard Martinez’s paintings from the 1932 Pueblo Indian Painting portfolio discussed above; in the works chosen for this portfolio (Plates 4 and 5), Blue Eagle mirrors the simplicity of some of the works in the 1929 Kiowa Indian Art portfolio.

Fred Beaver (1911-1980) a Creek artist from Oklahoma, credits Acee Blue Eagle with encouraging him to paint. But he tells a humorous story on himself as he aspired to be a painter:

I went off to Italy [i.e., World War II] and when I came back I used to see these girls in Esquire magazine...the pinup girls y’know. And I thought about it and said to myself: now I should do an Indian girl like that. So I did several paintings of these pinup Indian girls, and when I heard that the Philbrook Art Center was announcing its first Indian art competition, I sent my pinups to them. After all, I didn’t have the slightest idea what they meant by Indian painting...Anyway, they sent them back and said that that wasn’t exactly what they had in mind.

103 See, for example, Wyckoff, Visions and Voices, p. 96 and 99.
...By the next year I knew a lot more about painting and art exhibits. I submitted one little painting on a Seminole subject. Sure enough they accepted it and ended up giving me honorable mention.104

That 'one little painting' purchased by the Philbrook from its Second Annual Competition, “Seminole Family at Work,” was very much like the one Jacobson selected for inclusion in this portfolio (Plate 6). It depicts a Florida Seminole family in early Twentieth century patchwork clothing standing in front of their thatched chickee.105 One wonders what the source for his knowledge was, for Beaver grew up in Oklahoma; the view of this dwelling and its accoutrements (minus the people) is extraordinarily similar to one published in a Smithsonian report on Seminole culture.106 The lush, green sub-tropical setting is striking in this portfolio, where so often the figures float on the page or are grounded in a minimal landscape.

Blackbear Bosin’s “Two Horsemen” (Plate 17) pose in one such austere landscape; this work seems to be as much a portrait of the horses as of the


105 See Wyckoff, Visions and Voices, p. 77, bottom image.

individual men. Primarily a self-taught artist, Bosin (1921-1980) attended St. Patrick’s Mission School in Anadarko, Oklahoma, a generation after the Kiowa Five. As an adult he worked as a production illustrator in the aerospace industry. He is better known for his more dramatic works from the 1950s in which figures move across landscape. Perhaps his most famous is “Prairie Fire” (1953), a theatrical rendering of horsemen and animals streaking across the grasslands while fiery clouds race across the sky.¹⁰⁷

Arapaho artist Carl Sweezy (c. 1881-1953) was significantly older than most of those represented in this portfolio. Like the Kiowa artist Silver Horn, he worked for Smithsonian anthropologist James Mooney, making drawings of Arapaho warriors and shields in a style very much like that of elderly Lakota men at the beginning of the 20th century who were recalling their exploits from an earlier era.¹⁰⁸ He credited Mooney as his only teacher, for he was still in his teens when Mooney hired him as an

¹⁰⁷ “Prairie Fire” graces the cover of Highwater’s Song from the Earth, and is illustrated in Wyckoff, Visions and Voices, p. 101.

¹⁰⁸ For early 20th century Lakota drawings, see Berlo, Plains Indian Drawings, 1996. For Sweezy drawings in the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian, see ms 2531, vols. 8, 13, 14. Other works are in the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago.
illustrator.\textsuperscript{109} His works seem resolutely descriptive, without as much style or artistry as most of the other work in the portfolio. Sweezy’s painting “Indian Religion” (Plate 31) is a scene he painted several times in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{110} A circle of men sit inside a tipi with the walls rolled up. They are conducting a peyote ceremony. Their distinctive fans and peyote rattles are carefully delineated.

Cheyenne artist Walter Richard West (1912-1996) provides a self-portrait in Plate 36, “Dick Dancing.” In his caption, Jacobson observes, “It is thoroughly Indian in technique and execution, but his mastery of anatomy and movement reveals years of artistic training.” That training was at the University of Oklahoma, where under the tutelage of Jacobson and others, he earned a BFA (1941) and an MFA (1950). When this portfolio was produced, Dick West was the head of the Art Department at Bacone College, a job he held from 1947-1970.\textsuperscript{111} He is also known for his complex and

\begin{thebibliography}{9}

\bibitem{footnote110} The Philbrook Museum owns two versions from the 1930s. See Wyckoff, \textit{Visions and Voices}, p. 243.

\end{thebibliography}
accurate renderings of ceremonial scenes, as in "Cheyenne Sun Dance—Third Day" of 1949.  

In Volume II, five artists from Pueblo Indian Painting of 1932 reappear: Julian Martinez, Abel Sanchez, Romando Vigil, Awa Tsireh, and Velino Herrera. Most of them are represented by work quite similar to that shown in the 1932 portfolio.

One notable addition is the Hopi artist Fred Kabotie; the omission of this important artist from the 1932 portfolio had made that a less than representative sample of important early Pueblo painting. He began to paint while a student at the Santa Fe Indian School, and by 1920, he was being paid to paint pictures at the Museum and the School of American Research.  

Here, in the caption to his "Prayer for Rain" (Plate 44), Jacobson pronounces Kabotie “Dean of living Pueblo painters.” The work is an ambitious scene, as most of his are, with some twenty dancers arrayed in a range of poses. In the 1920s, Kabotie painted numerous scenes of the Hopi Snake Dance, as well as the dances of other Pueblos. Some, such as this one, omit

---

112 Illustrated in Wyckoff, Visions and Voices, p. 289
113 Brody covers Kabotie’s early years in admirable depth in Pueblo Indian Painting, 1997, chapters 4 and 5. See also Fred Kabotie with Bill Belknap, Fred Kabotie, Hopi Indian Artist, Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1977.
any sense of place and focus on the ceremonial performers. Others encompass the dance plaza, the spectators, and even the architecture. In the 1930s, Kabotie painted an ambitious scheme of murals in the interior of the Watchtower at the Grand Canyon, designed by Mary Coulter in 1932.

As mentioned previously, no women were included in the 1932 portfolio. Here there are five—Marina Lujan (better known as Pop Chalee), Geronima Cruz Montoya, Eva Mirabal, Tonita Peña, and Pablita Velarde.

Geronima Cruz Montoya's painting "A Matachina Dance, Christmas," (Plate 48), depicts a ritual performance that takes place in some Pueblo and Hispanic communities in New Mexico, including Montoya’s own village of San Juan. It is complex melding of 16th century Spanish and more recent Native performance traditions. In this image, Montoya portrays some of the dancers who wear headgear that looks like a bishop's miter, decorated with streamers, scarves,

114 See, for example, “Hopi Ceremonial Dance” of 1921, illustrated in Highwater, Song from the Earth, 1976, p. 50.


fringe and silk cloths that mask their faces. They are led by a little girl named Malinche, after Cortez's female guide.

Montoya began as a student at the Santa Fe Indian School, worked there with Dorothy Dunn from 1932-1937, and then ran the art program herself until 1962, training several generations of Native artists, including some represented in this portfolio, such as Ben Quintana, Joe Herrera and Jimmy Toddy.

Tonita Peña (1893-1949) was born in San Ildefonso, but later moved to Cochiti. She was the lone female among the first generation of painters that included Awa Tsireh, Fred Kabotie, and others discussed in this essay. As Jantzer-White has persuasively argued,

She broke down Pueblo prohibitions against women painting. Resisting pressures by Cochiti elders, Peña enlisted the aid of her husband Epitacio, four-time governor of Cochiti. Insisting on the same rights afforded Cochiti males who painted drums for both ceremonial use and sale to tourists, Peña eschewed boundaries, yet nonetheless supported and expanded the Pueblo female's traditional roles. Her painting emerged from within Pueblo mnemonic pedagogical practices--the use of rituals' repetitive visual and oral imagery to inculcate societal norms--exercised primarily by males. Moreover, her artistic skill and

\[117\] While many of Jacobson's watercolors went to the collections at the University of Oklahoma, this is part of the Jacobson Collection of what is now the National Museum of the American Indian. See David Fawcett and Callander, *Native American Painting*, 1982, fig. 59.

In the painting reproduced here (\textbf{Plate 52}, “Cochiti Eagle Dance”), she depicts both the male and female participants, as she almost always did.

Joe Herrera (\textbf{Plate 40}, “Old Time Butterfly Dance”) had an impeccable artistic lineage: his mother was Tonita Peña, whom he watched paint as a child:

\begin{quote}
When my mother was painting, I was interested, and I used to stay right there beside her. In the summer months she painted on the porch, and even though it was screened in, there were flies around, and they like paint, especially certain colors that are sweet, like yellow and green. The flies got into her paints. So she used to give me a dish towel, and I would swat the flies away so she could paint. …

As a reward, when she was done for the day, or when she was about to run out of some paints, she would give me a small tube which had a little bit of paint in it, and that was what I used to do my own painting. That was my pay. So that is how I got started. I must have been about five or six years old.\footnote{Interview in Seymour, \textit{When the Rainbow Touches Down}, p. 149.}
\end{quote}

Painters Julian Martinez and Romando Vigil were his uncles, and beyond all of that family influence, he studied at the Studio School in the 1930s.
Herrera is best known for the modernist paintings he began just as this portfolio was published. Beginning in 1950, he studied at the University of New Mexico with Raymond Jonson. As Rushing reports, what Herrera studied there was "Cubism, the art and theory of Wassily Kandinsky, and the Primitivist works of Paul Klee, which Herrera logically saw as similar to Anasazi pictographs." Moreover, Jonson's own works drew upon the visual vocabulary of the indigenous arts of New Mexico, so there was a true dialogue between the artists.

Eleven Navajo and Apache artists are included in the 1950 portfolio, most of them represented by one painting each, with the exception of Harrison Begay, Alan Houser, and Charlie Lee, each of whom have two selections.

Begay's delicate study, "Taking the Sheep Out" (Plate 64), shows a young Navajo girl with five sheep in a landscape. Jacobson comments in the caption that Begay "has reached the deserved position of first place among the Navajo artists of today." Just a few years after this portfolio was

---

published, Begay depicted portions of the creation story in extraordinarily literal yet poetic form,\textsuperscript{121} using to excellent effect the illustrative style of painting seen in many of these portfolio prints. In four paintings, he depicted the mountains at the four corners of the Navajo universe as they were being fastened to the earth and populated with plants and animals by the Holy People when the world was formed.

To those who know the strong, modern sculptures of Apache artist Allan Houser’s later life, his early painting “Resting Cowboys” (Plate 68) may seem anomalous, and indeed in some respects it is. Like Herrera, he is best known for his modernist works. Much of his early painting, both in watercolor and in murals, depicts traditional scenes of masked dancers, or nineteenth-century Apache warriors on horseback. But these are, unmistakably, twentieth-century cigarette-smoking, boot-wearing Indian Cowboys.

\textsuperscript{121} Begay (1917- ) painted these in the late 1950s, after reading Washington Matthews’ \textit{Navaho Legends}, American Folklore Society, Memoir 5, Boston, 1897. One set was given to the \textit{hataali} who performed the Enemyway ritual to rid Begay of the ghosts of all the dead he had encountered during his service in the Normandy Campaign in Europe during World War II. The others, made for a private individual, are now in the Museum of Northern Arizona (accession #s 2731/C656 to 659). See Leland Wyman, \textit{The Sacred Mountains of the Navajo in Four Paintings by Harrison Begay}, Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona, 1967. unpagedinated.
Houser (1914-1994) learned to paint at the Studio School. Jack Rushing has perceptively detailed his fraught relationship with his teacher, Dorothy Dunn.\footnote{See W. Jackson Rushing, III, \textit{Allan Houser, An American Master}, New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 2004, pp. 38-47.} Houser sought freedom, and instruction in anatomical drawing; Dunn sought Indian students who would adhere to her strict-constructionist approach both to “Indian” style and subject matter. Houser went on to become one of the most highly regarded Indian artists of the second half of the 20th century.

While Jacobson does not provide dates for the works in the portfolio, he describes Gerald Nailor’s “The Female Rain and Corn” (Plate 71) as a recent work. In Navajo thought, “female rain” or \textit{Nilts’a Bi’áad} is the delicate rain that helps the corn grow. In the caption, Jacobson mentions the ambitious murals Nailor completed in the late 1930s at the Department of the Interior Building in Washington DC, as well as his mural of the history of the Navajo people, done in 1942-43, that wraps around the interior of the Navajo Council House in Window Rock, Arizona.\footnote{Nailor’s paintings on the walls of the Indian Arts and Crafts Shop and the Employee Lounge in the Department of the Interior Building are discussed by Jennifer McLerran, \textit{A New Deal for Native Art: Indian Arts and Federal Policy 1933-1943}, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, forthcoming, 2009.} In their Rivera-esque
sweep of history, they are among the most ambitious Indian murals completed in that era.

North American Indian Costumes, 1952

Oscar B. Jacobson also authored the final title in the series, North American Indian Costumes 1564-1950, issued in two volumes in 1952 with illustrations by Oscar Howe. Each portfolio contains 25 plates, and the two volume set cost $80. Only 250 copies were issued and it was published only in English. As mentioned in the section on the publisher, this portfolio, though dated 1952, was not available until 1956.124

The Artist: Oscar Howe. This portfolio differed from the others; rather than featuring the original work of many Native painters (as in the 1929, 1932, 1938 and 1950 portfolios) or the work of many Pueblo potters as interpreted by one white artist (as in the 1933 and 1936 portfolios), one

See also Rachel Leibowitz, Chapter 5, "Murals, Models, and Modernity: Representing Window Rock," Constructing the Navajo Capital: Landscape, Power, and Representation at Window Rock, (Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2008), which considers Nailor's mural cycle in the context of the Council House itself.

Native artist was commissioned to paint all fifty plates of examples of
Native clothing from across North America. At the time of this commission,
Oscar Howe (1915-1983) was on his way to becoming one of the best-known
contemporary Native painters. The brief description of him on page 4 of the
text says only:

Oscar Howe (Nazuha Hokshina, Trader Boy) who painted the plates
illustrating this volume, under the direction of the author, is a
distinguished Sioux artist (see “Les Peintres Indiens d’Amerique”
Editions d’Art, C. Szwedzicki, 1950). He has several murals to his
credit. His watercolors have been widely exhibited, and won First
Prize in the 1947 American Indian artists exhibit in the Philbrook Art
Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Howe, born to Yanktonai Sioux parents on the Crow Creek Reservation
in South Dakota, drew constantly, even as a pre-school child, and continued
to do so through his years at the Pierre (South Dakota) Indian Boarding
School. Because of ill health and behavioral problems, his attendance there
was intermittent, and he finished grade school at the age of eighteen. Two
years later, in 1935, he enrolled at the Studio School (discussed above) at
the Santa Fe Indian School, where he was the only Sioux student in a high
school comprised primarily of young artists from the Southwest and
Southern Plains. He sold his first works of art while there, had paintings
included in an exhibit the Studio School sent to Paris and London in 1936, and graduated at the top of his class in 1938.¹²⁵

Howe was employed by the Federal Government's WPA (Works Progress Administration) program for artists in 1940; his job was to paint Indian-themed murals on the ceiling of the small Carnegie Library in Mitchell, South Dakota. After serving in the army in Europe from 1942-45, he resumed his artistic career, winning first prize at the Philbrook Art Center's Second National Competition for Indian Painters in 1947.¹²⁶

From mid-1947 to mid-1948, Howe lived in Norman, Oklahoma, working for Oscar Jacobson on the North American Indian Costumes project. Though it would not be published until 1952, he completed work on the 50 paintings in 1948. Upon his return to South Dakota, he earned a B.A. in Art at Dakota Wesleyan University (1952), and then returned to the University


Howe’s own paintings were generally far more complex narrative scenes than the simple figures he painted for the 1952 portfolio. The one reproduced as Plate 22 in the 1950 American Indian Painting portfolio is representative. Entitled “Sioux Battle,” it depicts a vigorous encounter between two warriors on horseback. Their bodies and those of their horses make an energetic circular movement in the middle of the picture. Set against a semi-abstract landscape, and with a schematized thunder cloud enframing the action, the figures grapple with each other.\(^{127}\) By 1954, Howe began to work in a highly innovative modernist style. His figures of Sioux dancers, riders, and tableaux from mythic narratives became fractured into numerous facets on the picture plane. In their neo-Cubistic abstraction, they defied the sedate predictability of most Indian painting of that era.\(^{128}\) Here, however, his aim is to present figures simply, and with visual clarity, so their clothing is easy to read.

\(^{127}\) For other characteristic works by Howe from this era, see Wyckoff, ed., Visions and Voices, pp. 144-147.

\(^{128}\) For examples, see Dockstader, ed., Oscar Howe, plates 32, 41, 42, 45, 52.
The Subject Matter. An interest in American Indian dress was part of a larger interest in this era in folk costume worldwide. As previously mentioned, the only other publication documented from L’Edition C. Szedwizcki was a portfolio of illustrations of Polish peasant dress.\textsuperscript{129} Several other small French presses published similar portfolios in the 1930s and '40s.\textsuperscript{130} Illustrated here is Plate 11 depicting a woman in traditional dress from Extremadura in western Spain, and the cover of Émile Gallois' \emph{Costumes Espagnols} of 1939. In its simplicity of style it is much like Howe's work. (see two plates at end of this essay.)

Jacobson and Howe sought to convey in fifty plates the incredible diversity in Native American dress in the historic period. Volume 1 covers 1564 to 1860, and Volume 2, 1865 to 1950. After a brief introductory essay on the materials and varieties of indigenous dress, Jacobson wrote lengthy captions providing a great deal of specific cultural and historical data, with only a small amount of analysis of clothing style. Much of it is overly general,\textsuperscript{129} Stryjenska and Seweryn, \textit{Polish Peasant Costumes}, 1939.

\textsuperscript{130}For example, Émile Gallois, \textit{Costumes Espagnols}, New York: French and European Publications, 1939, with 40 plates by Gallois, was produced at Ateliers Renson Fils, in Paris in an edition of 1000. \textit{Costumes de Provinces Françaises}, by the same author, with 48 pochoir plates was issued in 1946 by Henri Larens, Paris. Gallois (1882-1965) was a well-known French illustrator who produced several such works.
as evidenced by this commentary on Plate 9: “The clothing worn by the chief in Plate 9 shows evidence of contact with the Whites. Most of the eastern Indians abandoned skins for clothing acquired from the traders, from which they designed interesting garments that we now think of as 'Indian', but that bear little resemblance to their original costume.” (p. 13).

Jacobson and Howe did not seek to convey Native dress in a timeless, ahistorical manner, but rather to illuminate the many changes in Native garments during 400 years. Most of these changes were due to the fur trade and other commerce with non-Natives (see for example, Plates 8, 9, 11, 15, and 16). Notably, Pocahontas (1594-1617), the famous daughter of the Algonquian chief, Powhatan, is depicted in British court dress, during her trip to England in 1616 (Plate 4). It is based on a famous portrait painted at that time, though Howe omits the top hat she wears in that image.

While the author does not usually note in the caption the source of the imagery he provided for Howe to adapt, it ranges from early images and descriptions by Jacques LeMoyne (a member of a French expedition to Florida in 1564) (Plate 1), to famous watercolors done by the Swiss artist Karl Bodmer on his expedition with Prince Maximilian of Weid on the Upper Missouri River in the 1830s (Plates 14 and 18). Plate 8, of a Mohawk Chief,
which the caption dates to 1750, is closely modeled on John Verelst's 1710 painting of Sa Ga Yeath Qua Pieth Tow, one of the celebrated "Four Indian Kings" who visited London in that year.\textsuperscript{131} Howe's version omits the complex body tattoos, but otherwise is quite faithful to the portrait.

Classic early works on Native history and ethnology provided many of the images. McKenney and Hall's portraits in *History of the Indian Tribes of North America*, completed in 1844, was one source. To give just one example, Plate 16, of a Creek man of 1812, seems to be an adaptation of their portrait, "Yoholo Micco, A Creek Chief."\textsuperscript{132} The white sprigged calico garment, bandolier, cap, and detailed face paint of Howe's image all approximate that far more detailed engraving. Similarly, Plate 20 was probably adapted from Arthur Schott's 1853 image of Papago women; the staff, hat, white gauzy dress, and shoes of Howe's single figure are identical.\textsuperscript{133}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{133} Schott's work has most recently been reproduced in Christian Feest, ed., *The Cultures of Native North Americans*, Köln: Könemann, 2000, p. 380.
\end{flushright}
Some paintings were done after photographs. Plate 34 is based on a well-known photo of Quannah Parker. Plate 43 depicts the Kiowa artist Monroe Tsatoke (1904-1937), whose work was included in the 1929 and 1950 portfolios (See 1929, plates 26-30, and 1950, plates 34, 35, 77), and who was a student of Jacobson's at the University of Oklahoma. The photo upon which Plate 43 was based was taken by Jacobson himself in 1930, as he relates in the caption.

It is notable that Jacobson sought to bring the inventory of costumes up to contemporary times. The adult women of Southern Plains and Pueblo ancestry (Plates 46 and 47), the Apache school girl (Plate 49), and the blue jean and cowboy boot-wearing generic “Young Indian” of 1950 (Plate 50) all depict Native people wearing at least some aspects of clothing worn by many Americans in that era. Of the last plate, Jacobson writes: “the Indians of the younger generation, regardless of tribe, like to wear the clothes of the western cowboy: fine boots, blue levi trousers, colored cotton or woolen shirts, leather jackets, and if they can afford it, a Stetson hat.” (p. 11).

Other Native painters of the 1940s were also depicting modernity in Indian life. Creek/Pawnee artist Acee Blue Eagle (whose more traditional work appears in Plates 4 and 5 of the 1950 portfolio) depicted a Navajo
Squaw Dance in which three of the male dancers wear the kind of garb illustrated by Howe in Plate 50, while the fourth wears a U.S. Army uniform.134 Navajo painter Quincy Tahoma (1921-1956) portrays a Navajo woman and child greeting a man in army uniform in a 1943 watercolor entitled “First Furlough.”135 His painting of traditional life, “The Last Jump”, is Plate 73 of the 1950 portfolio.136

Howe himself did a tempera painting entitled “The College Indian” (1949), in which a young adult couple in formal dress—a Native man in white tie and tails, and a woman in a scarlet ball gown—faces the viewer.137 It was

134 See L. Wyckoff, Visions and Voices, page 95.


136 Curiously, although “First Furlough” belonged to Jacobson, he did not select it for that portfolio. See Fawcett and Callander, Native American Painting, 1982, which lists their entire collection of paintings and the individual collections to which they belong. One hundred paintings come from the Jacobson collection, including some from the 1950 portfolio, and all of the ones by Howe for the 1952 costume portfolio plus ten more by Howe that clearly were part of this project. (See listing on pp. 91-93.) “First Furlough” is illustrated in fig. 65, and listed on p. 83.

137 See Gerald McMaster and Clifford Trafzer, eds., Native Universe: Voices of Indian America, Washington, DC: the National Museum of the American Indian, 2004, Plate 165. It is also listed among the sixty works that Howe made for the 1952 portfolio that Jacobson gave to the museum. See Fawcett and Callander, Native American Painting, listing on p. 92.
part of the series of sixty that were made for this portfolio, of which only fifty were published. Jacobson gave all of these to the Museum of the American Indian.

Collaboration, Patronage, Mentorship and Entrepreneurship

Art historians have long recognized the important role of patrons in shaping art traditions around the world, from Chinese emperors to Catholic popes or Medici princes. In every part of the world, the relationship between artist and patron is a complex one. But in the study of Native American art, the issue of patronage has been seen as particularly problematic. Because of the economic imbalances between a dominant culture and indigenous artists, patrons have had the power to define authenticity and determine value according to their own criteria, rather than those of a native community or its constituent members. Yet, Native artists have always negotiated the world of commerce and the world of their own cultural values. Nowhere is this more evident than in the American Indian painting movements during the first half of the 20th century, when new
markets opened up and this art was celebrated far from the small Oklahoma towns and New Mexican villages where it was created.

The issue of artistic agency for Native Americans was a complex one in the first half of the 20th century. There is no question that the encounters described in this essay and reflected in the arts of these portfolios were unbalanced in terms of economics and education. Native artists of that era simply were not able to move among different cultural realms with the fluency enjoyed by the white patrons. Elizabeth Newsome has suggested that this unbalance extends to much of the subsequent scholarship on this era as well. She finds that the literature on these arts—and my own essay would be no exception here—“leaves the reader conscious of a great unspoken divide that separates those elements of causation and intentionality that they do and do not address.” Newsome points out that the literature rarely addresses the indigenous perspectives of the artists themselves:

Instead, within a variety of analytical frameworks they are viewed as responses to their engagement with an assortment of well-intentioned but controlling patrons and promoters....the resulting picture is one-sided, implicitly suggesting that the characteristics of this art were solely determined by the nature of those interactions. Conspicuously missing is an exploration of reflexivity as it pertains both to the creative
experience of the artist and the cultural viewpoint shared by the members of his or her tribal group.\textsuperscript{138}

In part, this is certainly a reflection of the ethnicity and training of the scholars who have written this literature: mainly non-Native and mainly trained in historical practices that value the written over the oral, and often the text over the image. Two forthcoming works by Native scholars may help redress this imbalance in the literature.\textsuperscript{139}

It is ironic that an era in which much art historical writing (on art world-wide, from many historical eras) focuses on reception, audience, and patronage has intersected with an era when some Native intellectuals are impatient with a literature that, in their eyes, keeps the focus on the dominant culture—the white mentors and patrons who brought these remarkable works of art to world-wide attention.


Increasingly scholarship in cultural studies, anthropology and post-colonial critique seeks to remind us that we are all implicated. Nothing generates on its own, in a vacuum, without the interplay of complex cultural and political economies that arise far from where an artist work. It has been a global world for centuries now.\(^{140}\) So not to acknowledge these imbricating forces is to seek a story that is far too simple. No 20\(^{th}\) century artist created work *sui generis*, whether in Berlin, San Ildefonso, or Lagos. The self-made artist is as much a fiction as the artist as passive responder to outside influence.

It has been twenty years since James Clifford wrote about “an ethnography of conjunctures” in which culture is “not a tradition to be saved but an assembled code of artifacts always susceptible to critical and creative recombination.”\(^ {141}\) As I wrote in 1992, we must always be aware of “the history of American Indian art in terms of shifting truths, falsehoods, appropriations, scholarly formulations, and public responses—different

\(^{140}\) A recent collection of scholarly essays that illuminates how this was equally true in the 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) century is J.C.H. King and Christian Feest, eds., *Three Centuries of Woodlands Indian Art*, Vienna: ZKF Publishers, 2007.

conjunctures for different historical moments." So of course there are multiple ways of interpreting the past, for diverse audiences and diverse points of view.

At the beginning of the 21st century, there is a tendency to interpret the cross-cultural relationships of earlier generations through the filters of a post-colonial theory in which every act of possession involves dispossession, and every act of patronage is always patronizing. Yet this all too often diminishes the agency of the indigenous side of the encounter—as if the great grandparents of today's native peoples were no more than dupes. The philanthropic actions of early 20th century white artists, academics, animateurs, and other interlocutors that I have written about here were not primarily self-aggrandizing: to interpret them as such is to flatten out a rich and nuanced historical record.

To take Oscar Jacobson as an example, his mentorship of a handful of Native artists in the 1920s, and his publication of the 1929 and 1950 portfolios were but a small part of a long and active career in which, as Dean of an art school, he mentored many colleagues and students, founded a museum, was a prolific painter, and brought world art to Oklahoma while

brining Oklahoma art to the world. In a provocative paper, Ruth Phillips has paired three sets of indigenous artists in the mid-20th century with the patronage of a European émigré artist (Jacobson and the Kiowa, George Swinton and Inuit artists, and Joseph Weinstein and Norval Morriseau). She suggests that in each case these animateurs simply "opened a door which the artists walked through," and that through such strategic alliances, "Aboriginal artists appropriated modernism as a means of documenting and continuing traditions of spiritual practice, narrative and knowledge." Through their own talent and initiative, and through the contacts they made at the University of Oklahoma, the first generation of Kiowa painters made money from their work, achieved international recognition, and went on to participate in public mural projects in an era when it was difficult for most Americans to make a good living.

Like many whites, some Native peoples in the early 20th century believed that their unique cultural features were destined to die out; it

seemed to them that young people, having been educated in white schools, were not interested in the old ways and no longer spoke the language. So they collaborated with diverse cultural interlocutors, making sure that their cultural artifacts and knowledge were preserved in museums and books.

Others looked to art as a form of cultural preservation. In this endeavor, they were encouraged and supported by a small group of Anglo patrons who helped promulgate their artwork to the larger world, believing that it was through fine arts (as opposed to cheap tourist trinkets) that indigenous cultures would survive. And indeed, in some communities, art was the bridge that helped them cross over to an era of increasing Native autonomy and self-determination.145

145 Another notable instance in which indigenous artists worked with outside interlocutors occurred in the 1950s and 60s in arctic Canada. There, Inuit artists in several communities were trained by white Canadian artists and print-makers in methods of stencil, etching, lithography, and stone cut (a locally-devised variant of the woodcut technique). Cape Dorset is perhaps the best known of these communities. For more than forty years, a handful of communities produced an annual series of locally-made prints (generally in editions of fifty) based on their drawings. Such prints, sold through co-operative ventures, became a significant source of income for these communities. For discussion of both the social and artistic processes, see Hessel, Ingo, Inuit Art: An Introduction, Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1998, chapter 7, and Helga Goetz, The Inuit Print/L’Estampe Inuit, Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1977. For an in-depth look at the marketing and reception of these works in the 1950s, see Norman Vorano, Inuit Art in a Qallunaat World: Modernism, Museums and the Public Imaginary, 1949-1962,
In New Mexico, both painting and pottery-making brought wealth into small Native communities like San Ildefonso. In the 1920s, painters could earn about $900 a year; the best potters made more than twice that—an excellent salary for the time. The wealth accrued from the marketing success of their art work allowed Maria and Julian Martinez, for example, to live in a way enjoyed by few Indian people in the early 20th century. They hired others to do their farming and household chores, and they owned the first car at San Ildefonso Pueblo.\textsuperscript{146}

Jantzer-White has pointed out the ways in which Tonita Peña negotiated both community traditions and larger art worlds in a manner that satisfied her needs as well as those of her patrons:

Concentrating on the ceremonials integral to Pueblo life, Peña painted her world and her place in it. Representing for her patrons a glimpse of the power of Pueblo traditions, she re-created those dances that were accessible to visitors. Each painting was unique within its prescribed format; each

presented a slice of an ongoing repetitive cycle of dances that comprised an essential part of Peña's life. […] Ceremonial dances functioned as the primary site through which the discursive practices of the Pueblos were constructed and transmitted. Conflating spiritual, social, and political mores through aesthetic means, communally prescribed dances reinforced Pueblo agency, while inculcating Puebloans' control over their own world. Peña articulated, through her paintings, an overt public reaffirmation of Pueblo practices.\textsuperscript{147}

During the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, talented Native peoples in diverse parts of North America figured out ways to negotiate modernity while maintaining their cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{148} In so doing, they followed in the footsteps of their 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century ancestors.\textsuperscript{149} The generations of Native artists whose work was featured in the Szwedzicki portfolios formed one important chapter in this centuries-long saga of artistic ingenuity and entrepreneurship.

\textsuperscript{147} Jantzer-White, "Tonita Pena (Quah Ah), Pueblo Painter", 1994, p.372.


Conclusion: American Indian Art After 1952

In the 1940s and 50s, many Native artists continued to produce decorative scenes of Native life of wide appeal to mainstream institutional venues and a broad audience of collectors alike. The Philbrook Annual, a juried competition for Native artists began in 1946. It was limited to painting for the first 11 years. Many works chosen for the competition were bought by the Philbrook to form its impressive collection of 20th century Native painting, and a number of traveling shows of this work toured the U.S.\textsuperscript{150} The Denver Art Museum began its own (short-lived) annual in 1951. At the inaugural exhibition, forty-eight paintings by eleven artists were exhibited.\textsuperscript{151} The National Gallery in Washington mounted “Contemporary

\textsuperscript{150} Jeanne Snodgrass King, the former curator of that collection, provided a brief history of the Annual as the Foreword to Wyckoff, \textit{Visions and Voices}, pp. 11-13.

American Indian Painting” in 1953, featuring 115 works by sixty artists.\footnote{Dorothy Dunn, *Contemporary American Indian Painting*, Gallery Brochure, Washington DC: National Gallery of Art, 1953. See also Dunn, “America’s First Painters,” *National Geographic*, vol. CVII, no. 3, pp. 349-377, which discusses this exhibit and illustrates work from it.}

Of these sixty, nearly half were artists whose work had been featured in the 1950 *American Indian Painters* portfolio.

But an occasional ripple of protest broke through this placid surface of a market-driven Native painting. Woody Crumbo’s “Land of Enchantment” (1946) was one of these.\footnote{See illustration of “Land of Enchantment in Wyckoff, *Visions and Voices*, p. 111. (Philbrook accession # 1946.45.4).} The title refers to the state motto of New Mexico, a tourist destination since the end of the 19th century. Crumbo (1912-1989), a Potawatomi raised in Oklahoma and Kansas, spent many years in New Mexico. Here turns the table on the usual Southwestern tourist stereotypes.

A Navajo woman, her daughter in the foreground, presents a rug for the inspection of a white tourist family. Each family member is a caricature, from the goofy freckled child, to the fleshy mother bursting out of her revealing play clothes, to the father--his bohemian beret counterbalanced by his briefcase. He also carries the ever-present camera with which to
chronicle his visit to “authentic Indians” in the land of enchantment. Each wears some element of Indian craft, which look absurd against their outlandish clothes. They examine a Navajo rug, while the weaver peeks shyly from behind her textile and her daughter looks down sadly. The wooden sign, “Land of Enchantment” is battered and askew. From the Native perspective, the days of enchantment are long gone.

Crumbo uses the accessible style of traditional Indian painting of the 1930s and 40s—the style featured in the 1950 and 1952 portfolios-- to draw in, and then lacerate, the viewer with the discomforting dimensions of inter-cultural exchange: the asymmetry of power between the Native maker and the white consumer. The critique of Native/white relations so common in Indian art in the last decades of the 20th century was prefigured here. Works such as this signaled that America’s static vision of the Indian could no longer be maintained. Those stoic, melancholy, picturesque and noble Indians of the visual record had broken out of the straightjacket in which American culture had tried to confine them, and were now controlling the image-making themselves.

Oscar Howe, too, was chafing under the yoke of “traditional” contemporary painting. A frequent exhibitor in the Philbrook Annuals., he
was outraged when one of his works was rejected from the 1958 competition for not fitting the standards of Native painting. He wrote a letter that stands as the first manifesto of Indian modernism and artistic autonomy:

Who ever said that my paintings are not in traditional Indian style has poor knowledge of Indian art indeed. There is much more to Indian art than pretty, stylized pictures....Are we to be held back forever with one phase of Indian painting, with no right for individualism, dictated to as the Indian has always been, put on reservations and treated like a child, and only the White Man knows best for him? Now, even in Art, 'You little child do what we think is best for you, nothing different.' Well I am not going to stand for it.¹⁵⁴

Due to the changing tenor of the times, in 1962, the Institute of American Indian Art (IAIA) was founded on the site of the former Studio School. It was, for three decades, the most important institutional force in the development of modernist Native artistic expression.¹⁵⁵ The ethos of cultural self-determination that was central to many political movements in the 1960s marked its pedagogical practices: Native educators formed both the curriculum and the faculty.

¹⁵⁴ As quoted in Frederick Dockstader, Oscar Howe, 1982, p. 19.
By the 1960s, it was a different world from what it has been in 1929, when the first Szwedzicki portfolio was offered to the public and received with such acclaim. The space made for Native art in museums, galleries, and private collections in the past fifty years had its genesis, in part, in the work that the Szwedzicki portfolios documented from 1929-1952.
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