

Copyright

by

Milanne Shelburne Hahn

2011

**The Dissertation Committee for Milanne Shelburne Hahn Certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:**

**The Studio of Painting at the Santa Fe Indian School: A Case Study in
Modern American Identity**

COMMITTEE:

Robert H. Abzug, Supervisor

W. Jackson Rushing III, Supervisor

G. Howard Miller

Neil Kamil

Pauline Turner Strong

**THE STUDIO OF PAINTING AT THE SANTA FE INDIAN
SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY IN MODERN AMERICAN IDENTITY**

by

Milanne Shelburne Hahn, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

**The University of Texas at Austin
December 2011**

Dedication

For my parents

The Studio of Painting at the Santa Fe Indian School: A Case Study in Modern American Identity

Publication No._____

Milanne Shelburne Hahn, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisors: Robert H. Abzug and W. Jackson Rushing, III

Abstract: Founded in 1932, the Department of Painting and Design, or “Studio,” at the Santa Fe Indian School was the first official, government-run boarding school program to promote pictorial paintings based exclusively North American Indian arts and culture. It was yet another program designed to bring about the assimilation of Indians into the economy and society of American, but progressive influences had introduced a change in orientation to Indian Policy by the beginning of the 1930s; instead of demeaning Indian cultures by demanding cultural assimilation, a beneficent stance was adopted that promoted them and their assimilation as American Indians into the ethnic diversity of society. As the Studio experience unfolded, it became a unique art world in which Indian artist-students from various cultures and non-Indian educators and patrons engaged in a cross-cultural effort to carry forward ancient Indian decorative arts to shape what became known as traditional modern American Indian painting. But the Studio also became a forum in which its young artists engaged in a cross-cultural search for an American art and identity with their non-Indian educators and patrons. As such, the Studio is a unique social microcosm for studying the nature and formation of the modern American identity of both its young Indian artists and of its non-Indian progenitors. This

study will examine the personal and collective identities that arose through this cross-cultural interaction during the formative years of the Studio – the tenure of its first “guide,” Dorothy Dunn, from 1932-1937. In order to gain a fuller understanding of the concept of identity formation, individual members of that art world are prominently portrayed against the background of BIA education policies concerning indigenous arts and the Studio’s unique historical position in that regard. A selection of 150 Studio paintings is examined to detect ways in which the artist-students chose to depict themselves and their cultures, i.e., their identities. And on that score, the Studio artist-students expressed themselves and their cultures, however marginal they were then and now to American society, and they shared with the non-Indians a new understanding of how they both were Americans.

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations.....	x
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: The Shoals of a Nebulous Shore: Indian Education and Identity in U.S. Government Policy.....	25
George Washington and the Cultivation of Indian Civilization.....	30
Improving and Transforming the Indian: The Strange Case of Richard H. Pratt.....	33
Assimilation in the Extreme: Dictating American Individuality in U.S. Indian Policy.....	40
Reform from a New Middle Ground.....	61
Chapter 2: American Indian Painting: A projection into the “Cosmopolitan Future” of American Culture.....	69
John Collier and the Mystique of the Indian.....	71
John Collier and the Ethno-romance of American Indian Cultures.....	77
The Cultural Invention of the Modern Tribal Indian.....	81
The Santa Fe Indian School Becomes the Multicultural Center of Pictorial Painting and Arts and Crafts.....	87
Considering the Creative Source of American Indian Painting for the “Cosmopolitan Future”.....	100
What Was So Special about the Studio Paintings?.....	102
Chapter 3: An Old and a New American Art: Reading the Studio Paintings Collectively and Individually.....	118
Chapter 4: From Ceremony, to Lifeway, to Skin, and In-between, The Studio Artist-Students Paint Their Identity.....	169

Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Ceremonies and Collective Identity.....	176
Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Ceremonies and Individual Identity.....	192
Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Lifeway and Individual Identity.....	193
Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Lifeway and Collective Identity.....	207
Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Skin and Mien.....	216
Chapter 5: Crisscrossing Borders: Dorothy Dunn Becomes the Studio.....	222
“There was so much to learn that it was almost overwhelming, but never had I felt so completely at home in the world before this,” Dorothy Dunn.....	224
A Midwestern Peripatetic: Dorothy Dunn’s Origins and Youth.....	227
Seeking a Home in the American Southwest.....	238
“Great taste” but “No money”: Dorothy Dunn at Work in the “City of Ladies”.....	243
Coming Undone: Dunn Leaves the Studio.....	251
Why Dorothy Dunn?.....	268
Chapter 6: An Afterword on Identity.....	273
Appendix A: List of 150 Paintings in the Study.....	297
Appendix B: Sixty-Six Artists Represented in the Selection of Studio Paintings and Number of Paintings.....	310
Appendix C: List of Students at the Studio, Fall 1932 through Spring 1937 Semesters.....	315
Abbreviations.....	328

Bibliography.....	331
Vita.....	342

List of Illustrations

Illustration 4.1: “ <i>Taos People at a Round Dance</i> ” 1935 Tonita Lujan “Khup Khu”..	184
Illustration 4.2: “ <i>Ghost Dancers</i> ” 1936 Lorenzo Beard “Horse Chief”	187
Illustration 4.3: “ <i>Hopi Woman Weaving Basket</i> ” 1933 Philip Zeyouma.....	194
Illustration 4.4: “ <i>Navajo Women with Corn</i> ” 1941 Mary Ellen.....	197
Illustration 4.5: <i>untitled</i> (‘ <i>Tourists Looking at a Rug</i> ’) 1938 Gerald Nailor “Toh Yah”.....	199
Illustration 4.6: “ <i>Chippewa Woman Stripping Birch Bark</i> ” 1932 Agnes Bird.....	204
Illustration 4.7: “ <i>Cherokee Hunter with Game</i> ” 1935 Cecil Dick/”Da-‘Ga-Dah’Ga”.....	205
Illustration 4.8: “ <i>Dressing Young Girl for First Ceremonial Dance</i> ” 1939 Pablita Velarde “Tse Tsan”.....	210
Illustration 4.9: “ <i>Sioux Warriors Coming Home</i> ” 1935 Wilmar DuPree.....	212
Illustration 4.10: “ <i>Comanche Dance</i> ” Leandro Gutierrez “Kygoo Yah”.....	220

Introduction

When the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) opened The Department of Painting and Design, or as it became commonly known, the “Studio,” at the Santa Fe Indian School in 1932, it was the first official, government-run boarding school program to promote pictorial paintings based exclusively on North American Indian arts and culture. The guiding principle of the Studio was to encourage adolescent Indian artist-students to study and draw upon their artistic and cultural traditions to create marketable pictures that mirrored their world. Despite the institutional setting, these prospective artists were not operating in an artistic void, for they also drew upon the modern painting tradition that had already been established by Indian artists from the Santa Fe Movement and Kiowa Five. As the Studio experience unfolded, it became a unique art world in which Indian artist-students from various cultures and non-Indian educators and patrons engaged in a reciprocal, cross-cultural effort to carry forward ancient and relatively new Indian decorative arts to shape what became known as traditional modern American Indian painting. Yet this creative endeavor involved more than just the formalities of art production and the rejuvenation of Indian cultures. Officially it was yet another program designed to bring about the assimilation of Indians into the economy and society of America, but progressive influences had introduced a change in orientation by the beginning of the 1930s; instead of demeaning Indian cultures by demanding their assimilation, a beneficent stance was adopted that supported and promoted them. But the goal was still to find a means to solve the age-old “Indian problem” and assimilate Indians into American society as *American Indians*.

The very nature of the Studio project, however, opened up possibilities that probably eluded its bureaucratic proponents. Through the creative act of painting pictures of their collective cultures and individual lives, the Studio artist-students revealed much about how they viewed themselves both individually and collectively, and vis-à-vis Americans, as a people. As participants in a project exploring the possibilities of art and assimilation, the Studio artist-students searched for the means to examine and express their modern identity as Indians and as Americans. For although the Studio was created for the more practical purpose of preparing Indians for a profession that would give them economic viability, it also became a forum in which its young artists engaged in a cross-cultural search for an American art and identity with their non-Indian American educators and patrons. As such, the Studio is a unique social microcosm for studying the nature and formation of a modern American identity for both its young Indian artists and of its non-Indian progenitors.

This study will examine and interpret the personal and collective identities that arose through this cross-cultural interaction between Indians and non-Indians alike during the formative years of the Studio of Dorothy Dunn's guidance from 1932 to 1937. The project of this interaction was the promotion of a distinctive genre of American Indian pictorial painting, and the present examination of the possibilities of this art to express the fusion of American and Indian identities will, I hope, be a worthwhile contribution to a historical understanding of American Indian identity. But it is also a story that involves the nature of American identity formation as a whole in regard to both Indian ethnicity, and to non-Indians' reconsideration of their social identity vis-à-vis the Indians. The progenitors of this innovative, government-sponsored experiment in assimilation hoped that the Studio artists would gain an understanding of how they and their art deserved membership in the cultural pluralism that constituted America's society. And in the

process, the non-Indian promoters challenged the ethnocentric thinking of that society, even as they experienced the personal challenges of crossing and re-crossing cultural borders and identifying themselves with what it meant to be an American and an Indian.

Indian identity as a signifier for diverse North American aborigines arose within the context of the meeting of two wholly distinct human populations – that of interloping Europeans and the peoples whom they “discovered” in what they termed a “New World.” The Europeans subsequently identified the aborigines by the collective term “Indians,” which, of course, was a misnomer. But as European settlers’ encroachment across the continent coalesced in the founding of a new nation called the United States of America, the nature and definition of being an Indian, both within indigenous groups and vis-à-vis the new Americans, changed as well. As such, the subject of Indian identity is a worthy subject for historicization. Historian Hazel W. Hertzberg presented the first comprehensive study in her 1971 book *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Hertzberg’s primary concern was to elucidate the ways in which tribal Indians came together to identify themselves as pan-Indians in an “effort to find a common ground beyond the tribe, a broader identity and unity based on shared cultural elements, shared experiences, shared needs, and a shared common fate.”¹ Although Hertzberg’s study was groundbreaking for its complete rejection of the biologically determined racial identity of Indians, academic studies of the increasingly multilayered nature of tribal and pan-Indian identity would not begin in earnest for over twenty years.

Sociologist Joane Nagel turned the discourse on Indian identity to these layers in her 1996 book *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of*

¹ Hazel W. Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971), 6.

Identity and Culture. Nagel agreed with Hertzberg that Native American ethnicity was historically based, but she argued that both ethnic boundaries and identities were constantly being “socially constructed and negotiated.”² Drawing upon the definition of ethnicity introduced by Norwegian social anthropologist Fredrik Barth, Nagel ascribed to the notion that ethnic identity arises “at the intersection of individual ethnic self-definition (who I am) and collective ethnic attribution (who they say I am).”³ Other social scientists have pursued Barth’s hypotheses concerning ethnicity and applied it to the concept of American Indian identity. Historian Alexandra Harmon has observed that Barth’s revolutionary thinking prompted many social scientists to come to the “realization that ethnicity is a fluid product of particular human relations.”⁴

Harmon has appealed to the academic community of Indian studies to pursue new subjects in this historicization, suggesting that through the investigation of “Indians’ part in the establishment and maintenance of ethnic boundaries,” “historians can invigorate not only Indian studies but also the broader field of North American studies.”⁵ Harmon argues that that “the lesson of history...is that Indianness is an ongoing creation, and Indians are chief among its creators.”⁶ And even though “Indians have defined themselves in opposition to presumed members of their own communities or race as much as they have defined themselves in opposition to outsiders,” Harmon points out most scholars now agree with historian William Simeone’s conclusion that Indian

² Joane Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 9.

³ Ibid., 21. Nagel acknowledged that the idea that ethnicity can or cannot be chosen or adapted was first advanced by Fredrik Barth and cited his book *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969).

⁴ Alexandra Harmon, “Wanted: More Histories of Indian Identity,” in Philip J. Deloria and Neal Salisbury, eds., *A Companion to American Indian History* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd., 2004), 251.

⁵ Ibid., 249.

⁶ Ibid., 259, 261.

identity is a “‘product of the dynamic relationship between Natives and non-Natives.’”⁷

In his study of contemporary Athapaskan culture, Simeone described these people’s identity as “a never-ending set of images Native people have of themselves and of non-Natives” that “revolve” around such “oppositions...as past and present, Indian and non-Indian.”⁸ This “dynamic relationship” in the shaping of a modern American Indian identity in Studio art is the central focus of this study, and it was a two-way street in which the identities of the non-Indians were affected as well when they joined the Indian artist-students in a quest to share a national identity as Americans.

However, the identities of these two groups are not easily bifurcated into “Indian” and “non-Indian,” although, of course, these rubrics are necessary for establishing their meta-identities. The Indian artist-students must also be understood as representatives of various cultures, tribes and nations who brought their artistic traditions to the Studio’s creative forum – a forum in which they also crossed the borders of those identifications to learn about each other as Indians. They remembered and studied the artistic subjects, motifs and designs that embellished their communities, gained an appreciation of their arts and crafts as an art, and came to understand how their art belonged to America. In the process they realized the unique identity that their cultural background afforded them, and that of their peers as well in what amounted to the emergence of their pan-Indian identity. They were also exposed to American and European art not for emulation, but to teach them that their paintings were worthy of being included in the fine arts of America, and of the world. As they painted and prepared their works for exhibitions and sale not only in Santa Fe, but also in venues throughout America and in Europe, they gained

⁷ Harmon, 251, quoting William E. Simeone, *Rifles, Blankets, and Beads: Identity, History and the Northern Athapaskan Potlatch* (Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1995), xxi.

⁸ Simeone, *Rifles, Blankets, and Beads*, xxi.

confidence in their abilities and in themselves. And all of these experiences contributed to their awareness of themselves as ethnic American Indians, and the vehicle for exploring and expressing these broadened perceptions of identity was their art.

The non-Indians who led this project of course shared a common Euro-American cultural background, and were representatives of mainstream American society. One would expect that their cultural identities were firmly grounded. However, the founders of the Studio, Kenneth Chapman and Dorothy Dunn, were treading a tricky course. They not only introduced the students to the European concept of pictorial painting as a fine art, but also endeavored to first study Indian art in order to understand how it could be adapted to this concept, and then to impart that understanding to the students.⁹ Through this process of crossing these cultural borders, Dunn and Chapman gained new and profound understandings of what it meant to be an Indian and ultimately an ethnic American Indian. Dunn stressed over and over again that the art had to be “Indian,” but she also tried to drive home to the artist-students that their art was also *American*. Despite, and indeed because of the fluid identities and the flux engendered by what amounted to a social experiment, together the Indians’ and non-Indians’ formative search for an authentic, modern American Indian art form revealed their understandings of how their cultures could be joined together in a pluralist society. They came to understand how their art form – modern American Indian painting – was a viable vehicle for assimilating ethnic Indians both into the American art world and American society. Their search for a modern American Indian art form helped shape a tradition in modern American Indian painting, gave that tradition an identity, and guided it into the diversity that is American identity.

⁹ The Studio paintings have been commonly referred to as “easel painting,” but this is a misnomer. The paintings were done on paper, not canvases. I have chosen instead to designate them as “pictorial painting.”

Despite the focus on Indian art, the inconvenient fact is that none of the Studio's founders or patrons was Indian. Rather, the opening of the Studio was a cooperative effort among BIA officials and Santa Fe enthusiasts of Indian art. The Santa Fe art community of artists, writers, and museum curators provided a unique and fertile field for such support. For over a decade prior to the opening of the Studio, these individuals, most of whom were internal émigrés in search of exoticism in the American Southwest, had established singular institutions devoted to the preservation, exhibition, and sale of Indian art and artifacts. The concept and impetus for the Studio was largely the brainchild of Kenneth Chapman, an artist who had established himself in Santa Fe as a curator and ardent student of Indian art. And it was through Chapman that Dorothy Dunn, a relative newcomer to the Indian Southwest, became the first teacher, or as she conceived it, a "guide," at the Studio. Chapman and Dunn, however, also relied greatly on the patronage of members of the Santa Fe art community who enthusiastically endorsed the Studio project by buying the students' paintings, and by providing moral and political support when bureaucrats who were less enlightened by the value of Indian cultures threatened to terminate the Studio or interfere in its activities.

The subject of white patronage of Indian art was the first context in which Studio paintings were situated in the history of modern Indian art. Art historian J. J. Brody addressed the Studio art world in his 1971 book *Indian Painters & White Patrons*, in which he established the interrelationship of Indian art and white patronage as a paradigm in the subsequent discourse on the place of Indian art within the white American art scene. For Brody, the reality of white patronage virtually negated the possibility that the artist-students could create an authentic Indian art, that is, an "extension of aboriginal

pictorial form and content.”¹⁰ He concomitantly asserted that Studio painting had no social or personal value whatever to the Indian artist-students; white patrons’ hegemonic influence had essentially stripped the Indian artists of any agency and forced them into an “accommodation to postconquest realities.”¹¹ He was also scathingly critical of Dunn and her methods, calling the enterprise not a program but “the first programmed art training center for Indians.”¹² Brody lambasted Dunn for having told the “children” that “art could and should be something more than a commercially successful activity, that it could have personal and social values that transcended description and decoration.”¹³ Instead, what was produced was “facile, decorative pictures for the White market, with subject matter that was idealized, nostalgic, or suggestive of ceremonial, symbolic, or ethnographic truths.”¹⁴ Brody did not believe that their art could possibly “be a matter of both tribal and individual expression,” or “how it could be socially meaningful to other Indians and commercially successful with Whites.”¹⁵ A few years later Brody pursued this line of criticism by stating that since the Studio was situated in a non-Indian institution presided over by individuals intent on assimilating Indians into the dominant white society, “its forms could never be anything but nontribal, antitribal, or pan-Indian.”¹⁶ Clearly Brody was unable to think about Indian identity – or the very concept of human identity—as multilayered. But even many years earlier, Dorothy Dunn and

¹⁰ J. J. Brody, *Indian Painters & White Patrons* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971), xv.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., 156.

¹³ Ibid., 131.

¹⁴ Ibid., 157, 156-157.

¹⁵ Ibid., 130.

¹⁶ J. J. Brody, “The Creative Consumer: Survival, Revival, and Invention in Southwest Indian Arts,” in *Ethnic and Tourist Arts: Cultural Expressions from the Fourth World*, ed. Nelson H. H. Graburn (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 82.

Kenneth Chapman were reaching some understating about the nature and complexity of ethnic American identity.

Brody's critique that Studio art, being hopelessly contaminated by white patronage, could not possibly be based upon indigenous traditions was subsequently refuted by art historian W. Jackson Rushing and anthropologist Bruce Bernstein, who led the way for a re-evaluation of the Studio in their book *Modern by Tradition, American Indian Painting in the Studio Style*, which was published in 1995 in conjunction with a major exhibition of Studio paintings at the Museum of American Indian Arts and Culture in Santa Fe, New Mexico. As evidenced by the book's title, Rushing and Bernstein did indeed view Studio paintings as emanating from Indian decorative and pictorial traditions. Rushing conceded that the "visual ideology (read 'style') inhering in Studio painting was more or less mutually agreed upon by the previous generation of Indian painters and their patrons," adding that his qualification of "more or less mutually agreed upon" meant that although that the early modern Indian painters had "made certain adjustments" to patrons' "expectations," they were certainly not "colonial puppets who simply cranked out exactly and only what they thought their patrons wanted."¹⁷ In Rushing's estimation, the Studio artists also were not "puppets," even though "there was often an intersection between what the patrons valued about Native culture and what artists wanted to signify to the dominant culture about themselves."¹⁸

Indeed, the Studio artist-students were active agents as much as any Euro-American art student painting in a studio overseen by an instructor. Nor can it be denied that patronage is an age-old institution in the art of Western Civilization that was as

¹⁷ Bruce Bernstein and W. Jackson Rushing, *Modern by Tradition, American Indian Painting in the Studio Style* (Albuquerque: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1995), 49, 54.

¹⁸ Ibid., 54.

necessary to its artists as it was to those at the Studio. Yet, given the history of Indian and non-Indian relations in America, some degree of suspicion that Indians were once again being pressed to produce exotica for a desirous non-Indian constituency is understandable. Art historian J. J. Brody assigned such hegemonic behavior to both Dorothy Dunn and Studio patrons. However, despite Dunn's undeniably inflexible admonition that the art had to be "Indian," eventually it was the demands from officials at BIA headquarters that the paintings should conform to Euro-American standards that drove Dunn to abandon her position at the Studio.

Bernstein also introduced a new perspective by recognizing that the Studio had been made possible by the BIA's shift from pursuing a policy of cultural assimilation to one that acknowledged cultural diversity. Instead of seeing whites as oppressors and Indians as accommodators as Brody did, Rushing and Bernstein paved the way for understanding how the works of the Studio artists, individually and collectively, helped define **modern** American Indian painting even as it recontextualized the many cultures upon which it was based. Rushing succinctly summed up this development by pointing out that "although 'traditional Indian painting' certainly reflected the intersection of different and conflicting cultures, it also embodied the efforts of the artists...to express themselves as members of specific cultures....¹⁹ In addition to those traditional identities assigned to Indians, this study will present the ways in which the Studio artist-students understood how their art both belonged to the national art of America and reflected their assumption of an American identity. And it was in those intersections of cultures that modern American identity took its shape.

¹⁹ Ibid., 29.

At the beginning of the last decade, historians of art education in America began a dialogue on art education for Indians in the American Southwest that focused on Dorothy Dunn's efforts at the Studio. Historian Laurie Eldridge in particular addressed the ways in which Dunn's theories and practices affected Native American authenticity and ethnic identity. Although the introduction of these topics offered the potential for new insights into the social and artistic world of the Studio, Eldridge concentrated instead on Dunn, concluding that Dunn "made herself, not her students or their communities, the definer and authenticator of Native American art."²⁰ Eldridge credited Dunn with having "helped to codify ideas about Native American identity, Native American art, and its authenticity for both Native people and non Natives," and her students either accepted Dunn's influence "to create positive identities for themselves as a Native people," or rejected it to find other bases for their identities and art.²¹ Certainly Eldridge assigned far too much importance and intractability to Dunn's intentions and abilities, and failed to define just what those identities entailed. Although Eldridge raised valid questions about Dunn's self-assumed role as a "guide" rather than a teacher, certainly Dunn did not wield such dictatorial power, and the discussion failed to examine Studio paintings for content that might have revealed expression of identity.

It is undeniable that Dunn was a central actor in the Studio creative process, and thus her story is crucial to understanding the art forum of the Studio. But there were, of course, other non-Indian members of that forum whose persons are important as well to round out the story. Of course there was Kenneth Chapman, who was the primary force in Santa Fe behind the opening of the Studio, but also patrons such as Margretta Stewart

²⁰ Laurie Eldridge, "Dorothy Dunn and the Art Education of Native Americans: Continuing the Dialogue," in *Studies in Art Education*, 2001, 42(4), 324.

²¹ Ibid., 318-319.

Dietrich, both of whom, in one way or another, endeavored to traverse the borders between non-Indian and Indian cultures in order to understand Indian art and identity for its own sake, and for their own sake as well.

Well into the twentieth century, notions of race and ethnocentrism continued to dominate non-Indian notions of who Indians were, even among progressive reformers of Indian policy who began to adopt cultural definitions of identity by the 1930s. Dorothy Dunn herself continued to speak of the Indians as a race at the same time that she lauded the special beauty of their cultures, and promoted them as part of the American experience. Two years prior to Dunn's arrival at the SFIS, the BIA had dispatched another non-Indian official, Mable Morrow, to set up an Indian arts and crafts department there, and with the introduction of the Studio this boarding school became the model for revamping vocational curricula from a longstanding grounding in a European culture to one designed to rejuvenate Indian cultures. However, despite this change in education policy, Indian Service officials' re-evaluation of Indian culture was nevertheless one designed to foster the assimilation of Indians into American society. But instead of seeking to eradicate elements of Indian culture to transform Indians into Americans, progressive policy makers now turned their sights to preserving those elements and assimilating them into American society. Their goal was to make it possible for Indians to become *American* Indians, and the chosen vehicle was the manufacturing of traditional Indian arts and crafts, and in the case of the Studio, the fine art of pictorial painting. The preservation and promotion of these arts was officially intended to achieve two goals: the incorporation of Indian cultures into America's plural society, and their entrance into the American economy through the marketing and sales of arts, crafts, and paintings. In the process of achieving these practical goals, however, the Studio's administrators and patrons alike hoped that these Indian artists would not only appreciate and

recontextualize their respective cultural legacies, but also find a place in American society.

However, the place the Studio artists and those who followed them found, both in the world of American art and in society, turned out to be a marginal one. For even as cultural borders were challenged and collapsed, new ones arose, particularly in the continued segregation of American Indian art in museums – a segregation that has preserved the separate Indian identity of the art even as it was generally recognized to be American. For even as Indian and non-Indian cultures intersected at the Studio, the non-Indian dominated art world subsequently established a pattern of exhibiting Indian art works as products of distinct cultures. Similarly in the 1930s American Indians as an ethnic minority found themselves on the margins of a mainstream, white-dominated society, as they do to the present day; indeed, for many Indians, their “American” identity is at best liminal, and often contested. But the Indian New Deal’s project of assimilation as exemplified in the Studio was an attempt to situate Indian identities as being part of the American experience by validating and including native cultures in the diversity of the nation. As such, it was truly part of an American project to celebrate the components that coalesced into the American nation. Despite the social problems that continue to plague Indian and non-Indian relations, the paintings of the young Studio artist-students stand as a testament not only to the mutual understanding that can be realized, but the possibilities of the medium of art to express those sentiments.

The coming together of these disparate groups of Indians and non-Indians lends itself to the characterization of an “art world” as defined by art historian Howard S. Becker. Becker proposed that an “art world” consisted of a “network of people whose cooperative activity, organized via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing

things, produces the kind of art works that art world is noted for.”²² This definition obviously places more emphasis on the activities of the non-Indians who were knowledgeable of the conventions of the American art scene, and there were certainly many such individuals in Santa Fe at the time. However, the non-Indian members of this world, individually and as a whole, were striving to cross over to the cultures of Indians both to better understand them, and ponder how they might share an American identity. By the time the Studio was founded, Kenneth Chapman had already established himself as a respected curator of Indian art in Santa Fe, and in particular as an expert on Pueblo pottery. His protégé, Dorothy Dunn, was a newcomer to the Indian Southwest, and she, too, would devote the remainder of her life to promoting the wider appreciation of Indian art. Dunn and Chapman became adept at crossing back and forth between the Indian cultures and their own. Indeed, Dunn came to identify herself with the Studio so intensely that her identity became intertwined with that of the Studio both in her own perception, and in most historical accounts where her name is ubiquitously mentioned with that of the Studio.

In order to gain a fuller appreciation of the concept of identity formation in the Studio art world, individual members are prominently portrayed against background discussions of BIA education policies concerning indigenous arts and the Studio’s unique historical position in that regard. Members of the Studio art world speak in their own words, and through analyses of their paintings by them and others. The author’s own interviews of Studio alumni as well as previous interviews of them, their family members, and their colleagues are presented to that end. In that way it is hoped that the

²² Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), x.

individual and collective identities of that cross-cultural world's members can be gleaned meaningfully.

This incorporation of the words and thoughts of Studio participants is crucial to establishing an authentic base to the discussion of identity, which is a subject that is perception-laden, fraught with subjectivity, and in search of a vocabulary. Care has been taken to identify these peoples by their traditional tribal, national, or band names, many of which are translated as just that, "the people." Of course many indigenous peoples in North America have always eschewed being called Indians, Americans, American Indians, or Native Americans, and indeed this sensitivity remains to the present day. However, the term "American Indian" is a vital thread of identity in the present study. Given that assimilation meant that these peoples were to somehow find a place in American society, that place would have qualified them as Americans in addition to being an Indian or a Navajo or Taos Pueblo, or any other designation as a member of a group. At the Studio, the artist-students were exploring not only the formalities of painting, but ways in which to represent their heritage. They were engaged in a project of historical preservation, but at the same time they wanted to present their paintings to the world to prove how they, too, were Americans not only because of their degree of assimilation, but *because* of their indigenous North American heritage. Hence, the students, as a whole, identified themselves first as they were *Indians* – *Indians* simultaneously in the pan-Indian sense and based on their individual cultural heritage – and secondly how that identification was nationally *American*. Theirs was an effort to show the world through their art how they were Indians, and to convince others that they and their art deserved to be recognized as truly American.

This study will begin by tracing the outlines of assimilation policies against the background of non-Indian notions of who Indians were, and who they were to become as

a result of “civilization” and assimilation. An excursion back to the founding years of the American Republic reveals how President George Washington’s “factory system” of trading houses set the precedent for intertwining “civilization” and education as the fundaments for assimilation. However, Washington still insisted that Indian nations be treated as such, but this stance, as well as the factory system, was eventually abandoned by officials bent on eradicating any semblance of Indian independence. After the “Indian Wars” ended toward the end of the nineteenth century, assimilation, in one guise or another, became the basis of all federal policies. The enactment of the Dawes Act in 1887 was based on the expectation that Indians could be “civilized” by becoming landowning Americans. The underlying presumption was that Indians were a separate race, and that if their cultures were obliterated and replaced by the values of white culture, individual Indians would be transformed into whites. This plan for cultural assimilation was doomed to failure from the start not only by the impracticality of Indians’ successful management, and subsequent loss, of private land allotments, but also by non-Indians’ failure to conceive of the persistence of Indian culture in the face of the onslaught of Euro-American values. Recognizing this failure, at the beginning of the twentieth century Progressive reformers of Indian policy began to turn their attention to the field of education as a potentially effective means for achieving assimilation. Whereas the previous assimilation campaign had included industrial boarding schools that taught students to fulfill menial jobs, now vocational programs promoting the production of Indian arts and crafts were instituted to build upon existing manufactures to provide a means of livelihood. The most important of these programs was directed by a Winnebago artist and teacher, Angel de Cora, at the Carlisle Industrial Indian School. However, De Cora did not teach Indian arts and crafts per se, but instead trained her students to adapt and apply Indian designs to everyday items from the non-Indian world,

e.g., crockery. Yet the items produced in De Cora's Native Indian Art Department did open up a dialogue for defining the nature and place of Indian arts in American commercial design. Progressive forces for Indian education reform culminated in the publication of the Meriam Report of 1928, which called for an extensive reorganization of Indian Service schools to introduce curricula that more closely met the personal needs and cultural backgrounds of students. Political focus was now oriented toward facilitating the social assimilation of Indian cultures into the fabric of an increasingly pluralist American society, the underlying assumption now being that Indians could still be Indians, but they could be American Indians as well. As a result of this new tolerance toward Indian arts and culture, the Department of Painting and Design, or Studio, was opened on a trial basis at the Santa Fe Indian School in the fall of 1932. Although the Studio is commonly recognized as having been a product of the Indian New Deal, its actual genesis lay in the reformist ideals of the Progressive Era that lingered on to address America's minority Indians throughout the 1920s.

Chapter Two examines three individuals' visions of how modern American Indian painting would enter the "cosmopolitan future" of American culture, those of John Collier, Kenneth Chapman, and Dorothy Dunn. All three of these individuals became deeply engaged in understanding Indian cultures to the point where their own identities merged with them, even as they were seeking to preserve these cultures and assimilate them into their own. Chapman's and Dunn's visions led to the founding of the Studio, where their hopes for a truly modern school of American painting based on Indian artistic traditions were successfully realized. But despite the Studio artist-students' astounding achievements, Dunn and subsequent historians could not rest on those laurels and sought some supra-explanation for the students' talents. John Collier's vision was also based on a project of preservation and assimilation, but his hopes were grounded in an almost

mystical communion of Indian and American cultures. Collier possessed an ethno-romantic reverence for Indian cultures as potential saviors of a spiritually bankrupt white America, and he engineered the government's promotion of Indian arts as a means of bringing about this salvation.

One of the prominent community activists of the Progressive Era, John Collier, pressed his ideals to the limit when he assumed the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933. Over a decade earlier he had become enchanted with Pueblo Indian culture when he visited his old friend Mabel Dodge Luhan from New York City, who was now presiding over a émigré salon in Taos, New Mexico. Collier's experiences in the Indian Southwest engendered a lifelong fascination with all things Indian, and his story of attempting to cross over Indian and non-Indian cultural borders is a revealing example of others who shared his zeal to hold up Indianness as a model for non-Indian emulation. Indeed, Collier engaged in an ethno-romance with American Indian cultures and also became an ardent activist for Indian rights. Collier's greatest accomplishment, as well as source of criticism and defeat, was the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which became the pillar of the Indian New Deal. While not abandoning the goal of social and political assimilation, Collier championed the intrinsic communalities of Indian peoples, and their right to tribal self-determination within the United States, even though the latter desire was rejected by many Indians themselves. One of his lasting accomplishments was the enlistment of academic anthropologists to study Indian cultures in order to more effectively improve Indian Service management. But most of all, Collier was a true believer in the incorporation of Indian arts and cultures into "the cosmopolitan future" of American's cultural diversity.

The Studio's on-the-ground instigators, Kenneth Chapman and Dorothy Dunn, shared Collier's hope that Indian arts would gain their due recognition. However, their

fascination with all things Indians was a less ethno-romantic engagement than Collier's. The end of this chapter deals with the nuts and bolts of how Chapman and Dunn pieced together their plan for a program in Indian pictorial painting at the SFIS, and how they fought to make it a reality. The Studio program quickly became a success through its annual end-of-semester exhibitions and sales, and through the many exhibitions that Dunn prepared for museums throughout the United States and in Europe. But despite the obvious, natural talents of many of the young artist-students, Dunn and others sought to explain their abilities as being attributable to some more esoteric reasons. A few decades after she left the Studio, Dunn referred to art historian George Kubler's thesis that all art forms are replications that can be traced back to "prime objects" to explain the nature of modern American Indian painting. Other historians have turned to analytical psychologist Carl G. Jung's concept of unconscious archetypes to explain the students' artistic impulse. But perhaps the most obvious explanation for their accomplishments is that they were painting "what they knew," which, of course, is a widely held prescription for European and American artists. What they knew was their identity, both individual and collective, as it emanated from their respective cultures, and this is what they painted. And this seeming paradox was, in fact, a reflection of their many-layered individual, tribal, pan-tribal, and American selves.

Chapter Three presents an examination of the many facets of the Studio art world that is punctuated by the artist-students' own words about how their paintings revealed the past and present of their people, and how their art was truly an American art painting America. Dorothy Dunn's "guidance" of the activities in the Studio, patronage received from the Santa Fe art community, and BIA politics occupy a good deal of this discussion. But the connective theme is the underlying current of Indian art as an expression of modern American Indian identity that was the impetus for the coming together of this art

world and all its tensions. Dunn not only struggled constantly with various administrators to keep the Studio open, but she also occasionally experienced difficulties in gaining the cooperation of students who did not agree with her methods. And although Dunn and the artist-students constituted the core of the Studio art world, they were nevertheless marginal members of the Santa Fe art community who were also dependent on it for patronage. However, this marginality also afforded the artist-students social distance that, in the final analysis, buttressed their identity and helped them maintain control over what and how much of themselves was translated to others through their paintings. And through their own words, the artist-students intone how they themselves perceived their paintings to be a truly American Indian art.

This study gets to the core of its thesis in Chapter Four, which examines a selection of 150 Studio paintings to detect the ways in which the artist-students chose to depict themselves and their cultures, i.e., their identities. The paintings are almost exclusively from the founding years of the Studio, which parallel Dunn's tenure there from 1932-1937. This selection includes the works of sixty-six artist-students from twenty-eight nations or tribes. The paintings were examined under the common rubric of how they portrayed American Indian culture and identity, and then divided into two broad subject categories of ceremonial or non-ceremonial/lifeway. These paintings were subsequently grouped according to how each depicted individual or collective identities. Non-ceremonial/lifeway paintings were sorted based on the following subjects: genre, the hunt, decorative, and fanciful/naturalistic landscapes. Close attention was also given to the ways in which the artist-students depicted the human form, e.g., were the faces stylized or individualized? What color was assigned to the skin? How were other physical characteristics depicted? Finally, the pieces are considered collectively in order to determine whether certain trends existed among co-tribal artists, and individually to

recognize those artists who expressed themselves uniquely. Despite all these categorizations, and questions that continue to arise about whether or not they collectively constituted a “Studio Style,” it is the natural artistic impulse to identify and express the union of self and culture that is most important. Indeed, it was these artist-students’ search for *an* – not *the* – American Indian identity in all its complexity that constituted the essence of the Studio Style.

From Chapter Five the focus shifts from the artist-students back to Dorothy Dunn. For it is not American Indian identity alone that is the subject of this study, but American identity. And although in the literature on the Studio Dunn has received perhaps more than her due share of intention, Dunn’s engagement in the Studio was essentially a journey of personal discovery. She arrived in New Mexico at a time when she was searching to find and make a life for herself, and once there her enthrallement with all things Indian led her on a path of personal rediscovery. Through the course of her work both at the Studio and at schools in Santo Domingo Pueblo and the Navajo Shiprock Agency, Dunn’s strenuous efforts to understand these Southwest cultures led her find and jealously defend professional and personal identities that she maintained for the rest of her conscious life. During her tenure at the Studio, Dunn was faced with enormous professional and personal challenges to carry out what she believed to be very important work. She identified so strongly with her Indian charges, and with defending their opportunity to revitalize and express their Indian cultures, that their cause became her own. As a relatively unsophisticated Midwesterner without the fancy academic credentials and art backgrounds of most of the members of the Santa Fe art community, Dunn was almost as marginal to it as the artist-students were. And in the end, all these tensions led her to suffer personal humiliation and defeat when she left the Studio in the fall of 1937.

The tensions that arose in Dunn's personal life came from several sources: unappreciative Indian Service bureaucrats who did not wholly support what she was trying to achieve with the artist-students, fellow teachers with whom she shared a mutual dislike, students who were uncooperative, and overwork being chief among them. But surely she must have also experienced some strain from trying to crossover so intimately into the various cultures represented by the artist-students. The attendant stress from these factors assumedly led her to act in irrational ways that only made her situation vis-a-vis superiors even worse. Indeed, the conclusion has been drawn that Dunn identified herself so intensely with the Studio that she *became* the Studio in her own mind; this certainly was not a healthy development. However, one must resist the temptation to put Dunn "on a couch," i.e., to psychoanalyze her. But it is possible to understand Dunn's tribulations, as well as the process of identity formation at the Studio, by examining contemporary developments in the fields of psychoanalysis and anthropology, specifically in the Culture and Personality Movement. To this end, this study ends with "An Afterword on Identity" which presents tentative insights into what had been learned by that time about the formation of human identity.

As mentioned earlier, BIA Commissioner John Collier enlisted anthropologists to study Indian cultures as part of his plan to manage them more efficiently. Other academic anthropologists from the Culture and Personality Movement, such as Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, applied the principle of cultural relativism in field studies of American Indian groups in the 1930s, and in the course of their work they developed theories concerning the formation of identity. Benedict made an important, albeit

controversial, contribution to the field by applying methods of psychology and history to the study of cultures, and subsequently proposing that cultures had personalities, or identities, just as individuals did. Benedict also explored how the individual psyche interacted with the “outer world” of culture to create one’s identity. Mekeel, Benedict, and Mead also found a colleague in Dr. Erik Homburger, a Freudian-trained psychoanalyst who had recently emigrated to the United States from Denmark. Better known by his self-adopted surname Erikson, he made a field trip with Mekeel to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in 1937 that resulted in keen insights into the psychological implications resulting from cross-cultural interaction between the Sioux and non-Indian teachers, insights which could have been similarly applicable to the same interaction in the Studio. But Erikson is better known for his research and observations into the nature of identity formation in adolescents. Like Benedict, he was interested in the interplay between the individual and culture in this process, but unlike Benedict, Erikson placed more importance on the workings of the “inner” world of the psyche. It is proposed that these insights into the making of identity are relevant to understanding that process as it was experienced by the artist-students at the Studio, who were drawing upon their respective Indian cultures to express themselves artistically, and to prove how their cultures were truly American. For in the process, they were examining their multilayered identities as individuals, as tribal members, as pan-Indians, and finally, as Americans.

Dorothy Dunn eloquently summed up her great expectation for modern American Indian art when she wrote, “the strain of Indian art must somehow enter the flow of the many strains toward a national art expression, not losing its own identity but contributing

indentifying features to the whole.”²³ Dunn was commenting in the context of an ongoing discussion about the realization of a “national art in America” that was “free at last of Europe.”²⁴ Dunn surmised that perhaps it was not even feasible to expect the development of “significant art homogeneity” in America, and that instead, “Perhaps the heterogeneous national character of America is to be reflected in the national art, lending it distinctive features from many arts and various stocks of mankind which merge in a diversified oneness that is characteristically American.”²⁵ As part of her own personal search for identity as well as that of the artist-students, Dunn insisted that the Studio art be “Indian” to protect that identity, and to promote its contribution to American national identity – hers and theirs. And on that score, and in the continuing evolution of American Indian identity, the Studio artist-students made their contribution by expressing themselves and their cultures through the medium of painting, however marginal it was then and even now to American society.

²³ Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1968), 363.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

Chapter 1: The Shoals of a Nebulous Shore: Indian Identity and the U.S. Government Policy of Education for Assimilation

By the end of the 1880s, the U.S. government's military campaign to subjugate indigenous peoples in the Far West was almost complete, and the massacre of Lakota Sioux at Wounded Knee in 1890 put a tragic exclamation point to those wars in the same year that historian Frederick Jackson Turner famously declared that the American frontier had been closed. Bureaucrats, politicians, and concerned citizens grappled with new solutions to the "Indian problem," finding a consensus in the so-called policy of assimilation that aimed yet again to "civilize" Indians by eradicating their cultures and transforming them into non-Indian Americans. The Dawes Act or General Allotment Act of 1887 was the first large-scale attempt accomplish this cultural assimilation by allotting partitioned reservation lands to Indians in order to "civilize" them into the ways of white, land-owning farmers. The Act's sponsor, Senator Henry L. Dawes, believed that the inculcation of the values of private ownership would de-racialize and de-segregate Indians into being non-Indian Americans. However, an answer to the question of how Indians could be introduced, somehow, as members of society when they were not even American citizens remained as elusive as ever. Could Indians, individually and collectively, enter the mainstream of society, or would they find themselves on its margins? Of course, the segregationist reservation system was an obvious hindrance to assimilation, and Indians needed to have some viable means of making a living in the national economy. But beyond the considerations of place and economy, assimilation policies aimed to create and give substance to an *American* Indian, and this was so whether their creators fully appreciated what this requisite transformation entailed. Federal and tribal guidelines for enrollment as Indians, usually based on blood quantum,

were complicated enough. But the inclusion of Indians in society – and the concomitant acknowledgement of them as *Americans* – involved the far more nebulous concepts of identity and culture, concepts which changed depending on the perceptions of Indians and non-Indians alike – perceptions that were complicated and contested. But in order to pursue a coherent policy, assimilationists needed to reach a consensus in face of a conundrum; how could Indians realize an American identity and at the same time preserve their Indian culture and identity?

By the beginning of the third decade of the twentieth century, Indian policy makers and reformers generally recognized that the Dawes Act had failed to assimilate Indians, and they looked for new means to pursue that goal in a variety of ways. Instead of considering private land ownership as the principal vehicle for assimilation, some policy makers believed that education in the ways of the white world was a far more effective means of transforming the Indian person. Some Progressive, reformist-minded policy makers also began to think in terms of assimilating Indian *cultures* into American society, albeit on the fringes, rather than transforming Indian individuals into being non-Indian Americans. The term “American Indian” assumed a new meaning for them, and also became a path of discovery for many Indians.

The traditional paradigm for identifying Indians as a separate race was now discounted by some reformers such as Richard Henry Pratt, who founded the first government-run Indian boarding school. Although he was in large part philosophically aligned with Senator Dawes, Pratt sought to de-racialize and desegregate native peoples through a radical program of re-education. On the other hand, at the beginning of the twentieth century progressive-minded officials such as Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Commissioner Francis Leupp pursued education policies designed to re-racialize and re-segregate Indians within the borders of reservations. But Leupp also reconsidered the

value of Indian culture in the assimilation process, and he promoted the instruction of Indian arts and crafts in BIA schools. During his tenure, Estelle Reel, the BIA Superintendent for Schools, devised the first program for the incorporation of Indian arts and crafts into BIA school curricula, and a Winnebago artist, Angel de Cora, taught Indian arts and crafts at the Carlisle Industrial School. By the end of the 1920s, certain Progressive reformers within the Bureau of Indian Affairs decided that the time had come to build upon what Leupp had attempted to accomplish by promoting Indian arts and crafts through a comprehensive re-vamping of the Indian Service's education program. The ultimate goal changed from being one of cultural assimilation to social assimilation, and Indian identity was now increasingly perceived in terms of both race and culture. For although many non-Indians had long assumed that Indian cultures would simply die out as "civilization" was brought to them, this had not turned out to be the case; some means had to be found to accommodate the persistence of Indian lifestyles. Yet there was no easy solution of the "Indian problem" through a segregated reservation system or full integration with American society.

Conceivably enough, the BIA's education program for Indians was the logical nexus for bringing social assimilation to indigenous peoples. Re-education was considered the most effective process for bringing about this transformation of Indian social identity. In order to accomplish this, the curricula had to go far beyond teaching English grammar and basic mathematics to Indian school children, and beyond the basics of good citizenship inculcated in non-Indian students as well. A re-education program for assimilation had to be guided by an overarching ideology that defined "Indianness" and situated that identity in mainstream American society, and as such it constituted a social experiment. Given the daunting task non-Indian officials set for themselves to formulate a comprehensive education policy adaptable to the many Indian cultures in the

country, it is no wonder that policymakers floundered on the shoals of a nebulous shore whose lines shifted with the course of changing times, and on the shoals of non-whites' conceptions of "Indian" identity and how that identity was or was not "American." Unfortunately, Indians themselves were rarely, if ever, consulted, but if they had been they most certainly could have readily defined their particular nation or tribe, and likely would have accepted of the erroneous term "Indian" since, after all, it designated them as peoples distinct from the strange people who had come to their land. However, when it came to defining just how they were *American* Indians, many Indians would just as likely have been uncertain as to just what that meant.

But the group of Indians who became known as "Red Progressives" most certainly did possess a strong sense of their American Indian identity. The Red Progressives, many of whom were college-educated "mixed bloods" who viewed themselves as being assimilated but culturally distinct Americans, certainly believed they had found their roles in a pluralist American society. The Red Progressives were joined by certain non-Indian Progressive reformers who looked for new directions in assimilation policy to advance more nuanced interpretations of what Indians' identity and place in American society should be, interpretations that combined the paradoxical goals of social assimilation and the preservation of Indian identity and culture – and the assumption that there was a place in that pluralist society for American Indians.²⁶

²⁶ In his critique of the traditionally condescending, racially-based orientation of the U.S. government's policy toward native peoples, historian Frederick E. Hoxie has identified two ironies of the government's campaigns to "civilize" and somehow assimilate Indians into a "homogenous" American society. Hoxie observed that by the 1920s, the campaign to assimilate the Indians had resulted in the marginalization of these native peoples, and simultaneously created "its antithesis – a plural society" through "the persistence, rather than the disappearance, of tribal cultures." See Frederick E. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920*. 2nd ed. (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 243.

Although Progressive ideals had crept into the thinking of some BIA officials at the turn of the nineteenth century, they did not gain a significant influence on policymaking until President Herbert Hoover's administration in the late 1920s. However, and again ironically, it was not until the 1930s during a time of national economic and social crisis that the federal government would develop and implement progressive programs that validated American Indian identity and culture – even as the struggle to assimilate and define them continued. One of the fundaments of the original assimilation campaign had been the institution of industrial schools to prepare Indians to obtain jobs in the white economy, and the Indian New Dealers remained focused on vocational education. However, unlike the ethnocentric philosophy that had aimed to obliterate Indians' heritage, policymakers now placed indigenous arts and crafts instruction at the center of a vocational education program.

The convoluted path to the educational reforms implemented in the 1930s can only be properly appreciated by following it within the context of revolving, complex understandings of Indian identity and what assimilation goals entailed. Rather than attempting to survey the entirety of the federal educational program for indigenous peoples, this chapter focuses on Indian art programs in boarding schools and how they reflected bureaucrats' appreciation, or lack thereof, of Indian culture. The time period under consideration spans from the 1870s through the 1920s, but first a few excursions will be made back to the founding years of the Republic in order to briefly outline how Indians had fit, or had not, into the intellectual schema of early American society.

George Washington and the Cultivation of Indian Civilization

In August 1790, President George Washington allegedly stalked out of a Senate conference and declared “he would be damned if he ever went there again.”²⁷ The president was reportedly angry because senators were stalling on ratification of a peace treaty he and Secretary of War Henry Knox had negotiated with the Creek Nation. The U.S. government was seeking to acquire Creek Indian land through this treaty, but it also raised for the first time the question of where authority resided in the federal government to affirm such agreements with native peoples. Washington contended that the American Republic must treat with Indian nations in the same manner that they would with any other nation (i.e., any “nation” as the term then was traditionally applied), and accordingly that the Constitution of 1787 dictated that the Senate must ratify these treaties. Washington’s opinion prevailed and the precedent was set for treaty making with Indians, but he also apparently made good on his promise never to return to the Senate.

The Creek treaty that Washington so adamantly defended also promised to provide the rudiments of items necessary for Indians “to become herdsmen and cultivators instead of remaining in a state of hunters,” that is, to provide tools for an uplift “to a greater degree of civilization” for people who had been successful cultivators of the land long before European settlers introduced their ways.²⁸ In 1794, the government went a step further and for the first time made provisions for the education of

²⁷ Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father, The United States Government and the American Indians*, Abr. Ed. (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 20. Unfortunately, Prucha did not provide a source for this quote. In his classic biography *George Washington, Man and Monument*, Rev. ed. (New York: New American Library, 1982), historian Marcus Cunliffe mentioned that Washington visited the Senate only once and the reason was “to confer on foreign policy.” Cunliffe stated that the “occasion was dismally unsuccessful” and that if Senator William Maclay “is to be believed, Washington was haughty and impatient, and departed irritably when the Senate was unwilling to give immediate assent to his wishes.” However, elsewhere Cunliffe characterized Maclay as having been “a caustic and irreverent senator.”

²⁸ Ibid., 20.

Indians in the Treaty with the Indians Living in the Country of the Oneidas, which was negotiated to reward those nations for fighting on the side of the rebels in the War for Independence.²⁹ Two years later, Congress passed the Intercourse Law of 1796, which was the first federal law delineating and recognizing the sovereignty of Indian lands, and also formalized a system of government-directed trading houses or “factories” that Washington had initiated a year earlier. The twenty-eight factories that were established between 1795 and 1822 were not only financially successful, but also entailed a reorientation of Indian policy from a foreign to a domestic one – a development that George Washington may not have foreseen. This factory system expanded on the “civilizing” plans of the Creek Nation treaty by providing for the education of Indians in the “gospel of agriculture and domestic arts,” and in modeling “what could be done in taming the wilderness.”³⁰ Essentially, this civilizing would transform the native peoples on the non-Indians’ frontier, which was certainly no “wilderness” to the Indians, into frontiersmen in the non-Indian image.

Although Congress eventually bowed to pressures from private traders to eliminate the competition so successfully presented by Indians in the factory system, Washington’s experimental initiative had set two precedents for U.S. Indian policy; the education and civilization the Indians into Euro-American culture became the fundaments for the domesticating goals of assimilation and acculturation. In 1819, Congress at last formally addressed the funding of a school system for Indians when it passed the Indian Civilization Act, and in the 1820s the federal government subsequently began to pursue

²⁹ Colin G. Calloway, *First Peoples, A Documentary Survey of American Indian History*, 2nd. Ed. (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2004), 551.

³⁰ Oneida Indian Nation. Oneida Indian Nation Treaties Project, Treaty with the Indians Living in the Country of the Oneidas or Veterans’ Treaty, 1794. <http://oneida-nation.net/treat-VETERAN.html> (accessed August 9, 2008).

aggressively the means to sort out Indians from “settled” lands and to intrude into every facet of Indian existence. The capstone of this new aggressiveness occurred in 1824 when Secretary of War John C. Calhoun, on his own initiative, established the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs within his department. Calhoun chose Thomas L. McKenney to head the new bureau, and this was probably a somewhat fortunate choice since McKenney had long taken a keen interest in promoting what he considered to be the welfare of Indians, particularly their acculturative education. In his first annual report, McKenney reported that thirty-two co-educational schools had been opened, and he optimistically expected that “a complete reformation of the principles and pursuits of the American Indian” within one generation.³¹ His was an expectation that “Indian” identity was to be expunged and replaced by a new individual – an assimilated and acculturated “American Indian.” But with the dislocations, removals, wars, and segregation of Indians on reservations that would occur under succeeding presidential administrations over the next fifty years, the two-pronged policy of assimilation and acculturation would alienate Indians even further from the society into which optimists such as McKenney hoped they would enter. And since Congress habitually refused to fund more federal schools for Indians in favor of contract schools run by religious groups, a cohesive government plan for Indian education fell by the wayside, and the severance between church and state was blurred and ignored in the breach.

McKenney, however, had one very important and unusual accomplishment – the first “Indian Gallery” in America. McKenney seized upon the idea of commissioning a painter, Charles Bird King, to do portraits of the many Indians who were traveling to Washington, D.C. during this period. These portraits, which McKenney hung on the

³¹ Jon Reyner and Jeanne Eder, *American Indian Education, A Survey* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004), 44-45, quoting from *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1824), 1-2.

walls of his office, became iconic representations for non-Indians of what Indians looked like. Unfortunately, more than a hundred years would pass before the BIA provided Indians the means to paint themselves.

As the railroads cut their swathes across the American West after the Civil War, depositing “settlers” and commerce, and the U.S. Army subjugated the majority of Indians in their paths in the “Indian Wars,” President Ulysses S Grant and Indian Service officials decided that the time had come to cease treaty-making with increasingly marginalized Indian nations. Indeed, in 1871 Congress declared that indigenous peoples would no longer be officially recognized as independent nations with whom the U.S. would treat. In actuality, the U.S. Supreme Court had already erased the fiction of Indian nations in 1831, just as President Andrew Jackson was ordering the first removals from the eastern seaboard, by declaring them “‘domestic, dependent nations’” (*Worcester v. Georgia*). President Washington’s fight had now been irrevocably lost, posthumously, and Indian peoples were pushed further into an ambiguous political identity. Over the next several years efforts to broaden the scope of Indian educational policy would not only be ratcheted up, but would also veer in a new direction to foster the development of an “American Indian.” And this development called for the extraction of Indian youth from within reservation borders to government-run boarding schools where it was now hoped they could be more readily acculturated and assimilated into the American workforce.

Improving and Transforming the Indian: The Strange Case of Richard H. Pratt

Richard Henry Pratt was a prominent and controversial figure in the history of U.S. Indian education. Pick up any book on the topic, and almost certainly you will read the oft-repeated line that he was the “father of American Indian education” who in 1879

opened the first government-operated, off-reservation boarding school in what had formerly been military barracks in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. However, of equal interest, particularly for the survival of Indian cultures, is the school Pratt improvised for captives from the Indian Wars held at Fort Marion in St. Augustine, Florida, where he condoned an area of education that he adamantly refused to establish at the Carlisle Industrial Indian School—an art program that not only illustratively preserved tribal histories but also brought its artists profits and interaction with white patrons. Pratt also first articulated his vision of assimilation at Fort Marion, but somewhere along the way he disabused himself of the notion of preserving Indian cultures and instead adamantly came to advocate their eradication through de-racialization and desegregation. Criticism of Carlisle's intolerant military regime designed to strip Indian youth of their culture and identity notwithstanding, there were two important consequences of Pratt's educational philosophy: the belief that Indians' racial and economic background should not deprive them of opportunities to assimilate as Americans, and the unintended appearance of a pan-Indian identity among boarding school students across the country.

Pratt was born in New York state in 1840, but spent most of his youth and early manhood in Indiana. He left school when he was thirteen years old so he could work to support his family, and after learning several industrial trades he enlisted in the Union Army at the beginning of the Civil War and rose to the rank of captain. By the time he mustered out at the war's end, his horse had been shot out from under him three times. But Pratt was apparently comfortable enough with military life to re-enlist within two years. He subsequently commanded Indian scouts and Buffalo Soldiers in Indian Territory and northwestern Texas until 1875 when he was given orders to accompany Kiowa, Comanche, Cheyenne, and Arapaho prisoners from the Indian Wars to Fort Marion.

Horse mishaps aside, Pratt's friend Episcopal Bishop Henry B. Whipple characterized him as a man who was “sure of his foundations” and held onto “intense convictions.”³² And his foundations were squarely Euro-American and Christian. From the vantage point of today’s American society, one might easily suppose that Pratt’s favorable impressions of his Buffalo Soldiers would have given him a multicultural perspective. This, however, was not the case. What Pratt saw as laudable in these men was their strengths of character that made them resemble whites. According to Pratt’s biographer, Elaine Goodale Eastman, Pratt lamented that these Indians and “Negroes” were “underprivileged races” due to segregation and whites’ prejudice.³³ By the time Pratt founded the Carlisle school, he no longer found anything of value in Indian cultures, and he made it his life’s work to convert as many of the students as possible into white American identities.

While much has been written about Pratt and Carlisle, little attention has been directed to what, in many ways, were his more interesting endeavors at Fort Marion. When Pratt’s would-be artists arrived at Fort Marion, he immediately began his program of acculturation by having them shed their own clothes and instead wear U.S. Army private uniforms. Pratt allowed local non-whites to visit the prisoners and he saw this as a means to encourage the Indians to learn English. Several women visitors volunteered to teach English classes, and this proved fortuitous in an unexpected way when one of the women, Miss Eva Scott, was so fascinated by their drawings that she obtained drawing books so that the captive artists could pursue their work. The Kiowa Zo-Tom and

³² Elaine Goodale Eastman, *Pratt, the Red Man’s Moses* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935), 59, 116, and 188. Eastman also wrote that Bishop Whipple was “widely known as Apostle to the Ojibways and Sioux.”

³³ Ibid., 30.

Cheyenne Howling Wolf (Honnennisto) produced drawings in these books, and in 1877 Miss Scott compiled them into book form.

In her introduction to the 1969 edition of these drawings, Dorothy Dunn observed that these artistic efforts reflected “the old” in several ways, “notably in their two-dimensional style and in certain conventions of drawing life forms and details of costumes and equipment,” in the custom of “drawing outlines and filling the enclosed areas with flat color,” and the “preference for profile views.”³⁴ Although Dunn associated the drawings with being characteristic of Plains artwork on muslin, ledger books, cardboard, etc. from the late nineteenth century, she also detected the “individuality of the two artists as to style and subject.”³⁵ She found Howling Wolf to be “the more formal and technical artist, with an inclination for decoration and display,” while Zo-Tom was “mainly a representationalist in an impressionistic vein...with sidelights of his own character.”³⁶ Dunn considered Howling Wolf’s “Chief on Horseback” to be “more representational of Plains painting, old and new,” and as typifying “the dynamic character of Plains art at its best.”³⁷ But she saw more individual expression in Zo-Tom’s work, particularly in his drawing of himself at the truce meeting with Pratt in 1871. Pratt is depicted on a rigidly standing horse that is larger than Zo-Tom’s, while Zo-Tom is seen hoisting a flag of surrender from a horse that is posed in an almost kneeling position.³⁸ These depictions of their power relationship point to Zo-Tom’s recognition that he was in a subservient position. In the final drawing of his series, Zo-Tom visualized a classroom scene in which a diminutive and daintily dressed

³⁴ 1877: *Plains Indian Sketch Books of Zo-Tom & Howling Wolf*, introduction by Dorothy Dunn (Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1969), 12.

³⁵ Ibid., 8-9.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 8, 13.

³⁸ Ibid., 24.

teacher, Mrs. Gibbs, stands to the left of stylized figures of male students in non-Indian garb who are sitting shoulder to shoulder in profile. Dunn saw this arrangement of the students as a “modification” of the “repeated conventionalized life figure of earlier Nineteenth Century Plains drawing.”³⁹ Dunn’s point is certainly insightful, but this “modification” can also be seen as Zo-Tom’s conception of the acculturative process the student-prisoners were experiencing – a process that stripped them of their previous individual and collective identities.

After Fort Marion was closed in 1878, Pratt spent about one year trying to set up an Indian Department at the Negro Institute in Hampton, Virginia. But what he really wanted was to establish a co-educational school exclusively for the education of Indians, and he eventually convinced Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz to allow him to do so. Pratt persuaded Schurz with his argument that Indians deserved the same chance to become American citizens that the former immigrant Schurz had enjoyed.⁴⁰ Noble sentiment aside, Pratt was ignoring the fact that Indians still had no legal right to obtain American citizenship, and that they may not have desired it.

In October 1879 the Carlisle Indian Industrial School opened its doors to a class of 136 Kiowa, Cheyenne, and Pawnee students.⁴¹ The youngest student was 14 years of age, with the average age being 15, and all students were required to be “at least one-fourth Indian” and legally enrolled in a tribe.⁴² Pratt insisted on this blood quantum because he believed that anyone who was half white or more was already a white

³⁹ Ibid., 63, 65-67.

⁴⁰ Eastman, *Pratt, the Red Man’s Moses*, 77.

⁴¹ Ibid., 81.

⁴² Ibid., 215-216, 197.

American, and thus there was no transformative work to be accomplished on their identity.⁴³

Pratt originally instituted a three-year diploma program at Carlisle, later extending it to five years, that emphasized the teaching of gendered vocational skills that would aid his Indian charges in becoming economically self-sufficient through menial jobs. As had been the policy in all government Indian schools, all instruction was conducted exclusively in English. Critics have complained that the students were being denied a more academic education that would prepare them for higher education, and instead were being consigned to jobs that whites did not want. Although there was certainly some truth to this, at the time similar vocational programs were being initiated in mainstream high schools as part of the progressive education agenda. However, there was virtually no objection by white bureaucrats and reformers to forbidding the use of native languages among the students themselves. Secretary of the Interior Schurz insisted that “If Indian children are to be civilized they must learn the language of civilization.”⁴⁴ Also absent from the curriculum was any instruction in Indian-themed art. However, Pratt did allow classes in mechanical drawing and easel painting, and more talented students were given lessons in “form, color and perspective.”⁴⁵ Pratt’s biographer Elaine Goodale Eastman defended his refusal to encourage native culture-oriented education by saying that although he was “not inclined to cater to any form of exhibitionism, Pratt would by no means deny the possession of distinctive art ability to the race.”⁴⁶ But Pratt had clearly abandoned his appreciation of a racial, “distinctive art ability” that he had tolerated and even fostered at Fort Marion.

⁴³ Ibid., 197.

⁴⁴ Prucha, *The Great Father*, 233.

⁴⁵ Eastman, *The Red Man’s Moses*, 212.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

Pratt and other contemporary non-Indian devotees of Indian uplift, e.g. the Indian Rights Association and Lake Mohonk conferees, saw the “Indian problem” in essentially racial terms. For them, Indians were a distinct race, but one that nevertheless had certain inherent abilities that could be transformed into those of the white race. Once these transformations were accomplished – and in a most liberal vein they believed that only they knew best how to “improve” Indians -- the then worthy Indian would be civilized and fully ready to take his or her place, somewhere, in white American society. However, these would-be social engineers were vexed with the problem of trying to construct boundaries and definitions of a new identity, while at the same time they were seeking to tear down these same elements of identity from cultures alien to their own. Yet Eastman also characterized Pratt’s basic philosophy as being “steadily concentrated upon the individual, seeing him not as heir to a limited and already disintegrating tribal culture, but as a free human being.”⁴⁷ The most obvious problem with this emphasis on individual transformation was that it ignored that fact that the Indian individual – or, indeed, any individual—was not nurtured from birth in a vacuum, but within a culture, and culture, as both BIA bureaucrats and seemingly well-intentioned sympathizers of Indians could not, but did, ignore, was a difficult reality to erase, even when buttressed by the convenient belief that it was “disintegrating.” And as Pratt and others would learn, social engineering is not without unintended consequences. Pratt reasoned that the Indians’ disappearing culture made them vulnerable to exploitation by whites, and this exploitation in turn held them back from becoming white Americans. What he did not foresee was that Indians could and would find their own agency to fight such

⁴⁷ Ibid., 190.

exploitation, even from professed well-wishers, by joining forces through the bonds of nascent pan-Indianism.

By 1900, Carlisle had become the prototype for twenty-five other boarding schools where Indian youth from many different cultures came together to create a multicultural forum where they held up their tribal identities for the inspection of others, and in the process learned not just how they were different, but how they were the same. The students were aided in this exchange by being forced to speak English with each other – a policy that provided them with a common means of communication. Pointing out yet another irony in Indian education policies, historian Hazel W. Hertzberg, one of the pioneers in the study of modern American Indian identity, observed that pan-Indianism “would have been impossible” without the assimilationist reformers’ insistence that all instruction be conducted in English, a universal rule established in government schools in 1880.⁴⁸ Segregated within the walls of the school while being urged to penetrate the boundaries of the white world, the students became aware of their supra-tribal identity as “Indians,” ironically assuming the false identity white Americans had assigned them. This pan-Indian identity was artificially constructed and perpetuated by whites, but it was also one that Indians such as the Red Progressives internalized consciously as their own in an act of empowerment that brought them squarely into American civilization of the twentieth century.

Assimilation in the Extreme: Dictating American Individuality in U.S. Indian Policy

At the same time that Pratt was attempting to monitor and transform every facet of his students’ lives, the federal government attempted to clearly re-define its assimilationist policy towards Indians by severing its ties and obligations to them. Like

⁴⁸ Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 12.

Pratt, government policymakers came to believe that the reservation system was hampering assimilation efforts, and in 1887 Congress passed the General Allotment Act, also known as the Dawes Act, to end the system. The Dawes Act provided for the allotment of reservation lands to individual Indian owners in order to inculcate in them the “American Dream” of individual property ownership. Two years earlier the government had forbidden the practice of religious ceremonies on reservations, and now all aspects of Indian cultures were under a full-scale attack. However, Pratt, ever the one who knew what was best for the Indians, criticized the Dawes Act for reinforcing tribalism and racial segregation because landed Indians still remained clustered together geographically. But Pratt would soon face opposition from other reformers, and in particular from a new U.S. president, Theodore Roosevelt.

Roosevelt had long been keenly absorbed with all things Western, and he felt a particular sense of both paternalism and lack of sympathy towards its indigenous peoples and cultures. When Helen Hunt Jackson published her groundbreaking critique of U.S. Indian Policy, *A Century of Dishonor*, in 1881, Roosevelt dismissed Jackson and other Progressive reformers as “foolish sentimentalists.”⁴⁹ But Roosevelt’s administration did create an atmosphere in which relatively more recognition and promotion of Indian culture could be introduced into Indian Service schools. He also carried on his previous reform record from when he had been the head of the Civil Service Commission (CSC), and it was on this score that Pratt ran afoul of the president. Pratt bristled mightily when the CSC told him that he could not choose his own teachers at Carlisle, incurring the wrath not only of bureaucrats there, but President Roosevelt himself. In 1904, Roosevelt arranged to have Pratt dismissed from his directorship of Carlisle.

⁴⁹ Theodore Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West*, Vol. 1 (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1889), 334-335, quoted in Reyner and Eder, *American Indian Education*, 108.

Between 1884 and 1900, eighteen off-reservation boarding schools had been established, for a total of twenty-five with an enrollment of 7,430.⁵⁰ In 1884 the Chilocco Indian Agricultural School was opened in what was still then Indian Territory, the Genoa Indian School in Nebraska, and the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas. And in 1890, the Santa Fe Indian School was established primarily for students from Southwest Indian nations, followed one year later by the Phoenix Indian School in Phoenix, Arizona that enrolled children from nations in that state. At the end of that same period the reservations included eighty-one boarding schools with a student population of 9,600, and there were 147 day schools with about 5,000 students.⁵¹ But despite the growing number of off-reservation schools, officials were realizing that the limited success achieved in assimilating students was making the schools more trouble than they were worth. The recruitment of students often entailed trickery that left parents and children grieving over their forced separation, pandemics were all too common, there were huge number of complaints about dismal school conditions and abusive treatment of students, and far too many students were returning home “to the blanket” after they graduated. Influenced by the reformist mindset of the Progressive Era, some Indian Service officials began to take a more sympathetic look at the Indian cultures and how they could form the basis for improving Indians’ lives. This amounted to the officials’ recognition that there had been, and still could be, positive features in Indian lifestyles, and in the process some of the more progressive of them re-evaluated the intrinsic worth and economic potential of promoting Indian arts and crafts in government-run schools. Such men as Office of Indian Affairs Commissioners William Jones and Francis Leupp decided that the most prudent course of action would be to build more reservation schools, curtail the number

⁵⁰ Prucha, *The Great Father*, 280.

⁵¹ Ibid., 281.

of non-reservation ones, and develop a standardized educational curriculum adapted to what they considered to be Indians' unique needs.

Historian Robert Fay Schrader has identified Commissioner Jones as “the first commissioner to offer Indian Office support and cooperation in preserving Indian arts and crafts,” and although “no government effort was considered, the Indian Office did instruct the field matrons to do what they could to stimulate the old industries” and ensure that Indians used authentic, indigenous materials in the process.”⁵² Jones’ successor, Francis E. Leupp, would later startle colleagues when he issued the following warning to them: “The Indian is a natural warrior, a natural logician, a natural artist.... We have room for all three in our highly socialized system. Let us not make the mistake, in the process of absorbing them, of washing out whatever is distinctly Indian.”⁵³ Although Schrader credits Leupp with having been one of the first officials “to state publicly that Indian culture was of value in the modern age,” Leupp did nothing concrete to promote Indian arts and crafts, other than appointing Angel de Cora, a Winnebago artist, as an art teacher at Carlisle Indian School.⁵⁴ However, by 1920 the Indian Office, which had been motivated by hopes for “commercial success” in marketing Indian arts and crafts, abandoned interest in the endeavor.⁵⁵

Jones and Leupp had been aided in their reform attempts by two women, one white and one Indian, who uniquely exceeded gendered expectations of the time by their public service – Estelle Reel and Angel De Cora. Estelle Reel was the first of many

⁵² Robert Fay Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of New Deal Indian Policy* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983), 5.

⁵³ Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Central Classified File, 900 General Service Records of the Office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, *Report*, 1905, 12, quoted in Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 5, 7.

⁵⁴ Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 7.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 10-11.

extraordinary women who guided the formulation of education policy in government schools for Indians. Born in Illinois but educated in the East, Reel moved out West to Wyoming where she began a career of public service as a schoolteacher. Reel was an ardent suffragist, and she took advantage of the often more lenient attitudes toward public careers for women in Western states by becoming active in the state's Republican Party and even getting elected to public office in Wyoming. In 1898 she hit the campaign trail for presidential candidate William McKinley, and when he won the election he nominated her to become the Superintendent of Schools in the Office of Indian Affairs, making her the first woman to be nominated for and receive a federal position that required Senate confirmation.⁵⁶

Indian historian K. Tsianina Lomawaima, although critical of Reel's adherence to "the racist ideology of her time," has nevertheless credited her with having "professionalized the Indian Service teaching corps" and introducing "summer in-service teaching training institutes."⁵⁷ Reel was the principal author of *Course of Study for Indian Schools of the United States. Industrial and Literary*, which Commissioner Jones approved in 1901 for implementation in all Indian Service schools.⁵⁸ However, according to Lomawaima and another historian, Brenda J. Child, "The *Uniform Course* was probably used by some teachers and ignored by others, and by the 1910s Reel's

⁵⁶ See K. Tsianina Lomawaima, "Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1898-1910." *Journal of American Indian Education* 35 (Spring 1996), for detailed biographic information on Reel.

http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/hww/results/getResults.jhtml?_DARGS=/hww/results_common.jhtml.21#record_2 [accessed July 31, 2008].

⁵⁷ K. Tsianina Lomawaima, "Estelle Reel," in Margaret L. Archuleta, ed., *Away from Home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences, 1879-2000* (Phoenix: Heard Museum, 2000), 31.

⁵⁸ This *Uniform Course* was distributed in August 1901 not only to all the Indian Service schools, but to those in the U.S. colonial jurisdictions of Puerto Rico and the Philippines. See "'Making A Willing Worker,' Academic and Vocational Instruction," in *Away from Home, American Indian Boarding School Experiences, 1879-2000*, eds. Margaret L. Archuleta, Brenda J. Child, and K. Tsianina Lomawaima (Phoenix: The Heard Museum, 2000), 31.

successors once again lamented the lack of a standardized curriculum.”⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the program that Reel laid on in her *Uniform Course* did contain aims and goals that are relevant for this study. For although Reel relied on the established ethnocentric precept that the “aim” of the course was “to give the Indian child a knowledge of the English language, and to equip him with the ability to become self-supporting as speedily as possible,” the course did contain something that was new: Indian arts and crafts were to be officially incorporated into curricula for the first time.⁶⁰

The *Course of Study* directed that classes were to be initiated in basketry, pottery making, blanket weaving, and beadwork, complemented by instruction in tribal histories. The recruitment of native instructors was also prescribed. However, Reel emphasized that basket-weaving was to be the number-one undertaking because “the demand for this article is great everywhere.”⁶¹ Of course, she was referring to white consumers of these articles, but Reel also clearly understood that these buyers desired something that complied with their concept of what was “Indian,” and “the more ‘Indian’ the baskets are the more valuable they are and the better price they will bring.”⁶² In order to achieve this authenticity, Reel suggested that teachers instill a sense of “rivalry among the children as to who can make the best baskets” and to choose the best work for exhibitions.⁶³ In addition, the students should be exhorted to learn traditional basketry from “the old Indians at home.”⁶⁴ Unfortunately, Reel overlooked the fact that competition was not an

⁵⁹ Brenda J. Child and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, “Life at School,” in eds. Margaret L. Archuleta, Brenda J. Child, and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *Away from Home*, 31.

⁶⁰ *Course of Study for the Indian Schools of the United States. Industrial and Literary* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), 5.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 145.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

accepted convention in most Indian cultures, and that learning from their elders would obviously be problematic for students residing in boarding schools.⁶⁵

By the end of the nineteenth century, Indian arts and crafts had become exotic objects for the decoration of American middle class homes. Baskets, pottery, and other items associated with Indian lore were available in department stores, in Indian traders' catalogues, and as souvenirs purchased on tours of Indian country in the Southwest. Historians such as Erik Trump have examined the significant role that white women reformers and patrons played in the marketing and popularization of these items.⁶⁶ These white promoters and consumers were usually charmed by the otherness of the objects, and many were also genuinely interested in preserving what they and anthropologists feared were remnants of dying Indian cultures. Obviously such activities also provided the Indian artists with a means to make a living, and Indian Service officials were also realizing the positive economic benefit such enterprises could bring to these people, the majority of whom were living in impoverishment. They also expected that the vending of these manufactures would promote assimilation into the mainstream economy.

Reel lamented that most of the items Indians were producing for sale were copies of "modern wares," and as a result the artist's "individuality does not assert itself as it should and as it does in all the work of the old Indians of generations past," so instructors needed to take care to preserve "Indian designs and shapes."⁶⁷ As a result, "The object must be to weave the history and traditions of the tribe in all distinctively Indian work,

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ See Erik Trump, "'The Idea of Help,' White Women Reformers and the Commercialization of Native American Women's Arts," in eds., Carter Jones Meyer and Diana Royers, *Selling the American Indian, Commercializing & Appropriating American Indian Cultures* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2001), 159-189.

⁶⁷ *Course of Study*, 55.

thus making it historical, typical, and of value.”⁶⁸ In other words, blankets, baskets, pots, etc., had to express both the individuality of the artist and re-express and represent the cultural artifacts of the tribe; an Indian article could only be authentic if it expressed tribal and individual identities. Of course, this requirement posed a paradox; how could an article be the product of both individual artistic impulse and traditional tribal decoration? Furthermore, Reel’s somewhat confused thinking was fundamentally driven by the racial genius of Indian artistic instincts, as is evident in her prescription that “Race pride should stimulate them in preserving the work of the past.”⁶⁹

In a meshing of ironies, Reel’s *Course of Study* incorporated wholesale sections of Pratt’s *Carlisle Course of Study* regarding character building into its call for the rejuvenation of Indian arts and crafts. One precept fairly encapsulates Pratt’s plan for identity transformation: “Encourage self-possession, repression, and absence of self-consciousness.”⁷⁰ For Pratt, this meant that the young Indian should repress their racial identity and cultural legacy, and become confident white Americans who valorized individuality. The encouragement of “self-possession” is certainly a laudable goal of any student. But the central quandary for this prescription for transformation is the question of how one could be self-possessed without being self-conscious. Perhaps Reel thought that the artwork should be the product of intuitive, racially based talents and absorbed traditions. Or perhaps she sought a primitive plan for social engineering intended to obliterate and restructure the individual, and by extension collective Indian identity, into some kind of new American identity. Reel’s stated goal was the Indian students’ “preparation for citizenship.”⁷¹ The promotion and sale of Indians’ traditional arts and

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 147.

⁷¹ Ibid.

crafts in order to achieve economic advancement was ironically the means through which these non-Indian administrators, however conscious they were about the true meaning of their words, aimed to eradicate the very identities they were promoting and exploiting.

However, to paraphrase the old maxim, sometimes there is good in the midst of misfortune. In her pioneering work on chronicling and interpreting student experiences at Carlisle and the Chilocco Indian School, historian K. Tsianina Lomawaima has examined these schools “as arenas for a reciprocating exercise of power...between school staff and students – in other words, as an interaction Indian students helped to create.”⁷² Lomawaima detected in this interaction the “Indian people’s commitment to the idea of themselves.”⁷³ This “commitment” was integral to the development of a pan-Indian identity in the schools. And on a personal level, one Indian teacher, a woman, best demonstrated the “idea” of herself, and her name was Angel de Cora.⁷⁴ It was De Cora, a Winnebago artist and teacher at Carlisle Industrial Indian School, who directed the first program in Indian arts and crafts in a government boarding school.

Angel de Cora’s directorship of the Indian arts program at Carlisle was a significant departure from Reel’s *Course of Study*, which stipulated that while Indians should be brought in to assist in instruction, only white teachers could supervise the students’ work. De Cora assumed her position as an art instructor in February 1906 after being introduced to Commissioner Leupp by Natalie Curtis, a white Indian rights reformer. De Cora herself was a product of both the government boarding school system

⁷² K. Tsianina Lomawaima, “Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority over Mind and Body,” *American Ethnologist* 20 (2), (May, 1993), 227, <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sci+0094-0496%28199305%2920%3A2%3C227%3ADITFIS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E> (accessed Feb. 4, 2007).

⁷³ Ibid., 236.

⁷⁴ De Cora married one of her former Carlisle students, William Lone Star Dietz, in 1908. Dietz, an enrolled Lakota, later taught alongside Angel in the Art Department at Carlisle. I have chosen, however, to use her maiden name since this is how she is referred to commonly in the literature. Note also that two spellings of this maiden name can be found, ‘de Cora’ and ‘DeCora.’ I have chosen the former since this is the most common spelling found in current and recent literature.

and prestigious American educational institutions. When she was about twelve years old, de Cora was attending a Winnebago reservation school when a white recruiter tricked her into leaving with the enticement of riding in a “steam car” for fun, but instead it took her to the Hampton Institute.⁷⁵ She studied non-Indian music and art at Hampton from 1883 to 1891, and after graduation she moved to Northampton, Massachusetts where “friends,” presumably white, helped her to attend the Burnham Classical School for Girls.⁷⁶ She subsequently studied in the fine arts department at Smith College and supported herself by working as a custodian in an art gallery. After graduating from Smith in 1896, de Cora studied illustration for two years with Howard Pyle at the Drexel Institute in Philadelphia, and life drawing for one year at the Cowles Art School and for two years at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

At the end of the nineteenth century, American art education was steeped in the cosmopolitan styles of the Barbizon school, American Impressionism, and French academism, as artists became more concerned with the formalities of art than with expressing Romantic naturalism. But after graduating from Smith, de Cora decided to broaden her horizons by studying the art of her fellow indigenous North Americans. In 1897 de Cora traveled to the Fort Berthold reservation in North Dakota where Akrikaras, Mandans, and Hidatsas were carrying on their own arts and crafts traditions. Later, after her first year at Carlisle, de Cora went to New Mexico to study the work of Pueblo women artists. Through her close study of these Indian artists’ work, de Cora began to realize the importance of design in Indian arts and crafts. During her stay in Boston, de Cora opened up her own commercial art studio where she pursued her new interest in

⁷⁵ Angel DeCora, “An Autobiography,” in *The Red Man* (1910; repr., *The Red Man, by Red Men*, New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971), 279-280.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 280.

Indian designs. From Boston she moved on to New York City in 1902, where she concentrated even more on design work, as well as on illustrations, portraiture, and landscapes. De Cora made the following comment in regard to her increasing emphasis on Indian design: “Perhaps it was well that I had not over studied the prescribed methods of European decoration, for then my aboriginal qualities could never have asserted themselves.”⁷⁷ From New York de Cora moved on to her new position teaching Indians about design in Indian arts and crafts at Carlisle Indian Industrial School.

One of her biographers, historian Margareta L. Archuleta, has written that de Cora came to understand that Indian art “was a well-established system of designing,” and this principle guided de Cora’s work with her students at Carlisle.⁷⁸ De Cora’s plan at Carlisle was “to encourage the Indian to use the conventional designing that is the characteristic art of his race”:

The day of the ornamental buckskin is past and the tribes that made basket and pottery find little time as they up [sic] the commercial strife of the white man, to keep up their native industries. About the only way to perpetuate the use of the Indian designs is to apply them on modern articles of use and ornament that the young Indian is taught to make. In the class they are asked to make designs for rugs, frieze for wall decorations, borders for painting, and designs for embroidery of all kinds.⁷⁹

It was not Indian art per se that de Cora desired of her students, but rather the ambience of Indian design as applied to non-Indian articles of use, such as “sofa cushion covers,” rugs, and crockery, and in particular harmony with the then-popular “Mission” style. Several years after her stint at Carlisle, De Cora found herself reporting that the

⁷⁷ DeCora, “An Autobiography,” 285.

⁷⁸ Margaret L. Archuleta, “The Indian is an Artist,” in *Away from Home*, eds. Margaret L. Archuleta, Brenda J. Child, and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, 87.

⁷⁹ Archuleta, “The Indian is an Artist,” 90; quoting Angel de Cora, *The Department of Indian Art* (Carlisle, PA: Carlisle Indian School, 1908).

production of these items was profitable, as well as “the fact that the Indian of North America possessed a distinctive art which promises to be of great value in a country which heretofore has been obliged to draw its models from the countries of the eastern hemisphere.”⁸⁰

De Cora also became engaged in the politics of pan-Indian affairs through her association with The Society of American Indians, which historian Hazel Hertzberg recognized as “the first secular Pan-Indian movement organized on a national basis.”⁸¹ The founding conference was held, under the temporary name American Indian Association, with deliberate irony on Columbus Day, October 12, 1911 in Columbus, Ohio. By the end of the conference, the conferees’ adopted a new name for the organization, “The Society of American Indians,” in order to distinguish it from “white-run ‘Indian associations’” such as the Indian Rights Association.⁸² In a speech much anticipated and well-received by the conferees, De Cora spoke at length about her philosophy on the relevance and meaning of Indian art instruction. She firmly stated that primary goals of her Carlisle program were “To train and develop this decorative instinct of the Indian to modern methods and apply it on up-to-date furnishings is the nature and intent of the Native Indian Art Department.”⁸³ De Cora was re-emphasizing that she was not fostering purely Indian art, but rather an adaptive one; Indian design was to be

⁸⁰ Angel de Cora Dietz, “Native Indian Art,” *Report of the Executive Council on the Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of the Society of American Indians* (Washington, D.C.: 1912), 86.

⁸¹ Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 31. It should be noted that a non-Indian progressive, Professor Fayette A. McKenzie of Ohio State University, laid the groundwork for establishing the American Indian Association, later renamed the Society of American Indians.

⁸² Ibid, p. 71; citing conferee Arthur C. Parker’s letter to Joseph Keppler, November 3, 1911, Parker Papers, Museum of the American Indian Library, New York, New York.

⁸³ Dietz, “Native Indian Art,” 84.

transferred to a non-Indian context, and that the only place for it was in the modern world of American commercial design. Such a philosophy left little room for individual expression, and de Cora maintained that conventionality was to be the guiding principle: “The nature of Indian art is formed on a purely conventional and geometric basis, and our endeavors at the Carlisle Indian School have been to treat it as a conventional system of designing.”⁸⁴ She also went on to explain her understanding of the racial and intuitive basis of Indian art.

The Indian in his native dress is a thing of the past, but his art that is inborn shall endure. He may shed his skin, but his markings lie below that and should show up only brighter....

His art like himself is indigenous to the soil of his country, where, with the survival of his latent abilities, he bravely offers the best productions of his mind and hand which shall be a permanent record of the race.⁸⁵

Her reference to “native dress” being “a thing of the past” clearly indicates that although de Cora had accepted the white man’s habits of outer attire for all Indians, Indians’ inner racial identity – “his skin” – was permanent. The Indian’s “art” was also “inborn,” and she also seemed to be saying that it, too, could not be changed. However, she also believed that Indians could be trained to adapt, or assimilate, their art to quotidian objects from the white man’s world. Seen in a more revealing light, the Indian design “markings” etched a “permanent record of the race” symbolizing the liminal status of Indians, in particular that of the acculturated Red Progressive members of the Society of American Indians in contemporary American society.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 85.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 87.

De Cora's repeated reference to the conventionality of Indian design further elucidated Indians' liminal social status; conventional art is by definition art that arises from custom and conforms to collectively held traditions, and individual spontaneity and originality are necessarily excluded from the process. But de Cora also insisted, paradoxically, that Indian designs were not static but evolving through "careful study and close application."⁸⁶ According to de Cora's benefactor, Natalie Curtis:

[Her] classes were told that they need not copy the teacher, or anybody else. The children were to express themselves. Her manner of teaching was to set her scholars a given task and then leave the room freeing her pupils from the restraint of the teacher's presence.⁸⁷

So was the students' art "evolving" through original, individual expression, or through a process of acculturative adaptation to white decorative requirements?

A common sense answer to this question is that both processes of artistic creativity were occurring. By removing herself from the classroom, de Cora obviously intended to give the students a sense of independence and freedom of expression. However, a reasonable argument can be made that de Cora, consciously or unconsciously, was advocating a process of acculturative adaptation on the part of the students, both individually and collectively; de Cora was attempting to train the students to carry on a dialogue between their inner Indian selves and the decorative requirements of non-Indian aesthetics. Thus, the product itself would be a fusion of these two artistic

⁸⁶ Ibid., 86.

⁸⁷ Natalie Curtis, "An American Artist," *The Outlook*, 14 January 1920, quoted in *Away from Home*, eds. Margaret L. Archuleta, Brenda J. Child, and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, 89.

viewpoints, and the art itself would open a dialogue for defining the nature of modern Indian identity.

Unfortunately, no information concerning subsequent artistic careers of de Cora's students has been found. De Cora and her husband left Carlisle in 1915 following Commissioner Leupp's departure and the Indian Service's regression to less tolerant attitudes toward Indian culture. Unfortunately, when she left, the arts and crafts program at Carlisle was suspended. De Cora and her husband subsequently moved to Washington state where Dietz had obtained a coaching job, but within three years the couple divorced and de Cora moved to Albany, New York and resumed her career as an illustrator. But de Cora's return to the unconventional life of an independent and successful Indian woman artist was short-lived. In 1919 she became a fatality of the influenza epidemic that swept across America and Europe. Her passing came a year after Carlisle had been closed, and almost fifteen years would pass before the Indian Service saw fit to institute another Indian art program in one of its boarding schools – this time at the Santa Fe Indian School.

De Cora's tenure at Carlisle occurred during the so-called Progressive Era in America. The term progressivism is a nebulous one that encompassed many aspects of social reform in an increasingly industrialized economy, but the underlying premise shared by its advocates was that changed times required positive changes on the individual level in order to move into a more socially equal future. It comes somewhat as a surprise that a group of Indians, mostly well-educated and largely acculturated into the dominant American lifestyle, also identified with progressive principles. These Red

Progressives adhered to the mythic American faith in independence and betterment through self-improvement, and in particular, they advocated the elimination of federal guardianship of Indians and full assimilation into American society. The Indians who joined The Society of American Indians, which historian Hazel Herzberg recognized as “the first secular Pan-Indian movement organized on a national basis,” were all Red Progressives.⁸⁸ Virtually all of the attendees at the founding congress in Columbus, Ohio were products of government boarding schools and American colleges. The identity that the Red Progressives clung to was just that, “Red,” and they did not aspire to become white. They wanted to be recognized as Indians who could adapt to the new political, economic, and cultural realities of American life, but finding the means to achieve this adaptation was, not surprisingly, a most difficult undertaking to agree upon. Perhaps this was why, despite their efforts to define who they were, they splintered from the start into “warring factions.”⁸⁹ They were bound by their commonly accepted racial identity as Indians, calling themselves members of the “American Indian race,” which perhaps would have made Richard Pratt proud. Given the ethnocentric attitude of white citizens and government bureaucrats, as well as of the vast majority of Indians with their welter of tribal cultures who were not progressives, this was a tenuous as well as ambiguous identity to define. But Red Progressives participating in the construction of their lives

⁸⁸ Herzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity*, 31. It should be noted that a non-Indian progressive, Professor Fayette A. McKenzie of Ohio State University, laid the groundwork for establishing the American Indian Association, later renamed the Society of American Indians.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 55.

from the margins of American mainstream society had finally found their voice – a voice that was “talking back” to white Americans in a new language of self-assumed power.⁹⁰ Several Indian women were prominent Red Progressives. One of them, Laura M. Cornelius, an Oneida from Wisconsin, gave a speech at the founding congress of the Society of American Indians in which she presented plans for creating a new political identity for Indians that historian Hazel Herzberg believed “foreshadowed the New Deal era in Indian affairs.”⁹¹ Cornelius envisioned turning the reservations into communal, “self-governing ‘industrial villages’” – a concept that resembled a combination of George Washington’s factory system and the tribal governments re-organized during the New Deal.⁹² Cornelius’s scheme got nowhere with her fellow Red Progressives, but her declaration of Indian identity garnered their applause. Cornelius succinctly defined this identity: ““*I am not the new Indian, I am the old adjusted to the new conditions.*”⁹³ Certainly Angel de Cora would have agreed with this self-definition.

Historians continue to debate whether or not the Progressive Era died out following World War I, but within the Indian Service the ideals of progressive education actually became more influential during the 1920s – an example, perhaps, of how U.S. Indian policy was lagging behind the times.⁹⁴ The 1920s was also a time when more

⁹⁰ The phrase “talking back” is taken from Frederick E. Hoxie, ed., *Talking Back to Civilization, Indian Voices from the Progressive Era* (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2001).

⁹¹ Herzberg, *The Search for American Indian Identity*, 60-61.

⁹² Laura M. Cornelius, “Industrial Organization for the Indian,” *Report of the Executive Council on the Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of the Society of American Indians*, 27-28.

⁹³ Ibid., 81.

⁹⁴ See Nicholas Cords and Patrick Gerster, eds., *Myth and the American Experience*, Vol. Two, 2nd ed. (Encino, CA: Glencoe Publishing Co., Inc., 1978) for essays arguing that the progressive movement did indeed survive during the 1920s and was influential in achieving the reforms of the New Deal in the 1930s.

Indian rights groups formed and became more successful in achieving their goals. And by the end of that decade, “new conditions” for Indian students of their traditional tribal arts had indeed arrived.

During the 1920s there was an unprecedented burst in government and independent efforts to study and reform every aspect of U.S. Indian policy. These efforts spanned a wide spectrum of assimilation efforts – from government edicts further alienating Indian lands and banning Indian religious practices, to the preservation, promotion, and imbibing of Indian cultures. In the process, the plight of Indians probably received more national attention than ever before. By the end of the decade the stage had been set for comprehensive changes in the government’s assimilation policy, and the principal focus was the field of education. Spurred on largely by pressure from proactive civilian reformers, Indian Service bureaucrats became receptive to the formal introduction of progressive education principles into government-operated schools for Indian children, and intertwined with these progressive ideals was a far-reaching re-thinking of the merits of Indian art and culture.

Controversy concerning one piece of federal legislation, the Bursum Bill, became the catalyst for many debates for and against improving the material and cultural life of Indians. In 1921 New Mexico Senator Holm O. Bursum introduced a bill that, as drafted, would have greatly eased the way for white claimants to seize titles to Pueblo ancestral lands in his state. Indian rights advocates in New Mexico joined with likeminded supporters on the East and West Coasts to form the Eastern and New Mexico Associations on Indian Affairs to fight the Bursum Bill. Several of the New Mexico

advocates were members of the art communities in Santa Fe and Taos who would become passionate patrons of Indian art. Two women transplanted from New York to Santa Fe, the sisters Amelia Elizabeth White and Martha Root White, were not only active in both associations, but also became active promoters of Indian art nationally and internationally. Another individual who had taken up the cause of protecting Indian life and culture during a visit to New Mexico, John Collier, helped found the American Indian Defense Association and the All-Pueblo Council to defeat the Bursum Bill, and thereafter Indian affairs became Collier's life passion. Thanks to the efforts of these reformers, the Bursum Bill was defeated, but their interest in the betterment of Indians' conditions, and in educating the American public on the virtues and beauties of Indian art and culture, continued.

Collier was instrumental in winning a second battle for improving the Indian condition. His constant and vociferous criticism of the Indian Service impelled Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work in 1926 to commission an independent and wide-ranging survey of the Indian Service operations. Secretary Work chose the Institute for Government Research to conduct the study, and one of the Institute's staff researchers, Lewis Meriam, directed the project.⁹⁵ Meriam and a staff of nine researchers conducted seven months of fieldwork, and in February 1928 they published their final report, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, more commonly referred to as the Meriam Report. The Report presented their findings as well as recommendations for improvements in the

⁹⁵ The Institute for Government Research was founded in 1916 as the "first private organization devoted to analyzing public policy issues at the national level." In 1927 it was merged with its affiliated organizations the Institute of Economics and graduate school into The Brookings Institution. Brookings. History. <http://www.brookings.edu/about.aspx> [accessed September 4, 2008].

areas of education, health care, economic conditions, law, and family life. But despite its documentation of scandalous health and economic conditions among Indians, historian Francis Prucha aptly recognized that it “was not a radical innovative document seeking to overturn existing policy.”⁹⁶ The authors declared their intent was “not to take sides for or against the Indian Office,” but to point “the way toward marked improvement” of the existing policy of assimilation.⁹⁷ The authors did, however, recommend that the Bureau of Indian Affairs focus on education as the primary means of absorbing all Indians “into the prevailing civilization,” or at least of condescendingly fitting them “to live in the presence of that civilization at least in accordance with a minimum standard of health and decency.”⁹⁸ The government had already granted one means for entering that “civilization” by granting Indians U.S. citizenship in 1924, a gesture largely meant to express the nation’s gratitude for the military service many Indians had given during World War I.⁹⁹ However, at the same time that the authors beat the drum for the assimilation of the Indian “race,” they struck a nuanced tone of conciliation toward Indian cultures.

Some Indians proud of their race and devoted to their culture and their mode of life have no desire to be as the white man is. They wish to remain Indians, to preserve what they have inherited from their fathers, and insofar as possible to escape from the ever increasing contact with and pressure from the white civilization. In this desire they are supported by intelligent, liberal whites who find real merit in their art, music, religion, form of government, and other things which may be conferred by the

⁹⁶ Prucha, *The Great Father*, 279.

⁹⁷ Institute for Government Research, *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), ix.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 21.

⁹⁹ Citizenship had also been granted to some Indians as a result fulfilling the requirements of land allotments through the Dawes Act.

broad term culture. Some of these whites would even go so far, metaphorically speaking, as to enclose these Indians in a glass case to preserve them as museum specimens for future generations to study and enjoy, because of the value of their culture and its picturesqueness in a world rapidly advancing in high organization and mass production. With this view as a whole..., the survey staff has great sympathy. It would not recommend the disastrous attempt to force individual Indians or groups of Indians to be what they do not want to be, to break their pride in themselves and their Indian race, or to deprive them of their Indian culture. Such efforts may break down the good in the old without replacing it with compensating good from the new.

The fact remains, however, that the hands of the clock cannot be turned backward. These Indians are face to face with the predominating civilization of the whites. This advancing tide of white civilization has as a rule destroyed the economic foundation upon which the Indian culture rested. This economic foundation cannot be restored as it was. The Indians cannot be set apart away from contacts with the whites. The glass case policy is impracticable.¹⁰⁰

The conundrum presented, however, was how to inculcate Indians with a new, civilized American identity without depriving them of their Indian culture; how could the “glass case” be shattered without shattering Indian culture and identity? And would this shattering include removing the onus of the “otherness” of Indians in non-Indian sensibilities, and vice versa?

The survey staff did find one possible solution in the manufacture and commercial marketing of Indian “handicrafts” and “native arts” by women to supplement family incomes.¹⁰¹ They recommended the implementation of a program to “supervise” the “workers in their homes” so that there would be no “mistakes that would make articles unsalable.”¹⁰² This white supervision of authenticity was reminiscent of Estelle Reel’s

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 86-87.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 652.

¹⁰² Ibid.

similar plan for Indian schoolchildren. However, unlike Reel, the authors primarily blamed the Indians themselves for not having turned their racial artistic skills into a profitable enterprise. Reasons cited for the “disappearance” or “degeneration” of these arts and crafts included the non-availability of traditional materials, but also the attitude of young, acculturating Indians, particularly those in boarding schools, who thought their elders’ ways were “old-fashioned.”¹⁰³ But somewhat baffling was the claim that modern life made Indians “prefer riding about in automobiles” like whites “instead of sitting quietly at home and working.”¹⁰⁴ After all, would it not be a sign of successful economic and social assimilation if Indians *were* driving around in automobiles? Would such new luxuries not be a sign that Indians had become true American consumers? However, it is highly doubtful that the Indian Service was having a real problem with Indians wildly driving their automobiles around the reservation. A more real and serious problem, however, was pointed out; the loss of “ancient religious and ceremonial customs” connected to traditional arts, but no blame was assigned – or assumed—for that loss. Nor was it apparently recognized that this loss was not accompanied by the kind of consumerism that would have been a hallmark of assimilation and acculturation.

Reform from a New Middle Ground

The issue of substantive reforms in U.S. Indian policy gained political prominence during the 1928 presidential campaign. Both the Democratic and Republican candidates, Al Smith and Herbert Hoover respectively, promised to address serious

¹⁰³ Ibid., 646-647.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

problems in the federal administration of Indian affairs. And when Hoover won the election, he made good on his promise by acting on several recommendations made in the Meriam Report. Historian of U.S. Indian policy Francis Paul Prucha characterized the Hoover presidency as a “transition period in the administration of Indian affairs,” and this was certainly true on the cultural and educational fronts. However, the basic goal of assimilation remained, albeit with a less ethnocentric bent.

Hoover chose two long-time members of the conservatively progressive Indian Rights Association to head the Indian Office, Charles J. Rhoads as the new commissioner, and J. Henry Scattergood as the assistant commissioner, but in fact, the two men agreed to work as joint commissioners. In keeping with the Meriam Report’s emphasis placed on reforming Indian education, the Rhoads-Scattergood administration prioritized such reform and appointed W. Carson Ryan, Jr., who had directed the writing of the Report’s education section, as director of Indian education. Ryan, a professor in the education department at Swarthmore College, proposed the implementation of progressive education practices that were adapted to the diversity of Indian cultures, and that also emphasized the importance of teaching Indian children holistically within a community school system. Certainly these were laudable goals, but it would indeed be a daunting task to devise culture-specific programs for the diverse Indian peoples.

Nevertheless, the reform-mindedness and cultural sensitivity of the Rhoads-Scattergood administration brought about an about-face in the way the Indian Service perceived its mission: instead of concentrating on ways to guide Indian peoples into assuming an American identity, it targeted the nature of Indian identity. The U.S. government would now proceed from a white, ethnocentric premise for solving the ‘Indian problem’ to one based on Indian cultures. Prior to 1929, the annual reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs contained no such definition of an ‘Indian,’ and for its

entire existence the Indian Service apparently had no official delineation of who an Indian was other than that laid out in the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. William S. Rogers* (1846), which stated that Indian identity was "confined to those who by the usages and customs of the Indians are regarded as belonging to their race."¹⁰⁵

In their first annual commissioner's report for the fiscal year ended on June 30, 1929, the Rhoads-Scattergood administration inaugurated the Indian Service's definition of Indian identity:

The definition of an Indian as employed by the Indian Service not only includes persons of Indian blood who through wardship, treaty, or inheritance rights have contact with the service, but also non-Indians entitled to enrollment.... The Census Bureau defines an Indian as a person of recognizable amount of Indian blood. Furthermore, the population enumerated at Federal agencies is not necessarily domiciled on or near the reservations. It is the population on the agency rolls and includes both reservation and nonreservation [sic] Indians. Thus, an Indian may be carried on the rolls because of tribal or inheritance rights, etc., and may reside anywhere in the United States or in a foreign country.¹⁰⁶

Ironically enough, despite years of Indians having been denied American civil rights, the Indian Service had now promulgated a definition of 'Indian' that was partially based on having rights vis-à-vis the Service, and not based on blood quantum, and this included African Americans who were former slaves of the Five Civilized Tribes. Also gone was the racially based definition established in the Supreme Court's ruling in *United States v. Rogers*. Indian Service policy would now be based on established individual and communal Indian *rights*, and its progenitors moved away from the dominant

¹⁰⁵ *United States v. William S. Rogers*, 45 U.S. 567, 4 How. 567, 11 L.Ed. 1105 (1846). The University of Tulsa College of Law. http://www.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/ussct_cases/US_V_ROGERS_45_567.HTM [accessed November 15, 2008]

¹⁰⁶ *Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1929*, dated August 15, 1929 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929), p. 23.

ethnocentrism of their predecessors by recognizing the cultural distinctiveness of the many Indian peoples within U.S. territory. In 1930, the Indian Service identified some 200 “separate groups” of Indians in twenty-eight states.¹⁰⁷ The foreword to the commissioner’s annual report stated that the intent of the Service’s culturally sensitive mission was to meet the needs of these “groups.”

While inevitably the Indian must develop such interests as may enable him to become a component part of our organized civilization and be self-sustaining, we should not destroy what is best of his own traditions, arts, crafts, and associations, but encourage their development and survival.¹⁰⁸

This statement of mission was reminiscent of Commissioner Leupp’s philosophy at the beginning of the twentieth century, but it expressed a more finite goal; assimilation had not been lost sight of, but the phrase “component part of our organized civilization” now stated that Indians were actually going to be prepared to enter American society as culturally and socially distinct groups.

Furthermore, concrete steps were being taken in order to reach that goal. In 1930, Congress increased appropriations for the Indian Service by over \$4.5 million.¹⁰⁹ And in March of that year, the Service sent out a circular to elementary teachers instructing them to educate themselves in the tenets of progressive education. The circular instructed these shapers of the young Indian mind to nurture “opportunities for personality and character development,” and to include “Industrial and fine arts as a

¹⁰⁷ *Annual Report for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1930*, dated September 24, 1930, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930), 11.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 1-2.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.

functional part of the school program.”¹¹⁰ In particular, the FY 1930 report noted that “native arts and crafts has been continued” at the Santa Fe Industrial School and in Pueblo day schools.¹¹¹ This was most probably reference to the arts and crafts department initiated that year at the Santa Fe Indian School, and also to drawings and pictures that Pueblo children were making in their day schools and had been sending to the Indian Fairs in Santa Fe since at least 1923.¹¹²

The new focus on accommodating Indian rights was made explicit in the “complete reorganization” of the Office of Indian Affairs that was accomplished by March 30, 1931.¹¹³ The Office was divided into two entities, that of human rights and of property, and overseen by two assistant commissioners. The human rights division included the areas of education, health, and agricultural extension and industry.¹¹⁴ The stated goal of education was to “reduce boarding schools as much as possible” in favor of increasing the number of reservation day schools, but “in the meantime all these boarding schools...should be made as effective educationally as it is possible to make them, utilizing Indian arts and crafts and Indian cultures generally wherever these exist or can be revived.”¹¹⁵ The Indian Office’s leadership clearly recognized that this would require a revolution of sorts among its teachers to make them understand this “new point of

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 9.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Kenneth Chapman Papers, School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico. AC02.121. Letters in this folder discuss pictures and drawings sent from the Picuris Day School and Laguna Day School.

¹¹³ *Report of the Commissioner for Indian Affairs for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1931* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931), 3.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 4-5.

view,” and to this end it set higher educational standards for teachers.¹¹⁶ Specifically, two-year normal graduates would no longer be hired, and a minimum of three years additional training beyond high school “with special preparation” to teach elementary or intermediate grades would be mandatory.¹¹⁷ Teachers were also put on notice that their old ways of disciplining students must come to an end: “flogging” would no longer be administered.¹¹⁸

The agency also announced that new congressional appropriations would also be sought for FY 1932 for fine arts, music, and physical education teachers, and it emphasized that fine arts positions “especially...help in the utilization of Indian arts and crafts and other Indian resources.”¹¹⁹ In their next annual report, co-commissioners Rhoads and Scattergood reported that FY 1932 had been a “good year”:

Especially successful have been the efforts to utilize Indian life and culture in the Southwest, in a school like that at Santa Fe, for example, where young Indian artists are having an unusual opportunity.¹²⁰

The “unusual opportunity” to which they referred was undoubtedly the Department of Arts and Crafts under the direction of Mable Morrow. The Santa Fe Indian School at that time had an enrollment of 668 students in grades B-10. In total, there were 14,226 students in twenty-nine off-reservation boarding schools out of an enrollment of 28,962 students in 195 schools.¹²¹ And as of April 1, 1932, the total Indian population was

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 5.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 9.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 11.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 10.

¹²⁰ *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1932* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932), 7.

¹²¹ Ibid., 64, 67.

317,324 souls.¹²² Interestingly enough, the annual report for FY 1932 also presented the Indian Service's new definition of Indian identity:

An Indian, as defined by the Indian Service, includes any person of Indian blood who through wardship, treaty, or inheritance has acquired certain rights. The Census Bureau defines an Indian as a person having Indian blood to such a degree as to be recognized in his community as an Indian.¹²³

The Indian Service had now significantly narrowed its definition: gone was the 1929 definition's recognition of "non-Indians entitled to enrollment," and now the basic requirement for being an 'Indian' was "blood." Unfortunately, the report did not explain this change in perception. However, one can speculate that the narrowing might have been part of an attempt to define Indian identity more precisely, and thereby part of the Indian Office's intent to tailor curricula to respect and preserve indigenous cultures. Such an intent would have mirrored government officials' recognition that these cultures had not only persisted, but should be provided the means for revitalization and for inclusion in the plural society of the American nation.

However, despite a number of detailed reports on Indian conditions and suggestions for ways to ameliorate them, by the end of the 1920s no comprehensive overhaul of the basic tenet of assimilation had been worked out. Throughout the decade, John Collier had positioned himself at the center of Indian policy reform efforts and ceaselessly criticized the ineffectiveness of government officials' Indian policy. His work on behalf of Indian welfare had survived the indifference of the Harding

¹²² Ibid., 32.

¹²³ Ibid.

administration into the engagement pledged by President Hoover to enact meaningful reform. In all fairness, the Rhoads-Scattergood administration had made serious efforts to change the prevailing mindset toward Indians by calling for the incorporation of Indian cultures into school curricula. But it proved to be difficult to achieve such change without setting up a supporting infrastructure. Ironically enough, such an infrastructure did finally come during the Great Depression, and Collier would again find himself in the center of enacting radical policy reforms that came to be known as the Indian New Deal.

Chapter 2: American Indian Painting at the Studio: A Projection into the ‘Cosmopolitan Future’ of American Culture

For many progressive reformers such as John Collier, the sense of alarm occasioned by the unraveling of American culture during the Great Depression prompted a re-evaluation not only of the failings of white culture to maintain an integration of self and nationhood, but of the lost significance of American Indians' contribution to American identity. As envisioned by Collier and other Indian rights activists, this significance, although heretofore brazenly ignored by the historically white ethnocentric orientation of government policy, not only remained alive, but offered a viable alternative to the lost sense of community in mainstream American society. As Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the New Deal, Collier oversaw a reorientation of U.S. assimilation policy that aimed to strengthen tribal organization and community, and also to weave their cultures into a repaired fabric of American society. At its basis this policy was not an exercise in the re-invention of Indians or of non-Indians, but rather an attempt at reparation that was founded on an inclusive understanding of cultural difference. In addition to restoring and building upon the social bases of American Indian peoples, Collier and his cohorts believed that the rejuvenation and promotion of the most readily accessible aspect of Indian cultures – arts and crafts – would do the same for their own culture, and at the same time provide a means through which Indians could market their products and achieve a modicum of economic vitality.

Collier inherited from the Rhoads-Scattergood administration the beginnings of an infrastructure for promoting the production of Indian arts and crafts at the Santa Fe Indian School (SFIS) in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The school's superintendent, Chester Faris, and Kenneth M. Chapman, an important figure in the art community there, had

promoted the opening of an arts and crafts department in 1930, and in 1932 these two men, along with a Dorothy Dunn, a relative newcomer to Santa Fe, added pictorial painting to that program with the opening of the Department of Painting and Design, which became known as the “Studio.” The Studio subsequently became a cause célèbre for other members of the Santa Fe art community who were interested in preserving and patronizing Southwestern indigenous art and culture. Like Collier, many of these individuals had come to the Southwest as adults and been enchanted with the land and its people. Some of them shared Collier’s ethno-romantic vision of Indianness and bound it up with a personal search for a life that would counteract what they considered to be the gross materialism and spiritual bankruptcy of modern American culture and society. This personal search also involved a search for a genuine American culture, and many of these seekers found it in the native cultures of the American Southwest. The Studio would become the focus of many of these non-Indians’ endeavors to preserve and promote a new school of American Indian painting – endeavors that ironically also promoted the Studio artist-students’ search for a modern identity in the very same project in which their patrons were seeking to escape theirs.

Although John Collier was not involved in establishing the Studio, his tale of personal discovery that eventually found concrete expression in his efforts to reform Indian policy provides relevant insights into the mindset of these devotees of Indian art and culture. Collier’s confreres in the Santa Fe Art community probably intuitively understood his public ruminations about the “unconscious creative bent of the Indian,” a concept that with equal certainty eluded the ethnocentric, practical mindset of most of the country’s politicians.¹²⁴ However, Collier was not simply engaging in a flight of fancy,

¹²⁴ “Proceedings of the 25th Annual Convention of the American Federation of the Arts, Washington, D.C., May 14, 15, 16, 1934,” *The American Magazine of Art*, 27, No. 9, Anniversary Supplement (Sept. 1934), 11.

but attempting to understand that culture rather than race was the underpinning for understanding the creative instinct and identity of American Indians. And it was to this end that he engaged academic anthropologists to study American Indian cultures in order to better understand them and then administer to them. For despite Collier's mystical ruminations about the Indian unconscious, his most immediate concern was to reverse previous damage inflicted on these cultures by U.S. policies, to nurture and promote what remained, and to find the means to assimilate them away from their segregated status relative to American society – all from the standpoint of the inclusion of their cultures into the whole of American culture, a culture that in the 1930s was on the brink of its own destruction.

John Collier and the Mystique of the Indian

At the core of the American progressive movement was a deep and abiding faith that the human condition could be perfected. For some this faith bordered on a puritanical and sometimes messianic insistence that they knew what was right for everyone, while for others it was more romantic, and even mystical. John Collier, who took up the cause of righting society in New York City in the 1910s, seemed driven by a faith that included all of these elements.

Collier was born in Atlanta, Georgia in 1884 to a family of former slave-owners and apparent Southern gentility but, in his own words from his “semi-personal memoir,” his nuclear family was crushed by the “doom of the House of Usher.”¹²⁵ Collier also obliquely described a life-changing experience in 1900 at the tomb of his parents that was followed by months of depression, but out of that adolescent crisis came his conviction

¹²⁵ John Collier, *From Every Zenith, A Memoir and Some Essays on Life and Thought* (Denver: Sage Books, 1963), 25.

“to live in behalf of the world’s hope.”¹²⁶ By 1902 he had sufficiently recovered from this malaise to enroll at Columbia University, but after a couple of years he dropped out, wandered around Europe and back to America to the wilderness of Southern Appalachia, and then in 1907 settled in New York City where he threw himself into “community exploration and organization” work.¹²⁷ Collier worked to improve individuals from the extreme ends of society – the intelligentsia through the League of Political Education and the “common man” through The People’s Institute.¹²⁸ Through these endeavors he desired “to live in behalf of the world’s hope,” and he idealized that “hope” as “Occidental ethos and genius,” while at the same time he was torn by the fear that that “hope” might “also become the world’s doom.”¹²⁹ But by 1920, feeling defeated by the failure of these community-organizing efforts (except for the Camp Fire Girls organization which he had also helped found) and the return of Tammany Hall’s corrupt city administration, Collier decided to leave New York. Admitting his failures, Collier consoled himself with the conviction that his work for progressive causes had “deepened and defined” his “perceptions of community.”¹³⁰ Along with the serendipitous friendships he had made along the way with individuals such as Mabel Dodge at her literary salon and Robert E. Ely at the League for Political Education, Collier carried his obsession with “community” and his fear of the “doom” of Occidental culture to the other worlds of America’s indigenous inhabitants. But although many of his fellow Americans had pronounced those indigenous cultures doomed as well, for Collier and others such as

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 68.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 69.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 68.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 123.

Mabel Dodge who became internal émigrés to the American Southwest, such cultures were not only not doomed, but offered salvation to the troubled American psyche.

After spending a year and a half directing the state of California's adult education program in Los Angles, Collier, his wife Lucy, and their three sons heeded the pleas of Mabel Dodge, now Mabel Dodge Luhan after marrying Tony Luhan from Taos Pueblo, to come to her new salon in Taos to experience the “magical habitation” of New Mexico’s “magical Indians.”¹³¹ Enchanted by all the magic they found there, Collier and his family stayed on until the following summer, and by that time Collier had seized upon an endeavor that would consume him for the remainder of his life – his fight to discover and rejuvenate a generic Indian community. Collier wrote in his memoir of that realization: “*This effort toward community must not fail; there can be no excuse or pardon if it does.*”¹³²

Along with many of his new friends in New Mexico, Collier took up political activism on behalf of Indian rights to fight passage of the Bursum Bill by the U.S. Congress. As discussed earlier, in 1921 New Mexico Senator Holm O. Bursum had introduced this bill to protect the interests of white claimants to ancestral Pueblo lands. Collier co-founded the American Indian Defense Association and the All-Pueblo Council to oppose what amounted to illegal land seizures, and the bill was eventually defeated. After years of wandering the country in search of a social cause, Collier had at last found one to which he would devote the remainder of his life, both professionally and personally.

After the Democratic presidential candidate, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, won the election in 1932, he nominated Harold Ickes, a long-time activist in Indian causes, to be

¹³¹ Ibid., 124.

¹³² Ibid., 123.

the new Secretary of the Interior. Ickes quickly chose John Collier to be the next Commissioner of Indian Affairs and, with Roosevelt's help, he rammed Collier's confirmation through the Senate on April 20, 1933. Collier immediately took advantage of his new power to bring changes in the administration of existing Bureau of Indian Affairs programs, but he also dove into the task of writing a bill that he hoped would radically alter U.S. Indian policy. In February 1934, Montana Senator Burton K. Wheeler and Nebraska Representative Edgar Howard introduced Collier's bill in both houses of Congress, and shortly thereafter Collier called for the convening of Indian congresses around the country in order to sell the bill's provisions. Carrying on the mission of changing the ethnocentric mindset of white government bureaucrats that arose during Hoover's administration, Collier's overarching vision was to transform non-Indian administrators instead of transforming Indians. As historian Vine Deloria, Jr., a Standing Rock Sioux, and co-author Clifford M. Lytle, a non-Indian lawyer, have justifiably asserted in their exhaustive study of Indian New Deal politics, *The Nation Within, The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*, Collier's genius lay in his recognition that federal institutions carrying out Indian policy were not "a given element in the equation," and in his insistence that it was the federal institutions themselves that had to be transformed.¹³³ Whereas President Hoover and his Commissioner of Indian Affairs Charles H. Burke had sought ways to get the federal government out of the Indian business, Collier aimed to find new roles for it while at the same time carving out an autonomous role for Indian tribes.¹³⁴ But despite his innovative plans, Collier retained the historical imperative of assimilation for America's Indians.

¹³³ Vine Deloria, Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle, Jr., *The Nations Within, The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*, 2nd Ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 55.

¹³⁴ See Thomas A. Britten, "Hoover and the Indians: The Case for Continuity in Federal Indian Policy, 1900-1933," *The Historian*, Vol. 61, 1999.

Collier's semi-revolutionary thinking was the impetus for passage of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) on June 12, 1934, the piece of legislation that established the infrastructure of the Indian New Deal. However, as is often the case with congressional legislation, the final product bore the scars of much compromise. Many of the provisions that Collier had championed were dropped in the final bill that became known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. In Deloria's and Lytle's summation, "Gone were the great philosophical preambles that he [Collier] had hoped would commit Congress to a clear support of the Indian right to self-government and self-determination."¹³⁵

However, the Wheeler-Howard Act did contain some far-reaching changes in how the new Indian policy would be carried out. First of all, Indian tribes themselves would determine whether or not they wanted to be a part of the new program through a majority vote. And perhaps the most significant change that acceptance of the Act would bring was the end of the allotment policy enacted by the Dawes Act of 1887. Historian Graham D. Taylor, who has extensively studied allotment and Indian New Deal policies and their consequences, has estimated that between 1900 and 1934 over one-half of allotments had been lost due to sale or forfeiture resulting from unpaid taxes; accordingly, the Dawes Act had failed to bring about mass assimilation because the government had failed to provide Indians the means to become even marginal, much less successful, participants in the dominant industrial economy.¹³⁶ The Indian land base of 139 million acres in 1887 had dwindled to 48 million acres by 1932, and only 5 million

¹³⁵ Ibid., 138.

¹³⁶ Graham D. Taylor, *The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism, The Administration of the Indian Reorganization Act, 1934-45* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 11.

acres had actually been allotted to Indians, with the rest having been sold to white settlers.¹³⁷ The majority of these remaining 5 million acres were unsuitable for assimilation's vaunted ideals of economic enterprise that might have made it possible for Indians living on them to escape cyclical poverty that was, in most cases, extreme by white standards.

Although the IRA audaciously attempted to reverse the damage done by the Dawes Act, one important fact must be emphasized; the IRA did not overthrow the assimilation policy. Rather, the method of assimilation was reassessed. Instead of assimilating individual Indians, the goal of the IRA was to assimilate Indian tribes on a re-envisioned "domestic dependent nation" basis into a pluralistic American society. However, even on this score the IRA fell short by falling back onto the timeworn paternalistic policy; Indian tribes would be allowed to re-organize themselves by writing and voting on their own constitutions, but only after the Bureau of Indian affairs had approved the documents. Collier's bill would have eliminated this government approval and given the tribal nations more self-autonomy. And gone, too, was Collier's provision binding Congress to assuming a new policy of promoting and preserving Indian culture, including arts and crafts production, and to assigning special funds to the Indian commissioner to initiate such programs and provide personnel and facilities for that purpose. However, one year later Collier successfully pushed Congress to create the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. But in the meantime, the Rhoads-Scattergood policy of

¹³⁷ Ibid., 5, citing Delos S. Otis, *The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973), 58, 73-75, 86ff.

promoting Indian arts in crafts in the schools was still in place, and its shining achievement was the Santa Fe Indian School’s Department of Arts and Crafts at the Santa Fe Indian School, and its Department of Painting and Design, the “Studio.”

John Collier and the Ethno-romance of American Indian Cultures

In the midst of congressional consideration of Collier’s proposed bill, Collier escaped the mundane realities of politics to wax poetically on the “unyielding wills” of America’s Indians who remained “the expressions, even...the harborers, of a great age of integrated, inwardly-seeking life and art.”¹³⁸ Collier’s audience was the 25th Annual Convention of the American Federation of the Arts that was being held in Washington, D.C. Pointing in contrast to the Indian communities of the Pueblos and Navajos, Collier deemed the “white world” a “shattered race – psychically, religiously, socially and esthetically shattered, dismembered, directionless.”¹³⁹ And this was ironically so since the “white world” of the U.S. government, despite its “warfare against Indian tribal life, Indian languages, Indian religious and disciplinary institutions and Indian landholdings,” had been “unable to dissipate the personalities of their individual members.”¹⁴⁰ Although Collier specifically addressed the enduring communal adhesiveness of the Pueblos and Navajos, he at times addressed “the Indian,” i.e., a generic Indian, who possessed “esthetic and psychical ways” whose origin he was struggling to understand; was this

¹³⁸ “Proceedings of the 25th Annual Convention of the American Federation of the Arts, 11.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

origin a matter of “racial, biological peculiarity” or “social heredity”?¹⁴¹ Collier supposed that the answer was “social heredity,” but concluded that regardless, the “facts” were “independent of any of the theories, and they show that the unconscious creative bent of the Indian...in more than a thousand highly differentiated cultures, forged itself into strong and unique beauty” that “was not successfully killed by the government’s policy.”¹⁴² Collier ended his speech, which no doubt must have mystified some his listeners, with the admonition that “Our understanding of art, of work, of pleasure, of the values of life, and even our worldview, may be somewhat influenced if we will pay attention to them.”¹⁴³ Most probably he meant that that influence would be for the better; modern American industrial society could gain from some understanding of the more simple and spiritual way of life exemplified by the exotic Indians, and in particular from their art which had the power to speak across generations. And surely Collier also had Washington’s calculating politicians in mind when he made this pronouncement.

At that same convention, Collier was asked, “Does the government welcome the Indian arts?,” and in response he confessed that he did not know the answer to that question, but that one intent of the IRA was to assist Indian artists “in their struggle to carry their ancient values across to the modern world.”¹⁴⁴ As noted earlier, assistance for promoting arts and crafts was omitted from the final version of the bill. But Collier also

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ “Proceedings of the 25th Annual Convention of the American Federation of the Arts, 10.

discussed a different development in Indian arts – pictorial painting that was already being produced by some Southwestern and Plains Indians.

The mediums used by these Kiowa and Pueblo boys and girls are not traditional; the intended placement and use of the finished paintings is wholly untraditional, and the working environment frequently is one divorced from the tribal past; and indeed, these are works of art freewinging into the cosmopolitan future, yet they are carried on wings of an ancient and special past, and the past has defied its social grave and has arisen from levels of the individual life too deep for personal memory to reach or personal oblivion to efface, and has achieved a new life in terms of pure design and pure idea.¹⁴⁵

The Kiowa youth Collier referred to were students at St. Patrick's Mission School near Anadarko, Oklahoma, whose paintings had been discovered and nurtured by Sister Olivia, a Choctaw teacher at the Catholic school, and Mrs. Susie Ryan Peters, a white field matron for the Kiowa Agency, United States Indian Service. In 1918, Susie Peters arranged for several Kiowa youth to attend "what she called a fine arts class," and since there was no official Indian Service recognition of this effort, Peters herself bought the "painting materials."¹⁴⁶ Within two years, Peters' encouragement had resulted in the formation of a group of Kiowa artists who became known as the Kiowa Five: Jack Hokeah, Monroe Tsatoke, Spencer Asah, James Auchiah, and Stephen Mopope. Mrs. Peters subsequently showed some paintings by the Five and another Kiowa student, Lois Smoky, to Oscar Jacobson, the director of the University of Oklahoma Department of Art. Jacobson arranged for the six young artists to attend "'special' unaccredited classes"

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 218.

at the university in 1927 and 1928.¹⁴⁷ The “Five” went on to found an independent style of modern Plains Indian painting.

As for the “Pueblo boys and girls” Collier referred to, it is not clear whether he was talking about the Santa Fe Movement of 1919-1932 or the Studio at the Santa Fe Indian School (SFIS). As stated earlier, Collier had inherited the painting program. Despite his possible pride in the Studio artist-students’ work, Collier had nearly been successful in shutting down the SFIS, and presumably the Studio program as well, in 1933 as part of an overall plan to phase out government boarding schools in favor of reservation day schools. However, Collier agreed to meet with the All-Pueblo Council, which he had helped organize to fight the Bursum Bill, to discuss the proposed closure, and it was there that he met with strong opposition. A representative from Santa Clara Pueblo expressed the majority view by stating that “‘mingling with other tribes and being outside the Pueblo [children] get a better education, while if you keep the children right in the village they won’t get very much.’”¹⁴⁸ The governors agreed on the importance of intertribal/multicultural education, and also pointed out that the Pueblo day schools did not provide vocational training. Collier not only acquiesced to their pleas, but oversaw a remodeling of the SFIS buildings in the Spanish Pueblo Revival style to reinforce geographical and cultural identity for the majority of the student body.

¹⁴⁷ Lydia L. Wyckoff, “Visions and Voices: A Collective History of Native American Painting,” in Lydia L. Wyckoff, ed., *Visions + Voices: Native American Painting from the Philbrook Museum of Art* (Tulsa: Philbrook Museum of Art, 1996), 23-24.

¹⁴⁸ Sally Hyer, *One House, One Voice, One Heart, Native American Education at the Santa Fe Indian School* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1990), 5.

The Cultural Invention of the Modern Tribal Indian

John Collier may have been unsuccessful in changing the mindset of some members of Congress regarding Indian cultures, but within his own realm at the Office of Indian Affairs, his views held sway, as evidenced in this statement from a circular sent to the field during his first year in office.

No interference with Indian religious life or expression will hereafter be tolerated. The cultural history of Indians is in all respects to be considered equal to that of any non-Indian group. And it is desirable that Indians be bilingual.... The Indian arts are to be prized, nourished, and honored.¹⁴⁹

Collier's respect for Indians' "cultural history" was certainly laudatory, but just where could this record be found? How could non-Indians learn to respect it if they were ignorant of it? And how could this cultural history be made relevant to managing Indian reservations? Collier found a solution by enlisting anthropologists to study indigenous peoples not just to record dying cultures, but to understand how they had survived into the present day. Collier intelligently recognized that this information would also aid in facilitating the tribal reorganizations. So, in his 1935 annual commissioner's report, Collier announced that an "entirely new collaboration with the Bureau of American Ethnology (Smithsonian Institution)" had been established.¹⁵⁰

The annual report's format now included a separate section titled "Applied Anthropological Research" to record the efforts of American anthropologists to apply their discipline to the "practical problems of Indian administration."¹⁵¹ Dr. Duncan Strong from the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE), who became the first director of

¹⁴⁹*Circular 2970*, issued Jan. 1934, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1934* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934), 90.

¹⁵⁰*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1935* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 119.

¹⁵¹*Ibid.*, 135.

these efforts, had already made “studies essential to the organization and functioning of the new tribal constitutions” among the Sioux and Pueblo nations.¹⁵² And Dr. Edward Sapir, Dr. Gladys Reichard, and Father Berard Haile were directing a project to devise a written language for the Navajo nation. Also in 1935, Dr. Sophie Aberle, an anthropologist and medical doctor who had studied the lives and health issues of Pueblo women, became the General Superintendent of the United Pueblo Agency in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The following year Dr. H. Scudder Mekeel, an anthropologist from Harvard University who also had psychoanalytic training, succeeded Strong as the first permanent head of the Applied Anthropology Unit, and his assistant was Dr. Julian Steward from the BAE. Mekeel and Steward were assigned the task of insuring “that the constitutions being drawn are based on the actual social organization and institutions for the particular tribe or group, thus giving reasonable assurance that such constitutions will become an integral part of tribal life.”¹⁵³ However, Collier was also still mindful of confining Indian identity to a blood quantum, and to this end he engaged a physical anthropologist to determine “the degree of blood” for individual Indians.¹⁵⁴

Collier’s incorporation of applied anthropology in the formulation of Indian policy was unprecedented, and he had a broad vision of how this application should be carried out. In his memoir *From Every Zenith*, Collier identified “two distinct epochs in these uses of anthropology”; in the first “mono-disciplinary phase,” anthropologists were assigned “to obtain fuller light on particular questions,” and in the second “multi-disciplinary” one beginning in 1941, the focus widened to include the “economic,

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1936* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1936), 165.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

ecological, and psychological, and needed to involve research into Indian Bureau and into wider governmental methods.”¹⁵⁵ The project to devise a written Navajo language was part of the “mono-disciplinary phase.” Of course, Navajos had gotten along very well for hundreds of years without a written language, but having one would help them to make transactions more easily in the American economy, and it was also a perfect example of a tool that simultaneously preserved Navajo culture and facilitated assimilation into American society.

Collier saw no contradiction whatsoever in calling for the simultaneous preservation of Indian cultures and their assimilation into American society. As he explained it,

Assimilation, not into our cultures but into modern life, and preservation and intensification of heritage are not hostile choices, excluding one another, but are interdependent through and through. It is the continuing social organism, thousands of years old and still consciously and unconsciously imbued with and consecrated to its ancient land, which must be helped to incorporate the new technologies. It is the ancient tribal, village, communal organization which must conquer the modern world.¹⁵⁶

For Collier the ethno-romantic, it was the communal tribe that had been “consecrated” to the American landscape, and this tribe needed to be intertwined into the social fabric of mainstream American society; “consecrated” Indian cultures, not individual Indians, needed to be assimilated into the pluralism of modern American society. Ever the community organizer, Collier sought meaning in the cohesiveness of people drawn together. And for Collier the romantic who had been captivated many years earlier by the cultures of Southwestern Indians, these cultures held secrets in their communality that

¹⁵⁵ Collier, *From Every Zenith*, 219-221.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 203.

could inspire a prosaic, spiritless non-Indian American public bogged down by the acquisitive individualism of modern industrialism that had now collapsed.

But however much Collier exalted Indian tribalism, he and his applied anthropologists still struggled to define just who an “Indian” was, and what constituted a ‘tribe.’ Operative definitions had been set forth in the Indian Reorganization Act:

Sec. 19. The term ‘Indian’ as used in this Act shall include all persons of Indian descent who are members of any recognized Indian tribe now under Federal jurisdiction, and all persons who are descendants of such members who were, on June 1, 1934, residing within the present boundaries of any reservation, and shall further include all other persons of one-half or more Indian blood. For the purposes of this Act, Eskimos and other aboriginal peoples of Alaska shall be considered Indians. The term ‘tribe’ wherever used in this Act shall be construed to refer to any Indian tribe, organized band, pueblo, or the Indians residing on one reservation. The words ‘adult Indian’ wherever used in this Act shall be construed to refer to Indians who have attained the age of twenty-one years.¹⁵⁷

Collier subsequently enlisted anthropologists to continue the efforts to define ‘Indian’ identity and tribal constitution. But where the IRA definition attempted to define the two terms in a political sense, Collier and his Applied Anthropological Unit attempted to define them in a cultural sense, even though they, too, fell back on the racial and biological blood quantum qualification for individual Indians, and on reservation residence for designating tribes.

Historian Graham D. Taylor has pointed out that the philosophical basis for the Indian New Deal was “a conscious recognition of the separate cultural identity of Indians,” and indeed both the mono-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary anthropological

¹⁵⁷ Tony’s Brain. American History. The Indian Reorganization Act. “The Indian Reorganization Act, June 18, 1934 (Wheeler-Howard Act).

http://tonysuess.com/wiki/index.php?title=The_Indian_Reorganization_Act&printable=yes. [Accessed September 10, 2008].

research shared this premise.¹⁵⁸ However, Taylor also argued that the New Deal's insistence on the tribe "as the most effective mechanism for improving Indian economic and social conditions" was the flaw that ultimately would "undermine the important economic achievements of the Collier administration.¹⁵⁹ Taylor observed that the tribe was "most appropriately a cultural concept," and that the vagaries of defining a tribe on this basis were simply too great; more importantly, "by the twentieth century the main area of variation was the degree of acculturation, or assimilation, as it was generally called then."¹⁶⁰ Admittedly, at the time some American anthropologists were only beginning to understand the complexities of Indian groups as cultural entities instead of ethnological abstractions, but Collier's inclusion of anthropologists promoted this new thinking in the field and offered them the opportunity to apply their studies and make them relevant to federal policymaking.

Despite, or because of, the vagaries for determining just what constituted a 'tribe,' Collier remained steadfastly committed to tribal re-organization as the basis for IRA reforms. Given the haste in which Collier pushed for passage of the IRA, and the pitted opposition of key lawmakers, there simply was not much time to confer with the Indians in order to obtain their own concept of the tribe, or with anthropologists to understand more accurately the complexities of Indian social, cultural, and political organization -- that would come later. As already noted, some American anthropologists themselves were only just beginning to move beyond a racial or ethnological understanding of Indians to one centered on cultural relativism. Taylor also pointed out that a more significant factor was the BIA's failure to carry out "much exploratory work to ensure

¹⁵⁸ Taylor, *The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism*, 39.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 40.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 2, 41.

that the Indians would understand and respond to the opportunities presented.”¹⁶¹ As a result of these and other factors, such as the lack of adequate congressional funding and the presence of tribal infighting, the program for tribal organization failed, and this failure in turn negatively impacted economic progress as well. Taylor cogently argued that tribal organization basically did not succeed because Collier simply did not understand the realities of internal tribal factions, but, nevertheless, the “ultimate failure of the Indian New Deal was the result of circumstances that to a large extent were beyond the control of the Collier administration.”¹⁶² And among these “circumstances” was a lack of understanding by Collier and his colleagues of the degree to which Indians had already acculturated/assimilated into mainstream American society.

Historians continue to debate the successes and failures of Collier’s administration. Deloria and Lytle credited Collier with having “engineered a complete revolution in Indian affairs”; as “authorized,” the tribal organization plan was “suitable” for the conditions under which Indians then lived, rigorous support was given to reorienting Indian education, and Indians were given “preference in hiring” in the BIA.¹⁶³ They also defended Collier by maintaining that he should not have been blamed for the BIA’s failure to organize the growing number of “smaller political units on the larger reservations” because the economic cooperatives and small businesses formed under tribal charters “were probably more important...than an effort to reconstruct the old band or village structure of former days.”¹⁶⁴ But curiously enough, Deloria and Lytle did not address the relative degree of assimilation/acculturation in the many tribes, or the unintended and paradoxical result of the tribal organization program – cultural and

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 144.

¹⁶² Ibid., 38.

¹⁶³ Deloria and Lytle, *The Nations Within*, 188.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 187.

political pan-Indianism, all of which Taylor tackled. And for all of his sensitivity to cultural relativity, Collier himself was blinded by the romantic light of Indian cohesiveness, read “the tribe,” which he heralded as a beacon for the salvation of modern American industrial society.

The Santa Fe Indian School Becomes The Multicultural Center for Indian Pictorial Painting and Arts and Crafts

The Santa Fe Indian School had already begun the process of substantive administrative and academic changes in 1930 when Commissioner Rhoads appointed Chester Faris as the District Superintendent in Charge for the Northern Pueblo Agency. Faris was clearly a proponent of progressive change in Indian affairs, as was evident in the profound changes he brought to the curriculum and culture of the SFIS; a high school was opened, students no longer had to march to classes, native language usage was permitted, vocational training resources were expanded, student self-government was introduced, tribal dancing was enjoyed, and courses in Indian culture, history, and art were introduced. Indeed, as one former non-Indian Bureau of Indian Affairs employee commented on Faris’s tenure in an oral history project of SFIS alumni, “‘Everyone knew that an Indian could be an Indian at Santa Fe Indian School.’”¹⁶⁵ Historian Sally Hyer, who wrote a history of the SFIS based on this oral history project, praised the SFIS of the 1930s as a “showcase for the educational reforms of the Rhoads and Collier

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 32.

administrations,” and as “a laboratory for experiments in multicultural education” that reflected the new cultural pluralist orientation of U.S. Indian policy.¹⁶⁶

This “laboratory” was a decided change from previous conditions at the SFIS. Hyer also cited alumni testimonies about having been subjected to exceedingly harsh regimens that were holdovers from those that Captain Pratt had established at the Carlisle Industrial School. Students wore uniforms as they were marched from their dormitories to incessant drills, to their classes, which included half-days of vocational training, or “work details,” that amounted to carrying out domestic and agricultural duties that sustained the school’s operation.¹⁶⁷ The students were given meager meals of “gruel and hardtack” that were alien to their native and more nutritious diets.¹⁶⁸ In the 1920s the extremely infectious eye disease trachoma was also rampant at the SFIS, as it was in most BIA boarding schools. It was not uncommon for students to run away from these harsh conditions, and at the SFIS they often slipped away to attend ceremonies at their home pueblos. Superintendant Faris clearly had a huge task in front of him to bring about both philosophical and humanitarian reforms that would make the school a healthy environment for the students, as well as a favorable environment for tolerating and promoting native cultures.

Nevertheless, beginning in 1930, the SFIS became the BIA’s center for “experiments” in multicultural Indian arts and crafts education. That year a Department of Arts and Crafts, i.e., Indian arts and crafts, was established, and two years later its

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 31.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 19.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 13.

scope was significantly broadened by the opening of the Department of Painting and Design, which later became known as “The Studio.” This painting and design was also to be exclusively Indian, which made it the first government-run boarding school program for pictorial painting based exclusively on American Indian tribal arts. One year later, a two-year program for graduates from BIA high schools was established at the SFIS in order “to attract older students from other tribes.”¹⁶⁹ While Angel De Cora had set up the first government-sponsored Indian arts and crafts program at the Carlisle Indian School, this was the first art program for high school graduates in any Indian Service school. Within the space of three years, the SFIS had indeed become the BIA’s center for multicultural Indian art education. Other arts and crafts programs were subsequently established on its model at the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas; Phoenix Indian School in Phoenix, Arizona; and Chilocco Indian Agricultural School in Oklahoma. Haskell and Chilocco had multicultural student populations, while Phoenix drew its students only from the state of Arizona. However, none of these schools ever had a painting program similar to that of the Studio at the SFIS.

Although Dorothy Dunn has been widely acknowledged as the founder of the “Studio,” in actuality she did not achieve this feat on her own, and certainly would not have been able to do so without the aid of Kenneth M. Chapman. Chapman, a native of Indiana who had studied at the Chicago Art Institute, worked as a commercial artist before moving to Las Vegas, New Mexico in 1899, where he supported himself by

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 32.

painting watercolors of New Mexican landscapes.¹⁷⁰ Chapman's recent biographers, Janet Chapman and Karen Barrie, believe that "Chap," as he was known to family and friends, "met destiny" there in the "form of two men whose names were Frank Springer and Edgar L. Hewett."¹⁷¹ At the time Hewett was the president of Normal University in Las Vegas, and he offered Chapman a job as an art instructor there.¹⁷² But more importantly for Chapman's future, Hewett was an amateur archeologist and Springer an amateur paleontologist. Springer employed Chapman to illustrate fossils he had found on a dig in Iowa, and Hewett employed him to map, sketch and photograph several of his excavation sites in New Mexico.¹⁷³ But it was Hewett who exerted the most influence on Chapman's future career. Hewett soon became a major figure in the Santa Fe art community by assuming the directorships of the School of American Archeology (now the School for Advanced Research) in 1907 and of the Museum of New Mexico in 1909, and he took Chapman on as a close associate at both of these institutions. During those years Chapman became an expert on Pueblo pottery, and eventually helped found the Indian Art Fund to fund and study the extensive collection of Pueblo pottery that was stored in the basement of the New Mexico Museum of Fine Arts. However, Chapman eventually found new benefactors in John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and his wife, when he guided the wealthy couple through the collections at the Museum and School. The

¹⁷⁰ Kenneth Chapman's document "KMC Memoirs, Chapters," dated May 1964, AC02:133. Chapman's dates are 1875-1968.

¹⁷¹ Janet Chapman and Karen Barrie, *Kenneth Milton Chapman: A Life Dedicated to Indian Art and Artists* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008), 39.

¹⁷² Beatrice Chauvenet, *Hewett and Friends, A Biography of Santa Fe's Vibrant Era* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1983), 38.

¹⁷³ Chapman and Barrie, *Kenneth Milton Chapman*, 47-49.

Rockefellers subsequently funded the founding of the Laboratory of Anthropology, a museum and research center that was opened in 1931. The Indian Arts Fund was also transferred to the Laboratory and Chapman became not only its curator, but a major figure on the Indian arts scene in Santa Fe.

Dorothy Dunn met Chapman shortly after she arrived in Santa Fe for the first time in the summer of 1928. A young woman in her mid-twenties whose only previous teaching experience was in rural schools in the Midwest, Dunn was a complete ingénue to the world of the Southwest – a world she had only glimpsed at the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois, and through studies at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago. Dunn's background and influence at the Studio will be discussed at length in Chapter 5. But by the fall of 1928, Dunn managed to obtain a teaching position at the Santo Domingo Day School – probably through Chapman's intercession. While she was there, Dunn innovated the standard Indian Service curricula by, in her words, “adapting them when practicable and forgetting their existence when not.”¹⁷⁴ Dunn made that confession in her first published article, “Going to School with the Little Domingos,” which appeared in *The School Arts Magazine* in March 1931. Under her guidance, the children produced a small book titled *Book of Birds*, in which they recreated geometric designs seen in traditional Santo Domingo pottery during an “art hour.”¹⁷⁵ And drawing upon progressive education ideals, she instructed the students to illustrate their regular lessons

¹⁷⁴ Dorothy Dunn, “Going to School with the Little Domingos,” *The School Arts Magazine*, Vol. XXX, No. 7 (March 1931), 469.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 473.

with illustrations drawn from their “everyday experiences.”¹⁷⁶ Dunn also confessed in that article, “When in doubt I always consulted Mr. Kenneth Chapman, Curator of the Indian Arts Fund in Santa Fe.”¹⁷⁷ At the end of the piece, she observed that “The field at Santo Domingo lies practically untouched” – a statement reflecting Dunn’s confidence that she had done nothing to disturb that culture, but also hinting that although she had found a culture that remained vital despite hundreds of years of repressive colonization, it was one that could be cultivated – again by outside forces.¹⁷⁸ For Chapman and Dunn had something in mind for not just the Little Domingos, but for all of the Southwest Pueblo Indians.

Dunn quoted Chapman concerning his hope that some of the students would learn enough about traditional designs on their Pueblo’s pottery to adapt them ““to new objects,”” and what seemed to be a proposal to launch a project to this end; ““We ought to strike a balance somehow [between traditional designs and new objects], and if we have done our part in giving back to each pueblo the best its forebears have produced, we ought to accept what grows out of it.””¹⁷⁹ Certainly it was presumptuous of Chapman to believe that he or any non-Indian could give back to the pueblos what was theirs, however sincere or innocent his intent. Yet, Chapman was sincerely interested in preserving and rejuvenating Indian arts and crafts, as was Dunn, albeit with a touch of innocence born of her relative ignorance of Indian arts and cultures.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 474.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 473.

By the fall of 1931, Dunn had left the Southwest and enrolled at the University of Chicago. And by this time Kenneth Chapman was already talking to higher-ups in the BIA about expanding the arts and crafts program at the SFIS. In the summer of 1931, Chapman corresponded with W. Carson Ryan, Jr., then the BIA Director of Education, regarding the appointment of James Auchiah, one of the “Kiowa Five,” as an art teacher at the SFIS. In response, Ryan expressed his reservations regarding Auchiah, asking, “Do you think he might be of any help in a school like Santa Fe or is it important to keep out cultural influences other than Pueblo?”¹⁸⁰ Ryan’s question is evidence of his sensitivity to cultural differences among Indians, for the SFIS had primarily been a school for Southwest tribes and pueblos since its opening in 1890.¹⁸¹

Chapman subsequently “insisted” that Mable E. Morrow, a white woman who at the time was the arts and crafts teacher at Haskell Institute, an off-reservation boarding school, be transferred to the SFIS “to take over the supervision of Indian art” there.¹⁸² Morrow had studied art at the University of Washington in Seattle before joining the Indian Service in 1923. She first taught at Flandreau Indian School in South Dakota, and then transferred to the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas. At Haskell Morrow developed an Indian arts and crafts program for female students, and Director Ryan subsequently asked her to establish and manage a program in Indian arts and crafts at the

¹⁸⁰ Letter from W. Carson Ryan, Jr. to Kenneth Chapman dated June 15, 1931, 89KC0.003.1.

¹⁸¹ Archuleta, Child, and Lomawaima, eds., *Away from Home*, 18.

¹⁸² Letter from Edna Groves to Dorothy Dunn dated November 2, 1931.

SFIS that was intended to become a “training center” for future teachers in Indian Service schools.¹⁸³

What Ryan had in mind was not only a reformation of BIA education programs, but the establishment of a prototype for progressive education suited to all minorities in public schools throughout the country. At the beginning of 1932, Ryan co-authored with Rose K. Brandt, BIA Supervisor of Elementary Education, an article titled “Indian Education Today” that appeared in the journal *Progressive Education*. In that article, Ryan and Brandt proposed that “If there really is a new way in education, certain Indian groups offer the best possible place to apply it,” and chief among those “groups” were the Pueblo Indians.¹⁸⁴ They quoted from the 1931 Indian Commissioner’s report to drive home their point about the applicability of a culturally grounded education not only for “indigenous peoples,” but for all minorities.

The purpose of education for any indigenous peoples at the present day...is to help these peoples, both as groups and as individuals, to adjust themselves to modern life, protecting and preserving as much of their own way of living as possible, and capitalizing their economic and cultural resources for their own benefit and as their contribution to modern civilization.¹⁸⁵

Ryan and Brandt believed that the Indians of the Southwest provided “an ideal setting for a new-type school of the progressive sort, with which the whole community would be

¹⁸³ Gary C. Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image: Hazel Pete, the Indian New Deal, and the Indian Arts and Crafts Program at Santa Fe Indian School,” *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vo. 78, No. 4, 446, 445, citing “Seek to Save Indian Arts by Education,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, 23 February 1932, and Susan Labry Meyn, *More than Curiosities: A Grassroots History of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and Its Precursors* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2001), 66.

¹⁸⁴ W. Carson Ryan, Jr. and Rose K. Brandt, “Indian Education Today,” in *Progressive Education*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932): 83.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 81.

involved,” so it was not surprising that the Santa Fe Indian School was chosen as the site for the new arts and crafts program.¹⁸⁶

Interestingly enough, Brandt and Ryan found a model for such reformation in the efforts of the Ministry of Education in Mexico to teach its indigenous peoples. That same edition of *Progressive Education* contained articles by John Collier, then the Executive Secretary of the American Indian Defense Association, author and Indian rights activist Oliver La Farge, and Mexico’s Minister of Education Moises Saenz. Saenz, who described Mexico’s example of multicultural, progressive education, had visited the Studio during its second year and subsequently observed that Indian art had ““much to contribute to American civilization,”” and to ““the world at large.””¹⁸⁷ In that same issue of *Progressive Education*, English biologist Julian Huxley took up a similar call for multicultural education in his article “The Education of Primitive Peoples.” Huxley expressed his belief that the “greatest danger” posed in the education of “primitives peoples” was to foist Western “concepts upon them readymade,” and without due understanding and consideration of tailoring educational programs to be culture-specific.¹⁸⁸ Echoing his fellow contributors, Huxley demanded that this education not be conducted in cultural and social isolation; these “peoples” needed to be made aware of cultures worldwide and to appreciate “their own position” within the world. Indeed, BIA officials must have had such principles and goals in mind when they instituted a two-year

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 83.

¹⁸⁷ Saenz, Moises, “Indian Education,” address to U.S. Indian Service Educators of United Pueblos, Albuquerque, Dec. 1, 1933, quoted in Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 272.

¹⁸⁸ Julian Huxley, “The Education of Primitive Peoples,” in *Progressive Education*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932): 122.

arts and crafts program for high school graduates from other Indian Service schools at the SFIS.

In February 1932 Morrow arrived at the Santa Fe Indian School, and she brought with her nine young Indian women who entered the new program. Morrow was not only in charge of the new teacher-training program, but also supervised the Home Economic Department, the school kitchen, and the dining room. She also traveled to the Northern Pueblos two days a week to oversee “dressmaking, general sewing, and housekeeping” by the women there.¹⁸⁹ Morrow confided to a contemporary that she was “in full charge of the artwork” and “responsible to no one.”¹⁹⁰ While she was at the SFIS, Morrow also traveled to various Indian Service sites around the country, one of them being a mission in 1937 to oversee a project to revive spinning among the Choctaws living in Idabel, Oklahoma.¹⁹¹ One writer who studied Morrow’s personal papers concluded that she followed a “scientific, methodological, and rational approach” to rejuvenate Indian cultures “through a regenerative process of study, practice, and application.”¹⁹² Morrow hoped that this process of strict adherence to traditional ways of Indian craftsmanship would reverse the damage done to such manufactures by previous assimilation policies. Such an approach left no room for individual creativity, and as will be discussed in

¹⁸⁹ Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image,” n. 16, 466, citing *The Santa Fean*, February-March 1975, 7.

¹⁹⁰ Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image,” n. 16, 466, citing Morrow to Helen Cahusac, 2 February 1932, folder 90MMO.051, Box 16, Mable Morrow Collection, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

¹⁹¹ Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 209.

¹⁹² Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image,” 446, citing documentation from the Mable Morrow Collection, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology.

Chapter Five, Morrow's teaching philosophy clashed with Dorothy Dunn's more freewheeling one based on guidance.

In November 1931, Edna Groves from the BIA education department offered Dunn Morrow's former position at the Haskell Institute. Dunn, who at the time was studying at the University of Chicago, refused the offer because she had other plans that included more than teaching arts and crafts. In biographic notes found in her papers, Dunn wrote that in 1928 she had already developed a plan for a program in Indian painting, and "It included three years of teaching on Indian reservations combined with research, and one year of further academic study."¹⁹³ While she was completing her last semester at the University, Dunn wrote a letter to the BIA Director of Education, Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr., in which she presented a detailed version of what she hoped to accomplish.

In a rather bold stroke for an ingénue with no impressive resume or connections, Dunn asked Dr. Ryan to create a new position for her as an art teacher in the pueblos of New Mexico, and she laid out in great detail her job description. She proposed to carry out "experimental work in Indian art" that "could be done best by beginning in the northern pueblos because of their nearness to Santa Fe."¹⁹⁴ In her plan she would travel to the various pueblo schools, cooperate "with the other teachers and people in the pueblo who may help," and oversee courses in "native design," "Home Arts," "Crafts,"

¹⁹³ Notes that appear to have been handwritten by Dunn, 93.DDK.022.

¹⁹⁴ Letter from Dorothy Dunn to Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr. dated March 9, 1932, 93.DDK.160.

“Drawing and Painting,” and “Lettering.”¹⁹⁵ She also listed “reasons” for her qualifications “as the teacher to do the work in case the Indian Office will allow the work to be done.”¹⁹⁶ One can only imagine Ryan’s personal response to this rather audacious proposal from an unknown woman to create a job and job qualifications for herself wholesale. Ryan denied Dunn’s request.

Not to be denied, Dunn subsequently appealed directly to the District Superintendent, Chester Faris, for a position teaching painting at the SFIS. Dunn pleaded with Faris to allow her the opportunity “to study Indian painting as art and, as an artist and research person, to assist in its creative development by Indian students through exploration with them of their own heritage or art forms and symbols.”¹⁹⁷ Dunn also based the painting program on “one fixed principle” – “the painting would have to be Indian.”¹⁹⁸ This time her plea fell on sympathetic ears. According to Margretta Stewart Dietrich, probably the Studio’s most prominent patron, Chapman was so impressed with Dunn’s work at Santo Domingo that he persuaded Superintendent Faris to hire Dunn.¹⁹⁹ Although there was no civil position for an art teacher at the SFIS, Faris suggested that Dunn apply to fill a vacancy for a fifth-grade teacher, and graciously told her that he would allow her to teach painting on the side. Faris even went so far as to employ Dunn

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Dorothy Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” *El Palacio*, Feb. 1960, Vol. 67, No. 1, 18.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ Typewritten document by Margretta Dietrich, 93.DDK.182.

in a slot for a common laborer until her teaching application was processed. Needless to say, Dunn gladly accepted Faris's exceedingly accommodating offers.

In doing so, Dunn had taken on the challenging task of creating a painting program that was unlike any ever undertaken before, both within and without the Indian Service. She carried out the day-to-day, hands-on tasks at the Studio, but Kenneth M. Chapman advised her along. There is every indication that Dunn and Chapman enjoyed a most harmonious working relationship, and on occasion they would team up to present slide shows of paintings from around the world for art history classes. Dunn respected Chapman's expertise, and probably realized that she was just as much as student of his as her students were of her. Reflecting some thirty years later on Chapman's work at the SFIS, Dunn wrote, "Most fortunately, Kenneth M. Chapman had accepted the position of official government consultant and was to pay weekly visits" to the Arts and Crafts Department.²⁰⁰ And certainly Dunn relied on Chapman's continued moral and bureaucratic support during the next five years – the so-called "founding years" of the Studio – as she struggled to figure out and juggle all the complexities of classroom work, exhibitions, and administrative politics.

Of course, what is missing from this discussion of personal machinations and bureaucratic politics in the founding of the Studio is the participation of Indians in the process – an absence that had historically been common practice in the BIA. However, as mentioned earlier, Pueblo leaders did speak up when Commissioner Collier proposed

²⁰⁰ Dorothy Dunn, "The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School," *El Palacio*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Feb. 1960), 18.

the closure of the SFIS in 1933, and they prevailed upon him not only to keep the school open, but to make it more hospitable to the pueblos which it served. And by ensuring the continuation of the Studio, Collier's administration promoted the expression of another aspect of Indian identity in addition to traditional arts and crafts – pictorial painting.

Considering the Creative Source of American Indian Painting for the “Cosmopolitan Future”

For all of Dorothy Dunn's musing about a racial psychology underpinning the Studio artist-students' creative process, she also strove to have them understand that their art was not only Indian art, but an American art. Dunn hoped that “the strain of Indian art must somehow enter the flow of the many strains toward a national art expression, not losing its own identity but contributing identifying features to the whole.”²⁰¹ This was not a development that Dunn could realistically have expected to be accomplished in a mere few years, but she did believe that the work her novices were doing was laying the foundation for a modern Indian school of painting. She also must have understood she was overseeing a painting studio in a government-run boarding school for adolescent Indian students, not a metropolitan academy of fine art, and that not all of her students were going to become professional painters. Nevertheless, the overall extraordinary talent and accomplishment evidenced in so many of the paintings must have astonished her, as it has many others. Contemporary Navajo painter Tony Abeyta, the son of Studio artist-student Narcisco Abeyta, agrees with this assessment.

²⁰¹ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 363.

I also have to echo that she was teaching students who were not at, didn't go to art school. They weren't there to specifically become artists or learn about art. So, you know, they're, the people that came out of that school, it's amazing how many wonderful artists came out of that school. It's just, there's just tons of them...80 or 90% of the students...happened to have some pretty phenomenal talent...[and Dunn] always championed those individuals who had...sort of marked differences or progressive tendencies in their careers.²⁰²

Certainly Abeyta's estimation of the success rate seems rather high for any art school, much less an experimental one in a government-run Indian boarding school, but the level of artistic accomplishment and expression found in the paintings is actually quite impressive and pervasive – admittedly a subjective opinion, but the paintings have won similar acclaim from such eminent art historians such as W. Jackson Rushing and J. J. Brody. As will be discussed in Chapter 4, 150 Studio paintings mostly from the five years of Dorothy Dunn's tenure at the Studio, the so-called "founding years," were selected for close readings in this study. Out of the sixty-six artists represented in this study, twenty-five individuals (38%) went on to pursue artistic careers – as painters, teachers, or artisans – either for several years or a lifetime, and thirteen of them (52% of the twenty-five and 19.6% of the sixty-six) established themselves in lifelong careers as respected and successful Indian painters.²⁰³ Although these calculations are obviously

²⁰² Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

²⁰³ See Appendix B for a list of the artists represented in this study. The twenty-five artists identified as having pursued an artistic career following their departure from the Studio are (cited by usual name): Ben Quintana (Cochiti), Joe Hilario Herrera (Cochiti), Joe Padilla (Isleta), Geronima Cruz Montoya (San Juan), Lorencita Bird Atencio (San Juan), Pablita Velarde (Santa Clara), Teofilo Tafoya (Santa Clara), Jose J. Garcia (Santo Domingo), Vicente Mirabal (Taos), Tonita Lujan (Taos), Pop-Chalee (Taos), Eva Mirabal (Taos), Rufina Vigil (Tesuque), Ignacio Moquino (Zia), Louis Lomayesva (Hopi), Andrew Tsighnahjinnie (Navajo), Gerald Nailor (Navajo), Narcisco Abeyta (Navajo), Harrison Begay (Navajo), Quincy Tahoma (Navajo), Allan Houser (Chiricahua Apache), Wilson Dewey (San Carlos Apache), George Campbell Keahbone (Kiowa), Oscar Howe (Yanktonai Sioux), and Cecil Dick (Cherokee). The thirteen who pursued lifelong careers in art are: Joe Hilario Herrera, Geronima Cruz Montoya, Pablita Velarde, Pop-Chalee,

not based on the entirety of Studio works, they should nevertheless provide a reasonable idea about the talent and success rate of artist-students who painted at the Studio during the first five years of its existence.

Much criticism has been directed at Dunn for having dictated what the Studio artist-students painted, but Abeyta, among others, believes that although Dunn certainly instructed them in painterly methods, she “championed those individuals who had...sort of marked differences or progressive tendencies in their careers” – among them being Joe Hilario Herrera, Oscar Howe, and Allan Houser. And therein lay a seeming paradox; although Dunn clearly intended that the paintings be grounded in Indian culture, she also wanted the novice artists to follow individual paths of creativity. But was it really a paradox unique to American Indians?

What Was So Special about the Studio Paintings?

In her book *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, Dorothy Dunn reached once again beyond the paradigm of race to seek another explanation for the wellsprings of Indian painting. Dunn began her discussion by boldly announcing that Indian painting was “the first art in history to have sprung, full-fledged, from the primitive into the contemporary world at a time when it was peculiarly compatible with both.”²⁰⁴ Furthermore, in her assessment there were primitive qualities in modern Indian painting; modern Indian painting was “both old and new, primitive and

Andrew Tsighnahjinnie, Gerald Nailor, Harrison Begay, Quincy Tahoma, Narcisco Abeyta, Allan Houser, George Campbell Keahbone, Oscar Howe, and Cecil Dick.

²⁰⁴ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 24.

contemporary.”²⁰⁵ In order to buttress her argument, Dunn referred to the ideas regarding the replication of “prime objects” that art historian George Kubler advanced in his book *The Shape of Time* to explain that American Indian painting had its origins, for example, in the ancient kiva murals found at Awatovi and the hide paintings of the Great Plains. Kubler had hypothesized that such “prime objects and replications denote principal inventions, and the entire system of replicas, reproductions, copies, reductions, transfers, and derivations, floating in the wake of an important work of art.”²⁰⁶ Further, there were only a few “prime objects” or “great moments” in the far distant past: “The history of art in this sense resembles a broken but much-repaired chain made of string and wire to connect the occasional jeweled links surviving as physical evidences of the invisible original sequence of prime objects.”²⁰⁷ Continuing on, Kubler argued that due to the “tradition-forming power of replication,” the artist “is not a free agent” and “his situation is rigidly bound by a chain of prior events.”²⁰⁸ As a result of this “chain,” “all things and acts and symbols – or the whole of human experience – consist of replicas, gradually changing by minute alterations more than by abrupt leaps of invention,” and as such a “shape in time” or “visible portrait of the collective identity” takes form.²⁰⁹ Kubler’s ambitious and controversial thesis explaining the development of worldwide art has never been widely accepted, yet Dunn, and presumably others, seized upon it to explain the phenomenon of modern Indian art.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ George Kubler, *The Shape of Time* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962), 39.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 40.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 82, 50.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 74.

One wonders why Dunn and others have thought it necessary to look for such explanations – Dunn’s explanation being, as previously discussed, grounded in George Kubler’s theory regarding prime objects set forth in his book *The Shape of Time*. Certainly her point about the paradox of modern Indian painting – that it had modern and primitive qualities—was relevant. But as art historian W. Jackson Rushing has pointed out, “the forms and iconography of prehistoric and historic Pueblo art...had been neglected, generally, by The Studio,” but were later “incorporated” by Studio artist Joe H. Herrera and others.²¹⁰ On that score, it appears that Dunn did not thoroughly understand Kubler’s thesis and its application to Studio art. However, the larger question remains as to why such precedents were sought not just as an exercise in art historicism, but in an apparent effort to explain how adolescent American Indians could paint such sophisticated works after only a few months of part-time art instruction at the Studio. Was it simply because some of the Studio artist-students produced paintings worthy of established, non-Indian artists’ hands? Was there some underlying assumption that these novices, all of whom were almost completely unacculturated to the European, American, or Oriental fine arts, should not have been able to achieve what they did? Was this curious mindset part of the white fascination with the exotic mystique of Indianness?

Other appreciative observers of Studio art have joined Collier in expounding almost mystical explanations for what these young artists were able to achieve. One such explanation has drawn upon the concept of the collective unconscious as proposed by

²¹⁰ W. Jackson Rushing, “Authenticity and Subjectivity in Post-War Painting: Concerning Herrera, Scholder, and Cannon,” in Margaret Archuleta and Dr. Rennard Strickland, Eds., *Shared Visions: Native American Painters and Sculptors in the Twentieth Century* (New York: The New Press, 1991), 14.

Swiss psychoanalyst Carl G. Jung in the first quarter of the twentieth century. For example, in the art-centered survey *The West of the Imagination*, historian William H. Goetzmann detected “a near Jungian ideal” at work in the artist-students’ creative process, imagining that it was “as if the vitality of their art and meaningfulness of the symbol would well up from the subconscious mind.”²¹¹ The “symbol” that Goetzmann was referring to is Jung’s concept of the “archetype,” which Jung defined in contradistinction to biological instincts that were central to understanding Freudian thought. Jung believed that instincts were “physiological urges” that “manifest themselves in fantasies and often reveal their presence only by symbolic images.”²¹² Further, these manifestations, or archetypes, “are an integral part of the unconscious, and can be observed everywhere”; “They form a bridge between the ways in which we consciously express our thought and a more primitive, more colorful and pictorial form of expression.”²¹³ Jung explained that there were many symbols, both individual and collective ones, but the “most important” ones were those “*collective* in their nature and origin”; these symbols were “‘collective representations’ emanating from primeval dreams and creative fantasies,” and “As such, these images are involuntary spontaneous manifestations and by no means intentional inventions.”²¹⁴ Jung considered these symbols to be “chiefly religious images,” and as such were the sources of universal symbols in religious art, but he also considered the relevance of archetypes to the

²¹¹ Goetzmann, William H. and William N. Goetzmann, *The West of the Imagination* (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Co., 1968), 404.

²¹² C. G. Jung, *Man and His Symbols*, eds. by Carl G. Jung, M.-L. von Franz, Joseph L. Henderson, Jolande Jacobi, and Aniela Jaffe (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1964), 58.

²¹³ Ibid., 32.

²¹⁴ Ibid., 41-42.

universal creative urge of humankind.²¹⁵ In a 1922 lecture titled “On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry,” Jung stated: ““The only aspect of art that can be a subject of psychological investigation is the process of artistic creation – not what constitutes the essential nature of the work of art.””²¹⁶ Jung’s biographer Ronald Hayman read this statement as expressing Jung’s adherence “to the notion that consciousness can be suspended while a writer’s creativity is requisitioned by the collective unconscious.”²¹⁷ Assumedly the process that Jung assigned to a “writer’s creativity” applied to other artists as well.

However, the introduction of Jungian analytical psychology to the subject of artistic creativity brings with it the concept of race – a concept whose biological basis excludes the interplay and influence of culture on the creative process. Later in his life Jung wrote of his belief in ““a general human precondition, the inherited and inborn biological structure which is the instinctual basis of every human being,”” and that ““every normal human situation has already occurred countless times in our long ancestral history.””²¹⁸ Thus, the introduction of Jungian theories injects not so much a mystical explanation for artistic creativity at the Studio, but rather a static, race-bound notion that excludes any consideration of individual agency or cultural change.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 41.

²¹⁶ Ronald Hayman, *A Life of Jung* (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999), 323.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ Hayman, *A Life of Jung*, 400, quoting from Jung’s introduction to the 1948 edition of an English translation of *I Ching* by Richard Wilhelm, in ed. Herbert Read, Michael Fordham and Gerald Adler, trans. R. F. C. Hull, Vol. 4 (London and Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957-1979), 302. This concept has been widely associated with German biologist Ernst Haeckel’s theory that the development of each human being recapitulates the developmental stages of the race, the so-called “recapitulation theory” that ‘ontology recapitulates phylogeny.’ American psychologist G. Stanley Hall also promoted this theory in the early twentieth century.

Perhaps the interjection of Jungian thought into the discussion of Studio art had its origins in Jung's trip to New Mexico in January 1925, where he famously visited Mabel Dodge Luhan in her Taos salon for non-Indians who wanted to join her in what she called the search for the mystical union with the "One" that could be found in the "Indian." Jung marveled at the Taos Indians' adamant insistence on keeping their religious beliefs and practices secret from outsiders, but he concluded that this "Preservation of the secret" empowered them "to resist the dominant whites" and gave them "cohesion and unity."²¹⁹ After talking with a Taos Indian named Ochwiay Biano (Blue Mountain Lake), Jung rhapsodized that Europeans' "'Knowledge'" had distanced them "'further and further from the mythic world in which we once felt at home.'"²²⁰ Perhaps it is this goal of finding something lost from essential humanity that continues to prompt observers to find a mythical or super-explanation for the creative act that is American Indian painting.

Another author interested in the nature of Indian identity, Scott B. Vickers, has proposed a different understanding of Jungian archetypes. Incorporating Jung's statements in *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, Vickers argues that "unlike stereotypes projected onto individuals from the outside, archetypes derive from within the individual via the 'personal unconscious' ('a more or less superficial layer') or the 'collective unconscious' ('which does not derive from personal experience and is not

²¹⁹ C. G. Jung. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, ed. Aniela Jaffe, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), 250.

²²⁰ Hayman, *A Life of Jung*, 257-258.

a personal acquisition but is inborn').²²¹ Furthermore, "the archetypes suggest a living, transitive, and thus historically active concept of identity" that is involved in "'making'" the world.²²² Thus explained, archetypes would and should not bind the artist's creativity. Vickers concludes, however, that

Ultimately, our search for a 'real' Indian identity must be deferred to the articulations of real Indians who, bearing witness to their own psychic experience, give rise to their own archetypes as extracted from the pervasive trivialization and stereotyping of them over time. Even within Indian artistic and literary discourses, however, identity and identification are as allusive, elusive, and controversial as they are in white discourse, and any definitive characterization of Indianness must remain as impossible as that of 'humanness' in general.²²³

Tony Abeyta would certainly agree with Vickers that the search for a "'real' Indian identity" should be left to "real Indians" – however "elusive" they are. Abeyta has offered a pragmatic explanation for the creative process behind Studio paintings, arguing that the Studio paintings were not trapped in time. In his estimation, during the 1930s there was an "ethnocentric perspective that assumed that Indian art was going to remain...outside the realm of...modernity," and that the "canvas was probably something that belonged to Anglo artists."²²⁴ Abeyta added that when you introduced things like...paint...some materials," then "different philosophies arose," but "These were the things that were going to be integrated regardless, whether it was the Spanish who

²²¹ C. G. Jung. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (Princeton and New York: The Bollingen Series/Princeton University Press, 1969), 3-5, quoted in Scott B. Vickers, *Native American Identities: From Stereotype to Archetype in Art and Literature* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), 7.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Vickers, *Native American Identities*, 109-110.

²²⁴ Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

brought silver, or Dorothy Dunn who brought...gouache and tempera.”²²⁵ Whether the impetus to taking up these “things” came from an unconscious urge influenced by archetypes or from what they had seen in non-Indian cultures, certainly it would be sheer fallacy to think that the Indian students who came to the Studio had lived in a complete vacuum shut off from non-Indian art. For example, one Navajo who studied at the Studio, Andrew Tsighnahjinnie (Yazzie Bahe/Little Grey), drew pictures of horses and buffaloes on rocks with a pencil when he was just a child. When he later attended the Fort Apache Indian School he painted “[enamel] designs on picture frames,” and started painting pictures as well.²²⁶ And certainly many, if not most, of the students had already been exposed to drawing on paper in the day schools. Realistically, how radically foreign could drawing and painting on paper have been for these students, or difficult for them to comprehend and master?

Tony Abeyta also believes that such new materials “were going to be integrated regardless,” and the idea that “somehow Indians would continue to paint only upon hides and pots” indicates an “ethnocentric perspective that assumes that Indian art was going to remain...outside the realm of...modernity.”²²⁷ Of course, the Plains Indian students not only had a longstanding tradition of painting on hides in their cultures, but they could harken back as well as to their ledger book art from the nineteenth century – ledger books that had been given to them by white soldiers.

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Wyckoff, *Visions + Voices*, 268.

²²⁷ Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

As for Southwest Indian forerunners, there was Kenneth Chapman's apocryphal meeting with a Navajo man named Api-Begay in 1902 at the Pueblo Bonito trading post. Chapman recalled that he saw Api-Begay's "drawings of 'Yei' dancers, made with black, red and blue pencils," and he subsequently supplied him with "better paper" and "a better assortment of colored pencils" and hired him to paint for "a half day."²²⁸ Margretta Dietrich provided a colorful account of this encounter:

Standing before the broad counter he [Chapman] looked up and saw what he recognized at once to be very accurate pictures of Navajo ceremonies. Drawn with red and black pencils on the ends of cardboard boxes were dance figures with their Yeibichai costumes surmounting feeble little legs. 'Who did them?' Chapman inquired, interested – actual pictures of ceremonies being rare.... 'Api-Begay,' someone grunted. (Son-of-Milk). 'What does he do?' 'He doesn't do anything – he's an artist,' they said.²²⁹

No doubt intrigued and amused, Chapman managed to find out where Api-Begay lived, and he went for a visit. Upon entering the hogan, Chapman found Api-Begay sitting "in the middle of the room with his legs stuck through a box that was drawn up over his thighs," and drawing a picture.

'Will you draw some for me?' the scientist said. "Yes. How much you give me?" 'How many you want?' Chapman said as many as he could get, handing out a box full of colored crayons. 'You could have knocked Api's eyes off with a stick – they bulged so,' Chapman said later. The artist set to work and before the afternoon was gone had produced quite a handful of paintings.²³⁰

However, according to Chapman "the earliest recorded instance of the production of paintings for sale" occurred in 1899-1900 when Dr. Jesse Fewkes, an anthropologist

²²⁸ Kenneth Chapman, "Notes on the development of pictorial art among the Pueblo, Navajo, Apache, and other Southwestern Indian tribes," typewritten document, 89KC0.002.

²²⁹ Margretta Dietrich, "Their Culture Survives," *Indians at Work*, Vol. III, No. 17 (April 15, 1936), 18.

²³⁰ Ibid.

with the Smithsonian Institution, commissioned four Hopi men to paint the Hopi spirit beings called *katsinas*. In his report on the endeavor published by the U.S. Bureau of Ethnology, Fewkes acknowledged that he had “provided the artists with paper, pencils, brushes, and pigments,” but “left the execution of the work wholly to the Indians.”²³¹ Fewkes described the paintings as having been “made primarily to illustrate symbols and symbolic paraphernalia used in the personation of the gods, but incidentally they show the ability of the Hopi in painting, a form of artistic expression which is very ancient among them.”²³² Then, of course, how can one ignore the painting precedents set by Crescencio Martinez and other members of the first generation of Pueblo painters? Chapman also recalled that Dr. Edgar Lee Hewett “first observed drawings of individual dance figures at San Ildefonso Pueblo, made by Crescencio Martinez on paper box covers with pencil and tinted with water colors.”²³³

Of course, these events established Fewkes, Chapman, and Hewett as early progenitors of what Chapman termed “commercialized developments” in Pueblo and Navajo art, but their stories also indicate that the artists encountered no insurmountable difficulties in painting on a flat surface of paper or box or canvas.²³⁴ And certainly it could not have been as difficult for the Studio students to master these materials as it was for Dunn to try to crossover into understanding the various artistic heritages represented

²³¹ Jesse Walter Fewkes, *Hopi Katcinas* (1903; repr., New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1985), 14. Fewkes’s original report was published under the title “Hopi Katchinas Drawn by Native Artists,” in *Twenty-First Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1899-1900* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903).

²³² Ibid., 15.

²³³ Ibid.

²³⁴ Ibid.

at the Studio. As the painterly achievements of the paintings themselves show, the students did not find it so difficult at all, although the degree to which Dunn's guidance facilitated or dictated their techniques cannot be measured.

Then there is the paradox of Dunn's insistence that individual expression and tribal identification could come together in the products. Dunn presumably assumed that by painting Indian subjects and designs from their respective cultures, and by imprinting them with their own style, the students would just naturally express the whole of their identities in their work. In his 1972 seminal study of the Studio, *Indian Painters and White Patrons*, art historian J. J. Brody condemned this parallel approach as being stultifying and well neigh impossible to achieve, with the result, nevertheless, being a singularly "pan-Indian," traditional style of painting. For many years, this argument dominated academic criticism of Dunn and the Studio Style. However, in 1999 Peter Smith, an art education researcher, questioned Brody's conclusion and proposed a more common-sense approach. Smith wrote that "even if we agree with Brody that individuality and group (or tribal) identity are exclusive and incompatible goals for one person to work towards, is that not the dilemma of every Native American artist who desires to retain her or his personal Native American identity, yet wants also to express her or his community values through artwork?"²³⁵ Most probably Smith was immediately referring to the sensibilities of the late twentieth century Indian artists, but Studio-educated artists surely must have had some personal inkling of this dilemma, and

²³⁵ Peter Smith, "The Unexplored: Art Education Historians' Failure to Consider the Southwest," *Studies in Art Education*, Winter, 1999, 40 (2), 117. From <http://www.jstor.org> [accessed January 9, 2007].

indeed they may well have been the first group of Indian artists to confront it. At the core of this dilemma was the very notion of who these artists were as individuals, as artists, and as Indians – that is, in the final analysis, how they viewed *themselves*. And the latter supposition brings to mind the age-old admonition to artists, “Paint what you *know*.”

Although she had no extensive training in art education, much less in psychology or psychoanalysis, Dunn grappled with trying to convey the meaning of Indian identity as she understood it through the medium of the plastic arts. As she attempted to explain the philosophical basis of her goals at the Studio, Dunn touched on the “values” of “Indian identity” in her assessment of the students’ progress during the 1935-1936 term.

By this time, it seemed very much worthwhile to everyone to record and illuminate events which might otherwise be lost forever, and to project little-known designs of the ancients into modern settings through new arrangements and inventive adaptations, and moreover to offer the original contributions of a new generation of artists who were yet maintaining Indian identity in values too precious to lose.²³⁶

At first glance, Dunn was acknowledging that not only were her students a dynamic new generation of cultural historians, but they were also studying the “old” to create the “new.” Moreover, they were *Indian* historians of *Indian* culture who were “maintaining Indian identity” through an artistic medium of expression. But Dunn was also pointing to the concept of cultural identity, a concept that some social scientists, e.g., anthropologists and psychoanalysts, were just beginning to propose in the 1930s. Moreover, Dunn recognized that American Indian identity was a dynamic reality, not a static ethnographic fact, and she consciously emphasized the individual nature of this creative process by

²³⁶ Ibid., 284.

calling for “new arrangements and inventive adaptations” to “project” the “designs of the ancients into modern settings.” This one sentence encapsulates Dunn’s rather perspicacious understanding of modern Indian identity, and how she hoped her artist-students would come to know and express it in their paintings. As such, the Studio project was one of restoration of the past and rejuvenation of the present in cultural art forms that were in the process of being lost. And it was the individuals in the present who were the agents of this endeavor, not the “ancients” who did, however, anchor their cultural identities.

Santa Clara artist Pablita Velarde, one of Dunn’s students who pursued a successful, lifelong career as a painter, believed that Dunn stressed individual expression over the bounds of tribal tradition. In a 2004 interview, Velarde recalled that Dunn once told her, “You’re not only historians, but you’re a painter, so paint it well and paint it correctly as you know it today, ‘cause who knows, ten, fifteen, twenty years from now it might not even be around.”²³⁷ Dunn wanted the artist-students to paint their own individual interpretations of and identification with their tribal cultures in order to define themselves as artists in the present. And according to Velarde, she and her fellow students followed Dunn’s admonition to paint what they knew.

[To] each tribe, like the Pueblos, she would say, ‘just do your Pueblo life and don’t try to do your Plains Indians, or the Navajo, or the Apaches. Just stay with your Pueblo thoughts.’ That’s the way she stressed it, and each group did their own little thing in their own little tribe, you know. And, we didn’t just go out and paint a horse with a Navajo on it because we weren’t supposed to do that, ‘cause Pueblos, if they want to ride a

²³⁷ Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

horse, we had to dress them like a Pueblo. We can't dress them like a Navajo.²³⁸

At this point in the interview, Velarde addressed the characterization of the Studio Style as having been pan-Indian and dictated by Dunn to be painted in the same way.

I asked her one time, I said, ‘Why can’t we put a landscape in the background? Why can’t...we even put a tree here, or a tree there.’ She says..., ‘From what I understand, the most important thought in the old minds was what this individual was thinking and doing at that one time --- wasn’t thinking about what was around him, just what his own head and heart tells him to do.’ So, we forgot landscapes. That’s why a lot are two dimensions, only have a floating figure there.²³⁹

So, judging from this quote, Dunn was actually telling the students how to think, and imagining – and asking the students to imagine – not only how the ancients thought, but to assume their identities. And she was asking them to imagine this on an individual level that was inherently subsumed into a collective past. To paraphrase William Shakespeare, past was but prologue.²⁴⁰ There was no contradiction between the past and the present, but the Studio artists were immediately Indians in the modern *present*.

Dunn was clearly cognizant of the two layers of identity – i.e., the past and present in her artist-students, and although her project was one of cultural preservation, she also promoted their individual identities as painters in the *now*. However, despite her perspicacity in beginning to understand the particularly complicated nature of modern American Indian identity, she nevertheless was grounded in the racial notion of “Indianness” that she brought to the project from her own culture. To reiterate, as Dunn

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Ibid.

²⁴⁰ The Literature Network. William Shakespeare, “The Tempest,” Act 2, Scene 1. <http://www.online-literature.com/shakespeare/tempest/3/> [accessed April 24, 2010].

formulated her objectives for a program for Indian painting, she adhered to a principal goal that the art had to be “Indian”; she believed her students had to draw upon their “racial heritage” to produce a modern art of “tribal and individual distinction.” Apparently Dunn did not wrestle with the paradox inherent in her proposal, and perhaps she was not equipped to; how could “modern” art – a European-based art that was all about freeing up individuality of expression – be restricted by cultural or racial dictates? For Dunn, however, there seemed to be no paradox whatsoever in the proposal; Indians were Indians, and their individual art must necessarily express their racial and cultural identities.

This process of identity expression was the “dilemma” that Peter Smith found at the core of modern Indian art, but for Dunn it was less problematic than natural. Dunn seemed to understand perfectly that her students’ identity as Indians was not a static ethnographic concept, but a dynamic process of becoming and being that united the unconscious and conscious. In the 1930s, American historians had not yet seized upon the concept of identity formation as a focus of attention in their studies, although, as will be discussed later, psychoanalysts such as Erik Erikson and anthropologists such as Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead were just beginning to think deeply about the subject. So it is somewhat surprising that Dorothy Dunn touched upon such a complex and controversial subject, but she did so in the process of analyzing a creative process that she was in many ways witnessing more than guiding.

Some thirty years after her work at the Studio had ended, Dorothy Dunn reminisced that she had hoped to “gradually” instill in her artist-students the “concept of

universal fine arts” through an appreciation of “Indian art itself as an art, and then as part of art which extends beyond the bounds of Indian culture and belongs to everyone for the knowing.”²⁴¹ Dunn’s non-Indian conception of Indian art, and by extension Indian identity, was transitional from one based solely on race to one expressing distinct cultures, and on that score it retraced the same cultural relativism promoted by John Collier and some American anthropologists in the early decades of the twentieth century. Instead of being static cultures in an ethnological present, Dunn and Collier were thinking not just in terms of traditional Indian art, but how that art could be recontextualized into modern American art. And as we shall see in the next chapter, some of Dunn’s students did develop an understanding of Indian art as an American art, and it was a conception that combined and expressed what they knew about the beauty of their own cultures and what they had assimilated from other cultures at the Studio. Certainly Dunn’s hopes echoed those of John Collier as he had proclaimed to the American Federation of Arts his desire that the paintings by Kiowa and Pueblo boys and girls would enter the “the cosmopolitan future” of American culture.

²⁴¹ Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” 19-20.

Chapter 3: An Old and A New American Art: The ‘Studio Style’ Quest for Self-Expression

Historians of American Indian art and culture rarely mention the Studio without invoking the name of its first Teacher of Fine and Applied Arts, Dorothy Dunn, whose indefatigable “guidance” during the founding years of the Studio is undeniable. But Dunn herself, as the first historian of the Studio, placed the adolescent artist-students first and foremost in the artistic process undertaken there. The Studio was also part of a more complex art world – an art world that included non-Indian patrons, artists, teachers, bureaucrats, and museum curators, and as such it became a forum in which North American Indian students and non-Indian enablers transformed their respective cultural boundaries into cultural borders, and crossed them. Adolescent students from over thirty Indian cultures crossed those borders, and brought their individual artistic legacies into the mix of what became recognized as the pan-Indian, “Studio Style” of painting. But despite non-Indians’ bureaucratic control, guidance, and patronage, the Studio paintings should be viewed foremost as a multicultural Indian product. As will be discussed, the so-called “authenticity” of Studio painting was undeniably influenced by Dunn’s “guidance,” and as well by the patrons from the Santa Fe art community. But in the final analysis, the Studio provided the space for the artist-students to recontextualize their cultural legacies in a creative process that shaped and expressed their individual and tribal identities, and situated them in the ongoing formation of a pan-Indian identity that had grown out of earlier, but less beneficent, social experiments in government-run, off-reservation boarding schools. And in the process, these young Indians also expressed their conception of an American Indian identity.

The historical moment for this process of recontextualization arose out of the Santa Fe art colony of non-Indian internal émigrés. Dorothy Dunn and her students were marginal members of this colony, and they undeniably depended upon patronage from that colony as much as on the official support of the BIA. For although Dunn and the students were in a very real sense émigrés to the Santa Fe community as much as its non-Indian members were to the exotic “otherness” of the American Southwest, they never assimilated fully into that community, nor did the new Santa Feans into the complex Indian world of the Studio. Although non-Indian friends from the Santa Fe art colony enthusiastically anticipated the creation of an authentic ‘Indian’ art from the Studio, what they received was a far more complex product. For despite their important role as desirous and paying patrons, their expectations were dependent upon the experience and creative powers of the Studio artist-students who, in the final analysis, had their own say in what and how they painted who they were.

“The early Indian art was a fine art and today modern artists are taking up the art and are pushing on to show the still existing great art and revealing it again in forms of mural paintings, or on fine paper with tempera paints, or frescoes and oil paints. The modern painters are setting out to show the culture of their people and to reveal the real Indian art....” Ha-we-la-na, Marcelina Herrera, Zia²⁴²

When the young Marcelina Herrera from Zia Pueblo wrote those words, she most probably was referring not to her fellow artists at the Studio, but to the modern Indian painters from San Ildefonso Pueblo and the Santa Fe Movement who had laid the aesthetic foundations for modern painting from 1919 to 1932. Some of those predecessors who came to paint murals at the SFIS directly influenced what the young artist-students created. Their art, too, had been based on traditional tribal decorative arts and culture. And like their heirs, those early painters had been patronized by the colony

²⁴² Marcelina Herrera, “American Art,” *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 30.

of white American painters, writers, poets, and art devotees who had been immigrating into the northern New Mexico villas of Santa Fe and Taos since the turn of the century. Both of these generations were “setting out to show the culture of their people and to reveal the real Indian art” to those white patrons.²⁴³

Most of these internal emigrants to the “Indian Country” of the Southwest had come in search of “America” and an art they hoped would be definitively American – either in the exotic art of the Indians, or in their own art that was often inspired by the same. By the 1930s, several of these individuals, such as Kenneth M. Chapman, had established singular institutions devoted to the preservation, exhibition, and selling of Southwest Indian art and artifacts. The colony that gathered over the years in Santa Fe became a unique and fertile source of support for the Studio venture. Dorothy Dunn succinctly summed up this extended community:

The Museum of New Mexico was the first to sponsor Indian painters and to collect and show their works. The Indian Arts Fund assembled, and later housed in the Laboratory of Anthropology, splendid specimens of arts and crafts. The New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs examined and championed the rights and works of Indians and Indian artists. *El Palacio* and the town newspaper, *The Santa Fe New Mexican*, recorded every noteworthy art event. In no other place, it is safe to say, was Indian art under such scrutiny and such protection as it was at this time in Santa Fe.²⁴⁴

In addition to Chapman, members of the colony such as Margretta Stewart Dietrich, a wealthy art aficionado and activist for Indian civil rights, were also primary players alongside Dunn in making the Studio a reality and sustaining it.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Dorothy Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” *El Palacio*, Vol. 67, No. 1 (Feb. 1960), 17. Note that *El Palacio* was published by The Museum of New Mexico, in cooperation with the Archeological Society of New Mexico and the School of American Research.

Margretta Stewart Dietrich, the wealthy widow of Nebraska U.S. Senator and Governor Charles Dietrich, joined the Santa Fe community in the early 1920s and became a key member of the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs. From that position, and through her many visits to the SFIS Studio, she also became a very important, if not the most important, patron of the Studio. Her patronage involved more than just purchasing large numbers of paintings, for as Pablita Velarde, one of the first Studio painters recalled years later, Dietrich and her sister Dorothy Stewart often visited to “give us encouragement...because we were all so bashful and shy and timid.”²⁴⁵

In Becker’s “art world,” painters also relied on “other painters, contemporary and past, who created the tradition which makes the backdrop against which their work makes sense.”²⁴⁶ Such a “tradition” was already present on walls in the Santa Fe Indian School when Dunn’s first students arrived. In the spring of 1932, the school’s superintendent, Chester E. Faris, approached Olive Rush, a non-Indian artist from Indiana who had emigrated to Santa Fe, about painting murals on the walls of the school’s dining room. Rush, however, convinced Faris that Indian artists should undertake the project, but she agreed to supervise their work. According to an historian of the SFIS, Sally Hyer, four San Ildefonso artists, Julian Martinez, Alfonso Roybal (Awa Tsireh), Romando Vigil, and Abel Sanchez (Oqwa Pi), were recruited, along with Zia artist Velino Shije Herrera and Kiowa Five artist Jack Hokeah.²⁴⁷ According to Dunn, SFIS students also joined the

²⁴⁵ Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

²⁴⁶ Becker, *Art Worlds*, 13.

²⁴⁷ Hyer, *One House, One Voice, One Heart*, 42.

project, and they included Juan Diego Martinez, the son of Julian and Maria Martinez, who became famous for their black-on-black pottery at San Ildefonso pueblo; San Ildefonso artist Crescencio Martinez's son Oqwa-tu (Miguel); and two others who later became her students at the Studio, Hopi Riley Quoyavema and Navajo Paul Tsosie.²⁴⁸ Upon the occasion of the unveiling of the murals in July 1932, a *Santa Fe New Mexican* reviewer observed that each artist had "worked with subjects that represented his own people," but the overall effect was "complete unity in the finished pictures."²⁴⁹

The murals that Olive Rush supervised can be seen as the passing of the baton from the Pueblo and Kiowa artists who had already forged the way in the development of modern Indian painting to the artist-students of the Studio. Paintings by three of the mural artists, Velino Shije Herrera, Oqwa Pi, and Awa Tsireh, had been shown in the "world's first exhibition of Pueblo Indian paintings" at Santa Fe's Museum of Fine Arts in 1919.²⁵⁰ These Pueblo artists were part of the first group of modern Pueblo painters whose work can be traced back to the beginning of the twentieth century, specifically to San Ildefonso Pueblo and the Santa Fe Movement. In 1903, Esther Hoyt, an Indian Service teacher at San Ildefonso, provided some of her students with watercolors and papers. According to one of her students, Tonita Pena, Hoyt suggested that they paint their ceremonial dances, although there is some speculation that Hoyt, being a staunch

²⁴⁸ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 244.

²⁴⁹ "Murals at U.S. School Here New Art Expressions for the Indians," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, July 22, 1932.

²⁵⁰ J. J. Brody, *Pueblo Indian Painting, Tradition and Modernism in New Mexico, 1900-1930* (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1997), 4.

advocate of assimilation and acculturation, did not promote such Indian paintings.²⁵¹ Hoyt's students included Alfredo Montoya, Awa Tsireh/Alfonso Roybal, Oqwa Pi/Abel Sanchez, and Romando Vigil/Tse Ye Mu, all of whom became members of the first generation of Pueblo painters.²⁵²

Perhaps the most well-known of these first-generation painters was Crescencio Martinez, or Ta-e, meaning "Home of the Elk." In the summer of 1917, Martinez brought some of his watercolors of Indian subjects to Edgar Lee Hewett, who subsequently commissioned Martinez to paint watercolors depicting all the tribal participants of summer and winter ceremonies – a collection that subsequently became known as *The Crescencio Set*. During the same year that Martinez was fulfilling this commission, seven young artists at the SFIS were being urged to develop their talents after school by Mrs. John D. DeHuff, the wife of the superintendent, at her home. Among them were Olive Rush's future muralists, Velino Shije Herrera/Ma Pe Wi and Awa Tsireh/Alfonso Roybal. They were joined by several other young men from the Zuni, Tesuque, and Hopi Pueblos, among whom Hopis Fred Kabotie and Otis Polelonema would go on to pursue artistic careers. Of course, these were not officially sanctioned art classes, and when his bosses found out about his wife's activities, Superintendent John DeHuff was transferred to another Indian Service position. Fortunately, by the 1930s the predominant attitude of BIA administrators had shifted

²⁵¹ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 202-203. See J. J. Brody, *Pueblo Indian Painting, Tradition and Modernism in New Mexico, 1900-1930*, 39, for a discussion of what Hoyt may or may not have done at San Ildefonso Pueblo.

²⁵² J. J. Brody, *Pueblo Indian Painting*, 39.

away from a strong ethnocentric bent to one of increasing respect for Indian art and culture, both at the national and local levels.

This change in attitude toward Indians and their work had in part been engendered by the Merriam Report, which had been commissioned by the BIA and released in 1928. But real change was opened up to Indians by including them in New Deal programs designed to help artists find work. These programs were intended to rediscover what had made America a great nation, and to celebrate the resiliency of its people at a time when they were enduring the dire uncertainties of the Great Depression. Certainly Indians knew something about surviving hard times, and their artists who participated in these programs were given the opportunity to reveal in new “forms” how traditional Indian art was still existed as “great art.”²⁵³ Olive Rush and Kenneth Chapman were instrumental in helping some of the Studio artist-students to participate in these programs. In the spring of 1933, Rush also invited three of the students to join the previous mural painters, who had now formed a Mural Guild, in painting portable murals for exhibition at Chicago’s Century of Progress, but Dunn later recalled that when the work started “the entire class” participated, producing what Dunn called a “buoyancy” to the general mood of the Studio.²⁵⁴ The following year Kenneth Chapman invited artist-students Pablita Velarde and Andrew Tsahnahjinnie to participate in the Works Progress Administration’s

²⁵³ Marcelina Herrera, “American Art,” 30.

²⁵⁴ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 266.

Santa Fe mural project, and some of these products were later exhibited at the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, and at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D. C.²⁵⁵

“The modern Indian painter is painting his culture in a true, simple style, which is right on par with the modern artists, who are striving for a typical American [art] done in designed simplicity.” Woodrow Ball, Klamath²⁵⁶

Some forty students, ranging in age from fifteen to twenty-two, chose to take the first classes in the SFIS Department of Painting and Design as electives.²⁵⁷ The majority of the students were from the Southwest – the Rio Grande Pueblos, the western Pueblos of Laguna, Acoma, Zuni, and the Hopi, the Navajo, and the Apache, with a few representatives from Plains Indians.²⁵⁸ Dunn’s plans for such a program were originally intended for only Southwestern students, presumably due not only to her preference for their arts, but because she hoped to work at the SFIS, which had traditionally been a regional school. However, unknown individuals back at BIA headquarters had decided to set up an all-tribal arts and crafts school at the SFIS, a “development,” according to Dunn, “of a few months.”²⁵⁹ Dunn subsequently had to improvise classes for the non-Southwestern students until, as she confessed, “detailed plans for them could be worked out.”²⁶⁰ Over the next five years, these unexpected students would include young men and women from Plains, Northwest, Californian, and Woodland tribes. This admission is

²⁵⁵ Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” 20; W. Jackson Rushing, “Modern by Tradition, the ‘Studio Style’ of Native American Painting,” in Bernstein and Rushing, *Modern by Tradition, American Painting in the Studio Style*, 38.

²⁵⁶ Woodrow Ball, “American Art,” *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 31.

²⁵⁷ Undated letter from Dorothy Dunn to “Margretta” [Dietrich], 93.DDK.183.

²⁵⁸ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 251.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

a bit odd given Dunn's insistence that she wanted to be a "guide" rather than a "teacher"; if she was only guiding all of the students, then why would she have needed to work out "detailed plans" separately for the Southwestern and non-Southwestern students?

That first year Dorothy Dunn spent half of her day teaching fifth-graders, and the other half introducing painting and design to her new art students under what she termed "impromptu circumstances."²⁶¹ The schedule must have been hectic for her since she also had to conduct the painting and design classes concurrently. Then there was the problem of limited supplies of paper, pencils, watercolors, brushes, etc, and even classroom space. That first year the Studio classes had to be held in the former display room of the new Arts and Crafts Building. The SFIS carpentry shop built some drawing boards for the students, but Dunn mentioned nothing about easels, canvases, or frames for stretching. The lack of easels and canvases might be explained by the fact that they were more expensive and harder to obtain than manila paper. However, Dunn may also have made the conscious decision to have the students paint on paper because such a method was closer to mural and pottery painting, and for the non-Southwestern students painting on hides and drawing in ledger books, and it eschewed completely the European tradition of painting on canvases. In any case, it is a misnomer to call Studio paintings easel art; all of them were executed on paper.

Clearly the pressure was centered on Dunn to develop a program that facilitated demonstratively creative work not only by her future painters, but by the arts and crafts students as well, and all this had to meet with the approval of administrators at the school

²⁶¹ Ibid., 260.

and back at BIA headquarters in Washington, D.C. The Curator's Report for the Indian Arts Fund for 1932-33 stated that all students wishing to study crafts at the SFIS would be required to study "design, drawing and painting."²⁶² This requirement not only increased Dunn's teaching load, but led to difficulties with arts and crafts students who did not want to pursue such studies. In a 1936 interview given to Jane Rehnstrand for an article that appeared in *The School Arts Magazine*, Dunn confessed that that first year "the students were as hard to convince as the outsiders," and that on the whole the year "was terribly discouraging most of the time."²⁶³

However, although Dunn's teaching demands were exacting from the start, she was afforded the opportunity to assess the artistic talents of a wide pool of students. Dunn described her assessment process in her book *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, as have W. Jackson Rushing and Bruce Bernstein in their essays in *Modern by Tradition: American Indian Painting in the Studio Style*. However, as the first historian of the Studio, Dunn also provided a detailed, chronological history of it from the fall of 1932 through the spring of 1937. This study will only highlight some of these activities that are relevant to understanding the students' attempts to express their Indian identity within the Studio art world.

Dunn chose not to use any art education texts or human models, but she did make appropriate books and publications available for the students to research, and these materials were exclusively about Indian art, e.g., Bureau of American Ethnology reports,

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Jane Rehnstrand, "Young Indians Revive The Natives Arts," *School Arts Magazine*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (November 1936), 140.

research portfolios from the Field Museum of Natural History, Peabody Museum Papers, *Mimbres Pottery Designs*, etc.²⁶⁴ She supplemented these materials with drawings and sketches she had done from her study of artifacts in the Indian Arts Fund, attendance at Southwest Indian ceremonials, and from visits to various museums made during the summer recesses. Among her drawings and paintings were also “do’s and don’ts”: the “do’s” included illustrated flat, two-dimensional depictions of Pueblo and Navajo ceremonial dancers and genre pieces; the “don’ts” were landscapes and other naturalistic subjects with shading and perspective.²⁶⁵ In effect, these illustrations did serve as models, although not in the traditional sense of using human models, and they do somewhat muddle Dunn’s claim to only having been a “guide,” rather than a teacher. Certainly Dunn was setting herself up for a daunting balancing act as she forged new ground in multicultural art education. She chose the pedagogical philosophy of her former professor at the Chicago Art Institute, Helen Gardner, as her guiding light. Gardner summed up this “guidance” in her book *Understanding the Arts*:

Guidance, we say. For neither book nor instructor can teach true appreciation of art any more than a guide can climb the mountain for the traveler. The most that one can do is offer guidance, to show a path which will help the student to do his own climbing, that is, to see, to feel, and to think for himself.²⁶⁶

Of course, the students needed to learn the rudiments of painting. In answering her self-imposed question of what “could be done with the few materials at hand to

²⁶⁴ Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” 22. Additional materials included *Introduction to American Art, Part I, Design in Nature*, “a book on lettering, one on fresco painting, and a few periodicals containing prints of Studio works.”

²⁶⁵ For examples of these “do’s” and “don’ts,” see Bernstein and Rushing, *Modern by Tradition, American Indian Painting in the Studio Style*, 17, 19, and 21.

²⁶⁶ Helen Gardner, *Understanding the Arts* (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1932), iii.

provide a common experience...and from which individual, free work might stem," Dunn attempted to show her students how to handle brushes and mix colors while they worked at communal tables.²⁶⁷ She also provided instruction in the techniques of arranging colors "in rainbow sequence" and in applying them "within controlled areas," and she engaged her students in exercises involving the nature of color relationships.²⁶⁸ From there, the students progressed to pictographic exercises with pencil, chalk, and charcoal, and then to watercolor and tempera. Dunn wrote that she "individually commended art tendencies and gave advice, not manual aid, where it seemed needed."²⁶⁹ She also admitted to having made suggestions "to develop peculiar aptitudes and original ideas," but "originality was constantly sought and encouraged."²⁷⁰ George Campbell Keahbone (Asaute), Dunn's only Kiowa student, recalled in 1993, "'Of course, she taught us mostly how to blend colors and things like that. The rest we did ourselves.'"²⁷¹ And Andrew Tsahnahjinnie (Yazzie Bahe/Little Grey) later recalled, "'She just gave us pencils and coloring and paper. So I watched the other tribes painting their own traditional dances...so I started painting my own traditional dancing.'"²⁷² As Klamath student Woodrow Ball stated above, the Studio paintings adhered to another core principle – the Indian painted his/her culture "in a true, simple style." Unfortunately, there is no evidence that Ball continued to paint after he left the Studio.

²⁶⁷ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 257.

²⁶⁸ Ibid.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 258.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 261.

²⁷¹ Wyckoff, *Visions and Voices*, 155.

²⁷² Ibid., 268.

The work for some of the students, however, did not proceed so successfully. Dunn lamented the lack of cooperation shown by a “small group” whose “poor work” and “negative attitude...were causing tensions in the class which were affecting the work of some of the students who now wanted to pursue only Indian art.”²⁷³ Presumably the “group” Dunn was referring to were the Plains students who had come to the SFIS to study arts and crafts with Mable Morrow. At the end of that first year, Dunn conceded that “most of the painting was rough,” but encouragingly there were “several promising trends in style and content,” while “technique, which seemed to interest the students more, would develop with practice.”²⁷⁴ Dunn also noted that “Names began to appear, even though to these admirably non-individualistic people it seemed superfluous to write one’s name upon a painting.”²⁷⁵

That first year Dunn and her students also ventured out of the school confines on excursions to the Laboratory of Anthropology, where the Indian Arts Fund collection was then housed, and to the Museum of New Mexico in order to study traditional Pueblo artifacts. Such excursions, which became a regular part of the Studio curriculum, not only brought the students into the physical extension of their art world, but certainly also contributed to their sense of self-esteem and confidence through interaction with the Santa Fe art community. In the spring of 1934 Dunn, Chapman, Mable Morrow and several of the students engaged in a series of ten lectures and demonstrations held at the Laboratory of Anthropology. On one occasion, artist-students Pablita Velarde, Andy

²⁷³ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 263.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 262.

Tsihnahjinnie, and Teofilo Tafoya painted at a table in front of Dunn while she gave a talk on modern Indian art. Although the purpose of this painting demonstration was almost certainly intended to educate the public about what was going on at the Studio, certainly these young artists must have been very self-conscious, and perhaps uncomfortable in being put on display as if they were acting in a tableau or being exhibited as a curiosity in a gallery. But Dunn and Chapman apparently believed that such a setting could only be beneficial to promoting an educated and respectful patronage of their art, and also draw the shy and heretofore alienated Indian youth into the Santa Fe art community. Indeed, the Studio itself became, in Dunn's estimation, "in some respects a public gallery, visited by artists, collectors, educators, government officials, and various people from most countries of the world," and "frequently and fairly regularly" by "fully a score of art-informed Santa Feans."²⁷⁶ All of these observers came to see the show, which was organized around fulfilling the task of discovering and finessing a new, modern Indian art form.

"Some of the Indians artists paint in a style that the white man says cannot be done. The Indian gets a perfectly balanced picture. The white artist generally puts a lot of unnecessary lines in a picture. We strive to tell a story in our painting with as few lines as possible and we leave out all unnecessary details. We never use a model for our art. It is all done from memory. Every student in our class has a distinct style of his own." Andy Tsihnahjinnie, Navajo²⁷⁷

²⁷⁶ Dunn, "The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School," 22.

²⁷⁷ Andy Tsihnahjinnie, "American Art," *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 24.

As stated earlier, Dunn organized the Studio around, as she termed it, “one fixed principle only [that] was absolute: the painting would have to be *Indian*.²⁷⁸ Although “Indian” was apparently what Dunn, Chapman, Morrow, and Superintendent Faris, and others who were carrying out this new BIA program of culturally-sensitive education reforms conceived it to be, this statement would continue to haunt Dunn not only for the rest of her tenure at the Studio, but also become a bone of contention for subsequent critics. The following is the outline of objectives and procedures for this ambitious plan in Dunn’s own words:

- 1) to foster appreciation of Indian painting among students and public, thus helping to establish it in its rightful place as one of the fine arts of the world (a continuation of certain preceding aspects of the Santa Fe movement), 2) to produce new paintings in keeping with high standards already attained by Indian painters, 3) to study and explore traditional Indian art methods and productions in order to continue established basic painting forms, and to evolve new motifs, styles, and techniques in character with the old and worthy of supplementing them, 4) to maintain tribal and individual distinction in the paintings.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the broad plan of procedure was 1) to determine, insofar as possible, each student’s personality, interests, abilities, the backgrounds of his tribal art and its relationship to his individual art and the general arts, 2) without teaching in the formal sense, to create a guidance technique which would provide motivation, clarification, and development for each individual student’s painting process.²⁷⁹

The first objective would require the students to think in new ways about their decorative traditions – new ways acquired from Euro-American culture and Western Civilization. Dorothy Dunn believed that “it did not occur to most of” the students “to think of Indian art as *art*” because “Indian art was something accepted without thinking

²⁷⁸ Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” 18.

²⁷⁹ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 252.

about it, as a part of everyday life, whereas *art* [for them] was some sort of composite of magazine and book illustrations, posters, calendar scenes, etc.”²⁸⁰ Dunn also surmised that “the concept of the universal fine arts of which their own is an integral part was utterly unknown to any one of the students in the entire school,” and “this was a concept which would have to be acquired gradually.”²⁸¹ She was saying that the students, as Indians, knew what art was, but simply did not conceive of it in the same way that other cultures did, and this is where her envisioned role as a “guide” came in.

Dunn’s first task was to introduce the students to the rudiments, e.g., different paints, brush techniques, painting on a piece of paper, etc., monitor work for Indian content, and then introduce the students to the “concept of the universal fine arts” so that they could appreciate their contribution to it. In order to achieve these goals, Dunn adamantly believed that academic training had to be eschewed, as she explained in the following excerpt from “The Function of Design and Painting Classes at the Santa Fe Indian School.”

Academic training, as the European-American knows it, has no place in a class in Indian painting. It cannot possibly furnish a basis for the development of an art which is an outgrowth of a racial psychology distinctly different from that of the European-American. Instead of academic training, the Indian painter should be given an extremely sensitive guidance in the revelation of his own inherent possibilities. The freer an Indian artist is of foreign influence, the more rapid and complete his native development will be.

This guidance could be given through the constant watch for and discerning recognition of every tendency in each individual’s artistic development. The good (in the Indian sense) tendencies should be immediately encouraged, and he undesirable ones defeated as carefully and promptly as possible.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 254.

²⁸¹ Ibid.

The guide's chief duty in the matter lies in acquiring somewhat of an Indian culture himself, in order that he can actually recognize a good piece of Indian art when he sees it and that he can sense, in a measure, the workings of the Indian mind. This can be done only by a great amount of observation of Indian work and life from the Indian's point of view.²⁸²

Perhaps the most striking feature of Dunn's conception of Indian art was that it was an "outgrowth of a racial psychology distinctly different from that of the European-American," however that statement is in competition with the guide's assignment to encourage "good (in the Indian sense) tendencies" and to defeat "undesirable ones" "as carefully and promptly as possible." On their face, such assignments belie the more benign assignation of guidance. Yet at the same time the guide needed to engage in a cross-cultural assimilation "from the Indian's point of view." It is hard to imagine how Dunn could have taken on more complex tasks for herself, but she did.

In that same document, Dunn extolled the "highest standards of the race" that would be reflected in the "high standard of achievement" by her students, but she also stressed the importance of individual creativity, again apparently seeing no contradiction with the concurrent goal of remaining true to tribal traditions.²⁸³ Dunn listed seven functions of the classes "in general," with five (nos. 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7) clearly focused on students as creative individuals and only two (nos. 3 and 5) on the students as a creative group. The functions were:

1. To bring out each individual's own best tendencies, keeping them as pure and original as possible, searching always for the new, emphasizing the great value of originality.

²⁸² Undated typewritten document "The Function of Design and Painting Classes at the Santa Fe Indian School," 93.DDK.022.

²⁸³ 93.DDK.022.

2. To develop judgment in the individual student; for instance, development of the ability to see the difference between the gaudy sketches in the curio shops and the refined ones in the permanent collection of the art museums.
3. To work toward a high standard of achievement by constantly raising the general level of the class work. To approach the highest standard s [sic] of the race by using fine products for examples; never using European-American criteria except in cases where they are big enough to be universal.
4. To create a market for the students' work, chiefly through exhibitions. In this connection to appeal to the highest type of appreciation and to develop appreciation in the public. To encourage the right attitude of the artist towards his sales and to cause him to feel a responsibility toward his part in the exhibition in order that he acquire the ability to handle his own affairs when he leaves school.
5. To use the laboratory and museums intelligently.²⁸⁴
6. To discover talent and encourage art work where it might not take form otherwise.
7. To develop in each student a genuine appreciation of Indian art in general and of his own tribe's in particular. By comparison and contrast with other so-called 'American art,' to show the Indian that the accomplishments of his race are not inferior, but that in many respects they have actually gone farther.²⁸⁵

Aside from the paradox of simultaneously seeking to foster an art that was both individual and racial, confusions also arises from Dunn's addressing the art as being both tribal and racial. However, Dunn seems to have considered tribal art synonymous with racial art, and such thinking was still common among white non-Indians who considered Indians a separate race. As mentioned earlier, American anthropologists in the 1930s were just beginning to move away from the traditional paradigm of race in their approach to studying American Indians to a new one based on culture. Dunn's lack of distinction between racial and tribal concepts can certainly be understood as characteristic of her

²⁸⁴ Presumably "laboratory" referred to is the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, New Mexico, where Dunn took the students to study Indian art and artifacts.

²⁸⁵ 93.DDK.022.

time, and certainly Dunn was not a racist in the sense of thinking that Indians were an inferior race to Caucasians. Certainly her goals, even though they were based on this fusion, or confusion, of concepts – and perhaps because of this – were laudably ahead of their time.

Dunn's explanation for why she eschewed traditional European-American “academic training” in favor of “extremely sensitive guidance in the revelation” of the Indian artist’s “inherent possibilities” was likewise based on her perception of the racial nature of the project. To reiterate, in Dunn's thinking, “academic training” could not “possibly furnish the basis for the development of an art” that was “an outgrowth of a racial psychology distinctly different from that of the European-American; furthermore, “The freer an Indian artist” was “of foreign influences, the more rapid and complete his native development” would be. Given this insistence on what amount to being genetically engineered artists operating in a vacuum, perhaps Dunn could have called the program “The Laboratory of Indian Art” instead of “Studio.” Indeed, given this prescription for physical isolation, perhaps the institutional setting of a government-run boarding school was appropriate for such an experiment, rather than at home in the pueblos and reservations where the artists' authentic creativity might have been tainted by inside and outside influences.

Of course, many critics of the Studio have maintained just the opposite, arguing that authenticity could never be present in the cultural isolation of an institutional setting dominated by white administrators and patrons. Dunn has also been much criticized for wielding control over the students' work, which she undeniably did. In her own words,

she spoke about being on “constant watch” and making sure that “undesirable” tendencies were “defeated.” Of course, practically every Euro-American teacher of art would admit that they had provided the same kind of guidance. But the art education methods and paintings at the Studio were inextricably entwined with notions of *race*, both by Dunn and others inside the Studio art world, by the majority of American society at the time, and by students and critics of the Studio to the present day.

There are the inescapable facts that a white, non-Indian woman, Dunn, was the self-professed “guide” or official “teacher” at the Studio, that the very setting was controlled by white, non-Indian administrators, all of whom were guided by the long-prevalent, white ethnocentric notions of Indians being a distinct race largely segregated within the borders of the United States. However, Dunn also perceived that as a guide, she needed to acquire “somewhat of an Indian culture” herself by observing – and understanding as much as possible – “life from the Indian’s point of view.” In other words, although she lacked the current academic vocabulary to express it, Dunn realized that she needed to cross the borders of the two cultures. However, in her thinking, this was required only of the guide; the Indian artist-students needed to remain within their own borders. But as she worked out the program in practice, Dunn exposed her students to the art of many cultures in order to show them where their art fit into the universal world of art, and in that sense she broadened her students’ understanding of the uniqueness of their art, and of their sense of place in the world in an excursion that stretched the borders of their culture and identity, while at the same time preserving it.

But as the young Navajo artist Andy Tsihnajjinnie (Little Grey) testified in the quote above, he and his cohorts were keenly aware that they possessed a painting style all their own. First of all, he pointed out that Indian painters told a story from their memory; they did not need models. In telling their story, Indian painters also eliminated extraneous “details” and used “as few lines as possible”; they strove to express the essence of their message. In Tsahnajjinnie’s view, Dunn did not need to promote individuality of expression; it came naturally to each student, who had a “distinct style of his own.” His statement boldly asserted the uniqueness of Indian art in contradistinction to the painting of the white artist; and it followed that no white, non-Indian person could teach Indians how to paint – a belief that Dunn also held, hence her self-professed role as a “guide” to the independent-minded Studio artist-students. Dunn recognized the genius of Tsahnajjinnie’s “incisive interpretation, spontaneity of brushwork, originality of color, vigor of draftsmanship and vitality of action,” and she singled him out as having had “no equals among the artists of the studio and perhaps few superiors among the modern painters.²⁸⁶ Indeed, Dunn effusively concluded that “If equanimity and self-confidence were to rule his artistic abilities, Tsahnajjinnie might well be one of America’s top-ranking painters.”²⁸⁷ After his service in World War II, Tsahnajjinnie went on to pursue an illustrious career as a full-time painter.

Dunn might have also wished such “equanimity and self-confidence” for herself. She was finding it increasingly difficult to navigate the very real and mundane world of

²⁸⁶ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 302.

²⁸⁷ Ibid.

BIA and school politics. In the spring of 1933 while Dunn was overseeing a group project for a marionette play that included both her fifth graders and students in the painting and design program, she was also preparing for the Studio's first exhibit of paintings. Apparently it was a stressful time for both students and guide. Dunn recorded in her private papers that she was frustrated not only by students' lack of progress in creating the marionettes, but by the behavior of some of the boys who were cutting class and being otherwise uncooperative. The marionettes were to depict the Hopi's ceremonial clowns called the "Wutzi," and the stage setting was based on those used in traditional Hopi ceremonies. A young man from Hopi Pueblo, Philip Zeyouma, was significantly involved in this project, and although he would go on to study in the Studio until 1937, at the time Dunn lamented his "disrespectful" attitude.²⁸⁸ Despite these frustrations, the play was successfully performed at the end of April, with the German artist Gustav Baumann and his wife, who were now Santa Fe art aficionados, approvingly in attendance. Then about a week later the Studio's first exhibit in the Art Gallery of the Museum of New Mexico opened.

Olive Rush, the artist who had supervised the first mural project at the SFIS, wrote the review of that first Studio exhibit for the *Santa Fe New Mexican* newspaper, and she was effusive in her praise for Dunn's endeavors. Rush wrote, "Under the direction of Dorothy Dunn, who has a keen appreciation of the Indian's native ability and flair for significant expression," the young artists had proved "that they need only their

²⁸⁸ 93.DDK.022.

own various forms to come through to brilliant racial expression.”²⁸⁹ Continuing on regarding the racial nature of the project and Dunn’s sensitivity to it, Rush wrote, “It is for her [Dunn] to tread softly a path she must pursue with courage and caution; it is for her to forget all rules she learned in the schools, not to commit the blunder of teaching one race the point of view, or method of attack, of another.”²⁹⁰ Dunn was no doubt heartened by this praise, especially since Rush had visited the Studio to observe the painting in progress. Dunn was also very pleased with the reception the Santa Fe art community as a whole gave to this first exhibit, noting that “Many Santa Fe artists and art patrons became acquainted with this younger supplement to the development they had been fostering among adult Indian painters,” and that they also “offered immediate backing through their favorable comments and their purchases.”²⁹¹ However, just as the art world of the Studio was coalescing, it was being threatened with an early demise.

Indeed, it appeared that these successes were going to be the first and last hurrahs for the Studio. On April 4, 1933 the school principal, Don May, informed Dunn that there was little chance that a permanent civil service position for an art teacher would be established, so the Studio was going to be closed at the end of May. He also declined Dunn’s offer to stay on without an official position.²⁹² But, curiously, the list of courses to be offered during the 1933-1934 year that was published in the school paper, *Tequayo*, included “Drawing and Painting, Water color and oil in the Indian manner, Mural

²⁸⁹ Olive Rush, “Indian Students Show Work,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 4, 1933, 4.

²⁹⁰ Ibid.

²⁹¹ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 267.

²⁹² Ibid., 266.

painting,” “Design,” and “Indian Culture – All Tribes.”²⁹³ Perhaps administrators planned to replace Dunn with a new teacher. But Dunn apparently still had the fifth-grade teacher position for the next school term since she recorded in her “notes” for the Studio that Morrow “made the summer work drudgery and slavery,” and that she longed to resign, opining “it’s breaking my spirit even!”²⁹⁴

However, that same summer Rose K. Brandt, the Supervisor for Elementary Education at BIA headquarters in Washington, D.C., conducted an official review of the Studio and subsequently “reversed the local order pending decision of Dr. Ryan and the Civil Service Commission in a fair consideration of the studio’s worth.”²⁹⁵ Apparently this reconsideration was partly due to advocacy from the Santa Fe art community since Dunn credited the “interest of the N.M. Association of Indian Affairs, certain Santa Fe artists, and other appreciative individuals” with helping “very greatly to gain recognition for the work of the Studio.”²⁹⁶ According to Margretta Stewart Dietrich, the Studio was one of the “chief concerns” of the NMAIA Arts and Crafts Committee which she was also a member of.²⁹⁷ Other concerned NMAIA members and Santa Fe artists lobbied the Bureau vociferously to reverse the closure ordered by SFIS’s “supervisors and superintendent.”²⁹⁸ In the end, the order was reversed, and Dunn gave all the credit to

²⁹³ *Tequayo*, United States Indian School, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1932-1933.

²⁹⁴ Document titled “Notes,” 93.DDK.022.

²⁹⁵ Letter from Dunn to “Margretta” [Dietrich], 93.DDK.183.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁷ Margretta Stewart Dietrich, *New Mexico Recollections, Part I*, 19.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

Rose K. Brandt, and “to her alone.”²⁹⁹ In September 1933, the Studio reopened on a “full time” basis, but as a “still unofficial project.”³⁰⁰ But Brandt promised Dunn that she would continue to lobby Dr. Ryan, the Director of Education, to establish the Studio officially and permanently.

Despite this tenuous existence, Dunn began the second year optimistically, observing that most of the students had “become genuinely interested in developing their painting upon Indian precedents,” although there were some, primarily students who were being forced by the Department of Arts and Crafts curriculum to take the painting and design classes, who objected to the lack of formal lessons (they were probably the same students whom Dunn complained about during the first year).³⁰¹ But Dunn was pleased that she was no longer teaching the fifth grade and was now able to conduct full-day classes in the Studio, and this new arrangement might have been due to the fact that enrollment in the Studio had doubled. However, most of the students were still only able to come in for half a day, and others continued to work before and after going to their classes and completing assigned chores.

In addition to the regular painting and design classes, the students were engaged in group projects for painting murals both on the walls of the SFIS and for outside commissions. Aside from the artistic exercise involved in painting these murals, Dunn believed it was important for the students, situated as they were in a non-reservation boarding school setting, to engage in such group activity which was “the prevailing order

²⁹⁹ Document written by Dunn with title “Studio notes,” 93.DDK.222.

³⁰⁰ Letter from Dunn to “Margretta” [Dietrich], 93.DDK.183.

³⁰¹ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 56.

in the Indian communities.”³⁰² Dunn also considered group projects to be “conducive to the integration of the various educational branches of the school.”³⁰³

One project entailed the gathering and preparation of earth paints for murals in the Studio, and according to Dunn, “visitors,” presumably Indian ones, joined in the search for the needed clays, sandstones, and ores.³⁰⁴ During the Studio’s second year, another group of students came together to design and paint murals corresponding to the subjects of astronomy, geology, biology, botany, zoology, physics, and chemistry on the walls of the science room. In launching this project, Dunn posed to them the following questions; “Could not a part of the conflict between the old art and the new be resolved in the science murals by showing in them that many elemental concepts of art and science are neither old nor new but eternal and commonly shared?” and, “Was there a conflict with tribal ideas?”³⁰⁵ In response to the latter question, according to Dunn the students believed that “the new information resolved and clarified some of the mysticism of older beliefs.”³⁰⁶ The following is Dunn’s description of the *Zoology* and *Botany* panels:

Zoology presents, through abstract forms, animal life from the lower orders to the higher, from sea prominence to land prominence. *Botany* shows a similar sequence of plant life from the mosses, ferns, and palms to such modern forms as yucca, giant cactus, Indian paintbrush, and aspen. A completely abstract composition between these two panels represents the carbon cycle and the principal factors – light, soil, water – necessary to life. Waves of color symbolize carbon dioxide given to plants by animals on one side, and oxygen given to animals by plants on the other side.³⁰⁷

³⁰² Dorothy Dunn, “Indian Children Carry Forward Old Traditions,” *School Arts Magazine*, Vol. 34, No. 7 (Mar. 1935), 432.

³⁰³ Ibid.

³⁰⁴ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 269-270.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 274.

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 274-275.

Dunn had viewed this project as a challenge “for the modern-yearning Indian young people to see how well their amazingly *modern* traditional motifs might unite with some of the most advanced ideas of the modern world,” and she judged that they had met the challenge beautifully.³⁰⁸ In addition to the obvious artistic exercise and study of scientific disciplines, the philosophical intent behind the murals was to have the students understand and express how they were not isolated individuals in a dying culture, that their cultures were relevant and stood worthily aside world cultures, and that they and everyone else could learn from each other. Unfortunately, the world will have to take Dunn’s word on that since the science murals were painted over in the spring of 1937, which was her last semester at the SFIS. Superintendent Seymour saw fit to write a letter of apology on this score to Dunn, and he explained that by the time he discovered that the murals were being painted over, the “work of covering them had already gone too far” and the only thing left to do “was to paint over what had not already been destroyed.”³⁰⁹ Seymour suggested that next time the students should varnish their murals – a suggestion that Dunn most likely considered infuriatingly ludicrous.

³⁰⁸ Ibid.

³⁰⁹ 93DDK.162, letter dated March 11, 1937 from Seymour to Dunn.

“Art depicts civilization, therefore art done by Americans has faded and merged, but now through art appreciation America will rise soon, we hope, to an individual and purely American art....From the Conquistadores to the present, nearly all of America’s art and culture has followed the lines and traditions of early ideals established by Europe. Now American is becoming interested in American culture....The fragments brushed aside by the Conquistadores are being complied [sic] and studied. The ‘American artists’ are not going to Europe to study and paint; they are painting America. In other words, ‘America is becoming ‘America-minded.’” Woodrow Ball, Klamath³¹⁰

Studio artist-students literally painted America in a series of earth colors murals painted on the walls of the social science classroom, the narrative of which spans pre-colonial North America through the United States of the 1930s. This group of ten students included representatives from the Navajo, Sioux, Apache, Cherokee, Klamath, and five Pueblos, and they labored over them for four months, much of the time outside class hours.³¹¹ The only known reproduction of these murals shows six panels that are read in sequence from left to right.³¹² The first two panels contain genre scenes from pre-colonial history in which the cultures of Pueblo, Plains, and Northeast Indian cultures are depicted through the grouping of men and women in typical tribal costumes and shown surrounded by their type of housing, e.g., pueblo multistoried buildings, teepees, and longhouses, agricultural products (corn plants being predominant), and types of animals hunted and consumed (deer, buffalo, and turkeys). However, at the beginning of the third panel we see the arrival of a ship bearing a Christian cross on its sails, followed by

³¹⁰ Woodrow Ball, “American Art,” *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 30.

³¹¹ Dunn gave the following list of these students: “Woodrow Ball, Klamath; Felice Cheromiah and William Sarracino, Laguna Pueblo; Dan Quiver, Sioux; Andrew Tsighnahjinnie and Ha-So-De, Navajo; Po-Qui, Santa Clara Pueblo; Emeliano Yepa, Jemez Pueblo; Allan Houser, Apache; Bennie Manzanares, San Juan Pueblo; Cecil Dick, Cherokee; Tonita Lujan, Taos Pueblo.” Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 280.

³¹² The reproduction appears in *School Arts Magazine*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (November 1936), 130.

Spanish priests and conquistadores proceeding across the panel up to an encounter with a Southwest Indian man. However, the painters did not forget the colonization of the Northeast, which is included by showing the profiles of an Indian man and woman who appear to be supplicant to a Puritan man standing force-square.

The narrative in the next panel repeats this last group of three individuals, and is followed by two generic Indian men who are on bowed knees before a white man who appears to either be English or American. The next figures are of two white men and an Indian woman, who might be the early nineteenth-century Louisiana Purchase explorers Meriwether Lewis and William Clark accompanied by their Shoshoni guide Sacagewea; the woman is pointing to a Conestoga wagon being drawn by a horse, perhaps indicating the coming of settlers across the continent towards the Pacific Ocean. The fifth panel continues to depict this continental march of white colonization with the engine of a train—the train, of course, being the means through which colonization’s path was efficiently and irrevocably laid out. Next we see farms, silos, and automobiles, but towards the end Indians are seen tilling the soil – this time wearing western-style hats and using modern implements – and finally an Indian is seen going to an adobe-style home modernized with glass windows and a wooden door, over which shines a Navajo or Pueblo stylized sun. But in the last panel we see a fusing of Indian and non-Indian lifestyles. The fifth panel is joined to the last by the same image of the modernized adobe and a Navajo or Indian depiction of the sun begins the narrative, followed by a car, bus, and streamlined modern train juxtaposed in front of a Navajo hogan, a woman making a rug, and a Navajo man herding sheep – a juxtaposition that clearly expresses the

differences between the two cultures, but also expresses the strain the artists felt in trying to bring the two together. At the end of the panel we see the train moving off the frame with an obscurely painted modern cityscape behind it and an airplane overhead, which suggests that this was the future into which both cultures were headed. But this image also poses an open-ended question of just how Indian identity would fare; would it continue under the nebulous rubric of an “Indian” identity, or would it discover and define itself as an *American* Indian identity as it progressed into the twentieth century? How would Indian identity confront modernity in general? Dunn believed that the artist-students could at least search for and express some answers to such monumental questions in their art.

Olive Rush once again wrote the review of the annual exhibition of Studio paintings for the *Santa Fe New Mexican* in May 1934. She mentioned the science and social science murals at the beginning of the piece, with the following comment: “But the art lover and connoisseur needs no promptings such as those [i.e., the murals] to win him to the side of art rich in design and wild in flavor from various tribes and nations.”³¹³ What is equally significant here is that instead of lauding the artist-students’ “brilliant racial expression” as she had when reviewing the 1933 exhibit, Rush had now shifted her perception of their work to one that was culturally based on the traditions of their tribes and nations. This was a shift, however imperceptible it may have been at the time, toward understanding what the students themselves were actually painting instead of relying on the timeworn concept of race. And it was as well a shift toward recognizing

³¹³ Olive Rush, “Remarkable Paintings by Indians at Art Museum,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 7, 1934.

the tribal and national identities of the artist-students. Rush also devoted more space this time to discussing the works and backgrounds of individual artists, and this in itself must have certainly been a surprise for them since it not only bestowed recognition of, and honor to, their accomplishments, but publicized them in a way that few other Indians anywhere in the country experienced. One can only imagine the wonder that Eileen Lesarley, a fifteen-year-old from Zuni Pueblo, might have felt when she read that “her first painting...would stand up anywhere,” or when Nehalsije was mentioned as being the first and only Apache painter in the Studio³¹⁴.

By the third year, the initial Studio enrollment had more than quadrupled with a “proportionate increase” of students from the Sioux, Omaha, Kiowa, Cherokee, Salish, Chiricahua Apache, Cheyenne, and Arapaho nations.³¹⁵ Exciting though this was for Dunn, the increased enrollment further strained the program’s budget and facilities. However, by October the Studio had moved into a newly renovated building where the old library had been (a renovation largely accomplished by the students from the Studio and campus at large). And while members from the Santa Fe art colony had visited frequently during the first year, there now came now a steady stream of visitors that included prominent figures from foreign countries. Several prominent international figures visited the Studio and extolled the students’ efforts. As mentioned earlier, Moises Saenz, Mexico’s Minister of Education, was interested in seeing how the Studio project compared to similar indigenous projects at home. H. D. C. Pepler from England arranged

³¹⁴ Ibid. “Nehalsije” appears to have been either a misspelling or alternate spelling of the name of the Jicarilla Apache young man elsewhere named Steven Vicente or Nehakije.

³¹⁵ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 277.

for an exhibit of Studio paintings at the Royal College of Art, London, and Pedro J. Lemos, Director of the Museum of Fine Arts at Stanford University, requested one for a campus museum. A major exhibition of Studio paintings at the Musee d'Ethnographie of the Trocadero in Paris, France, also took place in June 1935 after Paul Coze, a French artist and ethnologist, visited the Studio. Aside from the publicity which such exhibits brought the Studio, and the success born of fame that would hopefully convince BIA administrators to keep it open, Dunn's hopes for artistic creativity were also coupled with her concerns that such talents would improve the students' economic welfare.³¹⁶ Writing in a special Indian arts issue of *The School Arts Magazine*, which was edited by Pedro J. Lemos, Dunn expressly stated that she not only wanted to provide the students with a setting that appreciated and encouraged "individual manners of expression," but with the "sponsorship of appropriate exhibitions, and guidance in adequate marketing of their productions."³¹⁷ Furthermore, she stated that "A dignified manner of exhibiting and selling their work is a very valuable thing for the Indian boys and girls to learn because

³¹⁶ The following is a partial list of institutions and organizations to which Dunn sent Studio paintings for exhibition during her tenure: Addison Gallery of American Art at Philips Academy, Andover, Mass.; Musee d'Ethnographie, Trocadero, Paris, France; Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C.; School of the Art Institute, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago Academy of Fine Arts; San Francisco Museum of Art; Faulkner Memorial Gallery, Santa Barbara, Ca.; Central Coast Teachers Institute, Santa Cruz, Ca.; Public schools, San Jose, Ca.; International Children's Exhibit, Santa Rosa, Cal.; New Jersey State Museum, Trenton, N.J.; The Watercolor Gallery, Goose Rocks Beach, Maine; Syracuse University, N.Y.; Berea College, Kentucky; Witte Memorial Museum, San Antonio, Tex.; Hollins College, Va.; Public Library, Little Rock, Ark.; Germantown Friends School, Philadelphia, Pa.; Oneonta State Normal School, Oneonta, N.Y.; Clarksville public schools, Clarksville, Pa.; Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Greenville Public Schools, Greenville, Mich.; Roswell Public Schools, Roswell, N.M.; Seattle Women's Club, Seattle, Wash.; United States Tacoma Hospital, Tacoma, Wash.; University of Oklahoma, Norma, Okla.; Western State Teachers' College, Gunnison, Col.; Easter Arts Association Convention; Southeastern Arts Association Convention; Morris Studios, Cleveland, Oh.; Fred Wilson's, Phoenix, Ariz.; National education Association Convention; National Association of Indian Affairs meeting; New Mexico State Teachers Convention; and Second National Exhibition of American Art, Rockefeller Center, N.Y.

³¹⁷ Dunn, "Indian Children Carry Forward Old Traditions," 427.

they would cheapen their art by peddling it or they might have it exploited if they depended entirely upon selling through nondescript dealers.”³¹⁸ In Dunn’s estimation, the proper and non-exploitative marketing of Studio paintings would not only assimilate modern Indian painting into the fine arts world, but also into the American economy while bolstering their native dignity. On this score, she was in step with the philosophy of John Collier and the Indian New Deal.

Studio paintings were sold at the annual end-of-school-year exhibitions held at the Museum of New Mexico, the annual Santa Fe Indian Fairs, individual Southwest Indian fairs, and at the Studio itself. According to Dunn, the income from sales during the first year was “approximately \$75,” but in 1936 and 1937 the gross had increased to “about \$1500-\$1600,” with the selling price for individual paintings ranging between \$0.25 to \$40.00,” and the average price \$5.00, but “better paintings” bringing between \$10.00 and \$40.00.³¹⁹ The artist received half of the selling price, and the other half was placed in the Indian Arts and Crafts Fund “from which all materials and incidental expenses were provided.”³²⁰ Aside from making a little money, and even then it should be remembered that these seemingly paltry amounts were worth considerably more in the Depression era, the students’ participation in these exhibitions was very important on another level. Santa Clara artist-student Pablita Velarde recalled that such activities forced her and her classmates to overcome their bashfulness to “make sales talk,” which they did not know

³¹⁸ Ibid.

³¹⁹ Undated letter from Dorothy Dunn to “Margretta” [Dietrich], 93.DDK.183.

³²⁰ Ibid.

how to do since previously traders had just taken what they wanted.³²¹ Velarde recalled that Dunn would tell them, “Talk! Talk! Talk! Don’t just stand there, talk to them! Tell them this and that about your work,” and “finally they got it out of their system that...if they talked more, they would sell more.”³²²

However, Velarde also recalled that the students did not choose which of their works would be sent to exhibits; this was a task that Dunn and Kenneth Chapman carried out. Paintings were also often chosen not just on the basis of qualitative judgment, but according to how many ceremonial figures were depicted. The number of figures could also determine the prize category and asking price. For example, a 1934 directive from the Arts and Crafts Committee of the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs (formerly the Southwest Indian Fair Committee) to members sent to judge local Indian fairs in New Mexico and Arizona stated that the dollar amount of prizes would be based on the number of figures depicted, e.g., seven or more received \$5.00, less than seven \$3.00.³²³ This award schedule was implemented at the Zuni Fair in October 1935, and presumably along with the NMAIA requirement that “strictly non-Indian designs such as flags, ledge emblems, etc., will not be considered.”³²⁴ At the 1935 annual Studio exhibition, prices were fixed in the following categories: one figure; less than seven figures; and more than seven figures.³²⁵ Presumably, the more the figures, the larger was

³²¹ Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

³²² Ibid.

³²³ “Premium List, Arts and Crafts Committee, New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs,” 89KC0.029.

³²⁴ Ibid.; and “Premium List,” 89KC0.030.

³²⁵ “Prize List, Awards at the Santa Fe Indian School Fair, May 20, 1935,” 89.KC0.030.

the size of the painting. Of course, such criteria were decidedly not applied in any way to paintings on the American art scene, and their imposition was not only arbitrarily placed upon Indian paintings, but smacked as well of non-Indian aesthetes smudging a taint of inferiority on them as well. Such quantification also implied that these patrons overwhelmingly desired ceremonial paintings – essentially what they conceived to be the quintessential subject insuring “Indian authenticity.” However, the artist-students at the Studio nevertheless discovered new subjects for their paintings – paintings that, as will we will see, expressed their broadening expressions of self-identity.

“The modern Paintings [sic] consist of ceremonies and other dances. They paint the things they do in every day life. Some of the animals and some scenes are similar to Persian paintings. Designs that the modern painters paint are purely abstract. None of the paintings are realistic. Beautiful paintings are produced more and more which emphasizes that the Indian art is rising again.” Ha-we-la-na, Marcelina Herrera, Zia³²⁶

Aside from the financial endorsements the students received from the sale of their paintings, it is difficult to discern exactly how the Studio’s white patrons conceived of the art, of just how they believed it was authentically Indian and of artistic value, other than the fact that it was painted by Indians and was wholly devoted to depicting Indian subjects and designs. However, the reviews of the annual Studio exhibitions offer some concrete insight into how two of the Studio’s principal supporters, Olive Rush and Frederick H. Douglas, traced the development of Studio art, and into what they desired from it.

³²⁶ Herrera, “American Art,” *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 30.

In the spring of 1933 Frederic H. Douglas, the first Curator of Native Arts at the Denver Art Museum, made a surprise visit to the Studio to evaluate the work being carried out there. According to Dunn, Douglas “made enthusiastic remarks” to the students and told them he wanted to purchase some of their paintings for the Denver Art Museum, all of which she said “raised the Studio morale incalculably.”³²⁷ Douglas’s endorsement also broadened the range of the Studio’s art world early on into the country’s *art* museum culture, instead of into museums of natural history and ethnography. Much to the benefit of the Studio, Douglas was attempting to insure that the Studio paintings would be appreciated as *art*, which at the time was a novel idea that had only recently been introduced to American connoisseurs of art at the Exposition of Indian Tribal Arts in New York City.

Organized by artist John Sloan and writer Oliver La Farge, the Exposition opened in December 1931 at the Grand Central Galleries in order to show the world that Indian tribal art should be appreciated as an art rather than as an anthropological curiosity.³²⁸ Sloan and La Farge also hoped that the show, which also went on a two-year tour in leading art venues nationwide, would promote a respectable and appropriate market for Indian artists that would encourage them to continue to paint. Along with artifacts, the Exposition included paintings by Pueblo painters such as Crescencio Martinez, Awa Tsireh, Oqwa Pi, Otis Polelonema, Ma-Pe-Wi, Wo-Peen, and Fred Kabotie, and by the Kiowa painters such as Mopope, Hokeah, and Auchiah. Somewhat serendipitously, the

³²⁷ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 266.

³²⁸ See Sloan, John and Oliver La Farge, eds., *Introduction to American Indian Art* (New York: Exhibition of Indian Tribal Arts, 1931).

Studio stepped in to continue on this path of artistic recognition of Indian arts just as the Exposition tour was winding down – a fact that Douglas and Dunn probably seized upon. As discussed earlier, several of these painters exhibited had painted murals at the Santa Fe Indian School a few months prior to the opening of the Studio. Writing from the perspective of the 1960s, Dunn believed that the 1931 Exposition opened “the eyes of the nation to the beauty and worth of Indian arts and crafts.”³²⁹ Oliver La Farge also became a frequent visitor to the Studio and wholeheartedly supported its artist-students’ endeavors to contribute their art to the whole of American art.

However, by 1935 Frederic H. Douglas appeared to have had a change of heart regarding just how “Indian” the Studio paintings should be, and whether the artists should be constrained by the desire for perceived “Indianness.” In his review of the annual Studio exhibition, Douglas wrote:

One hears complaints today that some of the Indian painters have abandoned their flat early style in favor of experiments with three dimensional shading and perspective. These objections are quite understandable, for the ‘good-old-days’ complex is strong in all of us. Yet would we be satisfied with the flat stiffness of the Byzantine or early Renaissance painters if we knew that the beauties of depth painting are possible. If this Indian art is to reach its height, it seems to me that we must forget that it is Indian and think only of it as art. If it tends to develop three dimensions, let it. Why should we keep it rudimentary just because we have a sentimental fondness for the simplicity which we conceive to be characteristic of the Indian?³³⁰

When Douglas raised the notion that the Studio paintings, and indeed all paintings by Indian artists, should be thought of as a generic “art” rather than as “Indian,” he was

³²⁹ Dunn, “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” 17.

³³⁰ Dr. Eric Douglas, “Denver Art Curator Reviews Indian Exhibit at Museum,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 4, 1935.

raising a thorny issue concerning authenticity that lingers on into the present. As stated earlier, Dorothy Dunn was much maligned by later critics such as J. J. Brody for demanding that the art had to be “Indian,” and indeed she did lay down that requirement to her artist-students. However, there are many examples of three-dimensionality in the collections of Studio paintings purchased by Margretta Stewart Dietrich and by Dorothy Dunn herself; is that fact alone not evidence that Dunn accepted such inventions? However, Douglas also wondered whether Pueblo painters in particular would “turn to landscape or portraiture.”³³¹ Douglas posed this question in the context of tracing what he saw as the students’ progression from “the older fondness for drawings of ceremonies” to “a vogue for genre paintings illustrating scenes of daily” – a progression that he saw advancing as the students continued to paint.³³² Douglas viewed this as a natural progression resulting from the “artistic urge of these young intellects” that was “too vital to stand still,” with “new forms ever appearing, not only because of the spread of the art to tribes of other cultures, but among the varied pueblos.”³³³ Douglas considered the Studio artists to be engaged in the same process of development that all *artists*, read generic, went through as they experimented with subjects and forms and, in other words, found their true identity in the evolution of their work. Yet, Douglas still could not free himself from thinking of the Studio artist-students as representatives of the Indian race, even as he was thinking in terms of cultural traditions:

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² Ibid.

³³³ Ibid.

...the development of this art proves conclusively that the inborn artistic gifts of the Indian race are strong enough to have survived the attacks of bureaucracy and civilization and to emerge stronger than ever in its new generations. One may demolish manifestations of a culture, but its inner hopes and ideals defy any assault, and find expression somehow.³³⁴

Still entranced by romantic notions of the Indian race, Douglas may have also ended up being a bureaucratic voice that interfered in the Studio artist-students' freedom of expression, at least as Dorothy Dunn conceived of it. Dunn had already locked horns with Mable Morrow regarding the use of models and painting portraits. When Morrow told Dunn that she needed to pursue "a more objective approach" by using models, Dunn conceded that the students' work "thus far did appear amateurish...as compared with other recent art activities at the school," such as the mural projects.³³⁵ An instructor from the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque was brought in to teach an evening class in portraiture and models were introduced to the Studio, but according to Dunn the models were "completely worthless to the project and considerably confusing in the Studio."³³⁶ It is not known whether the models were Indian or non-Indian, which in any case would not have been relevant for as Andy Tsihnajinnie pointed out, the Indian artists did not need models since they painted from memory. Although Dunn did not explain just what this confusion was, it probably resulted from the artist-students' unfamiliarity with portraiture; there was no such tradition among the Southwest Indians, although representations of individuals had been painted on hides and ledger books in

³³⁴ Ibid.

³³⁵ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 263, 265.

³³⁶ Ibid., 265.

Plains Indians art. Yet a lack of enthusiasm among the students led to the discontinuation of the portraiture class after only a few weeks; Tsahnahjinnie must have been right.

Despite Douglas's apparent call for the inclusion for portraiture and more perspective in Studio paintings, the reviewer of the 1935 annual show, Annette Fassnacht, hailed the artist-students' ventures outside ceremonial subjects while at the same time adhering to the intuitive styles first seen in their work. Fassnacht, who was a close friend of Dorothy Dunn, provided the following definition of Indian art and painting per se:

Art is a serious business with the Indian. It has always been a dominant factor in Indian culture, and no Indian artist thinks it necessary to be temperamental or freakish in order to prove his worth. Painting is a composite of the arts of the Indians; it incorporates their poetry, their music, their drama, and their philosophy. Such complexity of content has made it necessary for the artist to do much more than copy the outside of things, and to paint what is within he needs to use something more subtle than tricks of perspective and anatomy.³³⁷

In short, Fassnacht seemed to be saying that in the final analysis, the Studio artist-students were the final arbiters of what their art was, and that only they could fully understand its “complexity of content.” She also appeared to be applauding the students’ choice of non-ceremonial subjects; that, as Marcelina Herrera noted above, they painted “ceremonies and other dances” as well as “the things they do in every day life.” Fassnacht chided non-Indian aficionados who believed that ceremonial paintings were the height of authenticity – an authenticity further enhanced by the mundane value patrons placed on the number of figures depicted. She declared to the likeminded, “We are giving Indian artists their rightful place among the artists of the world because of the

³³⁷ Annette Fassnacht, “Exhibition Shows How Indian Artist Profits by Contact with Ancient, Modern Art,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 9, 1936.

quality of their art, not because they have made concessions nor because they need patronage.”³³⁸ Furthermore, she chastised “sponsors” who believed the artist-students needed to “be kept ignorant of the art of other peoples for fear they would become confused and would forsake their own traditions to copy the work of others.”³³⁹ Indeed, these “sponsors” were partially responsible for the students wanting to learn about foreign art. Fassnacht noted that visitors to the Studio had pointed out to the students the ways in which their art reminded them of other world arts, and the artist-students subsequently “insisted on finding out about world art.”³⁴⁰

“Modern American art is different from other art. Every little thing stands for something in each tribe. A person does not understand Indian painting at first glance. Of course, you could tell a story by looking at a European painting, but you could not do this with Indian art until you have studied it.” Oscar Bearunner, Sioux³⁴¹

Fassnacht was echoing what Dunn had written in the April 1936 issue of the SFIS newspaper *Tequayo*, which contained several pages of papers the students had written in response to a series of lectures that Dunn and Chapman gave that spring. These lectures, which were carried out on four separate evenings, were accompanied by slides and prints of examples of ancient and modern art from European, Asia, and Central and North America. Dunn also gave the students a “condensed version” of her former Chicago

³³⁸ Ibid.

³³⁹ Ibid.

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

³⁴¹ Oscar Bearunner, “American Art,” *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 23. Note that this spelling of Oscar’s surname appears to be a misspelling. Elsewhere it is spelled “Bear Runner,” and that is the spelling adhered to in the text.

Institute of Art teacher Helen Gardner's book *Art Through the Ages*.³⁴² Dunn's stated purpose was not to show them these paintings as examples for emulation, but to have them "gain an appreciation – a background from which" they could "become more critical" of their own "efforts."³⁴³ Another of Dunn's purposes, however, presented another shift in her thinking about the wellsprings of Indian art:

...they learned that American Indian art is not greatly unlike others of the world's great arts, that it began as other arts began wherever art beginnings have been found, that its purpose and subject have their counterpart in distant countries, in short, that really fine art is art the world over.³⁴⁴

What Dunn seems to be suggesting here is that the creative wellsprings of Indian art are not *racial*, but cultural; that Indian art is not some racially bound phenomenon, but a natural human expression, and part of the world of arts to which they, too, belonged. Artist Pablita Velarde later lamented that "half of the time they [the students] didn't understand what she was really trying to do was to give understanding between the white culture and the Indian culture."³⁴⁵ Dunn was seeking to bridge *cultural* borders – borders that were presumably more easily traversed than racial ones.

In her review of the last annual Studio exhibition during Dunn's tenure, Olive Rush, ever the supporter of the Studio, chose to emphasize how the artist-students' paintings should be seen in the light of this worldwide phenomenon of human expression. She compared the color palette in Navajo Ned Notah's *Canyon de Chelly* landscape to

³⁴² Dunn, "The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School," 23.

³⁴³ Dorothy Dunn, "Why Was the Course in History of Art Given?" *Tequayo*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 13.

³⁴⁴ Ibid.

³⁴⁵ Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

Persian miniatures, and Taos Pueblo's Pop-Chalee's fanciful forest scenes to Paul Klee's oeuvre. Rush, who greatly admired Chinese art, also compared the artist-students' employment of line in Studio paintings to that of the Chinese artists who "used" it "to such simplification that it may become abstract, however objective the subject."³⁴⁶ It will be recalled that Andy Tsighnahjinnie likewise emphasized the Indian artist's conservative use of lines. Rush also observed that "like the Chinese, the Indian things in nature have a life of their own independent of man, and are presented in their natural atmosphere with a subtlety of flowing or staccato lines stressing life and vitality."³⁴⁷ On the one hand, Rush may have been making such comparisons in order to help non-Indian readers better understand the form and substance of Studio paintings by detracting from the exoticism and otherness commonly assigned to Indian artists. Perhaps, like the Sioux artist Oscar Bear Runner in his quote above, she was also encouraging the audience to study the paintings in order to understand them and their creators better. But even these goals would not have diminished her effort to explain how Indian art should be seen as a cultural phenomenon with shared elements of other arts and cultures – and as such this goal not only did not devalue Indian art, but elevated it to the worthiness of world attention that it was well on its way to receiving through the many exhibitions of Studio paintings being held throughout the United States, in England, and in France.

However, such recognition was lacking back at BIA headquarters in Washington, D.C. or in the Pueblo Agency office in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Margretta Stewart

³⁴⁶ Olive Rush, "Prominent Santa Fe Artist Reviews Exhibit of Indian School Students Aged 11 to 20," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, May 8, 1937.

³⁴⁷ Ibid.

Dietrich recalled in her memoirs that by the end of the 1936 spring semester, officials in the BIA Education Department announced their disapproval of the “teaching methods” employed at the Studio.³⁴⁸ According to Dietrich, the education bureaucrats “wanted realism, perspective and shadows, less (if any) of the symbolic, and they thought the students should work from models....In short, they wanted the Indians to paint, not as Indians, but in a mongrel European manner.”³⁴⁹ By February 16, 1937, concrete steps were apparently being taken to make changes in the SFIS art program when Dr. Sophie Aberle, the General Superintendent of the United Pueblo Agency, wrote Kenneth Chapman to arrange a meeting with him.³⁵⁰ Aberle told Chapman that she wanted to meet with him to discuss “our plans for the Santa Fe School” after she had a chance to talk with Dr. E. Carleton Seymour, the Superintendent for the United Pueblo Schools, about what was “needed specifically” there.³⁵¹ Seymour, who had arrived in Santa Fe about a year earlier in January 1936, had previously taught at Harvard University and conducted academic research into the field of Indian education.³⁵²

Clearly the opposition to the Studio and its paintings ran all the way from the local administration to the upper echelons of the BIA, leading Dunn to not show up for the 1937 fall semester and subsequently to resign. Dietrich noted that Dunn felt driven to take this drastic step due to exhaustion engendered “by the constant attacks on her

³⁴⁸ Margretta Stewart Dietrich, *New Mexico Recollections, Part I* (1959), National Museum of the American Indian, Vine DeLoria, Jr. Library, 19.

³⁴⁹ Ibid.

³⁵⁰ The original BIA Pueblo Agency was established in 1854, but in 1919 it was divided into the Northern Pueblo Agency and the Southern Pueblo Agency. In 1930 the Northern Pueblo Agency took over control of the SFIS, and this control was transferred to the United Pueblo Agency when it was established in 1935.

³⁵¹ Letter from Dr. Sophie Aberle to Kenneth Chapman dated February 16, 1937, 89KC0.016.

³⁵² *Tequayo*, Vo. 5, No. 4 (Jan. 1936).

teaching methods.”³⁵³ Certainly the irony was not lost on Dunn that at the very time that she was educating both her students and the public on how the Studio paintings fit into the universal arts, she was being hounded by higher ups for not teaching her students how to produce an art that was understandable in relation to European traditions. However, Dunn hoped that her assistant, Geronima Cruz Montoya from San Juan, who stayed on to teach at the Studio, would be treated better by the bureaucracy *because* she was an Indian.

Geronima Cruz Montoya remained at the Studio until it was closed in 1961 and reorganized into the Institute of American Indian Arts. However, although she has commonly been recognized as Dunn’s successor, this was not exactly the case. Dunn’s slot as the Teacher of Fine and Applied Arts at the SFIS was given to another white woman, Alfreda Ward, who had taught at the Santo Domingo Day School from the fall of 1935 until the summer of 1937.³⁵⁴ Ward took up her new position at the SFIS in the fall of 1937 and she was placed in charge of the entire Arts and Crafts Department, the position formerly held by Mable Morrow, and supervised ten individuals. According to Ward, even though she assumed Dunn’s civil service slot, Montoya was in charge of painting in the Studio.

³⁵³ Dietrich, *New Mexico Recollections, Part I*, 19.

³⁵⁴ Alfreda Ward Maloof, *Recollections from My Time in the Indian Service 1935-1943, Including my primer Maria Martinez Makes Pottery* (Klamath River, CA: Living Gold Press, 1997), unpaginated. I am very grateful to Mr. Sam Maloof for providing me with this book written by his wife, who died in 1998. Additionally, I am grateful to Mr. Tony Abeyta for informing me about Alfreda Ward’s tenure at the SFIS, and for giving me contact information for Mr. Maloof. Unfortunately, Mr. Maloof died in 2009 before I could help him set the record straight about his wife.

Somewhat surprisingly, Ward’s personal story shares elements with Dunn’s. Like Dunn, she was in desperate need of a job when she saw a BIA advertisement for an elementary teacher at Santo Domingo Pueblo on the wall of a post office. Ward had just graduated with a teaching degree from the University of California at Los Angeles, and was keenly feeling the economic effects of the Great Depression. When she obtained the BIA teaching job, Ward wrote in her memoir, “I was ready for anything.”³⁵⁵ In the summer of 1937, Ward received a new assignment when her “superiors” decided they wanted her to have “more first hand knowledge” of Southwest Indian crafts, and subsequently sent her to study basketry on the Pima and Papago Reservations and pottery at San Ildefonso Pueblo.³⁵⁶ Ward had been perfectly satisfied with her teaching position at Santo Domingo, but she accepted this new assignment with alacrity, and was then “thrilled” to receive the order transferring her to the SFIS.³⁵⁷ Ward remained at the SFIS until November 1941 when the BIA transferred her to the newly opened Museum of the Plains Indian in the Blackfeet Agency in Browning, Montana, where her new job title was “Arts and Crafts Marketing Specialist.”³⁵⁸ Curiously, no mention of Ward has been found in Dorothy Dunn’s personal papers, nor was she ever mentioned in Montoya’s

³⁵⁵ Maloof, *Recollections from My Time in the Indian Service 1935-1943*, unpaginated.

³⁵⁶ Ibid.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.; “Transfer and Change in Status” from the U.S. Department of the Interior to Miss Alfreda L. Ward, with handwritten notation “Rec’d 11-22-41”; “Promotion in Salary” document dated July 9, 1942, from the U.S. Department of the Interior to Alfreda L. Ward; and letter dated November 21, 1941 from the General Superintendent, U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Field Service, to Miss Alfreda L. Ward. All three of these documents were supplied by Ward’s widower, Mr. Sam Maloof.

1996 biography *The Worlds of P'otsunu, Geronima Cruz Montoya of San Juan Pueblo*, which was written by two California psychoanalysts, Jeanne Shutes and Jill Mellick.³⁵⁹

“Indian art is not easy to do. You have to mix your colors just right, and have the right kind of paper to work on. First of all you have to think fast. All the ideas have to come from the painter himself. Every day different paintings appear in our studio.... The reason why we put so much work on our painting is that each one represents his tribe.” Oscar Bearunner, Sioux³⁶⁰

If the BIA officials expected that Geronima Cruz Montoya would teach her students to paint “realism, perspective and shadows” – what Dietrich termed “in a mongrel European manner” – they were surely disappointed. Indeed, the so-called “Studio style” prevailed during Montoya’s tenure there. Perhaps Dunn’s wish that Montoya, from San Juan Pueblo, would be “treated better” because she was an Indian was granted, at least until the Studio was closed. Montoya’s presence also lent an aura of authenticity to the Studio paintings, but like Dunn she assumed, and insisted, that the art had to be *Indian*. But there were other Indian painters before Montoya who had exerted influence on what was painted. During the mid-1930s, the painter Tonita Pena was also present on the SFIS campus thanks to her work with the Indian Division of the 1934 Public Works of Art Project, which was headquartered there. According to historian Sally Hyer, through the Art Project some “thirty painters and craftspeople were hired to

³⁵⁹ Jeanne Shutes and Jill Mellick, *The Worlds of P'otsunu, Geronima Cruz Montoya of San Juan Pueblo* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996). In several conversation I had with Mr. Sam Maloof during the spring of 2005, he informed me that he and his wife often visited the Santa Fe area over the years, and that despite their efforts, Montoya never acknowledged his wife’s presence at the SFIS.

³⁶⁰ Oscar Bearunner, “American Art,” *Tequayo*, Vol. 15, No. 15 (April 1936), 24.

paint murals and watercolors, weave rugs, and make pottery.”³⁶¹ And some of them, like Pena, actually lived on the campus.

Pena was born in San Ildefonso Pueblo, but when she married a man from Cochiti Pueblo she moved there. Some of her paintings had been shown in the first Southwest Indian art exhibition in 1919. One Jemez Pueblo informant in Hyer’s SFIS oral history project recalled being greatly inspired by conversations with Pena as she painted in her SFIS dormitory room.³⁶² Another Studio student from Cochiti Pueblo, Justino Herrera, became acquainted with painting before arriving at the SFIS when Pena’s son, Joe Hilario Herrera, showed him some of his mother’s work. During an interview with Herrera in 2004, Herrera recalled, “She [Pena] taught me a lot.”³⁶³

Justino Herrera, or Stimone, which means “A Bird,” first enrolled in a Studio class in 1936. He had attended the Cochiti Day School, but transferred to the Studio for the seventh grade.³⁶⁴ One day Dorothy Dunn saw him drawing, and she asked him to join the Studio. Herrera remembered that older students there helped him at first in matters such as the application of oil and watercolors to measuring the proportions of human figures. However, Herrera recalled that students “were doing their own [art],” “whatever tradition they had, their own, they did their own,” and did not copy from each other. Sioux artist-student Oscar Bear Runner concurred that “All the ideas” had “to come from

³⁶¹ Hyer, *One House, One Voice, One Voice*, 42.

³⁶² Ibid., 42, 43.

³⁶³ Herrera, Justino, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. July 30. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA. This interview was conducted at the Laguna Rainbow Elderly Care Center, Casa Blanca, New Mexico, where Mr. Herrera was at the time a resident.

³⁶⁴ Justino Herrera is listed as a SFIS student in the school newspaper *Tequayo* for the 1932-1933 term. He was born in 1920, so he would have been twelve years old during that term, which was probably his seventh grade.

the painter himself.” Unfortunately, despite his eloquent characterization of the creative process, Bear Runner’s career appeared to have ended when he left the Studio. As for their guide, Herrera said that Dunn “just let you do whatever.”³⁶⁵ For Dunn, of course that “whatever” had to be *Indian*, but she emphasized that it should be an original “whatever.” Yet Dunn did realize that there was going to be some cross-fertilization among the students. In a 1935 article she wrote for *School Arts* magazine, Dunn observed that the “young artists, after having more or less struck their strides, are able to work in group units without affecting each other’s particular styles and interest.”³⁶⁶ The “group units” she was referring to were the mural projects, and the “strides” were the individual artists’ talents being carried forward by their own eyes; individuality of expression existed alongside group expression, and there was no contradiction in those facts, or in those identities.

Dunn is such a central figure in the story of the Studio that it is all too easy to keep referring to what she tried to accomplish and who she was. However, Dunn herself would probably be the first one to place the Studio artist-students forefront and center, as she did when she saw that the articles written by the students on the meaning of their art were published in the April 1936 issue of the school newspaper *Tequayo*. At the risk of dwelling on her yet again, she did just that in her one book and all the articles she wrote on the Studio and Indian art in general, wherein she masked her identity in the third person singular, even though her Studio experience probably shaped that identity as much

³⁶⁵ Herrera, Justino, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. July 30. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

³⁶⁶ Dunn, “Indian Children Carry Forward Old Traditions,” 432.

or more as it did that of her artist-students. But nevertheless, Dunn was inarguably a central actor in the Studio process to define modern American Indian painting as a fine art – a claim that would seem to bolster critics’ assertion that her participation doomed authentic expression by the Indian artists.

However, such critiques of authenticity are specious at best; their proponents seemingly expected Indian painting to have arisen in an idealistic vacuum. Instead, the concept of the Studio Style was embodied in the search for its Indian artist-students’ quest to express themselves, and this was a search carried out in the real world – physically in the institutional setting of a government-run boarding school situated within a supportive non-Indian art community, and conceptually among participants who brought their artistic legacies into play in a complex, modern world of collapsing boundaries. For Dunn as a “guide” was insisting that they express themselves in an art that would be not just an Indian art, but an *American Indian* art – an art that would express how they saw themselves after more than 500 hundred years of colonization and the mutual crisscrossing of cultural borders. Dunn wanted the artist-students to be recognized as *American Indian* artists, as part of a continuum of artistic creativity that embodied the meaning of what it was to be an American. Yet although Dunn, the Santa Fe art community, and the Studio artist-students collapsed mutual cultural boundaries in their quest to establish modern American Indian painting as a fine art, other boundaries arose in their wake. The Studio paintings would continue to be segregated in their own museums and shown as an Indian art that kept them excluded from the mainstream of American art. In a 1946 radio interview, former Studio painter Eva Mirabal (Eah Ha Wa,

Fast Growing Corn) lamented this state of affairs. Stating her disappointment that American Indian art was not being taught to white children in school, she commented that they were being deprived of the “most important” art: “Although most people overlook the fact, American Indian art is the only true American art because it originated here.”³⁶⁷ And on this score, Dunn and the Studio artist-students basically only succeeded in gaining this seemingly permanent label, and attendant segregation, of being Indian artists, but not particularly *American*.

Dunn’s primary focus was on her students and finding ways for them to express themselves not only artistically, but also in words. Subsequent to the lectures on the history of art that she and Kenneth Chapman gave in the spring of 1936, several of the students wrote articles on what they had learned that were printed in the school newspaper *Tequayo*. In an effort to again give voice to those artist-students, quotes from those articles which touch on their understanding of the relationship of Indian art to other arts the world over, and in particular to how their art was an *American* art form, punctuate this chapter. But beneath these words it is the artist-students’ innocent and exuberant expression of identity that shines forth in their paintings. So it is to these Studio artist-students and their paintings – and to whom they presented themselves as in them—that attention will now be turned.

³⁶⁷ “The Southern Hour,” University of Southern Illinois radio program, ca. 1946, in Wyckoff, ed., *Visions + Voices*, 181.

Chapter 4: From Ceremony, to Lifeway, to Skin, and In-between, the Studio Artist-Students Paint their Identity Collectively and Individually

The Department of Painting and Design, or “Studio,” at the Santa Fe Indian School (SFIS) offers a unique opportunity to examine the genius of American Indian individual and collective identities in the early twentieth century. It was an experiential setting in which student-artists contemplated and expressed themselves and their cultural heritages tribally and individually in their paintings, and collectively in what art historians subsequently dubbed the pan-Indian, “Studio Style” of traditional American Indian painting. Art historian W. Jackson Rushing III has defined the Style as “flat, decorative watercolors featuring a semiabstract, elemental figuration that emphasized rhythmic linearity and usually depicted dances, hunting, or genre activities,” that “has since come to be known by Indians and non-Indians alike as ‘traditional Indian painting.’”³⁶⁸ Proponents of this view of the Style have also noted the emphasis on the use of strong lines to define flat planes of color, as well as one-dimensionality and the lack of background perspective. However, there were artist-students who manifested individual styles in their paintings that seemingly belie the concept of a comprehensive, pan-Indian Studio Style; these styles included less emphasis on line, the use of background perspectives, and the depiction of multiple dimensions that even included the implication of a fourth-dimension to express the secret, esoteric meaning of the painting that was closed to the non-initiated. But of equal importance to these formal characteristics of the Style was the deeper, submerged element of the Studio artist-

³⁶⁸ Rushing, “Modern by Tradition,” in *Modern by Tradition*, 29.

students' modern, multilayered identity that now emerged through artistic expression. Perhaps instead of identifying a "Studio Style" per se, the paintings should be recognized as being the *products* of these adolescent artists' search for expression, rather than a generic *product* of the Studio. As products of individual artist-students from various cultural backgrounds, they reflected those group identifications, but in the end they were the result of individual hands putting brushes to paper. And it is in the conjoining of their hands and their cultures in the search to express themselves that a pan-Indian identity emerged; it was this search, more than any formal qualities, that constituted the essence of the Studio Style.

Academic studies of the Studio paintings have principally been grounded in the disciplines of art history and anthropology, but the multiplicity of individual and cultural expression bound up in the Studio Style also lends itself to being examined through close readings of the paintings not as objects of art, but as historical documents revealing the American Indian experience. To be sure, art historians are commonly occupied with discerning an artists' inner expression and worldview, but the liminal particularity of the American Indian lives leads historians to assess American Indian art differently than mainstream American art, or even European art. Part of the reason for this is that the askers typically are not Indians, and the subject(s) they are facing is often esoteric.

Some art historians, to be sure, have been cognizant of the different levels upon which the Studio paintings should be considered. Rushing, who has devoted much of his career to studying the Studio, observed that this "'traditional painting' certainly reflected the intersection of different and conflicting cultures," and "also embodied the efforts of

artists, many of whom began painting when they were only teenagers, to express themselves as members of specific cultures.”³⁶⁹ Anthropologist Bruce Bernstein also employed the cultural paradigm to study the Studio phenomenon, and he and Rushing joined forces to this end by authoring the essays in their book *Modern by Tradition, American Indian Painting in the Studio Style*, which has largely set the parameters both for this study and the reconsideration of the Studio subsequent to art historian J. J. Brody’s seminal critique of it in his book *Indian Painters & White Patrons* in 1971. Brody questioned the authenticity of the Studio paintings in light of the influence of its white patrons and of the authoritarian teaching method employed by the non-Indian Dorothy Dunn. Bernstein and Rushing, however, turned their focus on the agency of the young painters themselves and concluded that Dunn’s hand was not so strong as to suppress their creative force and authenticity of expression.

Arguments regarding the authenticity of Studio paintings as Indian art will never be resolved, but they have opened up the field for applying the concepts of cultural and racial identity to the subject. Indeed, the discussion of the very notion of identity itself is perhaps just as susceptible to accusations of submersion in tautology and abstract concepts. However, certain conclusions concerning the depiction of culture and identity can be drawn by posing relevant questions and by looking for answers through close readings of Studio paintings. What were the principal subjects of the paintings, e.g., ceremonial or non-ceremonial? How did the artists depict individuals Indians, presumably themselves, in them? Did they paint individualized or stylized faces? What

³⁶⁹ Ibid.

color did they choose to paint the skin? Was the clothing wholly traditional or did it exhibit changes in style from acculturation to non-Indian modes of dress? Did artist-students from a particular tribe develop conventions in these depictions? And did some of the artists express themselves in a style that was uniquely theirs? However, one conclusion is inarguably clear: *all* of the Studio paintings were depictions of Indian lives and cultures. Dorothy Dunn's dictate that all the paintings had to be "Indian" was indeed carried out.

In an attempt to find answers to these questions, a study of these paintings was devised involving close readings of 150 paintings primarily done during Dunn's tenure at the Studio from 1932 to 1937. The five years of Dunn's presence are commonly recognized as the founding years of the Studio, and as such can justifiably be considered profoundly influential on all the artists who studied there. However, fifteen paintings from the years 1938 to 1942 in The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, New Mexico were also included because they were shown in that institution's 1995 exhibit "With a View to the Southwest: Dorothy Dunn and a Story of Native American Painting," the largest exhibit to date of Studio paintings. In sum, the 150 paintings included the following: eighty-three paintings from The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, New Mexico reproduced in the book *Modern by Tradition, American Indian Painting in the Studio Style* by Bruce Bernstein

and W. Jackson Rushing, which was based on the 1995 exhibit;³⁷⁰ twenty-three from Dorothy Dunn's book *American Indian Painting of the Plains and Southwest Areas*, most of which are from the Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection held at the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, New Mexico; twenty-three from the William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U.S. Department of the Interior in Washington, D.C., reproduced in the book *When the Rainbow Touches Down* by Tryntje Van Ness Seymour;³⁷¹ and twenty-one additional paintings from the Museum of Indian Arts/Laboratory of Anthropology collection.³⁷²

Of course, the problem arises that the conclusions drawn from this selection could be challenged by studying paintings from this time period in other collections. The Heard Museum, Museum of Northern Arizona, and School for Advanced Research also have large holdings of Studio paintings. Then there are also, presumably, a large number of paintings held elsewhere in public and private collections. However, the number of

³⁷⁰ My reference for these paintings, Bruce Bernstein and W. Jackson Rushing, *Modern by Tradition, American Indian Painting in the Studio Style* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1995) was based upon the Museum of New Mexico's Museum of Indian Arts and Culture 1995 exhibit "With a View to the Southwest: Dorothy Dunn and a Story of Native American Painting." A smaller traveling exhibit was also organized. The paintings exhibited were chosen from a total of 265 in The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, New Mexico, and include works collected either by Dunn or by Margretta S. Dietrich and bequeathed to Dunn in 1961.

³⁷¹ My reference for these paintings, Tryntje Van Ness Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down, The Artists and Stories Behind the Apache, Navajo, Rio Grande Pueblo and Hopi Paintings in the William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection* (Phoenix: The Heard Museum, 1968), was part of a multi-faceted project which included a traveling exhibition and oral history project carried out by staff from The Heard Museum with the cooperation of the US Department of Interior, the Denman Committee, and various scholars, artists, and art patrons. Tryntje Van Ness Seymour was also the guest curator for the traveling exhibition.

³⁷² The author is grateful to Ms. Valerie Verzuh, Collections Manager, Museum of Indian Art and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, for providing access to the paintings in the collection.

paintings and Indian cultures represented, combined with the publication and public exposure of the chosen works, lends considerable credibility to conclusions drawn regarding the nature and type of paintings produced during this time period at the Studio. Indeed, Dunn herself and her influence on the Studio creative process is a major subject of this study. Since the majority of these paintings were purchased by the Studio's prominent patrons Margretta Stewart Dietrich and William and Leslie Van Ness Denman, and some as well by Dunn herself, one can also safely presume they had developed discerning eyes and purchased what they considered to be the *crème de la crème* of the lot – a presumption that creates the expectation that what was painted was formally well executed as well as uniquely expressive of the artists' respective culture and identities.

In order to address the wide-ranging considerations and aspects involved in the depiction of culture and identity, the paintings were divided into two broad subject categories: ceremonial, and non-ceremonial or lifeway. Non-ceremonial subjects were subdivided into the following categories: genre, the hunt, decorative, and fanciful/naturalistic landscapes. Proceeding from the cultural to the personal, close attention was given to the ways in which the Studio artists depicted human forms – forms that presumably were either depictions of themselves and/or members of their tribes. Facial features were studied for individualization or stylization, and for choice of skin color in tones of light-skinned, dark, or red. Additionally, varying depictions of these physical characteristics were noted.

This selection includes the work of sixty-six artist-students from twenty-eight nations or tribes situated in four conventional culture areas: thirteen Pueblos, four

Apache tribes, the Hopi nation, and the Navajo nation from the Southwest culture area; the Cheyenne, Arapaho, Kiowa, Sioux, and Omaha nations from the Plains; the Ojibwa (Chippewa) and Sauk Fox nations from the Northeast; and the Cherokee nation from the Southeast.³⁷³ The culture area method for classification is based on ten geographical regions occupied by indigenous peoples whose shared cultural, social, and economic traits are significant enough to distinguish them from others, and scholars commonly use it as a skeletal framework for sorting out the immensely complicated nature of multiculturalism among North American Indians. However, this method cannot accurately account for the many Indian nations who were relocated from aboriginal origins to the Indian Territory in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, the focus of this analysis of culture and identity will be directed from the general, or aboriginal area, to the particular features of individual nations or tribes from whose cultures the Studio artist-students came, and finally, and most particularly, to the individual artists-students themselves.

Dorothy Dunn's admonition that whatever her artist-students painted, it had to be "Indian," has been much criticized not only for the controlling intent, but for the suggestion that an authentic Indian art could be created in the artificial setting of a

³⁷³ The terminology used to designate Indians as either nations, tribes, divisions, bands, groups, etc., is extremely complicated and varies greatly depending both upon the Indians in question and on sources. For example, although the term "Sioux Nation" is commonly used, but at the same time contemporary Sioux refer to themselves as three separate nations or peoples – the Dakota, Lakota, and Nakota. And in the Southwest, the Hopi Nation is commonly considered a member of the Pueblo family, but is also not considered to be part of the nineteen Pueblo Nations in what is now New Mexico. However, the Zuni Nation is commonly classified as one of the nineteen Pueblos although the Zuni language is not related to any of the Pueblo languages. To complicate matters further, each of nineteen Pueblos consider themselves separate nations, and has been considered as such in this study. Unfortunately, I have also not been able to identify the exact Sioux identity for two artist-students. After taking into consideration all of these factors, I concluded that the artist-students in this analysis came from approximately 28 nations or tribes.

government boarding school. But when the admonition is translated into saying, “paint what you know,” which is, after all, a very common suggestion in American and European art schools and circles, it assumes a common-sense approach. Yes, of course the artist-students were not physically embedded in their respective cultures, but then neither were many American or European art students who travelled to art schools situated in metropolitan centers. Of course, “Paint what you know” can only be authentic provided the artist is being honest with himself and others, and that is indeed what the Studio artists did. All of the paintings studied depicted Indian scenes so faithfully that it was possible to divide their subject matters into only two areas, ceremonial and non-ceremonial. Out of the 150 paintings studied, seventy-one (46.33%) depicted ceremonial activities, and seventy-nine (52.66%) non-ceremonial. On the one hand, the near split in choice of subject matter indicates that the artist-students were squarely grounded in both sides of their cultural and social lives – lives in which ceremonies were bound up in a holistic sense of collective identity and lifeway as peoples, and almost equally willing to share expressions of those lives with outsiders.

Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Ceremonies and Collective Identity

The emphasis on ceremonial activities was most pronounced among the Hopi artist-students. Out of nine Hopi paintings in this study, eight dealt with ceremonies, and the majority of them depicted the esoteric *katsina* spirits who are central to their belief system regarding life and death. All six of the Hopi paintings in the Denman Collection were representations of *katsinas*, and five of them were painted by Kyrate Tuvahoema, a

native of Old Oraibi who was at the Studio from about 1933-1935, and one by Lewis Lomayesva.

American anthropologist and ethnographer Jesse Walter Fewkes who, as mentioned earlier, commissioned four Hopi men to paint *katsinas* in 1899-1900, learned that the painted figures “represent men personating the gods, as they appear in religious festivals, and duplicate the symbols on certain images, called dolls, which represent the same beings.”³⁷⁴ Fewkes understood the *katsinas* (which he spelled “*katcinas*”) to be “spirits of the ancients of the Hopis,” and that the “personations of them by men bear the symbols which are supposed to have characterized these ancients.”³⁷⁵ However, although the *katsinas* were originally only “the spirits, or personified medicine power, of ancients, personifications of a similar power in other objects” also became known as *katsinas*.³⁷⁶ Hopi ceremonial dances are part and parcel of their annual cycle of life; they structure the community and keep individuals on the “Hopi way.” But since the *katsinas* are the spirits of ancestors, and the actual dancers are, of course, male Hopi personators, the identities of the dead, the spirits, and living men are fused together in the dancer, and the spirits become manifest in a human form.

The entity of the *katsina* expressed the Hopis’ complete oneness with the spiritual world. Curiously, unlike most ceremonies painted by Pueblo artist-students, the *katsinas* in Tuvalhoema’s and Lomayesva’s representations are painted without the presence of human participants in the ceremony, which suggests that they were emphasizing the sanctity and three-in-one personhood of the *katsina*. And from most accounts, the artists endeavored to paint *katsina* masks and garb in exactly the same detail as those used in

³⁷⁴ Jesse Walter Fewkes, *Hopi Katcinas*, 15.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 16.

³⁷⁶ Ibid.

their ceremonies, and this is in utter contradistinction from the Pueblos to the east where it was forbidden to paint *katsinas* or share any esoteric information whatsoever to the uninitiated. One common explanation for the Hopi's relative openness lies in fact that they escaped the Spanish invasion and occupation at the end of the sixteenth century, while the Rio Grande Pueblos did not. The Pueblos fought back at Spanish repression by taking their religion underground, and thereafter became relatively paranoid about revealing much about themselves to outsiders.

Like the Hopi, the various Apache artists similarly emphasized the ceremonial aspect of their culture. Out of nineteen paintings, twelve were concerned with depicting their Mountain Spirit or Crown dancers who represented the Mountain Spirits or *Gaan* and their power. In the course of an interview given during an oral history project for the Heard Museum, Apache artist Delmar Boni stated that although there were minor variations to the dance among the Apache groups, ““The *Gaan* are a base for us, as to who we are, and there is always of sense of wonder about them.””³⁷⁷ Boni, who did not attend the Studio, added that the older, traditional Apaches believed the *Gaan* to be a taboo subject, but the Apache students at the Studio obviously felt the need to bring the *Gaan* into the modern world. The *Gaan* were usually depicted in a group of four, as they appeared during the ceremony, and without the presence of humans. However, Allan Houser, the only Chiricahua Apache known to have been a student at the Studio during Dunn’s tenure, did depict the circle of drummers and two observers in *Gaan (Mountain Spirit Dance)* (ca.1936-1938). In an earlier work, *Ghan Dancers* (1934), Houser had portrayed the ethereality of the *Gaan* completely in white against a black background. This choice of black and white was completely atypical of the color palette of Studio

³⁷⁷ Tryntie Van Ness Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down, The Artists and Stories Behind the Apache, Navajo, Rio Grande Pueblo and Hopi Paintings in the William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection* (Phoenix: The Heard Museum, 1988), 55, 37.

Style paintings, and the only one of its kind in this study. Houser also painted genre subjects, such as *Warrior's Funeral Procession* (ca. 1936), and in an interview with Tryntje Van Ness Seymour for the Hearst Museum project, he reminisced that he also used “subject matter” gleaned from the stories his father, Samuel Haozous, had told him.³⁷⁸ Haozous had been a runner for Geronimo, whom he followed into twenty-five years of captivity in Florida and then Oklahoma, where Allan had been born in 1914 at Fort Sill. During that interview, Houser also recalled that he had only “learned the basics” at the Studio. In another interview with author Jamake Highwater he went on the record for having been at odds with Dunn during his time at the Studio. Houser opined about Dunn’s allegedly dictatorial instruction, ““I think I was held down.””³⁷⁹ For example, Houser recalled that he had wanted to study anatomy, but Dunn reportedly told him, ““No, Indians have a natural feeling for action and rhythm.””³⁸⁰ Houser commented that he later realized that ““this belief that being Indian is something that you’re born into”” had become ““a good idea,”” but added that he always told his students, ““be an Indian but allow for something creative too.””³⁸¹ He went on to discuss how he and his fellow Studio artists were influenced by each other:

Now it’s fine to be influenced by each other. That was part of the good thing about being at The Studio with all the guys who became the big Indian artists. But you’ve got to do it creatively and make something personal out of it....But originally we were all copying each other so you just couldn’t tell one of us from another. It took us time to realize that we had to find ourselves as artists. And when we realized that we started to become the kind of artist that we are today.³⁸²

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 48.

³⁷⁹ Jamake Highwater, *Song from the Earth, American Indian Painting* (Boston: New York Graphic Society, 1976), 149.

³⁸⁰ Ibid.

³⁸¹ Ibid., 149, 150.

³⁸² Ibid., 150.

Perhaps what Houser is trying to say is that there are two sources of Indianness in art: the racial spring that Dunn clung to doggedly and somewhat confusedly, and the cultural, which Houser and his cohorts were struggling to define.

As stated earlier, this openness to outside discovery of spiritual entities is absent among the other Pueblos, with the exception of the Zuni, who do allow their *katsinas* to be painted.³⁸³ However, several of the Pueblo artist-students did paint the clowns, called either *Kossa* or *Koshare*, who participate in or direct some ceremonies, and presumably it was permissible for them to do so since the clowns appear in ceremonies open to the non-Indian public.

The Pueblos share an annual cycle of ceremonies and dances that does not vary significantly. And while all of these events concern spiritual matters, there are three categories based on the level of sacredness and secrecy: sacred or ceremonial dances, semi-sacred dances, and social dances. Only the social and some of the semi-sacred dances are open to the public. The lingering influence of Spanish proselytism of Catholicism is also quite evident in annual feast-day ceremonies that combine reverence to the pueblo's patron saint with a traditional Indian dance. Two depictions of these ceremonies uniquely narrate the multicultural aspects of social communion as well as individuality of expression, Sah-wa's *Mass at Fiesta* (1936) and Lolita Torivio's *Feast of St. Steven* (1936).

³⁸³ The only painting by a Zuni artist-student, Eileen Lesarley, in this study was non-ceremonial, *Zuni Girls with Ollas*.

In her painting *Mass at Fiesta*, Sah-wa (Rufina Vigil) of Tesuque fused Pueblo traditional and Spanish Catholic influences by framing the background with the bow-covered shrine containing the altar into which the Pueblo faithful – men, women, and children—are entering. The semi-abstract figures are shown from the rear, with the colorful and figured shawls of some of the women creating their forms. None of the figures stands alone; each of their bodies is fused to one or more bodies, expressing unity of belief and identity in the most obvious of ways. And although their forms are stylized, e.g., by the shawls and round black heads with similar body shapes, their individuality is still evident in the different colors of their clothing. The artist also took ownership of her work by clearly painting her name in the bottom right corner. Lolita Torivio from Acoma also signed her name on *Feast of St. Steven* (1936), but her take on the celebration of her pueblo's patron saint expressed more individuality than communion among its participants. Like Sah-wa, Torivio employed an architectural background, in this case a pueblo building, but she positioned the shrine one-dimensionally as if it were on the face of the building. And instead of depicting a fused group of worshippers, Torivio painted only four women who are placed at distances from each other. The vertically elongated shapes of the women are stiffly depicted and fused with the building and shrine instead of with each other, which renders the entire picture as one mass, suggesting that the women are spiritually one with their Pueblo.

This employment of an architectural background is not an attribute commonly assigned to the Studio style, in which one-dimensional figures and objects seemingly float in space. Yet there are several instances in which artists also used this device to

provide dimensionality to the action of the foreground. In Taos artist-student Chiu-tah's (Vicenti Mirabal) *Taos Turtle Dance* (1938), one of the two multistoried apartment houses in his ancestral home of Taos Pueblo sets the scene for his chorus line of stylized dancers in the foreground. Both the building and the dancers seem to be competing with each other for dominance of the picture plane, but perhaps Chiu-tah, who began painting as a child while he was at the Taos Pueblo Day School, was instead emphasizing the equal weight as well as oneness that existed between the people and their ancestral home.³⁸⁴ The imposing presence of the ancient adobe apartment house is clearly representative of the Tao people's communal living arrangements, which continue to be occupied this day. Anthropologist Ruth Underhill, who conducted studies of Pueblo life during the 1930s and 1940s, suggested that an adobe house could be thought of "as a gigantic form of pottery," both of which were traditionally crafted by women's hands.³⁸⁵ This comparison of adobe objects also presents a continuity in Pueblo life: both the pottery and the pueblo buildings were handcrafted vessels integral to the sustenance of Pueblo life. In another of his paintings from 1938, *Turtle Dance on New Year's Eve*, Chiu-tah used the Taos church as the architectural backdrop. Here the church clearly dominates the picture plane with its width and verticality, and to depict this dance Chiu-tah included scores of observers brightly clad in shawls and blankets, many of which are identical in form to those painted by the Taos artist-student Khup Khu (Tonita Lujan).

³⁸⁴ Seymour, *After the Rainbow Touches Down*, 167.

³⁸⁵ Ruth Underhill, *Life in the Pueblos*. Rev. ed. (Santa Fe: Ancient City Press, 1991), 71. This book was originally published in 1946 by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as *Workaday Life of the Pueblos*.

Perhaps the most interesting ceremonial painting at Taos Pueblo came from the hand of Khup Khu, who finely developed the depiction of female forms in the shape of brightly colored, figured shawls, and, indeed, she may have originated this form, which in turn may have been adopted by artists such as Chiu-tah in the paintings already discussed, and by Acoma artist-student Lolita Torivio in her *Feast of St. Steven* of 1936. Two of Khup Khu's paintings from 1935, *Taos Buffalo Dance* and *Taos People at a Round Dance*, display her treatment of this semi-abstract form. In *Taos Buffalo Dance*, the torsos of the women are formed by their shawls, while their heads are depicted semi-naturalistically. The women are surrounding semi-naturalistic male dancers shown aligned in the center of the painting, but the broken and uneven placement of the women creates a dissonance both between the two groups and in the rendering of the scene as a whole. However, in *Taos People at a Round Dance* – a social dance that did not include costumed personator-dancers—Khup Khu fused the figures of the women in a pictorially and socially harmonious manner. Few actual faces were depicted, which suggests that Khup Khu had refined her unique expression of a shared female human form that was nevertheless distinguished by the color and design of the clothing encasing and defining them. The result was an expression of social solidarity, as well as a pictorially enticing piece.

Of course, the fusion of Catholicism into Pueblo dances was the direct result of Spanish colonization that began at the end of the sixteenth century and lasted until the early nineteenth century. And not unexpectedly, one can also see the influence of cultural elements from Mexicans and Mexican Indians who had likewise been conquered



Illustration 4.1: 53912/12 “*Taos People at a Round Dance*” 1935 Tonita Lujan “Khup Khu”, Taos Pueblo, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs, www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

by the Spanish. The resulting multiculturalism is exemplified in a painting by San Juan artist-student T’o Pove (Lorencita Bird Atencio), *Matachines Dance* (1937). This dance, which at the time was performed annually on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day in San Juan Pueblo, contains Spanish-Mexican cultural as well as religious elements. The dancers mingle with replicas of saints carried in a procession from the church to the tunes of a violin and guitar, musical instruments brought to the Pueblos by the Spanish. According to San Juan artist Geronima Cruz Montoya, who studied with Dunn at the Studio and subsequently taught there, the Matachines Dance was “taken after a Spanish or Moorish dance and made into the Indian ceremony” during the period of Spanish

colonization.³⁸⁶ Variations of the dance are also performed by Spanish people in northern New Mexico, and by the Tarahumara and Yaqui Indians in Mexico.³⁸⁷ Thus the Matachines Dance, as well as the Catholic feast day dances, provide evidence that traditional, as well as modern, Pueblo identity contains elements of Spanish influence that are shared with other peoples in the Southwest.

Elements of Hispanic identity are also evident in paintings done by the Jicarilla Apache artist Nehakije (Steven Vicente) and the Navajo artist Sybil Yazzie. The paired men and women in Nehakije's *Bear Dance* (1935) are predominantly attired in Hispanic style clothing; the men are wearing Mexican-style hats and high-heeled boots, and the women are wearing colorfully patterned blouses, skirts and shawls, and high-heeled shoes. Indeed, the only visible sign of Indian identity are their painted faces and the women's hairstyles, but the figures' sense of unity and grace in dance is nevertheless evident. Similarly, Navajo artist-student Sybil Yazzie dressed the people in *Going to the Yeibichai* (1937) and *Yeibichai* (1937) in Hispanic clothing – the men in wide-brimmed Mexican hats, shirts, and pants. But aside from these acculturative details, what is more apparent in Yazzie's ceremonial paintings is the unity of purpose and solidarity of identity seen in the way in which she fuses the individuals together – in the meandering line seen in *Yeibichai*, and in the movement of the horses and wagons in *Going to the Yeibichai* that seems to be pulling the procession inexorably out of the right side of the picture frame.

³⁸⁶ Tryntje Van Ness Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down*, 184. The Matachines Dance is also performed annually in Jemez Pueblo earlier in the month of December.

³⁸⁷ Ibid.

Perhaps the most melodic depiction of Pueblo peoples' solidarity in this selection of Studio paintings is seen in Peen Tseh's (Manuel Trujillo) *Deer Dance at San Juan* (c. 1938). The dancers are stylized in form and size, with slight variations of color in design in their costumes, as they move in identical steps to the left across the picture plane. Except for two stylized fir trees anchoring their direction before and behind them, they are moving through a blue-gray, non-defined space. The color "palate" is harmoniously complementary, making for a sense of the traditional tribal unity that constitutes the action of the piece. The Pueblo Indians' sense of unity with each other and Nature is at the core of their belief system, and is enacted in their ceremonies. Zia artist-student Waka (Ignacio Moquino) eloquently expressed this oneness with nature in his tempera painting *Dancers Coming from the Hills* (ca. 1937). Elaborately graceful, stylized flora flank the winding path being followed by the dancers vertically down the picture plane. Two dancers with half-hidden, featureless faces dominate the foreground, and at first glance they appear to be accompanied by only one other dancer behind them on the path. However, when one looks closer, two other dancers painted in lesser color values are seen at the top of the path. The presence of these two dancers, who are impersonating deer, is also obscured because their figures appear to be inseparable from the stylized flora, suggesting their oneness with Nature. It is noteworthy that Dorothy Dunn chose *Dancers Coming from the Hills* as the frontispiece for her book *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, so she apparently apprised this painting to be a significant portrayal of Pueblo Indian ceremonialism and life.



Illustration 4.2: 51348/13 “*Ghost Dancers*” 1936 Lorenzo Beard “Horse Chief,” Cheyenne/Arapaho, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

Although the bulk of the paintings in this study were from the Southwest, the presence of Plains Indians artist-students in the Studio was nevertheless strongly expressed in sixteen paintings that depicted their cultures. Only seven Plains students have been identified by name for the period of Dunn’s tenure at the Studio, and they came from the Cheyenne, Kiowa, Arapaho, Sioux, and Omaha nations. Of these sixteen paintings, six were ceremonial in subject, but only one stands out as distinctively rendering a communal – and here historical—sense of identity. In this painting, *Ghost Dancers* (1936), Cheyenne/Arapaho artist-student Lorenzo Beard/Horse Chief presented five faceless dancers wearing fringed tunic shirts made from what appears to be colored cloth. The question arises as to whether or not these shirts were meant to be ghost shirts,

the garment important in the pan-Indian, Ghost Dance revitalization movement circa 1890. Ghost Dance members believed that these shirts would protect the wearers from physical harm. Beard's shirts do appear to be made from cloth and have fringed long sleeves, but the cloth is printed in various colors and designs. However, according to one of the informants in ethnologist James Mooney's contemporary account of the Ghost Dance and the 1890 massacre of its participants at Wounded Knee, which was published in the *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1892-1893*, the ghost shirts were made of white muslin.³⁸⁸ However, an illustration of an Arapaho ghost shirt from Mooney's report has similarly fringed sleeves, as well as the same V-shaped fringed design on the chest plate area seen in Beard's shirts, but is not made of printed cloth.³⁸⁹ Dorothy Dunn was known to have shown her students copies of Bureau of American Ethnology reports, and she even arranged an exhibition at the school of Kiowa and Sioux paintings on loan from the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution.³⁹⁰ Of course, it is not known whether Lorenzo Beard/Horse Chief saw the ghost shirts shown in Moody's report, or if he had seen the shirts or simply heard descriptions of them from fellow tribesmen. In any case,

³⁸⁸James Mooney, *The Ghost-Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890* (1896; rev. ed., Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), 42. This translated account was written by George Sword, Ogalala Sioux.

³⁸⁹Ibid., Fig. 18, "Arapaho ghost shirt – reverse," 152.

³⁹⁰"Plains Indian Skin Paintings Exhibited," *Tequayo*, Vol. 3, No. 5 (Spring/April 1934): 7. The article was probably not written by a Plains student since it stated the following: "The Kiowa paintings show scenes from their weird ceremonies, and many tribal designs," as well as subjects such as a "sun dance altar, a mud bath ceremony, a peyote meeting, and camp scenes." Note was also made that the exhibition "was for the especial benefit of the Plains Indian students, to give them a better idea of ancient tribal art, costumes, and design."

Beard's choice to paint them certainly indicated that he identified them with his people's tragic history.

Another example of the depiction of Plains ceremonialism, Cheyenne artist-student Allen Bushyhead's *Buffalo Dance* (1936), displays the use of fine lines of delineation similar to Beard's in *Ghost Dancers*. Certainly the choice of the dance performed to entice the appearance of the buffaloes pounding the Great Plains was indicative of the Cheyennes' identification of that animal as having been crucial to their vitality as a people. The covering of the dancers' heads with buffalo masks not only signified their impersonation of the buffalo, but erased their individual identities for the sake of the tribal good.

Indeed, it can be safely asserted that ceremonies were primarily performed by all these tribes for the good of the community, rather than for individual gain. This is again evident in the one painting by an artist-student from the Northeast culture area, Sauk/Fox Charles Pushetonequa, in his *Woodland Buffalo Dance* (1942). The dancers, all male, are seen with women dressed in traditional attire, and two of the men and women are wearing what appear to be oak branches on their heads. This touch of oak greenery clearly sets this dance off from buffalo dances of the other areas, but clearly reminds the viewer that the buffalo was an extremely important life-giver for Indians in this area as well at one time. However, the painting has a peculiarity rarely seen in Studio painting. At the top of the painting there are Southwest-type motifs of the sun, rain, and thunder, all of which suggests that Pushetonequa had incorporated cultural elements from fellow students from the Southwest into his own painting. Perhaps Pushetonequa, the only known Sauk/Fox

student at the Studio, had incorporated these motifs as a show of understanding and solidarity with indigenous peoples. Another explanation is that Pushetonequa was fulfilling desires of Studio patrons to see Southwestern motifs that they recognized as being Indian, while he had no such readily recognizable markers from his own culture.

Aside from these visible signs of communal identity evident in ceremonial paintings, there are most probably invisible ones that only the artist and other initiates could discern, and most certainly there are secret, communally-shared elements of these ceremonies that were intentionally omitted. As mentioned earlier, one theory is that this secrecy among Pueblo Indians resulted from the repressive Spanish colonization and Catholic proselytism. While this is certainly plausible, such secrecy protected the beliefs and rituals they shared as a people that not only defined who they were, but set them apart from others.

As best as she could, Dorothy Dunn respectfully kept a watchful eye for any depictions of tribally proscribed subjects and symbols. During her year of teaching in the Santo Domingo Day School, Dunn had learned the hard way that adults there most decidedly did not want the students to paint certain items, such as masks, as part of their studies. Santo Domingo elders were quite vigilant about what artist-students from their pueblos were painting at the Studio. Pop Chalee, a Taos student at the Studio who developed a quite successful lifelong career as an artist, recalled during an interview for the Heard Museum oral history project that when Dunn opened the Studio, ““Santo Domingos would come and watch, to see what the kids were painting,”” and ““if they saw

one of their kids painting the sacred dances they would tear the painting up.”³⁹¹ Pop Chalee explained that the Santo Domingos “did not want to be exploited – pictured and painted and hung on walls.”³⁹² Dunn noted in her book that “Even human figures which had no ceremonial significance were practically taboo in Santo Domingan art, and if they were shown at all they would usually have faces turned away or partly hidden behind some object.”³⁹³ Students from other pueblos also commonly stylized or obscured the faces of dancers in their paintings, whether it was due to tribal restrictions, chosen style, or limitations of artistic facility. However, there was also the possibility that instead of fearing that the essence of a human being would be captured on a piece of paper, the artists were emphasizing their tribal identity and communal identity by painting anonymous human figures. As will be discussed later, it was possibly due to this tribal proscription that Santo Domingo artist-students found their own voice in decorative pieces derived from traditional tribal motifs.

Indeed, it appears from this study that the majority of human figures in ceremonial paintings were depicted anonymously in groups. However, some artists, such as Tonita Lujan, Vicente Mirabal, and Lolita Torivio, discovered innovative means of portraying a communal nature of identity and form. Others, such as Navajo Sybil Yazzie, experimented with expressing the multicultural aspects of identity and explored several painting styles, while Hopi and Apache artist-students characteristically concentrated on depicting spirit figures to the exclusion of human ones. However, the Studio artist-

³⁹¹ Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down*, 144.

³⁹² Ibid.

³⁹³ Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 291.

students rarely depicted only one ceremonial dancer, and as will be discussed later, they also seldom chose a single human figure for their non-ceremonial paintings.

Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Ceremonies and Individual Identity

Out of the eighty Studio paintings in this study, there are only two of single ceremonial dancers. One of these, Se-Ru's (Joe Hilario Herrera) *Men's Arrow Dance* (1938), is also perhaps the most unique painterly depiction of a dancer. Despite the anonymity of the stylized face shown in profile, the exquisite choice of color and streamlined details combined with the grace of action make this a uniquely personified figure, and one that cannot be compared to any other dancer seen in Studio paintings. It was also an early indication of the individuality of style that distinguished Se-Ru as an innovative artist in subsequent years.

Another singular painting by the Kiowa artist-student Asuate (George Keahbone), *Kiowa Eagle Dancer* (1935?), expressed the exuberance of a single dancer ironically through his static stance. With the dancer's outstretched arms and legs forming an "X," and his profiled head looking up, one senses that he is declaring his presence in the dance. The muted values of the colors red and yellow, combined with the costume's details in black and white, reveal a singularity of style, and clearly indicate that this is a Plains version of the Eagle Dance.

It would seem, then, that the Studio artist-students as a whole interpreted their respective tribal ceremonies as communal events in which the individual dancer, or personator, and spectator were subsumed into the ceremony – all were one, and one was all. Alfonso Ortiz, a San Juan historian of the Pueblo peoples, has written that “the self is

submerged” among Puebloans.³⁹⁴ In Pueblo traditions this is ideally so, and is born out by this study of Pueblo ceremonial paintings. However, when it came to painting non-ceremonial or lifeway subjects, the Studio artists overwhelmingly emphasized modern, individual identities whether they were expressed in the number and activities of the human figures depicted, or in individual artistic styles, as will be seen in the following discussion.

Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Lifeway and Individual Identity

The categories of ceremonial and non-ceremonial/lifeway paintings chosen for this study in themselves characterize the nature and preoccupation of American Indian art, and distinguish it from mainstream American art, to which, obviously, such categorization could never be applied. Of course, it must be kept in mind that Indian subjects though they were, the medium of expression – painting on paper – was not Indian, but assimilated from the dominant Euro-American culture. But the non-ceremonial subjects – e.g., genre, decorative, hunting – were also assimilated ideas for many of the students as well, in particular for the groups from the Southwest. Interestingly enough, although Dunn often lamented the largely vanished artistic tradition of the Plains Indians, many of them had taken up such subjects in their ledger book art and hide paintings that depicted hunts, war, and “winters” documenting their collective histories. Yet despite this tradition of recording collective identities, ten of the sixteen Plains Indian paintings studied were concerned with non-ceremonial subjects. On the whole, the ratios between ceremonial and non-ceremonial subjects were also close in the

³⁹⁴ Alfonso Ortiz, “Ritual Drama and the Pueblo World,” in Alfonso Ortiz, ed., *New Perspectives on the Pueblos* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972), 153.



Illustration 4.3: 53985/13 "*Hopi Woman Weaving Basket*" 1933 Philip Zeyouma, Hopi Pueblo, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

Navajo and Pueblo paintings: eighteen ceremonial versus twenty-two non-ceremonial/lifeway for the Navajo, and thirty-three ceremonial versus thirty-nine non-ceremonial/lifeway for the Pueblos. Thus, it appears that the Studio artist-students gave almost equal weight to these arbitrary divisions – divisions that were foreign to them

since in their cultures, ceremonies were part and parcel of their lifeways and who they were.

As discussed previously, the Hopi paintings were almost exclusively involved with the ceremonial aspect of their community. Given this preoccupation, the one non-ceremonial Hopi painting, Philip Zeyouma's *Hopi Woman Weaving Basket* (1933), is especially interesting because stylistically and subject-wise it is one of the most individualistic of all the paintings, and also is not typical of the Studio style. A lone woman, dressed in the traditional *manta* (the traditional Pueblo one-shouldered dress) and shawl is seen in a seated position and weaving a basket as she looks directly out of the picture plane. We can also tell from her braids that she is a full-figured adult, which also suggests the importance of fecundity in the Hopi matrilineal society. Throughout all of the paintings, only six (including Zeyouma's) depict a woman alone, and four of those were painted by a female artist. *Hopi Woman Weaving Basket* is also the only instance where a woman is looking squarely at the viewer, which suggests both a sense of self and lack of timidity uncharacteristic of contemporary Hopi women, or indeed of the majority of American Indian women traditionally. Aside from showing considerable respect for this woman and her identity and craft, Zeyouma painted the outline of her body fluidly and with flowing forms of color, and without the usual heavy lines seen in most Studio paintings; in doing so he seemed to be expressing her softness, or femininity, while at the same time asserting her unquestioned sense of self. As for the artist, Zeyouma apparently found his own impressive style at the beginning of his career at the Studio since he executed this painting in 1933. In her written reflections on the fifth year of the Studio, Dorothy Dunn observed that Zeyouma's "work had a strong individual stamp and could

never be mistaken for that of any other Hopi artist.”³⁹⁵ Unfortunately, although Zeyouma was at the Studio during Dunn’s entire tenure, he apparently did not continue to paint his watercolors since his record ran dry afterwards.

Perhaps the most salient aspect of expressions of individuality in the non-ceremonial paintings studied is found in the work of female artist-students at the Studio, and among them Pueblo women predominated. Of particular note is the centrality of a single woman in the Pueblo paintings. P’otsunu’s (Geromina Cruz Montoya) *Gathering Peppers* (1935) and *Picking Plums* (1934) are simple and eloquent pictures of single women going about their work of procuring daily food for their families and the pueblo. Despite the presence of a lone woman, with stylistic hairstyles and profiled faces, each of these women could be any woman in the pueblo. P’otsunu’s choice to paint only one woman, rather than a few or several, was a symbolically powerful statement of the feminine life-force and identity within Pueblo culture.

A most unique expression of female individuality can be seen in Acoma artist-student Lolita Torivio’s *Woman Picking Chili* (1936). First of all, the one-dimensionality of the background of a stylized tree and food-bearing plants certainly does not fit the definition of the Studio style. Juxtaposed on this scene is a lone woman with the commonly stylized, profiled face and dressed in typical Pueblo fashion. However, one element makes her unique among all the women seen in Studio paintings: the woman has gray hair, which, of course, defines her as being elderly. Torivio seems to be making the point that even though the woman is aged, she is still strong and still making her contribution to the pueblo, a statement reinforcing the traditionally matrilineal society of Acoma.

³⁹⁵ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 298.



Illustration 4.4: 54003/13 “*Navajo Women with Corn*” 1941 Mary Ellen, Navajo, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs, www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

Particularly interesting are the depictions of both the female and male sexes in Navajo paintings. Perhaps the most visually pleasing expression of the two sexes is seen in Navajo artist Mary Ellen’s paintings *Navajo Women with Corn* (1941) and *Man with Corn* (ca. 1936). Formally, one is initially struck by Mary Ellen’s amazing application of shades of white in these pictures – an application not seen in any other Studio paintings. At the center of *Man with Corn* is a man standing and holding a husk of corn in one hand and a hoe in the other; his stance is resolute but relaxed and confident, and the bandana on his head and his tunic shirt identify him as a Navajo. He is surrounded by tall

cornstalks that seem to be in movement. The man's pale blue tunic and the cornstalks of ceremonial/lifeway for the Navajo, and thirty-three ceremonial versus thirty-nine non-ceremonial/lifeway for the Pueblos. Thus, it appears that the Studio artist-students gave almost equal weight to these arbitrary divisions – divisions that were foreign to them.

Such gracefulness in portraying the Navajo male and female is starkly different from the satirical depiction of the sexes seen in Toh Yah's (Gerald Nailor) *untitled* ('Tourists Looking at Rug') (1938), and indeed this painting is *the* singular piece of social commentary on Indian and non-Indian relations in this selection of Studio paintings. At the center of the picture is a Navajo rug, which is being held up by a Navajo man who is looking down shyly and avoiding the perusal of two non-Indians who appear to be man and wife. On the other side of the rug stand a Navajo woman and two children, and presumably they and the rug bearer are a nuclear family. The Navajo woman is also avoiding the two non-Indians, whom Toh Yah cleverly chose to portray as stereotypically wealthy tourists, indicating, of course, that he had knowledge of how such individuals were represented in the dominant white American society. The balding man is shown smoking a cigar, and the woman is wearing a fur-trimmed coat as she peers through a pince nez at the rug. Toh Yah also suggested the sated status of these would-be consumers of Navajo labor in subtle details; the man is heavy-set, and the well-fed nature of the woman is suggested by her fat ankles vainly stuffed into tiny high-heeled shoes. This is a telling example of an Indian man's visualization of the clash between the two cultures: one is clearly dominant (non-Indian) and the other submissive (Indian). Toh



Illustration 4.5: 51404/13 *untitled* {‘Tourists Looking at a Rug’} 1938 Gerald Nailor “Toh Yah”, Navajo, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

Yah also made another inescapable comment about the difference between what he recognized as two races – the Navajo family has dark skin and the non-Indians are very pale. This painting is not only a Navajo statement about identity, but about counter-identity that also turns white racism on its head; on the surface the Navajo family's bodily expressions are meek, but in contrast to the intrusiveness and jerky body behavior of the tourists the Navajos represent the height of serenity and confidence, and good manners.

The subject of the coloring of skin by the young adults at the Studio will be discussed further later in this chapter. However, since Toh Yah's *untitled* ('*Tourists Looking at Rug*') is probably the most important piece of social commentary to emanate from the Studio, a few comments are needed here. Of the six individuals in the painting, three of them – the Navajo couple and the male tourist – have facial features that make them easily identifiable as individuals. This identification, combined with the other narrative details, suggests that Toh Yah took the racial and social differences very personally; if he had obscured all of the individuals' faces, he would have been commenting in the abstract on this perceived racial and cultural divide. Either way, surely Toh Yah was expressing a social consciousness that he did not harbor alone among his Studio compadres; they were fully aware of their racial and social distinction vis-à-vis not only their white patrons, but also the dominant white American society.

Toh Yah's Studio classmate Allan Houser recalled in an interview for the Heard Museum oral history project that Toh Yah “was a man who was very daring with color.”³⁹⁶ Toh Yah's brave excursion into satirical art was superseded by his fascination with horses, as seen in another one of his works from 1937, *Wild Horses*. Fanciful

³⁹⁶ Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down*, 91.

depictions of horses was a favorite subject for several of the Navajo artist-students, among them in particular Andrew Tsighnajinnie and Narcisco Abeyta, but Toh Yah gave his horses a uniquely magical essence. He was not afraid to distort anatomical features in order to give these animals supernatural powers of movement. Perhaps he reveled in the celebratory possibilities of decorative art, an art that was essentially apolitical. After leaving the Studio, Toh Yah made a successful career as an artist until his untimely death at the age of 35.

The career of Navajo artist Ha So De (Narcisco Abeyta) was most productive before his service in World War II. Ha So De's subject matter consistently focused on the Navajo way of life, but he found his distinction in achieving a modernism in his paintings akin to that of modern European painters, and this was evident even while he was at the Studio. In particular, his *Antelope Hunt* (1938) is a modern masterpiece. In this painting, Ha So De created a confluence of lines strafing across the canvas that moves the planes of the men, flora and fauna into the third dimension. The horses and antelopes seemingly are dancing in space, and whereas stylized flora typically anchor central figures in Studio paintings, here they, too, are liberated and reinforce the multi-planarity of the entire ensemble. The planar movement of each component proceeds along a diagonal line with only the imagination left to carry it into another dimension. If one draws diagonal lines charting each drift, i.e., reduces it to its essence, the result is an utterly nonobjective painting. The painting also brings to mind Russian avant-garde painter Vasilii Kandinsky's *White Background* (1920), which also operates around a planar movement of objects that are far more deconstructed than those in *Antelope Hunt*. However, one can easily imagine the horse in *White Background* as a further abstracted version of the horse in the right half of *Antelope Hunt*, and Kandinsky's black checkerboard greatly resembles one of Ha So De's abstracted plants. It is quite possible

that Ha So De saw *White Background* during one of the European art lectures that Dorothy Dunn presented to the students, for Dunn stated that she had exposed the students to the “color, design and dynamism” of Kandinsky and as well as to the works of other European moderns.³⁹⁷ Regardless, Ha So De had intuited the modernist sense of abstraction and fused it with his paintings of Navajo distinction.

Dunn wanted to show the students “that there were many periods, schools, and styles contributing to the whole of art.”³⁹⁸ She recorded that “at times [they] were amazed at unaccountable similarities” between designs and styles from ancient Mediterranean art or Persian and Indian miniatures and their own.³⁹⁹ One of her students, Pop-Chalee (Merina Lujan Hopkins) was especially surprised to find a likeness between her own work and that of Oriental art. Pop-Chalee’s father was from Taos Pueblo, but her mother had some East Indian ancestry mixed into her predominantly Swiss family ancestry. Dunn surmised that this East Indian background, coupled with Pop-Chalee’s study of Persian and Indian miniatures, “partially” accounted for paintings such as *Running Deer* (1937?), with its fanciful, mosaic-like flora and semi-naturalistic running antelope.⁴⁰⁰ Pop-Chalee went on to enjoy a lifelong, varied career as an artist and exponent of Indian culture after her graduation from the Studio, but she never acknowledged any influence from her East Indian ancestry. Instead, Pop-Chalee always identified herself and her art with membership in the Taos Pueblo.

These discussions of artistic individuality in non-ceremonial paintings have, of course, been dominated by the works of Pueblo and Navajo artist-students simply

³⁹⁷ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 287.

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

³⁹⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁰ Dorothy Dunn, “The Artists of Taos Pueblo,” *The Taoseno* (March 27, 1941). Pop Chalee Papers, Scrapbook; quoted in Margaret Cesa, *The World of Flower Blue, Pop Chalee: An Artistic Biography* (Santa Fe: Red Crane Books, 1997), 59.

because they constituted the dominant groups at the Studio. However, attention should also be given to artist-students from two other groups who had interesting things to say in this regard: Chippewa/Ojibway Agnes Bird and Cherokee Cecil Dick. Two paintings from these artists share two components – the depiction of a solitary figure, which, as stated earlier, was an uncommon phenomenon in Studio paintings, and a style that deviated from the Studio norm – the complete painting of the pictorial space.

In *Chippewa Woman Stripping Birch Bark* (1932), Agnes Bird painted a female figure into a scene of white birch trees and green foliage uniquely crafted among Studio paintings. Against a background of golden color, the trees and foliage traverse the entirety of the pictorial space, while the lighter golden color of the female figure's leather costume blend her into the scene as she goes about stripping birch bark. The traditional Chippewa/Ojibwa inscribed maps recording their migration onto birch bark scrolls that were then used in ceremonies of the Midewiwin medicine society. Perhaps Bird was celebrating Chippewa women's contribution to preserving their people's history, especially since only men were admitted into the Midewiwin society, and few of the scrolls have survived since they were usually buried with their medicine-men owners.⁴⁰¹

Interestingly enough, a Mide Wiwin Club was formed at the SFIS in March 1933. The stated purpose of the club was to learn "Indian songs, dances, games, sign language, Indian foods, clothing and archery," and each member was called "by his Indian name."⁴⁰² Both males and females were admitted to membership in this club, and they were divided into clans. The SFIS take on this tradition was also trans-cultural since

⁴⁰¹ John D. Nichols, "Ojibwa," in Frederick E. Hoxie, ed., *Encyclopedia of North American Indians, Native American History, Culture, and Life from Paleo-Indians to the Present* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996), 438. Note that the designation "Ojibwa" is now primarily used to identify this group in Canada, while its corruption, "Chippewa," is the name used by tribal groups recognized by the U.S. government. However, many Ojibwas in the U.S. and Canada also identify themselves as Anishinaabe, translated as "First [or Original] People."

⁴⁰² "Mide Wiwin Club," *Tequayo, 1932-1933*, 23.



Illustration 4.6: 51357/13 “*Chippewa Woman Stripping Birch Bark*” 1932 Agnes Bird, Chippewa, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

among the members of the “Plains Indians Clan,” only one that year was a Plains Indian, Kiowa Jack Hokeah.⁴⁰³ Of course, this may have been because Plains Indians were a small minority of the student enrollment, but it is nevertheless interesting that such a clan was still formed. Unfortunately, no information has been found regarding Agnes Bird after she left the Studio in 1935.

⁴⁰³ Ibid.

Cherokee Dagadahga or Da-'Ga-Dah'-Ga (Standing Alone) (Cecil Dick), however, went on to enjoy a long career as an artist and educator. Dagadahga recalled in an interview conducted a year before his death in 1992 that he “was the only student at



Illustration 4.7: 51360/13, “*Cherokee Hunter with Game*” 1935 Cecil Dick/”Da-'Ga-Dah’Ga”, Cherokee, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

the Studio who painted in the Woodlands style, an individualist who didn't conform, so he was left to paint in his own way.”⁴⁰⁴ And indeed Dagadahga does appear to have found his own personal style of painting, one of strong, swirling background colors filling the pictorial space, at the Studio, as seen in *Cherokee Hunter with Game* (1935?). Perhaps the most striking feature of this hunter is the coloring of his skin in a deep red color, a skin coloring that is not found in any other Studio painting. Dagadahga also had the unique opportunity of signing his name to the painting in Cherokee syllabary, something that no other Studio artist was able to do since they did not yet have their own.

Only fourteen of the seventy-nine non-ceremonial paintings centered on a solitary man or woman, but the number of male and female subjects, and the number of male and female artists painting solitary figures, was fairly even. However, among the non-ceremonial paintings concerned with group identity, which will be discussed next, women artists predominated, and the majority came from the Pueblos. More significantly, the majority of the non-ceremonial paintings were concerned with individual identity as opposed to collective identity. Of course, ceremonial subjects intrinsically involved group participation, so predictably the paintings would reflect this fact. On the other hand, non-ceremonial subjects lent themselves to the portrayal of lifeway preoccupations carried out by both groups and individuals, the gendering of which was rigidly portrayed, e.g., women never painted hunts, and men never painted women’s traditional activities. By opening up the possibilities for depicting activities performed by individuals, perhaps the range of choice prompted the Studio artists to delve into expressing the one as a part of the whole, and to more readily explore unique styles in the process. However, even when depicting group identity in non-ceremonial

⁴⁰⁴ Cecil Dick, as quoted in Patrick Lester, ed. *The Biographical Directory of Native American Painters* (Tulsa: Sir Publications, 1995), 151.

paintings, the Studio artist-students nevertheless found ways to express a unique understanding of their sense of place. And throughout, as contemporary artist Tony Abeyta has pointed out, there was an “immense honesty to all these paintings.”⁴⁰⁵

Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Lifeway and Collective Identity

Pueblo women’s crafting of utilitarian objects for everyday life, which was typically a group effort, was a common subject in these paintings, and likewise an important subject of women’s paintings. In Acoma artist-student Rosita Martinez’s *Acoma Women Selling Potteries* (1936), we see three rather naively painted women arranging a display of pots, to which the artist assigned more care in fashioning their designs than to the human figures. In her painting *Pueblo Crafts* (1938), P’otsunu from San Juan Pueblo displayed other traditionally female crafts such as boot making and the weaving of clothing. The women’s faces in both paintings are indistinguishable, again suggesting that the emphasis is placed on the objects of their communal work labor rather than on themselves. However, a lone woman is seen in Sah Wa’s (Rufina Vigil) *Woman Firing Pottery* (1935?), but even here the absence of individualization in the woman’s figure suggests that she, too, is representative of all women potters in Sah Wa’s home in Tesuque pueblo. Additionally, the fire and pots occupy almost three-fourths of the picture while the woman’s figure, although strong and prominent through contrasting colors, is placed on the right-hand margin.

By the 1930s, tourism to the Southwest had helped cultivate a steady market for Pueblo women to make these items for outside sale, and as a result some of the women had begun to displace their husbands as the principal source of family income. However, as historian Margaret D. Jacobs has pointed out, non-Indians may have been the primary

⁴⁰⁵ Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

economic force for commercializing these crafts, but they were not the primary force driving their creation. Citing statements made by Pueblo women potters, including the famous Maria Martinez from San Ildefonso, that pottery making had not died out in the pueblos before non-Indians became interested in it, Jacobs argues that “Far from assimilating them, however, the commercialization of Pueblo culture fostered new cultural forms and a set of fresh strategies for both maintaining ethnic identity and integrating into the American economy.”⁴⁰⁶ One can safely assume that these young female artists were keenly aware of what their sisters at home were doing to keep the pueblo economically viable and their craft traditions vibrant, even as they themselves were finding similar new roles and identities for themselves. However, Pueblo men, such as Maria Martinez’s husband Julian Martinez, also participated in the pottery making by painting designs on the surfaces. Their son, Popovi Da (Tony Martinez), who not only observed his parents at work but joined them in making and painting pottery, brought this knowledge with him to the Studio, as did Jose Vicente Aguilar from San Ildefonso, whose father, Jose Angela Aguilar, painted pottery made by his mother, Rosalie Simbola, who was a native of Picuris Pueblo.⁴⁰⁷ Years later Aguilar told author Tryntje Van Ness Seymour, particularly regarding his observation of ceremonials, “Most of my work is from memory. You see so much of it when you are growing up, I guess it is just in your mind.”⁴⁰⁸

Some of the Studio artist-students wanted to reach beyond pottery design motifs for their inspiration and open up Indian art to express other aspects of Indian life. Santa Clara artist Tse Tsan, who became better known as Pablita Velarde during her subsequent

⁴⁰⁶ Margaret D. Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters, Feminism and Pueblo Cultures, 1879-1934* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 10, 178-179.

⁴⁰⁷ Seymour, *After the Rainbow Touches Down*, 157-158.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., 158.

lifelong and successful career as a painter and doll-maker, keenly understood the challenge that this presented vis-à-vis non-Indian patrons.

There were so few of us that were trying to push Indian art and trying to influence people to like Indian art. And they [patrons] understood pottery because it was a thing that they could touch and hold and take it home if they want and it was cheap. But art, they just couldn't see that a painted little picture hanging on their wall with an Indian hopping around on, on air, they just couldn't picture that connection there with their own life and with the poor artist that was trying to make fifty cents under the Portal.⁴⁰⁹

Velarde seemed to be saying that while Indian art could easily be objectified in a pot, non-Indians had a much harder time trying to understand the nature of Indian identity when it was presented in the less tangible form of a painting. In order to bridge this lack of understanding, Velarde and others painted lifeway scenes in ways that they hoped would both humanize them and speak to their identities.

Perhaps the most visually assertive example of expressing women's personal traditions among the Pueblos is offered in Velarde's *Dressing Young Girl for First Ceremonial Dance* (1939?). The young girl is the focal point and apex of a triangle formed by three women as they attend to the details of the traditional ceremonial attire of the manta, white boots, and shawl. The young woman's strength is powerfully yet gracefully depicted as she assertively looks out of the picture frame, yet modestly since her gaze is not full on. Tse Tsan keenly understood the strength and stamina that women

⁴⁰⁹ Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.



Illustration 4.8: 24355/13 “*Dressing Young Girl for First Ceremonial Dance*” 1939
Pablita Velarde “Tse Tsan,” Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of
Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John
Franks

from her culture possessed, and she herself was a prime exemplar of these powers that she expressed in many of her paintings.

Navajo Mary Ellen's *Keshjee* (*Shoe Game or Moccasin Game*) in which six men are shown playing the game while seated in an odd, one-dimensional configuration, is one of the more unusual genre paintings from this group – both in subject and style. According to Navajo informant Kalley Museal from the Heard Museum oral project, this game was a “kind of ceremony in itself” that was carried out only in the winter with the objective of bringing rain.⁴¹⁰ The subdued and dark color palette is unique, and altogether the style of this painting marks the individuality of Mary Ellen's oeuvre. Studio artist Joe Herrera remembered that Mary Ellen, who was older than him, “mostly did domestic things,” although she did paint some ceremonial dances.⁴¹¹ Most unfortunately, nothing is known about Mary Ellen after she left the Studio. According to Tony Abeyta, a painting by Mary Ellen “is the hardest thing in the world to get,” eclipsing even those by Sybil Yazzie and his father, Narcisco Abeyta.⁴¹²

In addition to the gendered identification evident among the Pueblo female artists, such cohesion is also evident in paintings by some non-Pueblo men. Sioux artist Wilmer Dupree/Wilmar DuPree eloquently depicted the victory march of warriors in *Sioux Warriors Coming Home* (1935). The warriors' horses are fused together in one mass that seems to be moving to the right across and out of the picture plane. A war ritual from

⁴¹⁰ Seymour, *After the Rainbow Touches Down*, 97.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., 90.

⁴¹² Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

Sioux culture is evident by the bands tied on the tails of the two riderless horses, indicating that they have been stolen from an enemy. A similar fusion of forms is seen in Navajo artist-student Quincy Tahoma's *Riders Resting* (1937), in which he engaged the subject of sheepherding, traditionally a male occupation among the Navajo. The tilting



Illustration 4.9: 51362/13 "Sioux Warriors Coming Home" 1935 Wilmar DuPree, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

positions and graceful lines of the horses and their riders make for an interconnectedness of their masses that expresses their comradeship out in the desert. Acculturative influences from the non-Indian world are present in western-style clothing, yet one of the men is wearing more traditional Navajo garb while he lights a cigarette. Tahoma also anchored them by providing the perspective of a horizon and distant butte and mountains.

Given the vastness of the landscapes that visually and physically dominated the lives of native peoples of the American Southwest, one might easily expect that Studio artists from that region would naturally gravitate toward painting such scenes – and this despite Dorothy Dunn's discouragement. However, there are only a few landscapes present among these paintings, and they were executed by Navajo and Pueblo students. Quincy Tahoma exchanged his three sheepherders in *Riders Resting* for a mother bear and two cubs in *Three Bears* (1936). The bears are shown occupying what appears to be a precipice, but the picture itself is dominated by the vastness of a sky penetrated by two pine trees. However, in fellow Navajo Ned Notah's *Canyon de Chelly* (1936), the sky has been reduced to a sliver of white that is almost undetectable due to the colorful, semi-naturalistic landscape that covers the remainder of the picture plane. In both of these paintings, animals are presented in the absence of human beings – aside, of course, from the implied eye of the artist.

Nature is never purely represented in any landscape simply because what is painted is of course not *sui generis*, but the expression of how the artist views the environment. As such, landscapes are by nature fanciful no matter how naturalistically they are painted. Several of the Studio artist-students apparently understood this element of whimsy and took it into unique, exploratory realms. Pop-Chalee (Merina Hopkins) in particular explored the magic, or supernatural aspect of Nature most exuberantly both in her early paintings at the Studio, and throughout her career by creating a unique repertoire of fanciful landscapes and decorative pieces. In one of her earliest paintings, *Trees and Animals (Forest Scene No. 3)* (1935?), Pop-Chalee pieced together a multitude

of tiny, mosaic-like pieces into a vibrant composite of delicate tree foliage and graceful creatures that apparently established not only a style of her own, but one that was emulated, however weakly, by fellow Navajo artist-students Wade Tadischine in *Wild Animals in the Woods* (1937?) and Che-Chilly-Tsosie (Stanley Mitchell) in *Along the Lake* (1936). And only two years after having painted *Trees and Animals (Forest Scene No. 3)*, Pop-Chalee had amplified her fanciful forest into the exquisite delicacy of flora and gravity-defying deer seen in *Running Deer* (1937?). For these artists, the elements of Nature were eternal and steadfastly fused into the universal harmony of man and Nature at the core of their belief systems. But when given the opportunity to express this harmony, the Studio artist-students were not limited to any iconographic representations of Nature, but instead thought about Nature and their relationship to it in dynamic, idiosyncratic ways.

Somewhat unexpectedly, similar dynamic inventions of depictions of Nature were produced among Studio artists from extremely conservative tribes. Paradoxically, this inventive stance was partly influenced by tribal restrictions on painting ceremonial esoterica. Belardo Nieto from Santo Domingo streamlined his forest scene to the extreme in his painting *Untitled* (1936?). The painting consists of a pine tree traversed by a running deer, yet he included traditional stylizations of the sun and rain clouds in the upper corners. The overall style recalls that of the Art Deco movement, yet there is no doubt about the identity of the painting as Indian. However, Zia Juan B. Medina did a number of abstracted paintings of flora and birds that on first glance are not readily identifiable as being Indian. However, upon closer examination, it is clear that Medina

had lifted his flora and birds from pottery designs. Caroline Coriz from Tesuque also studied and incorporated cross-tribal designs into her painting *Textile Pattern from an Acoma Motif* (1934). By incorporating design basics into their paintings, Medina and Coriz were exemplary proponents of examining what traditional arts the Pueblos held in common, and of reducing these design elements into a common denominator of identity.

Certainly the existence of such a common denominator of identity is crucial to supporting the proposition that a “Studio Style” of painting emerged at the SFIS in the 1930s. But it was also a pan-Indian identity that included but exceeded the bounds of Pueblo cultures to include all of the American Indian cultures represented in the Studio. Of course, the question arises as to whether or not the landscapes and decorative pieces fit this definition, and the answer is that they definitely did. Landscapes such as Ned Notah’s *Canyon de Chelly* deviate from the flat, decorative figuration definitive of the Style. Yet the defining of the Style entails more than the description of its formal, programmatic qualities. In her reconsideration of the meaning of landscapes in history of American art, *The Empire of the Eye, Landscape Representations and American Cultural Politics, 1825-1875*, Angela Miller attempted to explain “not only why landscape painting held such a key place in American art but, more precisely, what its role was in the formation of cultural identity.”⁴¹³ Miller argued that “it is in the dilemmas of representation itself that landscape painting reveals its deepest, most submerged concerns

⁴¹³ Angela Miller, *The Empire of the Eye, Landscape Representations and American Cultural Politics, 1825-1875* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993), 1-2.

– concerns that parallel the central dilemmas of nation building.”⁴¹⁴ Miller did not include any Indian art in her discussion, and this is certainly understandable since one would be extremely hard pressed to find any association between American Indian art and nineteenth-century landscapes. Yet Miller’s thesis does speak to these Studio artist-students’ attempts to express their identification with the land of their ancestral homes in the social landscape of the twentieth-century America. And this identification of American Indians with the land, and their coming to grips with their modern identity, was certainly crucial to defining the multicultural essence of the “Studio Style.”

Painting American Indian Culture and Identity: Skin and Mien

The previous discussions concerning the depiction of group versus individual identity largely concerned sorting out general impressions of how the Studio artist-students viewed themselves from a cultural standpoint. However, the focus of the study will now be turned to more specific concerns of how they actually painted their representative human forms. Did they give their faces individual characteristics? Were the faces individualized or stylized? What color did they paint their skin? Was the skin brown, light-skinned, or red? In other words, how did these American Indians display their physical identity?

Out of the 150 paintings chosen for this survey, the faces in seventy-four paintings were studied, as were the skin colorations in eighty-two. The overall conclusion based on these two elements of distinction was that the majority of the human forms presented were light-skinned with individualized faces; 55.4% or forty-one of the paintings had individualized faces, and 36.6% or thirty had light-skinned bodies.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., 2.

However, in 35.3% or twenty-nine of the paintings the human figures presented brown-colored skin, 22% or eighteen had varying colors (some painted), while only 6% or five had red skin. This variation suggests that while the majority of the Studio artist-students had a strong sense of the cultural distinction of their people, they were less sure in the matter of skin color. Of course, the reasons for the latter phenomenon can only be speculative. The concept of race probably played a role in this quandary. The Red Progressives certainly spoke of in terms of the “Indian race,” and certainly contemporary non-Indian Americans were squarely oriented in thinking about Indians as a separate race. However, it is impossible to know just how much the Studio artist-students looked to the color of their skin to define themselves as a people or vis-à-vis the dominant society, yet the distribution of skin colors chosen points to the existence of some confusion among them on this score.

Certainly the most definitive statement regarding skin color is found in Navajo Toh Yah’s (Gerald Nailor) *Untitled* (1937). As stated earlier, this painting is probably the singular piece of social commentary on Indian and non-Indian relations to be found in Studio paintings, and it also presents the most obvious distinction between the skins of Indians and non-Indians. The white couple’s skin is milky white, while that of the Navajo couple and their two children is not only decidedly dark brown, but the man and woman have red paint on their faces – a touch through which Toh Yah may have been suggesting their “other” nature vis-à-vis the white couple. Tony Abeyta considers such pieces “political statements of that time” by artists who “were really talking about that element of...who they were as painters,” and as such they “really speak for what that school was about.”⁴¹⁵ Perhaps this was the case with Toy Yah, but one is a bit

⁴¹⁵ Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

circumspect about assigning such political perspicacity to the majority of Studio artist-students. But when Pablita Velarde recalled how shy she and the others were to show and sell their paintings to non-Indians, perhaps Toh Yah was indeed expressing a shared sentiment that lay behind that shyness.

As for the Indian tribes and nations represented, the distribution of brown and light skin in the paintings is fairly even among the Navajos and Pueblos. However, light skin appeared more frequently in paintings by Apaches (four versus two brown), and Sauk/Fox artist Charles Pushetonequa chose light skin in his painting *Woodland Buffalo Dance* (1942). Somewhat curiously, Jicarilla Apache artist Nehakije chose to paint skin of his figures bleached white in *Races* (1933) and in *Bear Dance* (1935). In *Races*, Nehakije painted the skin of both the Indians and the two figures representing Spanish Conquistadores white. The Plains Indian artist-students, however, chose dark skin by a margin of four to two. The warriors so perfectly fused in purpose in Wilmer Dupree's *Sioux Warriors Coming Home* are dark-skinned with their heads shown in featureless profiles. Likewise, the hunter shown in Um-Pah's (Calvin Tyndall) *Omaha Buffalo Hunt* (1934) has skin that is almost as dark as the hides of the buffalo, yet the woman and baby in his painting *Travois* (1934) are quite light-skinned. Of course, these variations in skin color might be mundanely explained by the availability of paint colors, or simply by the level of mastery in application. It is also possible that this lighter skin color might have been an accurate depiction, and that it resulted from non-Indian ancestry, in which case Um-Pah might have been making a cogent comment regarding racial identity.

Similar unanswerable questions also arise when considering the individualization or stylization of facial features in these Studio paintings. Out of seventy-four paintings with faces depicted, forty-one or 55.4% had individualized features, and thirty-three or 44.5% stylized. Here again, the possible explanation for some of the stylized features

may have been a low development of painterly technique. However, as anthropologist Bruce Bernstein has pointed out, some of the artists “solved” the problem of depicting secretive ceremonial dances “by depersonalizing the individuals’ faces” and “giving each human subject the same features.”⁴¹⁶ However, Bernstein explained that “Although each figure represented a real person to the painter, to protect himself or herself, as well as the subjects of the paintings, their identities were often obscured in this manner.”⁴¹⁷ This was certainly the case in the more conservative Pueblos such as Santo Domingo, whose Studio artists did not produce any pictures containing individualized facial features. But the number of paintings with stylized and individualized facial features by Pueblo artists was almost evenly divided at fifteen to sixteen respectively. And among the paintings in this study, the list of artists by preference did not overlap; they either painted individualized or stylized features.

It should be pointed out, however, that virtually none of these paintings resembled a European or American portrait, the only possible exception being Philip Zeyouma’s *Hopi Woman Weaving Basket*. Similarly, only one painting suggests that that the artist was actually depicting herself, this being Agnes Bird’s *Chippewa Woman Stripping Birch Bark*. Of course, these were not ceremonial paintings, which on the whole did follow Bernstein’s prescription, as seen in Manuel Trujillo’s *Deer Dance at San Juan* (c.1938) and Leandro Gutierrez’s (Kygoo Ya) *Comanche Dance* (1936?). However, the Navajo artists represented in this survey actually favored individualization by a margin of six to four. Harrison Begay (Haskay Yah Ne Yah) infused an enormous amount of attention into detailing the faces in his painting *Navajos at a Dance* (1939). The Apache artists

⁴¹⁶ Bruce Bernstein, “Dorothy Dunn and A Story of American Indian Paintings,” in Bernstein and Rushing, *Modern by Tradition*, 153n4.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid.

favored individualization by an even wider margin of five to one. San Carlos Apache artist Roger Dickson ascribed crudely individualized identities to the figures in his painting *The Sunrise Dance* (1936), as did Jicarilla Apache Chatta Montoya in *Singers and Sandpainters* (1936).

The emphasis turned to stylization among the Plains artist-students in a margin of five to three. The most extreme example of this is found in Lorenzo Beard's/Horse Chief's *Ghost Dancers* (1936), where the faces have been obliterated into white forms, self-evidently suggesting that the dancers represented not just the forebears who participated in that revitalization movement, but their ghosts as well. And in his painting *Sioux Ceremonial* (1937), Oscar Howe (Mazuha Hokshina), who went on to enjoy a long



Illustration 4.10: 51817/13 “*Comanche Dance*” Leandro Gutierrez “Kygooy Yah”, Santa Clara Pueblo, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, Department of Cultural Affairs www.miaclab.org Photography by John Franks

and successful career as a painter and college professor, muted the light-skinned faces of the participants to the point that they almost faded into the manila color of the background.

In the final analysis, whether or not the Studio artist-students individualized or stylized their human figures, and whatever the color they assigned to their skin, what was important was the process, a process that was a search for unique artistic expression of self, culture, and an innate sense of belonging. Certainly such a search is undertaken by any artist anywhere who is honestly engaged in a quest for expressing truth as he or she sees it. But what made this search at the Studio unique was the very exclusivity of the setting and its members, all of whom were adolescent North American Indians who were on the brink of gaining an understanding of what bound together their various tribal cultures, and of understanding how they were, paradoxically, set apart from yet contributors to the fine arts of modern America. The essence of the Studio Style was these artist-students' search for an – not the—American Indian identity in all its complexity, and no critiques of the influence of non-Indian patronage can take the innocence of that search away from them.

Chapter 5: Crisscrossing Borders: Dorothy Dunn Becomes the Studio

It sometimes happens that a mere few years in the shape of time can determine a person's life to such an extent that all else becomes a footnote. Such was the case with Dorothy Dunn, whose five years spent as the first Teacher of Fine and Applied Arts at the Santa Fe Indian School "Studio" not only forever tied her name to that painting program, but created lifelong professional and personal identities for her. Indeed, Dunn's intense identification with the Studio and her devotion to promoting American Indian art permeated her own life to such an extent that the borders between life and art collapsed; Dorothy Dunn became the Studio.

As is often the case with uniquely successful professional careers, Dunn's achievements were realized through hard work, good ideas, some of which were borrowed from others, a touch of serendipity, and self-reinvention. In so many ways, Dunn was not prepared for the job she undertook at the Studio; she lacked a solid academic background, had no experience as an art educator, and minimal knowledge about American Indian art and culture. Yet by the end of her fourth year at the Studio she felt that she and her "artist-students," as she called them, had not only produced fine paintings, but had arrived at an intimate understanding and fusing of each other's unconscious artistic drives. Dunn later proffered the following summation of this creative communion in her book *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*: "Thus, the guidance and the expression were fluid and continually evolving. At times it seemed as if the two met in perfect understanding and that each was somehow conditioned by the other."⁴¹⁸ The "guidance" came from Dunn, who, as discussed earlier, eschewed the title and concept of a "teacher" for that of a "guide," while the "expression"

⁴¹⁸ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 287.

was understood to have emanated from the artist-students. It was an eloquent appraisal of an artistic process that had a mystical overtone; identities on both side of the equation seemed to have collapsed into one creative force. There is no reason to doubt Dunn's sincerity in her appraisal of work that was so very important to her, and which had become inextricably bound up with her identity, both professionally and personally. Yet the actual wording of this appraisal, while most probably not lacking in honest sentiment, may not have been completely genuine.

Among Dunn's personal papers held at the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, New Mexico is a small piece of paper with the following passage in what appears to be Dunn's handwriting: "in the perfect act of creation, the conscious and the unconscious meet almost equally, and that each has somehow been conditioned by the other," and below it is found the attribution "Review, NYT," "NYT" presumably being the initials of *The New York Times*.⁴¹⁹ Below this passage is the following: "At times it seemed that the guidance and the expression met almost equally and that each was somehow conditioned by the other."⁴²⁰ Perhaps Dunn had come across this phrase while reading *The New York Times* and it touched an intuitive chord with her about her experience at the Studio. Whatever the case, Dunn appeared to have been struggling to express an experience that she considered uniquely important, but she needed help in doing so. It was an experience that pointed to what Dunn must have felt was the essence of the Studio creative process, and her triumph – the collapsing of borders between "guide" and "artist-student" into a communion that authentically expressed modern American Indian art. However, although there is no context available, the *Times* quote appears to allude to a

⁴¹⁹ Dorothy Dunn's handwritten notes, Dorothy Dunn Kramer Papers, Laboratory of Anthropology/Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, Santa Fe, New Mexico, hereafter cited by the file number and the abbreviation "DDK" and additional information as appropriate, 93.DDK.022.

⁴²⁰ Ibid.

psychological explanation for individual creativity, perhaps even to the school of analytical psychology founded by C. G. Jung, that may have been equally applicable to the creative process active at the Studio. In either case, Dunn was striving to understand on the deepest level possible – and to the best of her ability – the way in which she and the artist-students had explored the medium of art to express their individual and collective identities – as Indians and as Americans.

“There was so much to learn that it was almost overwhelming, but never had I felt so completely at home in the world before this.” Dorothy Dunn⁴²¹

Dorothy Dunn made the confession quoted above to Jane Rehnstrand, head of the Art Department at Wisconsin State Teachers College, in an interview conducted for an article that appeared in the November 1936 edition of *The School Arts Magazine*. Dunn was reflecting on her intense self-education in Indian arts which she continued in earnest after she arrived in Santa Fe, New Mexico in the summer of 1928 – a self-education that was tutored, in part, by her new acquaintance Kenneth Chapman, then the curator of The Indian Arts Fund Collection. Dunn told Rehnstrand that she first became interested in Indian art by viewing exhibits at the Field Museum in Chicago, and her interest grew through reading books at a public library – in particular, novels by Willa Cather. But in Santa Fe, she was able to touch and feel the real thing, and during the next several years Chapman would open up even more opportunities for Dunn to immerse herself in the cultures and arts of Southwest Indians.

⁴²¹ Jane Rehnstrand, “Young Indians Revive Their Native Arts,” *School Arts Magazine*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (November 1936), 138.

Dorothy later recalled that she had arrived in Santa Fe “with no money and no job.”⁴²² Spin as one might this statement, it could betoken the westward pull felt by many an American pilgrim, or folly. It is unknown whether or not Dunn had already applied for a teaching position in Bureau of Indian Service (BIA) schools, but based on her letters home she almost certainly did not have any personal contacts among BIA bureaucrats or in the Santa Fe art community. Upon arrival in Santa Fe, Dunn obtained a waitressing job at The Bishop’s Lodge, and it was there that serendipity shone its beneficent face upon her when she made the acquaintance of two important members of the Santa Fe art community, the artists Olive Rush and Kenneth Chapman. Rush and Chapman, like Dunn, were also internal émigrés who had come to Santa Fe, been enchanted by the exotic cultures of the neighboring Pueblo Indians, and resolved to support and preserve these cultures from the ravages of American industrial society – and, perhaps, in the process to save, or reinvent, themselves as well.

Certainly Dunn must have found herself in a rarefied new world of devotees of art. Subsequent to their introduction, Chapman opened up the extensive holdings of the Indian Arts Fund, which were housed in the basement of the New Mexico Museum of Art, to Dunn and she entered into her first intensive study of Indian art. Dunn managed, probably also through Chapman’s aid, to obtain a job as a second-grade teacher at the Santo Domingo Pueblo Day School in the fall of 1928, where she remained for two years. In 1931, Dunn published her first article, “Going to School with the Little Domingos,” which was published in *The School Arts Magazine*. In that article Dunn revealed more

⁴²² 93.DDK.183, Dunn’s handwritten biographical notes.

about herself than she did about the ‘Little Domingos.’ Throughout the article she spoke contritely about her lack of knowledge of Pueblo culture while esteeming its inherent value. But tellingly, she began by poignantly describing her own otherness and even loneliness while living in that Pueblo, and by expressing her gratitude to the Santo Domingos for sharing their lives and culture with her. As for herself, she wrote, “Fortunately I had been endowed with an open mind and a sense of appreciation, and had recognized the fact that I should undoubtedly be taught far more than I taught.”⁴²³ Describing how she had instituted an “art hour” for the students, she confessed that it was “as much or more instructive” to herself “than it was to the children.”⁴²⁴ Dunn also confessed that she “always consulted” Chapman, and that he always made her “feel most welcome to his excellent advice.”⁴²⁵ And a few years later, Dunn would confess to her mother, “My dear Chap...is still, as for 6 years past, my guiding light in my work.”⁴²⁶

During her first year at the Studio when she was struggling to set up the painting program and simultaneously dealing with difficult behavior among some of the students, she often went to the Laboratory of Anthropology to consult with Chapman. In her surviving notes from that year, Dunn wrote concerning one meeting, “He believes in me which is all that counts after all.”⁴²⁷ More than once Dunn noted that Chapman “believed” in her, and he may have been the first person who ever did. Perhaps more than any other individual who entered Dunn’s life, Kenneth Chapman had the greatest

⁴²³ Dunn, “Going to School with the Little Domingos,” 469.

⁴²⁴ Ibid., 473.

⁴²⁵ Ibid., 473.

⁴²⁶ Letter from Dunn to “Mom” dated August 18, presumably in 1937, 93.DDK.162.

⁴²⁷ “1932 Notes,” for Dunn for November, 93.DDK.022.

impact both as a mentor and provider of opportunities to realize what became her life's work – the love and promotion of American Indian art.

A Midwestern Peripatetic: Dorothy Dunn's Origins and Youth

There was nothing in Dunn's family background that predisposed her to devote her life to the pursuit of things Indian. There is no known Indian ancestry, and there are no accounts that Dunn ever had any contact with American Indians during her childhood and young adulthood years spent in Midwestern states. In her personal papers now housed at the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, Dunn herself left virtually no information about her life prior to coming to New Mexico, and the principal source for her early life comes from a family history, "*Tell Me About the Old Days, Grandma,*" written by her only sister, Mildred Dunn Lepper.⁴²⁸

Mrs. Lepper wrote that on her father's side of the family, she and her siblings were sixth-generation Americans descended from Irish and German immigrants, and on her mother Harriet Seabury Dunn's side they hailed from a Baptist minister from Wales who immigrated to the American colonies in the seventeenth century and fought in the war of the American Revolution.⁴²⁹ The descendants of these immigrants included several prominent lawyers and judges, but Dorothy and Mildred's father, Frank Dunn, and his siblings were the first to earn university degrees. Frank Dunn became a

⁴²⁸ I am grateful to Mildred Dunn Lepper's daughter, Lois Lepper Nassen, for giving me a copy of this book.

⁴²⁹ Mildred Dunn Lepper, "*Tell Me About the Old Days, Grandma*" (Ackley, IA: Ackley Publishing Company), 7, 8.

merchant, two of his sisters teachers, and his sister Clara a medical doctor who had a practice in Chicago, Illinois. Frank married Harriet Seabury in Topeka, Kansas in 1900, and when their oldest child, Dorothy, was born, Clara Dunn wrote the following note to the new mother: ““Ah, how in future years old St. Marys, Kansas, on the Kaw, USA will pat itself on the back for having been the birthplace of so great a wonder – for of course since it is a girl you may expect great things of it.””⁴³⁰ This was a fine sentiment coming from a woman who had shattered gendered professional expectations in the early years of the twentieth century, when American society in general certainly did not expect “great things” from its female members. Unlike her sister Mildred, Dorothy went on to attend institutions of higher learning, but, as will be shown, the accounting of her academic pursuits produces more confusion than normally would be expected from what should be recorded facts.

In 1908 Frank Dunn moved his family to Excelsior Springs, Missouri, where he hoped the mineral waters of that resort town would improve his failing health. However, the waters were not enough to prevent his death the following year, leaving his wife and three children, Dorothy, then aged 5, son Francis, aged 3, and Mildred, aged 1.⁴³¹ As they grew up, Dorothy and her siblings were often taken in for months at a time – sometimes individually, sometimes with the sisters paired off – by paternal relatives, but they returned again and again to their mother as she engaged in several home-based

⁴³⁰ Sally Hyer, “Reminiscences of Etel,” in a pamphlet of testaments by family members and friends for the memorial service of Dorothy Dunn Kramer’s only child, Etel Thea Kramer, who died on April 21, 2001. I am grateful to Dorothy’s cousin, Marcia Dags, for giving me a copy of this pamphlet.

⁴³¹ Lepper, “Tell Me About the Old Days, Grandma,” 5.

efforts to make a living. At various times the children lived in Iowa, Oregon, Kansas, and Illinois, but Mildred reflected in her old age on how “privileged” they had been to have had “those many and varied experiences,” surmising that “Our horizons were broadened in ways that would affect our future lives, although we could not realize it then.”⁴³² But Mildred also confessed, “life anywhere with our mother was better than any life apart from her.”⁴³³ For despite their perambulations born of their mother’s necessity, the family remained close-knit and enjoyed all the holiday rituals, e.g., Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, birthdays, that bind American families together. And despite straitened circumstances, Harriet Dunn managed to maintain a modicum of gentility by bringing out fine table linens and even silver napkin rings engraved with the initial “D” for holiday meals.⁴³⁴

As for Dorothy, she alone appears to have been accorded the privilege to broaden her “horizons” by living with her aunts in a big city—Chicago, where she started elementary school, as Mildred vaguely recounted, “rather late for her age.”⁴³⁵ However, from there Dorothy went on to attend several public schools until she graduated from Decatur County High School in Oberlin, Kansas in 1921. Dorothy obtained a temporary teaching certificate and subsequently taught in Steamboat Springs, Iowa for part of a year before going on to obtain a permanent certificate at Iowa State Teachers’ College in Cedar Falls. Dorothy then taught in a rural school near Wellsburg, Iowa, “followed by

⁴³² Ibid., 52.

⁴³³ Ibid.

⁴³⁴ Ibid., 17.

⁴³⁵ Ibid., 52.

two years in Albion and several years in Miles, Iowa.”⁴³⁶ During those years Dorothy continued to take summer courses at Iowa State Teachers’ College, but she had bigger “horizons” in mind than being a school marm in the rural Midwest.

Posterity has Dorothy’s sister Mildred to thank for the account of these years since Dorothy herself apparently never wrote about them for the record. Dorothy did, however, relate in a handwritten document found among her papers that “in 1925, a student of art discovered American Indian painting on buffalo hide in the Field Museum and thereafter was determined to learn more about Indian painting and to help to in any way possible with its preservation and development.”⁴³⁷ As would come to be her habit, Dorothy referred to herself in the third person singular, here as a “student of art,” when writing about herself – a practice that on the surface points to a lack of personal assertion, but might also point to modesty, a desire to distance herself from the action, or just plain bad writing. And although there is no way of knowing when Dunn wrote this about herself, most probably it was long after the fact, and probably after her tenure at the Studio. However, the assertion that she was already intent on preserving and developing Indian painting in 1925 is a bit incredulous since there is no indication that Dunn had received any formal training in or personal encounter with Indian painting at this point. Rather, it would seem that Dunn’s first interest in American Indian art and culture arose from her passive observation of exhibits of Indian artifacts – exhibits that were part and

⁴³⁶ Ibid., 74.

⁴³⁷ 93.DDK.022.g

parcel of the “glass case policy” that the 1928 Merriam Report decried as segregationist and “impracticable.”⁴³⁸

Although the timeline for Dorothy’s teaching positions in Iowa is sketchy, in 1928 she appears to have moved to Chicago to attend the School of the Art Institute of Chicago (SAIC). Sister Mildred recalled that when she visited “Dort” (her family nickname) there in the summer of 1928, the latter was attending day classes at the SAIC and working for her board at an Eleanor Club.⁴³⁹ Presumably Mildred made this visit very shortly before Dorothy made her first trip to New Mexico that summer. However, Dorothy’s attendance at the SAIC cannot be accounted for definitively. One records check at the SAIC confirmed that Dunn was a “student for 1928 in the evening school program,” but the individual who provided this information added that as for other facts, “We seem to have a mystery.”⁴⁴⁰ The “mystery” was that Dorothy’s birthday was given as April 3, 1910 in Chicago, with the informant adding, “The Dorothy Dunn of the Santa Fe Indian School seems to have the dates of 1903-1991.”⁴⁴¹

A subsequent records check at the SAIC Office of Registration and Records yielded the news that there was no record of anyone named ‘Dorothy Dunn’ having ever attended the school. However, the registration coordinator did suggest that if Dorothy had been what is today referred to as a “continuing studies student and not pursuing a

⁴³⁸ Institute for Government Research, *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), 21.

⁴³⁹ Lepper, “Tell Me About the Old Days, Grandma,” 74.

⁴⁴⁰ E-mail response of April 4, 2002 from Marie Kroeger, SAIC, to Milanne Hahn. Kroeger also stated that the information was from microfilm “that may be incomplete.”

⁴⁴¹ E-mail response of April 4, 2002 from Marie Kroeger, SAIC, to Milanne Hahn.

degree they might not have kept a record.”⁴⁴² Beginning in 1928, applicants also had to pass an entrance examination in order to enter the Bachelor of Arts degree program in the Normal Department, and that year the program was also lengthened from three to four years.⁴⁴³

Dorothy herself related different stories regarding her alleged studies at the SAIC. Margretta Stewart Dietrich, who was such an ardent supporter of Dunn that she bequeathed her sizable collection of Studio paintings to Dunn in her will, was under the impression that Dunn had graduated from the SAIC.⁴⁴⁴ And in the wedding announcement that Dorothy wrote for her mother to publish in a local newspaper in September 1937, Dorothy noted her accomplishments as having graduated from the SAIC, “and also attended Iowa State Teachers College, The University of Chicago and the University of New Mexico.”⁴⁴⁵ However, at other times, Dunn stated only that she had attended the SAIC. There is evidence that she did indeed attend classes there among her papers archived at the Laboratory of Anthropology/Museum of Indian Arts and Culture. Dunn mentioned that while she was a student at the SAIC, she had written a paper titled “A Summary of Two Chapters from Batchelor’s ‘Design in Theory and

⁴⁴² E-mail of September 11, 2007 response from Matt Sams, Registration Coordinator, Office of Registration and Records, SAIC, to Milanne Hahn. Sams also wrote me that he was puzzled by the absence of records for Dunn, especially since he recalled that his office had received “a couple of requests for this student.”

⁴⁴³ Roger Gilmore, ed. *A History of The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 1866-1981*. (Chicago: The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 1982), 84.

⁴⁴⁴ 93.DDK.182, typewritten document attributed to Margretta Dietrich.

⁴⁴⁵ DDK Correspondence [unprocessed]. This undated letter was found in an envelope postmarked September 24, 1928 with a return address of “Santo Domingo Pueblo, Domingo, NM,” however Dunn was married in the fall of 1937. Due to the content it is assumed to have been written in Dunn’s hand, to her mother, although the salutation and closing are missing (i.e., pages appear to be missing).

Practice,'" and she made the following notation, "Survey, Mrs. Morse 'Div. G.' Design, Conard."⁴⁴⁶ However, when Dunn wrote her proposal "to do some experimental work in Indian art in the pueblos" to BIA Director of Education Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr. in March of 1932, she listed her formal educational qualifications as "three years fine arts at the Chicago Art Institute," and "Two years teacher training at the Art Institute and University of Chicago," adding that she was currently completing her studies at the latter institution.⁴⁴⁷ However, in a 1960 article that she wrote for *El Palacio*, Dorothy stated that "the writer of this account...had completed five years at the Art Institute of Chicago," but she made no mention of having studied at the University of Chicago.⁴⁴⁸

A records check at the University of Chicago only added to what was already a web of conflicting facts. According to an official transcript from that institution, a "Dorothy D. Dunn" completed one course, 'Hist. of American Education,' in the autumn quarter of 1931 and another course, "Psych. Of H. Beh. Subjects," in the spring quarter of 1932, however no evidence of a graduation was recorded.⁴⁴⁹ The transcript stated that Dunn had graduated from "IAa.S.T.C. [Iowa State Teachers College] 1922" and included the notation "Art. Inst. '25-'28," with the latter indicating that she had only attended, but not graduated, from the SAIC.⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁶ 93.DDK116.

⁴⁴⁷ 93.DDK.160, letter dated March 9, 1932 from Dunn to Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr.

⁴⁴⁸ Dorothy Dunn, "The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School," *El Palacio*, vol. 67, no. 1 (Feb. 1960): 18.

⁴⁴⁹ Transcript of Academic Record, The University of Chicago, Office of the Registrar, stamped September 11, 2007. I am grateful to Dorothy Dunn's niece Lois Lepper Nassen for providing family permission to the University of Chicago to allow me to obtain this transcript. Mrs. Nassen's mother, Mildred Dunn Lepper, was Dorothy Dunn's sister.

⁴⁵⁰ Transcript, University of Chicago.

Even more baffling were the two different dates recorded at the SAIC and University of Chicago for Dunn's date of birth. As stated earlier, Dorothy's date of birth at the SAIC was given as April 3, 1910 in Chicago, Illinois. However, the University of Chicago transcript listed her date of birth as December 2, 1903 in "St. Mary's [sic], Kans."⁴⁵¹ According to the 1910 United States Federal Census, a Dorothy Dunn, mother Harriet, was born "abt 1904" in Kansas.⁴⁵² And the California Death Index, 1940-1997 yielded the information that "Dorothy Dunn Kramer" was born on December 2, 1903 in Kansas, and died on July 5, 1992 in Santa Clara, California.⁴⁵³ The U.S. Census and the California Death Index should certainly be considered credible sources, and given their congruity, Dunn was evidently born in 1903, and most probably on December 2.⁴⁵⁴ Additionally, Dunn's niece Lois Lepper Nassen states that her "Aunt Dort" was born on December 2, 1903 and weighed in at nine pounds.⁴⁵⁵

Tenuous though the information is concerning Dorothy's studies at the SAIC, she probably did attend evening classes there between 1925 and 1928. However, even if those facts are true, questions concerning the discrepancies for Dorothy's birth date and

⁴⁵¹ The correct spelling is 'St. Marys, Kansas.'

⁴⁵² Ancestry.com, http://search.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/sse.dll?gl=35&rank=1&msT=1&gsfn=Dorothy&gsln=Dunn&_81004010=1903&msbpn_ftp=Kansas&msrpn_ftp=Chicago&_8000C000=Frank%20Seaburg&_80008000=Harriet&gss=angs-i&ti=0 [accessed March 22, 2010].

⁴⁵³ Ancestry.com, http://search.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/sse.dll?rank=1&msT=1&gsfn=Dorothy&gsln=Dunn&_81004010=1903&msbpn_ftp=Kansas&msrpn_ftp=Chicago&_8000C000=Frank+Seaburg&_80008000=Harriet&gss=angs-i&ti=0&pcat=34&h=4032820&recoff=1+14+15+56&db=CAdeath1940&indiv=1 [accessed March 22, 2010].

⁴⁵⁴ I tried unsuccessfully several times to obtain Dunn's birthdate from the Clerk's Office, Pottawatomie County, Kansas, and subsequently learned that vital statistics are not public records in the state of Kansas. I also looked at issues of two newspaper published in St. Marys, Kansas, *St. Marys Journal* and *St. Marys Eagle*, but found no birth announcement for Dunn in 1902, 1903, or 1904.

⁴⁵⁵ Nassen, Lois Lepper. 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. Corinth, Texas. March 19.

academic record still remain. Of course, possible reasons for these discrepancies include incomplete records and clerical errors, as well as dishonesty. The purported birth date of April 3, 1910 in Chicago from the SAIC, which almost surely is incorrect, is particularly troubling. The 1910 birth date would have meant that she would have only been 15 years old in September 1925, and thereby far too young to enter the SAIC. So dishonesty on Dorothy's part would have been self-defeating, unless she was presenting herself as a wunderkind, and provided, of course, that there was no minimum age requirement for evening classes, or for day classes.

That leaves remaining questions concerning Dorothy's later misrepresentations of her academic record. Dorothy's academic record in her 1932 letter to the BIA Director of Education, Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr., appears to be accurate. However, her later presentations of herself as being a graduate of the SAIC appear to be patently false. Why would Dorothy have lied about that? The most immediate reason is that she was inflating her resume, but again, we can only conjecture about why she would have done this. She made the SAIC graduation claim in her 1937 wedding announcement at a time when she was experiencing a difficult period surrounding her resignation from the Studio. The audience for the wedding announcement was back in Iowa, and Dorothy may have been inflating her sense of self-worth to impress the "folks back home." But in 1960 she claimed in an *El Palacio* article that she had studied for five years at the SAIC (perhaps combining the SIAC and University of Chicago years per the transcripts). Her close friend Margretta Stewart Dietrich was also under the impression that Dorothy had

graduated from the SAIC. One thing, however, is clear; Dorothy was reinventing herself.

People lie, intentionally and unintentionally, for all sorts of reasons – to protect themselves, to protect others, or to hurt others. Psychologist Dr. Erik Erikson believed that every conscience had “its own peculiar logic, which safeguards its coherence,” and he provided the example of a child who denies having stolen something, and actually believes he has not because he stole “less than he might have.”⁴⁵⁶ Protecting oneself can also include misrepresentation in order to make oneself into someone else – someone better to overcome a perceived inferiority. A person who would do that is obviously experiencing a crisis of identity and/or of self-esteem, either consciously or unconsciously. In Dorothy’s case, perhaps she was attempting to gain recognition and achieve a sense of worthiness for her work at the Studio. She might have well felt that her lack of a formal education detracted from her accomplishments at the Studio, and also contributed to a sense of inferiority vis-à-vis the matrons and patrons of the Santa Fe art world, many of whom were graduates of the elite Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania.⁴⁵⁷ It is quite possible that Dorothy was conveniently leaving behind her provincial Midwestern background to fit her new sense of a more sophisticated identity coming into being both as a young woman in Chicago, and as a qualified professional in the art community of Santa Fe.

⁴⁵⁶ Erik Homburger Erikson, “Observations on the Sioux,” *Journal of Psychology*, 7 (1939), 123. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.openu> [accessed February 27, 2008].

⁴⁵⁷ See Molly H. Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace, Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001) for a discussion of women such as Martha White, Elizabeth White, Elizabeth Sergeant, and other Bryn Mawr alumni who were prominent members of the Santa Fe art community.

As stated earlier, according to her sister Mildred, Dorothy was attending day classes at the SAIC and working for her board at an Eleanor Club when she visited in the summer of 1928. Dorothy's choice to live in one of the residential clubs operated by the Eleanor Association is particularly interesting, and her exposure to that organization's founding philosophy and goals may well have influenced her to broaden her horizons, in her case westward to New Mexico. Founded in 1898 by Ina Law Robertson, the Eleanor Association operated boarding houses for unmarried young women, most of whom were businesswomen, teachers, or students. According to social historian Lisa M. Fine, Robertson's intent was to provide an environment in which these women could work out together an understanding of their transitional status from the traditional "women's sphere" of the home to that of the business world.⁴⁵⁸ Additionally, the Eleanor Clubs were also noteworthy because their residents engaged in special performances and parties, e.g., "Spinster Parties" and "mock weddings and funerals," that coincided with birthdays, holidays, and weddings showers.⁴⁵⁹ Fine writes that these enactments can "best be understood as a form of ritualistic behavior" that revealed how the women "perceived their transitional positions both personally and historically and how they assess their choices for the future."⁴⁶⁰ Presumably Dorothy either participated in these rituals or at least observed them. Of course, one can only speculate about the effect these performances of rites of passage may or may not have had on her, but certainly it was

⁴⁵⁸ Fine, Lisa M. , "Between Two Worlds: Business Women in a Chicago Boarding House 1900-1930," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Spring 1986), 512.

<http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/stable/3787862> [accessed February 17, 2009]

⁴⁵⁹Ibid., 514.

⁴⁶⁰Ibid., 512, 514.

during her stay in the club that Dorothy decided to travel to New Mexico, and apparently she did so impetuously.

Seeking a Home in the American Southwest

After her two-year stint as a teacher in the Santo Domingo Pueblo Day School, Dunn returned to Chicago to study at the University of Chicago in August 1930, but almost immediately upon her arrival she turned around and went back to New Mexico, this time to teach at the San Juan Boarding School at Shiprock in the Northern Navajo Agency. Almost nothing is known about Dunn's experiences there, but certainly she must have gained first hand knowledge of Navajo culture that aided her later at the Studio. By the fall of 1931 she returned to the Midwest to study at the University of Chicago. In November of 1931, the Indian Service offered Dunn an arts and crafts teaching position at the Haskell Institute in Kansas, but she turned down the offer. The position was being vacated by Mable Morrow, who was being transferred to the Santa Fe Indian School. It is not known why Dunn refused this offer, but perhaps she had set her sights on returning to the more exotic Indian Southwest instead of living again in the more prosaic Midwest of her childhood. When Dunn arrived at the SFIS in 1932 she found herself under Morrow's supervision, and afterwards she complained repeatedly that Morrow did not appreciate what she was trying to accomplish in the painting studio. Although there might have been some truth to this accusation, perhaps Dunn was also jealous that Morrow was not only her supervisor, but held the job that she had wanted.

Dunn resided in SFIS quarters for its teachers during her entire tenure there, but this living arrangement was far different from that of the Eleanor Club. Dunn described her spartan accommodations, for which she paid \$15/month, in detail to her mother, and the picture conveyed is that of an ascetic monk's chamber.⁴⁶¹ Commenting that this was the first time that she had described her "surroundings to anyone although I've subconsciously to myself," she announced, "My real life is so out of this place that most of the time I don't realize this inexcusable ugliness caused by generations of political Indian agents who have let their employees do without in order to spend their money where it will make a big show to the outside world."⁴⁶² However, elsewhere it is clear that Dunn expected that she would personally overcome that corruption, particularly when she boasted to her mother about having recently had dinner with Miss Rose Brandt, who was then the Supervisor for Elementary Education at BIA headquarters in Washington, D.C. Dunn appeared to be confident that her association with Miss Brandt would protect her new position, and, indeed, it was thanks to Miss Brandt that the Studio continued beyond its first year after the SFIS administrators had recommended that it be closed. Dunn's sense of personal empowerment is evident in the following lines from the letter to her mother:

But it will take one more year to finally tame the Santa Fe school, Supt. [sic] other bosses et [sic] al. They've surely fallen in line considerably this year.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶¹ 93DDK.Unprocessed, letter from Dorothy Dunn addressed to "Mrs. Bert Carpenter, 203 W. Church St., Marshalltown, Iowa." The following is written on the front of the envelope in a hand other than Dunn's: "My 'million dollar' letter – a real legacy."

⁴⁶² Ibid.

⁴⁶³ Ibid.

It would seem that Dunn did not think that she needed, nor would she tolerate, anyone telling her what to do, but “tame” her superiors she did not. During the summer of 1933, Dunn wrote in a document found among her papers (perhaps part of a diary) that Morrow had “made the summer work drudgery and slavery” to the point that Dunn lamented, “I’d give anything to be able to resign tonite [sic], it’s breaking my spirit even!”⁴⁶⁴ Dunn noted in the same document that in the fall of 1933 she had a “Horrible clash” with Superintendent Faris and Morrow, and that Morrow was being disruptive and holding an “awful sway over class arrangements.”⁴⁶⁵ Shortly after the beginning of the next term she opined that Chapman had come “to cheer” her up, while Morrow was disruptive and holding an “awful sway over class arrangements.”⁴⁶⁶

Dunn was also having problems with some of her students. She complained that first year about “the wretched ‘special arts’ students” who had transferred there from the Haskell Institute along with Mable Morrow, that some of the boys were skipping class, and that she had arguments with some of them about what was considered art.⁴⁶⁷ Many years later, one of the students who had studied with both Dunn and Morrow, Hazel Pete from the Chehalis Indian Reservation, remembered them both fondly, but she also recalled that Dunn’s and Morrow’s personalities and teaching philosophies clashed. Pete remembered that Morrow was “very rigid” not only in her teaching methods, but in her

⁴⁶⁴ 93DDK.022.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid.

disciplining of the students.⁴⁶⁸ According to Pete, Morrow insisted that her arts and crafts students consult each other about their work. Dunn, on the other hand, wanted each student to ““be different”; ““We weren’t put in a class to be the same. We were all individual[s] and from different tribes.””⁴⁶⁹ Pete explained that she and the other students in Morrow’s class studied various tribes and listened to Navajo storytellers, but in Dunn’s class. ““When we went to art class, we were individuals, [doing] our own work, and separate,”” and ““With Dorothy...everybody did their own.””⁴⁷⁰ Pete felt certain that these different philosophies created tensions between Dunn and Morrow, and she did not remember ever seeing the two of them talk to each other. Pete also suspected, however, that despite her high regard for Dunn, Dunn was jealous of Pete’s rapport with Morrow. Pete recalled, ““Sometimes I thought she [Dunn] thought I was Morrow’s pet and she was trying to let me know I was just like everybody else. She didn’t give me any edge.””⁴⁷¹ So it would appear that Dunn’s enmity toward Morrow may have shadowed even her relations with her students.

During the fall of 1934 Dunn lamented, “So hard to get some of these poor kids started,” but by the end of the school term she expressed her satisfaction that all of the ““outs”” had become ““ins.””⁴⁷² And by the end of that school term, Dunn believed that

⁴⁶⁸ Gary C. Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image: Hazel Pete, the Indian New Deal, and the Indian Arts and Crafts Program at Santa Fe Indian School, 1932-1935,” *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vo. 78, No. 4, 446, quoting from the author’s interview of Pete on 26 August 1999.

⁴⁶⁹ Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image,” 449, quoting from the author’s interview with Pete on 24 November 1997.

⁴⁷⁰ Collins, “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image,” 449, quoting from the author’s interview with Pete on 26 August 1999.

⁴⁷¹ 93DDK.022.

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*

her “stock” had gone up with Faris, who nevertheless “had to be shown and shown” that the Studio program was worthwhile.⁴⁷³ Dunn did not seem to understand “office politics,” took every criticism personally, had no sure grip on her self-esteem and confidence, and had a domineering attitude – all of which were determining factors in her decision to leave the Studio after only five academic years.

Dunn also seemed boastful about the disdain in which she was held by the majority of her peers, telling her mother that she “was about as interested” in them as she was in certain other individuals – presumably other perceived inferiors—from her past.⁴⁷⁴ Yet she had made friends with a “Mrs. Smith,” and with the science teacher, Max Kramer, whom she would marry in the summer of 1937. But she considered herself, Max, and Mrs. Smith outliers, saying, that the other teachers considered the three of them “reds, devils or something.”⁴⁷⁵ One of the teachers listed in the school newsletter *Tequayo, 1932-33* was Ann Nolan Clark, and it is curious that Dunn did not mention her. Clark had taught in the Zuni and Tesuque Pueblo schools before coming to the SFIS, where she lived on campus with her mother and son until she returned to Tesuque in 1936.⁴⁷⁶ Clark employed progressive education ideas to teach the students English, and after leaving the SFIS she became well known, and widely respected, for engaging Pueblo students to write and illustrate many books about Indian life, and to illustrate

⁴⁷³ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁶ Rebecca C. Benes, *Native American Picture Books of Change, The Art of Historic Children's Editions* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2004), 36.

textbooks that she herself had written. One would have thought that Dunn would have found a kindred spirit in Clark, but apparently she did not.

In another letter to her mother that appears to have been written a couple of years later, Dunn continued to paint this picture of her social ostracism. Once again in a boastful tone, Dunn wrote that the other teachers thought she was a “radical and unconventional and impolite and an awful mess in general,” and that they considered her plain hairstyle and mode of dress “an affront to their established customs.”⁴⁷⁷ Dunn observed how her homemade clothes suitable for hard women’s work clashed with the more dressed-up code that her colleagues followed, yet she went into great detail to describe a colorful outfit she had purchased to wear to a Christmas party that she claimed she did not want to attend. Dunn recounted that when she appeared at the party in the new outfit, the “snoop” who lived in the room next to hers remarked to another teacher, “Huh! Who’s the dressed up lady with you?”⁴⁷⁸ Dunn concluded her dramatic rendition of her party experience by writing, “I was never so stared at and commented upon in all my days.”⁴⁷⁹ Dunn was mocking this “snoop” and the others, but one also senses that she felt a sense of elation in having caused a minor scandal.

“Great taste” but “no money”: Dorothy Dunn at Work in the ‘City of Ladies’

Dorothy may have felt intellectually superior to her female colleagues, but she almost certainly did not enjoy such smugness at the expense of the Anglo-American

⁴⁷⁷ DDK.Unprocessed, undated letter from Dunn to Harriet and Bert Carpenter.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid.

⁴⁷⁹Ibid.

ladies who dominated the Santa Fe and Taos arts communities. For by the 1930s, as a Scottish permanent immigrant named Jean Buchanan observed, Santa Fe was very much a “*city of ladies.*”⁴⁸⁰ Santa Fe art doyennes such as Margretta Stewart Dietrich, and the sisters Elizabeth and Martha White, have been the subject of many cultural histories of internal American émigrés in the American Southwest in the early decades of the twentieth century. Anthropologist Molly H. Mullin has made a fascinating study of how these upper-class women’s “shopping” for Indian and Spanish Colonial art were “projects of reconstructing personal and national identities,” and of inventing and reinventing their personal and interpersonal identities.⁴⁸¹ Gender historian Margaret D. Jacobs has perceptively argued that émigrés such as Mary Austin in Santa Fe, and Mabel Dodge Luhan in Taos, were antimodern feminists who “had a tendency to act out their struggles upon Pueblo Indian women” and used them to articulate their emerging views on marriage, divorce, sex, and the home.⁴⁸² So where did Dunn fit in among these well-educated and mostly wealthy women?

One of Dunn’s contemporaries in Santa Fe who moved on the fringes of the arty elites, Maria Chabot, has perhaps best summed up the social dynamics of these women. In an interview with Molly H. Mullin, Chabot observed that “there were also people who had great taste who had no money,” and these were the people who carried out the work

⁴⁸⁰ Molly H. Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace, Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001), 60-61.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid., 37, 5.

⁴⁸² Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters*, 80-81.

that “philanthropically interested people,” i.e., the elites, funded.⁴⁸³ Chabot identified Dorothy Dunn and Kenneth Chapman among these doers.

However, Dunn apparently did establish a close friendship with Margretta Stewart Dietrich. Dietrich first visited New Mexico with her husband, Charles, and sister Dorothy in 1921, and continued to spend time there until establishing a permanent residence in Santa Fe in 1927 after Charles’ death.⁴⁸⁴ Margretta Stewart was born in Philadelphia in 1881 and graduated from Bryn Mawr in 1903, the same year that Martha White graduated from that institution (Elizabeth White was also an alumna from the class of 1901).⁴⁸⁵ Margretta subsequently married Charles H. Dietrich, the father of a classmate, and moved to his home state of Nebraska where the two became prominent in political and social activist circles.⁴⁸⁶ Charles served as a U.S. senator and governor of Nebraska, while Margretta became president of the Nebraska League of Women Voters and regional director of the National League, founded a home for the aged, and advocated for the reform of child labor laws, among other causes.⁴⁸⁷ Molly H. Mullin has described how Dietrich bucked the dour, plainly clad stereotype of the suffragist by dressing herself in extremely elaborate, feminine dresses, when participating in public debates, the aesthetics of which had become a “trend among Dietrich’s generation of suffragists, who

⁴⁸³ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 85.

⁴⁸⁴ Margretta Stewart Dietrich, *New Mexico Recollections, Part I*, and Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 69.

⁴⁸⁵ Script of tribute written by “Tonita Pena’s child” for *Pueblo Indian Hour*, Radio Station KTRC, January 15, 1961, Margretta Stewart Dietrich Papers, New Mexico State Library, Santa Fe, New Mexico; and Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 32.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁴⁸⁷ *Pueblo Indian Hour*, January 15, 1961; and Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 68.

attempted ‘to sell the movement – and thus woman’s citizenship – by affiliating it with femininity, good looks, and style.’”⁴⁸⁸

Dietrich similarly carried her flair for personal adornment into her new cause of Indian rights activism and art patronage, as is seen, for example, in a 1925 photograph of her dressed in Navajoesque regalia and resolutely standing with her hands clenched and smiling for the camera.⁴⁸⁹ According to Dietrich, she joined the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs (NMAIA) “soon after” she “settled in Santa Fe,” and sat on its Arts and Crafts Committee. Dietrich served as the NMAIA president from 1933 to 1953 when she continued on in an “honorary” capacity.⁴⁹⁰ Dietrich also became a charter member of the executive committee of the Indian Arts Fund, trustee of the School of American Research and of the Laboratory of Anthropology and, of course, a patron of Indian art, most especially of the SFIS Studio.⁴⁹¹ Following her death on January 13, 1961, she was eulogized on a Santa Fe radio station show, *Pueblo Indian Hour*, for her “great influence” in having helped to “bridge the cultural gaps that make the problems of the Indian unique ones in America.”⁴⁹² After lauding Dietrich as having been an “inspiration...to our tribal leaders,” the tribute continued on with this curious statement: “The click of the high heels in a city may seem remote from the quietness of the moccasins on the reservation but as we see times are changing, the woman’s role has

⁴⁸⁸ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 68, 69.

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., 70, photograph reproduced from Dietrich, *New Mexico Recollections, Part II*, with permission from Elizabeth Berry Sebastian.

⁴⁹⁰ Dietrich, *New Mexico Recollections, Part I*, 14; *Pueblo Indian Hour*, January 15, 1961; and Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 71.

⁴⁹¹ *Pueblo Indian Hour*, January 15, 1961.

⁴⁹² Ibid.

changed, too.”⁴⁹³ Just which “woman’s role” had changed, Dietrich’s or the Pueblo woman’s? Perhaps it was the author’s awkward way of saying that the white woman Dietrich’s role had changed from clicking her high heels to treading a path of understanding between whites and Indians, and to seeking a new identity that entailed “playing Indian” in a way that Pueblo tribal leaders could understand.

Historian Philip J. Deloria coined the term “playing Indian” to sum up the various ways that various non-Indian American “social groups used Indian play to advance different agendas and materialize a complex range of identities.”⁴⁹⁴ Deloria also suggested that “whenever white Americans have confronted crises of identity, some of them have inevitably turned to Indians” to define their personal and national identities.⁴⁹⁵ Dressing oneself in “Indian” garb was a common manner for enacting this imagined “Indianess.” Margretta Dietrich performed this juxtaposition in the above-mentioned photograph, and there are also photographs of Mabel Dodge Luhan doing the same. One photograph of Luhan shows her in a pose of particularly assumed Indian identity: Dodge is wearing an Indian-style dress while she sits, legs crossed, beside her Taos Pueblo husband Tony as he beats an Indian drum while sitting in a Mission style chair.⁴⁹⁶

As for Dorothy Dunn, there is only one extant photo of her “playing Indian,” and this during her first trip to New Mexico. Dunn is shown standing beside a horse in what appears to be a male Navajo outfit of belted pants, shirt, jacket, with a bandana tied

⁴⁹³ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁴ Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), 58.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid., 158.

⁴⁹⁶ Margaret D. Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters*, photograph with caption “Mabel Dodge Luhan and Tony Luhan in Taos, 1924.” Reproduced courtesy of The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, album 296, fold. 04(26).

around her neck and another around her forehead, and the inscription on the back of the photo reads “Dorothy Dunn. 1928. Santo Domingo Pueblo, New Mexico.”⁴⁹⁷ However, according to Dunn, during her tenure at the SFIS she customarily wore white women’s work clothes, which, she claimed, drew derision from her colleagues. One curious item found among her papers is a comment written in what appears to be Dunn’s hand on an envelope containing a photograph of her dressed in a Indian-motif printed dress: “Disillusioned Dorothy Dunn soon after she left the Studio (taken Sept. or Oct. 1937).”⁴⁹⁸ Dunn’s hair is pulled back severely from her face as she looks away defiantly from the camera – pictorial evidence that corroborates Dunn’s state of mind at the time. Later in her life Dunn was occasionally photographed wearing Western-style dresses made of cloth printed with Indian designs, as for example at the 1954 Inter-Tribal Ceremony in Gallup, New Mexico when she and twelve Indian painters and artisans received the meritorious arts award “Palmes Academiques” from the government of France.⁴⁹⁹ But during her time spent at the SFIS, Dorothy Dunn evidently never felt the need to “play Indian” on her own, and likewise there is no evidence that she “played Indian” with Mabel Luhan, the Whites, or even Margretta Dietrich.

Miss Elizabeth White supported and patronized the Studio, but it appears that there was no personal friendship between her and Dunn. An extant note from Dunn to

⁴⁹⁷ Photograph provided to me by Dunn’s niece, Lois Lepper Nassen. 2004. Interview by author. Corinth, Texas. March 19.

⁴⁹⁸ 93DDK.170. A reproduction of this photograph appears in Margaret Cesa, *The World of Flower Blue, Pop Chalee: An Artistic Biography* (Santa Fe: Red Crane Books, 1997), p. 61, with the caption “Dorothy Dunn., 1937. Courtesy of Etel Kramer.” Note that Etel Kramer was Dorothy Dunn’s only child.

⁴⁹⁹ See photographs in *Inter-Tribal Indian Ceremonial Magazine and Official Program, Gallup, New Mexico*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (August 1955), 25.

Elizabeth White is extremely formal in style. Addressed simply to “Miss White,” Dunn wrote a note to accompany a package returning paintings owned by White that had been exhibited, adding that two paintings were being retained for another exhibition and would be returned afterwards.⁵⁰⁰ The wording of the letter is very businesslike, but there is also a perfunctory tone that leads one to wonder whether or not Dunn had obtained White’s permission in advance to retain the two paintings. However, “Miss White” may have been a significant monetary donor to the Studio. A scrap of paper found in the Dorothy Dunn Archives bears the handwritten note “see for material for: Miss White’s donations under CONTINUATION & for Studio.”⁵⁰¹

There also is no record that Dunn ever attended any of the fabulous parties that sisters Elizabeth and Martha White threw at their Santa Fe estate named “El Delirio.” Dunn is only mentioned once in the book *El Delirio, The Santa Fe World of Elizabeth White*, which Elizabeth White’s longtime “nurse, companion, and friend,” E. Catherine Rayne, co-authored.⁵⁰² Dunn is only mentioned in passing as an art teacher at the Santa Fe Indian School, and this within the context of Elizabeth White’s promotion of Indian art.⁵⁰³ Given Dunn’s unsociable behavior among her SFIS colleagues, one wonders just how gaily she would have interacted with the Bryn Mawrters and other “El Delirio” partygoers. Dunn had presumably experienced pageants in the Eleanor Club that were similar in nature to those performed at Bryn Mawr, but such performances by working

⁵⁰⁰ Letter from Dorothy Dunn to Miss White, dated May 22 (no year provided), AC18.051, Kenneth Chapman Papers, School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

⁵⁰¹ 93DDK.022.

⁵⁰² Gregor Stark and E. Catherine Rayne, *El Delirio, The Santa Fe World of Elizabeth White* (Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1998), back cover.

⁵⁰³ *Ibid.*, 68.

women were a far cry from Bryn Mawr and the Santa Fe social world dominated by wealthy white women. Most likely Dunn would have felt herself to be just as much an outsider to these middle- and upper-class women – as well as Santa Fe men—as she did to her less rarefied SFIS colleagues.

Anthropologist Mullin has described “El Delirio” as a “stage” where the Whites’ directed and acted in costumed pageants along with their friends.⁵⁰⁴ Photos from the 1930s display the Whites and their “contingent” dressed in Moorish, Spanish, and Mexican garb at their parties and in Santa Fe Fiesta parades.⁵⁰⁵ However, these famous parties were not scenes of debauchery, for the Whites were very much cut out of Victorian cloth. Mullin pointed out that in Santa Fe, Elizabeth White “is remembered as quite shy and in many ways constrained by class and gender conventions.”⁵⁰⁶ Mullin also perceptively observed that when these Bryn Mawrters came to New Mexico they “applied theatrical skills to the movement to protect Indian land rights, and to promoting a rather colonial version of cultural pluralism, including the development of markets in Native and Spanish Colonial art.”⁵⁰⁷ And they had fun doing it.

As for the upper-middle class Mabel Dodge Luhan and the émigré resort she founded on the outskirts of Taos Pueblo, there is no evidence that Dunn ever associated with anyone from this group, even when she and her new husband Max Kramer moved to Taos after she left the Studio. Nor is there any evidence that Mabel ever visited the

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., 67.

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., 108, 111.

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid., 181.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid., 62.

Studio. And Dunn certainly never subscribed to the mystical Southwest conversion experience that Dodge acted out.⁵⁰⁸ Enough has been written about Mabel, whose history of serial self-invention continues to delight historians, perhaps because they fancy themselves guests at Mabel's famous cocktail hours. Suffice it to say that Dunn was not a convert to Mabel's "newly emerging religion" of the ancient "One."⁵⁰⁹ Instead Dunn was a tool for Mabel, just as she was to the Whites, to fulfill their desires to possess and appreciate Indian art.

Coming Undone: Dunn Leaves the Studio

As the trite saying goes, Dunn was 'all work and no play' during her years in Santa Fe. Dunn worked long hours and on weekends in the Studio, often preparing exhibits of Studio paintings as the number of requests for them grew every year. Devotion aside, Dunn probably felt she deserved some compensation for working longer hours than her peers. But she may also have been motivated by her desire to buy a ranch.⁵¹⁰ By the spring of 1936, Dunn was feeling confident enough of her abilities and self-worth to submit a bold, self-promoting request to Dr. H. C. Seymour, Superintendent for the United Pueblo Schools, for a salary increase, and this at a time when the country was experiencing a setback in New Deal efforts to climb out of the Great Depression.⁵¹¹

⁵⁰⁸ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 81.

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁵¹⁰ DDK.Unprocessed, undated letter to her mother.

⁵¹¹ Dr. H. C. Seymour was a graduate of Harvard University and he taught there for several years. Seymour had also been an administrator with the school system in Medford, Massachusetts, and according to an article in the SFIS newsletter, he had "done considerable research in the field of Indian education"

Dunn asked for a “substantial salary increase or a fully trained associate capable of assuming half the responsibilities of the studio” so that she could have “official free time for personal work to supplement” her “income.”⁵¹² Dunn requested that her annual salary be increased from \$1,860 to \$2,200, and she justified this sizable raise by stating that even a “civil service awning maker” made what she was requesting.⁵¹³ But in the spirit of compromise, Dunn offered to agree “to dispense with all titles.”⁵¹⁴ Dunn was asking to be paid more money to pursue her “personal work” – a request that the administration probably not only considered impracticable financially, but overbearing in its thrust. Seymour waited until the beginning of May to respond to her, and although he stated that he would attempt to obtain this raise for her, he doubted that the increase would be as high as \$2,200, or that the “secretarial help” she had requested would be forthcoming.⁵¹⁵ The following January Dunn did receive a salary increase to \$1,920 effective immediately, but she still was not satisfied, and certainly this perceived slight was a reason for her subsequent resignation the following fall.

Several months later, Seymour wrote Dunn a letter that most probably angered her at a time when she was still awaiting an answer on her demand for a salary increase and additional staffing at the Studio. Seymour informed Dunn that a “Mr. West” from the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, who had recently visited the Studio, was not pleased

(see *Teguayo*, Vol. 5, no. 4 (Jan. 1936), 2. Seymour assumed his job as the Pueblos Superintendent on January 23, 1936.

⁵¹² 93DDK.160, letter dated March 27, 1936 from Dunn to Dr. Seymour.

⁵¹³ Ibid. According to the website www.dollartimes.com, \$1,860 in 1937 dollars translates into a buying power, adjusted for the rate of inflation, of \$27,930.56 in 2009 dollars, \$1,920 to \$28,831.54, and \$2,200 to \$33,036.14. <http://www.dollartimes.com/calculators/inflation.htm> [accessed March 12, 2009].

⁵¹⁴ Ibid., and 93.DDK.162, letter dated January 16, 1937 to Dunn from the Indian Service.

⁵¹⁵ 93.DDK.162, letter dated Mary 5, 1936 from Seymour to Dunn.

with the discrepancy between the percentages of sales profits that arts and crafts students and Studio students received for their work. According to Seymour, Mr. West believed that the students should all “receive the same percentage” in order “to avoid inequality.”⁵¹⁶ Seymour suggested that the percentage that arts and crafts students received be raised from 35% to 50%, and that of the Studio students be reduced from 50% to 35%. Using faulty reasoning, Seymour contended that this “would involve the institution in less unfairness to certain individuals, since, “After all, this is an education institution and not one run for any commercial purpose.”⁵¹⁷ Although there is no record that these changes were instituted, their mere proposal surely must have further rankled Dunn’s grousing about the lack of support that the Studio was receiving. For it must have seemed to her that the intent was not so much to increase the percentages for the arts and crafts students, but to reduce those for the Studio, and thereby diminish its prestige.

The most telling account of Dunn’s state of mind during what turned out to be her last semester at the SFIS is found in a narrative she wrote about a one-on-one meeting she had with Dr. Sophie Aberle at the latter’s home. Dr. Aberle was a very accomplished woman. She was several years older than Dunn, having been born in 1896, and had earned a doctorate degree at Stanford University in 1927 and a medical degree from Yale University School of Medicine in 1930.⁵¹⁸ At the time of this interview between her and Dunn, Aberle was the General Superintendent for the United Pueblo Agency in

⁵¹⁶ 93.DDK.160, noted dated August 16, 1936 from H. C. Seymour to Dunn, “Re: Arts and Crafts.”

⁵¹⁷ Ibid.

⁵¹⁸ University of New Mexico, University Libraries, Center for Southwest Research, Sophie D. Aberle Photograph Collection, Biography/History, <http://rmoa.unm.edu/docviewer.php?docId=nmupict000-509.xml> [accessed March 30, 2010].

Albuquerque, New Mexico (1935-1944), and from there she went on to a post with the Executive Directory of the Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian (1935-1966). According to the website for the Petroglyph Nation Monument, where Aberle's and her husband's former home is now the Visitor Center, Aberle was "the first practicing applied anthropologist in the United States."⁵¹⁹ This is a dubious claim, but Dr. Aberle did focus her work on the lives of Pueblo women, particularly in improving practices in childbirth, childcare, diet, and general health care, and her position as the General Superintendent certainly did provide her with the opportunity to apply her studies in the field.⁵²⁰ She was also interested in issues concerning gender and sexuality among the Pueblos.⁵²¹ But by the spring of 1935, many Pueblo Indians had become disgruntled by Aberle to the point where Commissioner John Collier thought the situation was serious enough that he arranged and attended a meeting at Santo Domingo Pueblo to discuss their complaints.

The *Santa Fe New Mexican* reported on this meeting in an article titled "Mabel Luhan Claims Indian Objectors to Superintendent Aberle Being Suppressed" in its May 5, 1935 issue. The article reported that "Mabel Luhan alleges that 'all the pueblos except San Juan' have come to the conclusion that Dr. Aberle, 'while evidently endowed with energy and ambition, seemed unequal to dealing with the multitude of problems that arise in twenty-two pueblos that heretofore have taken all the time, experience and wisdom of

⁵¹⁹ Petroglyph National Monument, Las Imagenes Visitor Center, <http://www.nps.gov/petr/planyourvisit/vchistory.htm> [accessed March 30, 2010].

⁵²⁰ Ibid.

⁵²¹ Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters*, 142, citing Aberle's manuscript "Pueblo of San Juan," 33, 35, 46-47, Box 2, Folder 1, Aberle Papers, Center for Southwest Research, General Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

two men versed for many years in Indian administration.”⁵²² However, aside from any objections to Aberle’s job performance, the fact that she was a woman was part of the Indians’ problem with her. Two delegates from Taos Pueblo reportedly stated “that it was ‘very hard to criticize or oppose a woman; that if they have complaints to make or feel they have to fight, it is impossible to fight a woman.’”⁵²³ Luhan failed to comment on this apparent bias against a woman being a professional, but she did complain that objections to Aberle were being ignored, and that Aberle had summoned one of the Taos delegates to her office and threatened to fire him from his BIA job unless “he would be loyal to the Indian administration.”⁵²⁴ In response, Collier steadfastly expressed his support for Aberle.

Most probably the discontent surrounding the issues prompting this meeting was still whirling around the Santa Fe area in the spring of 1937. And certainly by then many members of the Santa Fe art community and NMAIA were extremely angry at Collier because of the impact of several of his New Deal policies, high among them being the disruptive tribal reorganizations and heartbreaking slaughtering of Navajo sheep as part of the federal soil conservation program. Collier, who it will be remembered had been summoned years before to the wonders of New Mexico and its Indians by Mabel Dodge Luhan, was concerned enough about his growing unpopularity there to come and defend himself and Dr. Aberle. And Dr. Aberle, whether on her own volition or on instructions

⁵²² *Santa Fe New Mexican*. “Mabel Luhan Claims Indian Objectors to Superintendent Aberle Being Suppressed.” Tuesday, May 5, 1936, p. 3.

⁵²³ Ibid.

⁵²⁴ Ibid.

from high administrators, felt the situation in the Studio had become important enough to summon Dorothy Dunn to a meeting in her own home.

Dunn's narrative account of this meeting found in her personal papers reads like the script for a one-act play. Aberle's character opened the dialogue by telling Dunn's, ““Well, I know you've been having lots of troubles,”” and then proceeded to admonish Dunn for having jumped the chain of command by writing a letter directly to Willard W. Beatty, the BIA Director of Education, over the heads of Aberle and School Superintendent Dr. Seymour.⁵²⁵ Dunn told Aberle that she had written Beatty that her work was ““growing faster”” than she could ““keep up with it,”” and she defended herself by saying that she had only written to Beatty ““simply as a reminder”” because Seymour had not responded to the letter she had written to him.⁵²⁶ Dunn has Aberle respond by repeating the ““very great compliment”” that Seymour had given Dunn when he said that the Studio was ““the one place in the school he didn't have to look after,”” but this weak praise for Dunn was followed by her own reminder, ““You must realize the school doesn't revolve around the art! You are part of an institution!””⁵²⁷ When Aberle asked the following question regarding her request for a salary increase, ““Don't you think you're a bit selfish in asking for these things?”” Dunn responded, ““No, I don't, especially when 5000 is being spent at the school now for a sprinkling system.””⁵²⁸ Certainly the installation of the sprinkling system to put out fires was necessarily

⁵²⁵ 93.DDK.170, document handwritten by Dunn. Note that the dialogue quoted throughout is attributed to Dunn's and Aberle's ““characters,”” even when not so designated due to stylistic preference.

⁵²⁶ Ibid.

⁵²⁷ Ibid.

⁵²⁸ Ibid.

defensible, but this conflagration sizzling between Dunn and the administration would not be so easily extinguished.

Aberle then made the reasonable observation that if Dunn's work was growing beyond her ability to "keep up with it," then she should "drop some" of her students and "stop sending so many exhibits."⁵²⁹ Dunn acknowledged the reasonableness of these curtailments, but insisted that there was still "so many others that should be sent."⁵³⁰ Dunn's character's responses began increasingly agitated when Aberle made several suggestions for ways in which Dunn could obtain assistance in preparing paintings for shipment to exhibitions; Dunn shot down every one of them, basically returning to the defensive argument that she could do all the work by herself. When Aberle reasonably suggested that Dunn was overworking herself, Dunn's character reached a breaking point.

I saw that I could talk till doomsday and get nowhere with her. I realized by this time that she didn't want the Studio to progress and that she would back Seymour to the limit and I know that Collier would back her. I suddenly saw the hopelessness of the situation. 'I think I'd better go now. I can't talk....' (meaning that my simple honest questions couldn't cope with her quick, shifting evasions).⁵³¹

Dunn's comment that "Collier would back her" may well have reflected Dunn's knowledge of the problems Pueblos had voiced against Aberle, as well as the contentious meeting that had occurred the previous spring. But Dunn's account is really all about herself and her own grievances with not just Aberle, but with all BIA administrators. In

⁵²⁹ Ibid.

⁵³⁰ Ibid.

⁵³¹ Ibid.

what perhaps was an effort at self-defense, Dunn's Aberle character concludes the interview with praise for Dunn.

Oh I think you did very well. I understand you completely. It was so nice of you to come. Now don't think we don't appreciate you because we do!' (as if it were a personal matter over which I had felt personally slighted!).⁵³²

Dunn's character, and no doubt Dunn as well, "wept all the way home."⁵³³

But it was all too much a "personal matter" for Dorothy Dunn. At the end of her narrative "play" on the Aberle interview, Dunn opined that she "had had enough fights with Seymour to know how deeply and sickeningly they affected her" (was this an admission of being overwrought?) and her work; rather than fighting on, she concluded that such "sensitive creative gentle [sic] work as that was" – presumably that of her work as a "guide" to her student-artists – could not continue under such circumstances.⁵³⁴ So, she decided to resign from the SFIS before "everything was ruined," and attempted to console herself by vowing to concentrate on writing her book about the Studio, a book that would not be published until 1968 under the title *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.

There has been much speculation that Dunn was driven to resign because of differences with Mable Morrow. In her book, Dunn recalled that the "head of the arts and crafts department indicated that she considered the accomplishments of the painting classes unsatisfactory."⁵³⁵ Dunn quoted this "head" as having said, "'The students have

⁵³² Ibid.

⁵³³ Ibid.

⁵³⁴ Ibid.

⁵³⁵ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 263.

no standards; we don't want little things, we want big things,""⁵³⁶ Dunn wrote that the "head" expected "big things" to be accomplished through "a more objective approach" and through the use of models.⁵³⁷ Curiously, Dunn did not name the "head," but she was certainly referring to Mable Morrow. In her writings Dunn had a peculiar habit of not naming, or rather, disguising certain non-Indians involved with the Studio, including herself (but she always cited her Indian students by name). Perhaps Dunn refused to name Morrow in a spasm of childish hatred, and she may have also still been harboring a grudge because Kenneth Chapman had insisted that Morrow, and not Dunn, should "take over the supervision of Indian art" at the SFIS in 1931.⁵³⁸ However, it may have been a simple case of a clash of teaching philosophies, Morrow's being based on a methodological approach, and Dunn's on guiding or evoking individual creativity. And it may just as well have reflected a clash of personalities.

It also is not clear that Dunn intended to resign from the SFIS. A draft of her letter of resignation is dated August 12, 1937, just six days after her wedding. In it she told Dr. Seymour that it was "time" for her to move on to "other work in addition to studies in Indian Art [sic], and that she had been spending more and more of her "time and thought in Santa Fe...in routine and less and less really creative work."⁵³⁹ Dunn offered "to stay on for one month of intensive reorganization and to give guidance to the Studio staff and students once each week thereafter until the new plan moves efficiently,"

⁵³⁶ Ibid.

⁵³⁷ Ibid.

⁵³⁸ 93.DDK.160, letter from Edna Groves to Dunn dated November 2, 1931.

⁵³⁹ 93.DDK.162, Dunn's handwritten draft of a resignation letter addressed to H. C. Seymour dated August 12, 1937.

and thereafter to come in “one full day” each week.⁵⁴⁰ This “new plan” was Dunn’s. And there was not one word about her earlier adamant request for a higher salary or assistant for preparing exhibitions.

Dunn’s official letter of resignation was dated October 12, 1937, a week after H. L. Newman, the SFIS business manager, sent her a letter urging her to submit one.⁵⁴¹ As was her wont, she did not address it to Superintendent Seymour, but jumped the chain of command by writing to Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier. This time her tone was quite formal, compared to the earlier draft. Dunn began by formally and professionally submitting her resignation, citing the reason as wishing to “have more time for creative work.”⁵⁴² However, the next and final sentence in the letter should have caused Dunn some embarrassment; “I do not wish to drop my work in Indian art, and,because, [sic] in developing my beginnings further, I need greater freedom than was available in the boarding school, Ihave [sic] made application for a position with the Arts and Crafts Board of the Indian Service.”⁵⁴³ Typing errors aside, Dunn was writing on a far too personal level with an individual whom she not only did not know personally, but to whom a true professional would have written in a tactfully neutral manner. Additionally, telling the Commissioner that she was seeking another Indian Service position, while casting aspersions on another within his purview by lamenting that she had been denied “freedom,” was an imprudent move.

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁴¹ 93.DDK.162, letter dated October 6, 1937 from H. L. Newman to Dunn.

⁵⁴² 93.DDK.162, letter dated October 12, 1937, Espanola, New Mexico, from “Dorothy Dunn (Mrs. Max Kramer)” to “The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.”

⁵⁴³ Ibid.

Dunn's longtime supporter, Rose K. Brandt, the Supervisor for Elementary Education at BIA headquarters in Washington, D.C., wrote Dunn to express her regret over the resignation, stating that Willard K. Beatty, the Director of Education, regretted it "as well."⁵⁴⁴ Brandt's letter was dated October 12, 1937, the same date as Dunn's resignation, so obviously she had a "heads up" that Dunn was intending to quit the Service, perhaps from Dunn herself. Brandt cryptically apologized that she and Beatty were "comparatively helpless" in affairs in Santa Fe, and that they had "been requested to keep hands off."⁵⁴⁵ Brandt may have been referring to a "turf war" with BIA officials in Albuquerque who wanted to retain as much control as possible over matters in the United Pueblo Agency. Nevertheless, Brandt wrote that Beatty was planning to travel to the Southwest soon to meet with Dunn to discuss "an art school plan he has in mind."⁵⁴⁶ Perhaps what Beatty had "in mind" was in line with the prescriptions that Frederic Douglas had made for Studio paintings in his review of the 1936 end-of-semester exhibition. Brandt may very well have been keeping this information from Dunn, for back at headquarters there was growing opposition to the kind of paintings being produced in the Studio. Dunn never mentioned Beatty in her book, but her friend Margretta Dietrich pointed her finger directly at Beatty and his department as the principal cause for Dunn's resignation.

Several months after leaving the Studio Dunn took the opportunity to make a revengeful jab at Director Beatty. Dunn had accepted Director Beatty's offer to be a

⁵⁴⁴ 93.DDK.162, letter dated October 12, 1937 from Rose K. Brandt to Dunn.

⁵⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁶ Ibid.

consultant on the illustration for a series of bilingual books for Indian children, which was the idea of Director Beatty.⁵⁴⁷ Beatty's idea for the series certainly was a laudable attempt to further the progress of multicultural education, however he also fancied himself as both an artist and an aesthetician. The first book in the series was titled *Little Boy with Three Names*, which told the story of a Taos Pueblo boy struggling to understand his identity while having three names, Taos, Spanish, and one from his boarding school.⁵⁴⁸ Beatty chose Taos artist Tonita Lujan, one of Dunn's former students, to do the illustrations, but he himself was the book's "editor, designer, and layout artist," and he knew exactly what style of illustrations he wanted from Lujan – realism.⁵⁴⁹ Dunn disagreed with Beatty's criticism of the symbolism used in the illustrations first submitted to him, and she fired off a letter to him expressing her disagreement with his "point of view which demands technical skill, in the European sense," and ended her missive with the barb, "My severely academic training made me rebellious; yours made you obedient."⁵⁵⁰ Indeed, Dunn spoke the truth about herself, for she rebelled not only against institutional conformity, but against Indian Service attempts to dictate that Euro-American expectations be incorporated into Indian art.

After the strain of so much conflict, Dunn must have felt the need not only to get out of town, but to take important steps – steps that she could control – in her personal life. On August 6, 1937 Dunn married Max Kramer in Denver, Colorado, and they

⁵⁴⁷ Rebecca C. Benes, *Native American Picture Books of Change, The Art of Historic Children's Editions* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2004), 45-46, 48.

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid., 46.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid., 49.

⁵⁵⁰ Letter from Dunn to Mr. Willard W. Beatty dated February 1, 1938, Taos, New Mexico.

subsequently honeymooned in Mexico for the remainder of the month until moving to Taos, where Max now had a job as the principal of the Taos Day School. But the wedding was hushed-up. When Dunn wrote her mother to announce her marriage, she implored her not to “let any of the relatives write” her “at Taos until after September 6 or 7 because no one...knows we’re married.”⁵⁵¹ Dunn included a prepared text for a wedding announcement to be placed in her mother’s local newspaper (and in which, as stated earlier, she claimed to have graduated from the SAIC), but Dunn noted that she was “taking care to keep it out of Southwest papers.”⁵⁵² Regarding her relatives, Dunn curiously noted that “Marriages cause such consternation and much fuss and bother is made over them.”⁵⁵³ She then expressed her fear that relatives would object to the fact that Max Kramer was Jewish, which, according to her niece Lois Lepper Nassen, they did not. Throughout the years Dunn, her husband and daughter Etel Thea remained close to her kin, and they and Mildred’s family regularly exchanged visits. However, Dunn provided no explanation for why she didn’t want the marriage announced in New Mexico.

After she left the studio, Dunn had hoped that she could find work with Kenneth Chapman at the Laboratory of Anthropology, but sometime before October 1937 she had also applied for a research grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, which had funded the opening of the Laboratory. While she was awaiting news about that grant, Dunn also

⁵⁵¹ 93.DDK.Unprocessed correspondence. Dunn’s undated, handwritten letter was obviously to her mother, although there is no salutation. Curiously, this letter was found placed inside an envelope postmarked “September 24, 1928,” with a return address of “Santo Domingo Pueblo, Domingo, NM,” which is where Dunn was living at that date.

⁵⁵² Ibid.

⁵⁵³ Ibid.

took the bold step of applying for a position as a “Specialist in Indian Arts and Crafts” with the Indian Arts and Crafts Board (IACB), despite the fact that there was no such position available in New Mexico or Arizona at the time.⁵⁵⁴ In early October she wrote directly to the IACB Director, Rene d’Harnoncourt, about her desire to have this position created for her in New Mexico.⁵⁵⁵ She wrote d’Harnoncourt, “Working directly for the Arts and Crafts Board, it seems to me, would be vastly more satisfactory and effective than trying to make continuous creative developments within the hidebound system of the boarding school.”⁵⁵⁶ Dunn wrote to a friend that she was attempting “to get a position directly under Rene d’Harnoncourt” that “would take” her “into the pueblos and reservations to work with the artists and craftsmen themselves, without the tremendous handicap of petty local authorities who know nothing about art and very little about anything except cheating and lying and bluffing.”⁵⁵⁷ Dunn had proposed this same idea of going into the pueblos to work in her initial job pitch to Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr. in March, 1932.⁵⁵⁸ In reply, d’Harnoncourt said he had talked to Kenneth Chapman and Margretta Dietrich, that he did “not know whether the present set-up will make it possible,” but he felt “pretty sure that something” could “be worked out that would make it possible for you to do the type of work you wish to do most.”⁵⁵⁹ The following February, Dunn wrote d’Harnoncourt once again, and this time she had the temerity to

⁵⁵⁴ 93.DDK.182, letter dated March 10, 1938 to Dunn from Margretta Dietrich.

⁵⁵⁵ 93.DDK.163, letter dated October 5, 1937 to Rene d’Harnoncourt from Dunn.

⁵⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵⁷ 93.DDK.164, letter dated October 6, 1937 to “Mrs. Hadley” from Dunn.

⁵⁵⁸ 93.DDK.160, letter dated March 9, 1932 to Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr. from Dunn in Chicago, Illinois.

⁵⁵⁹ 93.DDK.163, letter dated October 14, 1937 to Dunn from Rene d’Harnoncourt.

ask him to contact the Rockefeller Board to check on the status of her grant application, a most odd thing to do.⁵⁶⁰ Dunn never received a job with the IACB, nor did she receive the Rockefeller Foundation grant or a job at the Laboratory of Anthropology.

While corresponding with Dunn concerning this hoped-for position with the IACB, Margretta Dietrich once addressed her as “Dear little Spit Fire.”⁵⁶¹ Dietrich hastened to assure Dunn that this salutation was not meant to be “uncomplimentary,” and one supposes that she used this assignation in tribute to Dunn’s recent and continuing bold behavior. But Dietrich may well have caused Dunn to engage in some self-reflection, for several days later Dunn wrote her to confess that she had made a “mistake” by leaving the Studio, and she expressed her “regret” for her

[u]nwitting unfairness to the people who believed in me and tried to help me. But I had never had such an experience before – of so many people really caring and trying to help all at once, and, in my slow-witted way, I was the one who blundered. There were times when I didn’t know what to say or do and yet found myself in situations where I had to say or do something without delay. I invariably said or did the wrong thin, too, and being shocked and pained by the unforeseen consequences didn’t undo the mischief.⁵⁶²

Dunn was contritely sincere, and no doubt Dietrich, as did Kenneth Chapman and Olive Rush, believed in her and cared about her well-being as a person.⁵⁶³ One wonders if she was also feeling some remorse about her emotion-fraught confrontation with Dr. Sophie Aberle as well.

⁵⁶⁰ 93.DDK.165, letter dated February 7, 1938 to d’Harnoncourt from Dunn in Taos, New Mexico.

⁵⁶¹ 93.DDK.182, letter dated March 10, 1938 to Dunn from Margretta Dietrich.

⁵⁶² 93.DDK.183, letter dated March 21, 1938 to Margretta Dietrich from Dunn in Taos, New Mexico.

⁵⁶³ “1932 Notes,” 93.DDK.022.

But it was too late. Dunn had abandoned not just a job, but an avocation that she loved, and there would be no going back. However, she continued to promote the cause of Indian art for the remainder of her life, attending events such as the Gallup Ceremonial, helping to arrange exhibitions of Studio paintings, and writing articles for magazines. When she inherited Margretta Dietrich's collection of Studio paintings in 1961, Dunn busied herself for many years with sending these paintings to exhibitions both in American and Europe. But throughout the years Dunn fought to defend her work – and herself—at the Studio, as when the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored the Directions in Indian Art Conference (1959), and the subsequent Southwestern Indian Art Project at the University of Arizona (1960-1963), to consider reforms in BIA policy in art education. Dunn, whom one historian of these deliberations identified as being “symbolic of the old guard of Indian painting,” found herself at the center of the controversy raging between conferees who wanted a traditional Indian painting that conserved Indian culture (Dunn and her “camp”), and others who wanted a new school of art with modern aesthetics (the “anti-Dunn camp”).⁵⁶⁴ In 1962, the “anti-Dunn camp” won and succeeded in replacing the Studio with the newly founded Institute of American Indian Art in Santa Fe. However, Dunn now had a new battle to fight as she continued to defend herself and Studio painting from those who decried its inauthenticity, and like her battle at the Studio itself, it was a lifelong battle for her students and for herself.

⁵⁶⁴ Joy L. Gritton, *The Institute of American Indian Arts* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 38, 2.

Dunn finally published her book, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas* in 1968. It is not known exactly when she completed the text, but its publication was delayed because some potential publishers questioned her qualifications since she did not have impressive academic credentials. Dunn also mentioned in correspondence with friends and supporters that some would-be publishers objected to the cost of printing all the illustrations she wanted to be included. In it, using the third personal singular to identity herself, Dunn provided a detailed year-by-year account of the Studio that is the most definitive account we have of its students and activities, provided, of course, that one does not accuse Dunn of impartiality. Dunn explained who “D” was in a footnote referencing the “plan” for the Studio that was four years in the making: “Made by the writer of this account, referred to as D, who considered herself as an artist-researcher and guide rather than as teacher in the formal sense.”⁵⁶⁵ Dunn seems to have been humbly admitting that she did not have the academic training to be a “teacher” of Indian art to her Indian students. And perhaps Dunn also spoke of herself as “D” in order to avoid accusations of having written a self-serving account of what she truly believed was an authentic, independent artistic process.

In 1978 two psychotherapists, Jeanne Shutes and Jill Mellick, interviewed Dunn in the course of researching their biography of Geronima Cruz Montoya, Dunn’s student and assistant who taught at the Studio until its closure. In that book, *The World of P’otsunu*, Shutes and Mellick wrote that when Dunn talked to them about the time when she left the Studio, “she appeared passionate, guarded, and sad about what she

⁵⁶⁵ Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*, 250.

experienced as injustice, miscarriages, and misinterpretations, which remained alluded to yet veiled during our conversation together.”⁵⁶⁶ Dunn told them, “I did not make the children do Indian art. They wanted to. My encouragement has been vastly misunderstood by critical people.”⁵⁶⁷ Years later when Mellick was a consulting psychologist at a nursing home, she saw Dunn, who by then was “terminally ill” with Alzheimer’s Disease.⁵⁶⁸ Perhaps for reasons of confidentiality, Mellick did not relate what, if anything, Dunn said at that last meeting, or indeed if Dunn remembered the Studio at all.

Despite her complaints to the contrary, Dorothy Dunn’s work at the Studio had become all too much a personal matter for her. One assumes that Dunn spent the rest of her life dwelling on the events surrounding her departure, but the degree to which she looked inward for explanations cannot be known. Perhaps Mellick, a psychotherapist, could have helped Dunn to come to terms with that traumatic event, but, sadly, by the time of their last encounter Dunn was probably incapable of participating in therapy.

Why Dorothy Dunn?

The question, Why talk so much about Dorothy Dunn in a study focused on American Indian identity formation in the modern America? Does not a discussion about this non-Indian female detract from an authentic consideration of people, here artist-

⁵⁶⁶ Jeanne Shutes and Jill Mellick, *The World of P’otsunu, Geronima Cruz Montoya of San Juan Pueblo* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 72-73.

⁵⁶⁷ Ibid., 73.

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid., 9.

students of the SFIS Studio, who were struggling to define themselves in a dominant American society of which Dunn was a representative? What, then, is the relevance of Dorothy Dunn's life to the discussion? The answer is: Dorothy Dunn's adult life was inexorably bound up in the quest for expression of identity, the "Studio Style," that was the essence of Studio painting; Dunn was not only the Studio's professed "guide" for this exploration of identity, but the very essence of her own identity quest fused itself to that of her students. Dunn truly empathized with her students' and their people's desire to maintain their cultures and identity. Dunn also understood in a most fundamental way that their identities were both collective and individual, and that they should be encouraged to express these identities in their paintings. She believed that she was fighting the fight against entrenched reactionaries in the BIA that the students could not fight for themselves, since their identity vis-à-vis the modern American society was still in the incubator. But the stress of this struggle, and her intense personal identification with the artist-students, led her into a state of emotional agitation and defiance that proved to be her downfall. True, the artist-students were not reinventing themselves in the manner that Dunn was, but together they were seeking to reinvent American sensibilities and attitudes toward native peoples in the representations of themselves proffered through the medium of art. Together, the search they embarked on was not one seeking only an American Indian identity, but an *American identity*.

Dunn also found herself in what had to have been an exceedingly stressful situation not only with the students, but also with Indian Service administrators who were allowing her to take part in this new experiment in Indian art – at least until the last

couple of years that Dunn was at the Studio. And even more immediately, Dunn herself was a student, lacking both a solid academic background in art education and American Indian cultures. Indeed, one can venture to say that Dunn's knowledge of her students' cultures was not greater than their knowledge of the "white man's" culture, or even their knowledge of other Indian nations. In this most personal way for all involved, the Studio was a level meeting ground for Dunn and the artist-students, despite the fact that the location was in what heretofore had been a traditional, U.S. government-operated boarding school for Native American youth.

And on this level meeting ground Dorothy Dunn made lifelong friends. In a 2004 interview just a couple of years before her death, artist Pablita Velarde paid her the highest praise: "Well, she gave me a lifetime of history and education and she stayed to be my best friend throughout her whole life. And I appreciate that very much, you know, 'cause to me I owe her a lot."⁵⁶⁹ Velarde also remembered that Dunn was "more patient with the students and more helpful, and not so demanding as Mable Morrow was."⁵⁷⁰ However, hinting that some of her fellow students may not have been so enamored of Dunn, Velarde also recalled that "whether we liked it or not, we cooperated, or had to, you know."⁵⁷¹ Years later in an interview for a Heard Museum oral project, Chiricahua Apache artist Allan Houser expressed his disappointment "because of the limitation" at the Studio, but reported that when Dorothy Dunn visited him at his studio and home

⁵⁶⁹ Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁷¹ Ibid.

outside Santa Fe some forty years after he left the Studio, “she was so proud of what I had done.”⁵⁷² In an interview for the Heard Museum project, Geronima Cruz Montoya, who also became lifelong friends with Dunn, recalled that she tried to follow Dunn’s guidance:

‘The main thing was to encourage the Indian students to carry on their traditions....To know what is the beauty in the Indian world and to bring it out in painting. And she encouraged each one to do their own way of painting.’⁵⁷³

Dunn’s personal identity transformation was a complicated one indeed, especially since she was in her mid-twenties by the time she discovered the American Southwest. Her experiences in teaching in the day schools, struggling to obtain more academic credentials, and forging an innovative art program at the Studio affected her profoundly during a time when she was seeking a new life for herself, and this personal search coincided with her newfound mission to aid American Indians in bolstering their cultural identity, even as she was preparing them to enter the world of American art. Most probably Dunn expected more from herself than her students did.

There was also much that was coincidental about Dunn’s tenure at the Studio. Dunn greeted her Studio students as an American émigré into Indian country, and she acknowledged her newcomer status by insisting that their cultural traditions would dominate the artistic dialogue. Likewise, she insisted that she would be an “artist-researcher” and “guide” rather than their “teacher,” at once creating a tenuous situation in which the students were deemed to know what it was they were expected to create, and

⁵⁷² Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down*, 48, 50.

⁵⁷³ Ibid., 160.

Dunn was along for the ride. But, of course, this situation was tempered by Dunn's dictum that the art had to be "Indian" – a guideline that was nevertheless fraught with all the uncertainties of determining just what that identity encompassed.

She was Dorothy Dunn, a Midwestern woman in her late twenties who had no college degree, much less a cosmopolitan Bryn Mawr marker; she had never taught a formal painting class; and she was a newcomer to the cultures of American Indians. And while she was in many ways naïve about Indian Service politics, she rebelled against authority figures whom she believed did not support her work as passionately as she dedicated herself to it. She was Dorothy Dunn, the first director of a government program in Indian painting, a program that was intended to be the pilot program for the BIA's new promotion of Indian art and arts and crafts, and, hopefully, one that would – and did—establish a prototype for similar programs within the Indian Service school system. The pressures on her had to have been immense. There she was, with all these challenges, trying to crisscross the borders that had for so long divided her own Eurocentric-American culture and American Indian cultures in order to foster a new Indian art form that could be rightfully recognized as a truly American art. But ironically, it was pressures from her own culture, and her failure to master the politics of that culture, that caused her the most grief and ultimately drove her away. It was truly an American tragedy.

Chapter 6: An Afterword on Identity

The Studio project was essentially a forum in which its Indian artist-students sought to define themselves not only as Indians, but as *American* Indians. Together with their fellow non-Indians they, consciously or unconsciously, searched for the means to define and express themselves in a modern, cosmopolitan America. The artist-students accomplished this by painting who they were as a people; their subject matters were traditional ceremonies and scenes of everyday life, they presented themselves in traditional and acculturated clothing, and they depicted themselves collectively and individually by either stylizing or individualizing their faces, and in some cases apparently chose to use the color of skin to identify themselves vis-à-vis non-Indians. In short, they painted their composite identity.

This study has traced how some ethnocentric white Americans concerned with the “Indian problem” began to consider the role of culture, instead of only race, as the determinant factor in understanding Indian identity. At the beginning of the twentieth century Indian Service bureaucrats not only began to understand that there were many North American Indian cultures, but also that these cultures should be saved and valued in their own right. As a result, the Service instituted programs in Indian arts and crafts in many of its schools, and these efforts culminated in the opening of the first class of exclusively Indian-themed pictorial painting at the Santa Fe Indian School. And concurrent with this educational trend, American academics were also discarding notions of race and developing theories about the importance of studying culture in order to understand who Indians were as distinct peoples. During the 1930s, a group of these individuals came together within the Culture and Personality Movement, and although none of them were directly involved with the Studio, what they learned through their

analyses of Indian cultures can provide potentially relevant insights to the intersection of cultures and identity formation. It would also be worthwhile to present some history of contemporaneous research into the fields of cultural anthropology and psychological identity formation.

As discussed earlier, in 1935 Indian Commissioner John Collier initiated the employment of anthropologists, such as H. Scudder Mekeel, to study Indian cultures. Concurrently, other anthropologists such as Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead went into the field and applied the principle of cultural relativism to their studies of “primitive” peoples. And neo-Freudian psychoanalysts such as Erik Homburger Erikson and Karen Horney were likewise interested in the psychic and social makeup of American Indians. I believe that the conclusions they drew from their observations of American Indians in their cultural environment certainly provide some insight into contemporary adolescent Indian artist-students at the Studio, and shed some light as well on the general state of Indian identity at that time. And in the case of Erikson, his visit to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota involved not only Indian Service efforts to better understand the culture of Sioux Indians in order to manage them more efficiently, but his own efforts to understand Indian culture and identity in relation to that of non-Indian Americans.

In the summer of 1937, Dr. Erik Homburger⁵⁷⁴ accepted Dr. H. Scudder Mekeel’s invitation to accompany him to an Indian Service institute for its civil servants on the Sioux Indians’ Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. At the time Dr. Mekeel was Indian Commissioner John Collier’s field representative in charge of applied anthropology. According to Dr. Erikson, Mekeel had invited him to serve on the institute’s faculty as a “mental hygienist” and to make an exploration into the specific

⁵⁷⁴ Dr. Homburger had not yet assumed his new surname of “Erikson,” as will be discussed.

psychological problems waiting for solution” in the field of Indian education,” in particular to compile an “anthropological reconstruction of what once was Sioux childhood.”⁵⁷⁵

Erikson initially reported his “first impressions of a most complicated problem of clinical sociology” in the essay “Observations on Sioux Education,” which was published in the *Journal of Psychology* in 1939, and he later reworked his material for the chapter “Hunters Across the Prairie” in his book *Childhood and Society* in 1950.⁵⁷⁶ In both works Erikson quoted poetry written by whites about the Oglala Sioux people, but despite an apparent desire to wax poetic himself about the Sioux, Erikson bluntly stated, “Only the most stubborn of romantics will expect to find on a reservation today anything resembling the image of the old Dakotas who were once the embodiment of the ‘real Indian’ – a warring and hunting man, endowed with fortitude, cunning, and cruelty.”⁵⁷⁷ Erikson reminded his readers that the much vaunted buffalo culture of the Sioux had only arisen when they migrated onto the Plains “a few centuries” before the white settlers arrived.⁵⁷⁸ These settlers, of course, had indiscriminately slaughtered the buffalo herds to near extinction, wiping out the central source of sustenance, material culture, and identity for the Sioux. Erikson quoted anthropologist Clark Wissler’s conclusion that, ironically, the “relative youth” of the Sioux “adjustment” to the buffalo hunt explained the

⁵⁷⁵ Erik Homburger Erikson, “Observations on Sioux Education,” *Journal of Psychology*, 7 (1939), 101 <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/openu> [accessed February 27, 2008].

⁵⁷⁶ Erikson, “Observations,” 102. This essay, along with his essay “Observations on the Yurok: childhood and World Image” originally published in 1943, were also condensed into one article which appeared as an article in *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* in 1945 and as a chapter in the anthology *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry Murray in 1948. Erikson’s biographer Lawrence Friedman states that these new iterations depicted a “healthier America” than the one described in *Childhood and Society*. See Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity’s Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 185.

⁵⁷⁷ Erik H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, 2nd Ed. (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963), 115.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid., 116.

apocalyptic result of the loss of this animal: ““When the buffalo died, the Sioux died, ethnically and spiritually.””⁵⁷⁹ During early years of the twentieth century, the Sioux had finally begun to engage in the cattle industry – an economic activity that somewhat recalled the old buffalo culture, and one which Erikson saw as offering the Sioux a new identity based on a white model – that of the “cowboy.”⁵⁸⁰ But “Washington” decreed that the Sioux had to give up their cattle, and Erikson concluded that “the loss of their herd, which had rapidly increased, and the later land boom which made petty capitalist spendthrifts out of the unprepared Sioux, were modern catastrophes which, psychologically, equaled the loss of the buffalo.”⁵⁸¹ Sioux identity clearly was on shifting, if not sinking, sands, but Erikson nevertheless found a strong, surviving remnant in their traditions for childrearing that hopefully would sustain them.

Erikson reported that “Several intelligent Indians” told him that while “intellectually they could comprehend perfectly well the relentless decision of history,” they still could not situate this defeat “into their picture of the world, the intellectual knowledge serving only to increase the unreality of their existence.”⁵⁸²

The very fact that the Sioux can afford to avoid a testing of his communal strength on the realities of today, allows him to preserve an anachronistic system of child training which remains the continued source of inner peace under desperate communal conditions. Thus the Sioux can wait for a restitution of the mythical abundant life and leave to the United States government the providing of immediate necessities.⁵⁸³

So despite the unreality of their situation, Erikson perceived the origin in Sioux childrearing of “the strange inner security and inner personal harmony which makes it

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid., quoting from C. Wissler, “Depression and Revolt,” *Natural History*, 1938, Vol. 41, No. 2.

⁵⁸⁰ Ibid., 118.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid.

⁵⁸² Erikson, “Observations,” 116.

⁵⁸³ Ibid., 147.

possible for the Indian to submit to white supervision without surrendering to it,” and the origin as well of the “basic psychological problem of Indian education.”⁵⁸⁴ One might also interpolate that this inner strength harbored the essence of Sioux identity – both individually and collectively. And as well that such “strange inner security and inner personal harmony” were the result of strong religious belief.

Erikson’s delineation of the problem of Indian education shifted a bit from an appreciative understanding of the Oglala psyche in his essay “Observations on Sioux Education” to a more practical, and at the same time unpractical, definition in *Childhood and Society*. In “Observations,” Erikson proposed two solutions to “bridge this historical vacuum” and “make whatever is left of the Sioux’s communal conscience meet reality again for better or worse”: one was starvation to force compliance, the other “proper influence on and wise utilization of the Sioux child’s early education.”⁵⁸⁵ Erikson dismissed the first out of hand, thankfully, but he was pessimistic about the second as well because it would require “systematic research” that amounted to a “laboratory experiment” whose end result – “tribal re-education” – would probably liberate the Sioux to “join the racial minorities in the poorer American population.”⁵⁸⁶ However, in *Childhood and Society* Erikson dropped the “psychological” adjective and identified instead only the “problem of Indian education,” which he now explained was

in reality, one of culture contact between a group of employees representative of the middle-class values of a free-enterprise system on the one hand, and on the other, the remnants of a tribe which, wherever it leaves the shadow of government sustenance, must find itself among the underprivileged of that system.⁵⁸⁷

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid., 128.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid., 151-152.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid., 152.

⁵⁸⁷ Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, 154.

Rather than proscribing all white efforts at educating the Indian as being doomed, Erikson seemed to be saying that the Oglala's traditions, in particular those of childrearing, must be recognized and sustained. Erikson argued that it was not traditional child training that had stunted the Sioux children, but rather "the fact that for the last hundred years the integrative mechanisms of child training have not been encouraged to sustain a new promising system of significant social roles."⁵⁸⁸ Apparently he believed that this had to be accomplished on the reservation since assimilation into American society would doom the Oglala into "alignment with the lowest strata of our society."⁵⁸⁹ The implication was that it was the conscience of the white government employees and their education methods that needed to be adjusted to fit the Oglala's "mutual assimilation of somatic, mental, and social patterns which amplify one another and make the cultural design for living economical and effective."⁵⁹⁰

Indeed, Erikson and Mekeel found that there was no need to apply their expertise in mental hygiene since they discovered "little evidence of individual conflicts, inner tensions, or of what we call neuroses" among the general Sioux population.⁵⁹¹ However, they did detect "neurotic tension, expressed in compulsions, overconscientiousness, and general rigidity" in "a few 'white man's Indians,' most of whom were employed by the Indian Service.⁵⁹² What they did find in the general Sioux population was "cultural pathology," sometimes in the problems of alcoholism or petty thievery, but mostly "in the

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., 164.

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid., 156.

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid., 131.

⁵⁹² Ibid.

form of a general apathy and an intangible passive resistance against any further and more final impact of white standards on the Indian conscience.”⁵⁹³

Erikson was, however, concerned about the non-Indian teachers in his search for possible solutions to the ‘problem of Indian education.’ In the *Observations* essay, he acknowledged the teachers’ “special tasks on this cultural frontier,” and that the resulting “psychological strain” that distorted “observations and attitudes is an intricate part of the total problem of Indian education.”⁵⁹⁴ And much like his conclusions regarding the Sioux state of mind, Erikson concerned himself primarily with the psychological aspect of the stresses experienced by the teachers. Erikson described sympathetically – to the point that one wonders whether he was voicing a shared perspective—the burden carried by “those who want to understand”; the “spacial [sic] isolation as well as the intimacy with a foreign people who so stubbornly adhere to and still often unconsciously enjoy standards hostile to all that is basic to the employees’ upbringing, efficiency, and health.”⁵⁹⁵ Erikson pronounced the danger that such stress could activate “latent neurotic and psychotic tendencies” that would be “dissimulated.”⁵⁹⁶ Erikson found no easy solution for this problem since he recognized that “Each individual’s attitude repeats historical oscillations: One day the Indian seems more foreign than an animal; the next day one will be surprised to discover something of the Indian in oneself and much of

⁵⁹³ Ibid., 131.

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid., 154.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., 153-154.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid., 154.

oneself in the Indian.”⁵⁹⁷ However, this struggle with identity represented “only one of the strenuous psychological situations” that non-Indians had to confront; another one was the prevailing convention in Western civilization that “a systematic regulation of functions and impulses in earliest childhood is the surest safeguard for later effective functioning in society.”⁵⁹⁸ Erikson’s recognition instead of the internal logic of another culture was a core principle of cultural relativism and an object of research for the Culture and Personality Movement.

At the time of his visit to Pine Ridge, Erikson was conducting research at the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut. Erikson, who had emigrated to the United States from Denmark in 1933, had begun his training in 1927 in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society at a time when its founder, Sigmund Freud, was aged and ill, and increasingly transferring the affairs of the psychoanalytic movement to his daughter, Anna Freud. It was also a time when some of Freud’s students, such as Carl G. Jung in Switzerland, and Karen Horney in the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society, were beginning to advance their own psychoanalytic theories, some of which were considered heretical by Freud and his staunch followers. Erikson underwent his training analysis with Anna Freud, and he chose the field of child analysis as his specialization. Anna Freud and other psychoanalysts in the society were at the time pioneering this field that concentrated on analyzing the psychic development of children and adolescents. But Erikson had already begun to think deeply about the

⁵⁹⁷ Erikson, *Observations*, 154-155.

⁵⁹⁸ Erikson, *Observations*, 155, and Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, 155.

psychology of childhood and youth years before he engaged in depth psychology training in Vienna.

During the years 1923 and 1924, while Erikson, according to his biographer Dr. Lawrence J. Friedman, was experiencing a period of *Wanderschaft* grounded in German Romanticism, he recorded his thoughts and impressions in notebooks. Friedman asserts that these notebooks contained the seeds of “what became some of the most significant concepts of his intellectual career,” one of which was “identity.”⁵⁹⁹ At this incipient stage, Erikson wrote, ““the self is that which, living, experiences itself; for if there is no outer [world] there would not be self,”” which Friedman interpreted as meaning that one could experience the ““self”” only if one could ““differentiate”” oneself from others in the ““outer”” world.”⁶⁰⁰ Friedman observed that although ““self”” and ““I”” overlapped decidedly in his thinking,” they were bound up with what Erik “would come to call identity.”⁶⁰¹ It was also in these notebooks that Erik first propounded his theories about an “inner world” and “outer world” whose interaction formed the child’s identity.

During Erikson’s tutelage in Vienna, Anna Freud was also pursuing the concepts of these inner and outer worlds, but according to Friedman, he complained that Anna was placing too much emphasis on the role of the inner world. Echoing still the strain of Romanticism which had so long influenced European intellectual thought, in his notebooks Erikson had “emphasized the interaction of the self with nature and the world,” but was nevertheless moving toward an equal emphasis on the inner world in the

⁵⁹⁹ Friedman, *Identity’s Architect*, 53, 55-56.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid., 53.

⁶⁰¹ Ibid.

interaction of the two; Erikson concluded that ““at every step the child takes so much of the outer world into the inner world, he experiences the outer world in terms of the inner world.””⁶⁰² Erik applied this equal emphasis on the two worlds to his clinical case studies in Vienna, and he later recalled

that study of ‘the patient’s mutual involvement with significant persons’ within a ‘communal unit such as the family’ sometimes accounted for elements that could not be accommodated by the focus on ‘inner “economics” of drive and defense’ or vague reference to the ‘outer world’ that rarely took ‘outer’ seriously.⁶⁰³

But Erikson did not consider this position heretical to orthodox Freudianism, and he maintained years later that the interaction of the two worlds ““seemed to me always implicit in Freud’s own writings.””⁶⁰⁴ Nevertheless, Erik and his bride Joan, were growing increasingly exasperated over the lack of alarm expressed by members of the Vienna psychoanalytic community toward the threat to Austria looming from the increasingly powerful Nazis in Germany – a lack of alarm that Erik attributed to their emphasis on the inner world that blinded them to the outer world. So, in 1933 the Erikson and his family sailed for America.

After arriving in the United States, Erikson continued to his work as a child analyst in Boston, and subsequently obtained positions first at Harvard University, and at the end of 1935 at Yale University. Friedman, the title of whose masterful biography of Erikson sums up his subject’s avocation, *Identity’s Architect*, believes that Erikson’s

⁶⁰² Ibid., 89.

⁶⁰³ Ibid., quoting Erik H. Erikson, Tape-recorded interview, April 1, 1983, Tape 1, 30.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid., citing Erik H. Erikson, “Autobiographical Notes on the Identity Crisis,” *Daedalus* 99 (Fall 1970), 741.

discovery “that there was something about the culture of this nation of immigrants” prompted him to develop the concepts of identity and identity crisis, and “to elaborate on identity as the key element in human development.”⁶⁰⁵ And as he embarked on a new life in a new country, Erikson also tackled identity issues of his own when he changed his surname in his petition for U.S. citizenship in 1938; he would now be known as Erik Homburger *Erikson*. Homburger was the name of his stepfather, but Erik never knew the identity of his real father; hence, he became his own man literally.

By the time he transferred permanently to Yale, Erikson had already garnered a great deal of professional respect both as a psychoanalyst and for his research into child development. But it was here that he also broadened his scope of research by gradually integrating the disciplines of anthropology, psychoanalysis, psychology, and sociology – the so-called Culture and Personality Movement. Dr. Edward Sapir, a cultural anthropologist at Yale, was the first individual to introduce Erikson to this new interdisciplinary field. Friedman observed that Sapir’s “interpretive and rather eclectic form of cultural anthropology” seemed “to add an important dimension to Erik’s psychoanalytic perspective and to augment his interest in connecting the culture of the ‘outer world’ to the drives and restraints of the ‘inner world.’”⁶⁰⁶ These “outer” and “inner” worlds were at the core of Erikson’s understanding of the concept of identity. And when Dr. H. Scudder Mekeel invited Erikson to accompany him on the Indian

⁶⁰⁵ Friedman, *Identity's Architect*, 103-104.

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid., 133.

Service field trip to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, the latter's interest in joining this new movement was heightened.

Erikson subsequently became professionally associated with the principal figures in the movement, chief among them being anthropologist Margaret Mead. Indeed, Friedman believes that the two became dependent on one another. For one thing, Erikson and Mead were both very interested in child development, but Friedman believes that Mead was especially intrigued that Erikson was “breaking from the individualist notion of a person (the subject) that was pervasive in America,” and instead was studying how “the self was inseparable from important others within a social context.”⁶⁰⁷ And for both Erikson and Mead, the cultures of American Indians and other “primitives” were amenable sources of a “social context” for study. Erikson was likewise influenced by Mead’s work, and he cited conclusions from her book *The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe* (1932), which was a study of the Omaha under the pseudonym “the Antlers,” in his essay *Observations on Sioux Education*.⁶⁰⁸ Much like Erikson’s own conclusions drawn about the security provided by Sioux child training in a home that did not meet white hygienic standards, Mead had surmised that the “Antlers” children benefitted similarly despite these standards that were, of course, relative and subject to their own internal logic.

Meade and anthropologist Ruth Benedict had been mentored in the field of social anthropology by Dr. Franz Boas at Columbia University. In the early decades of the

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid., 137.

⁶⁰⁸ Curiously Erikson redacted those excerpts from his chapter on the Pine Ridge Sioux in *Childhood and Society*.

twentieth century, Dr. Boas had championed the theory of cultural relativity, which held that each culture was uniquely conditioned by its history and possessed its own internal logic, and as such should not be judged as inferior or superior to any other. Such thinking, of course, challenged the established, ethnocentric orientation of white, mainstream American society, which viewed Indians as lesser beings who were locked into a primitive life on the basis of their race. And instead of pursuing an ethnographic errand to collect information from dying cultures, Boas and his students, as well as other academics in the social sciences, studied the totality of individual cultures as entities that were both unique and susceptible to change. But as historian Margaret M. Caffrey pointed out in her biography of Ruth Benedict, these social scientists' search for "cultural laws" "had the potential to lead to internal social change in American society."⁶⁰⁹ Caffrey based her argument on the following quote written by Benedict concerning Boas: "'The study of the mental life of man in other cultures was to his mind one of the best pedagogical means of making men 'free.'"⁶¹⁰ But Caffrey also observed that some of these same scientists were seeking "workable means for controlling society."⁶¹¹ And, indeed, in seeking the aid of anthropologists and psychoanalysts, such as Mekeel and Erikson, the Indian Service was not only seeking cultural knowledge for its own sake, but to more efficiently administer the persisting 'Indian problem,' and the possibility of a

⁶⁰⁹ Margaret M. Caffrey, *Ruth Benedict: Stranger in this Land* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989), 118, 119.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid., 118.

⁶¹¹ Ibid., 119.

“free” people – as in politically, socially and economically independent, was not a topic for consideration.

In 1934, Ruth Benedict published her groundbreaking book on the application of psychological principles and history to understanding culture. Titled *Patterns of Culture*, this book was based on Benedict’s field studies of three cultures – those of the Pueblos in New Mexico, American Indians on the Northwest coast, and the natives of Dobu in Melanesia. Benedict proposed that “A culture, like an individual, is a more or less consistent pattern of thought and action,” and that the “whole...is not merely the sum of all its parts, but the result of a unique arrangement and interrelation of the parts that has brought about a new entity.”⁶¹² In other words, cultures, like individuals, could have their own distinct personality. Benedict introduced what she termed a “configurational interpretation” of cultures, which was “an exposition in terms of individual psychology” that depended “upon history as well as upon psychology” to determine whether or not the existence of a configuration or dominant character was active in that society.⁶¹³ Benedict explained that regarding the study of “social custom,” “the behavior under consideration must pass through the needle’s eye of social acceptance, and only history in its widest sense can give an account of these social acceptances and rejections.”⁶¹⁴ Of course, Benedict realized that this thesis challenged the longstanding acceptance of the biological basis of culture, e.g., its racial underpinning. She conceded that although “the biological

⁶¹² Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, intro. Mary Catherine Bateson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1989), 46-47.

⁶¹³ Ibid., 232.

⁶¹⁴ Ibid.

bases of cultural behavior in mankind are for the most part irrelevant,” “the fact that the historical factors are dynamic” could not be overlooked.⁶¹⁵ However, one problem with Benedict’s thesis was that not every culture had a distinct personality, yet every individual did, and Benedict realized this. She recognized that in any culture, “individuals” were not “automatons, mechanically carrying out the decrees of their civilization.”⁶¹⁶ Nevertheless, Benedict defended her configurational approach, stating,

The problem of the individual is not clarified by stressing the antagonisms between culture and the individual, but by stressing their mutual reinforcement. This rapport is so close that it is not possible to discuss patterns of culture without considering specifically their relation to individual psychology.⁶¹⁷

Yet Benedict placed more emphasis on the “outer world” of culture, rather than the “inner world” as Erikson did, as the force that bound a person together and gave them their core identity.

Benedict and Margaret Mead had become friends when they were graduate students at Columbia, and they remained close and professionally supportive to one another throughout their careers. In 1958 Mead wrote a preface to the second edition of *Patterns of Culture*, in which she recalled that Benedict later “came to feel that each primitive culture represented something comparable to a great work of art or literature, and that this is how the comparison between modern individual works of art and primitive culture should be made, rather than by comparing the scratched designs on the edge of a pot with the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel.”

⁶¹⁵ Ibid., 235-236.

⁶¹⁶ Ibid., 253.

⁶¹⁷ Ibid., 253-254.

When only single arts were compared, primitive cultures had little to offer; but if one took these cultures whole – the religion, the mythology, the everyday ways of men and women – then the internal consistency and the intricacy was as aesthetically satisfying to the would-be explorer as was any single work of art.⁶¹⁸

Perhaps Benedict would have applied this same mode of appreciation to the Studio paintings and viewed them not as singular works of art, but as windows on the cultures they depicted. And certainly she would have been interested in these paintings for the simple fact that so many of them were created by Pueblo Indians, whose culture she characterized in *Patterns of Culture* as being “Apollonian.”

Benedict analyzed American Indians through her extraordinary adoption of German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche’s character studies of Greek tragedies. Writing in the late nineteenth century, Nietzsche applied the antithetical terms “Apollonian” and “Dionysian” to describe how ancient Greeks approached the meaning of existence. Benedict quoted Nietzsche’s explanations for these categorizations of “ways of arriving at the values of existence.”

The Dionysian pursues them through ‘the annihilation of the ordinary bounds and limits of existence’; he seeks to attain in his most valued moments escape from the boundaries imposed upon him by his five senses, to break through into another order of experience. The desire of the Dionysian, in personal experience or in ritual, is to press through it toward a certain psychological state, to achieve excess....The Apollonian distrusts all this, and has often little idea of the nature of such experiences. He finds means to outlaw them from his conscious life. He ‘knows but one law, measure in the Hellenic sense.’ He keeps the middle of the road, stays within the known map, does not meddle with disruptive psychological states.⁶¹⁹

⁶¹⁸ Ibid., xiii.

⁶¹⁹ Ibid., 79.

Benedict, however, hastened to qualify these personalizations by stating that she was not “equating the civilization of Greece with that of aboriginal America,” and by admitting that not all of the “attitudes” of Greeks were also present in the Pueblos.⁶²⁰ However, she insisted that these categories brought “clearly to the fore the major qualities that differentiated Pueblo culture from those of other American Indians.”⁶²¹ In particular she held up the example of the ritual dance common to all Indian cultures. Whereas the non-Pueblo dances displayed ecstatic “frenzy,” the Pueblos were “bent not at all upon an ecstatic experience, but upon so thorough-going an identification with nature that the forces of nature will swing to their purposes.”⁶²² Benedict surmised that it was “the cumulative force of the rhythm, the perfection of forty men moving as one, that makes them effective.”⁶²³ By emphasizing the unity of intent that gave power to the Pueblo dance, Benedict subsumed the individual in the group mentality; however, the primacy ascribed to the transformative intent of non-Pueblo dance raises the individual out of the group. Put another way, group identity was primary among the Pueblos, while individual identity was among non-Pueblos. Of course, these categories not only represented opposites, but two extremes in human behavior. The Dionysian personality was prone to transformative excess and seemingly devoid of self-suppression, while the Apollonian seemed to be mired in a host of repressions that made it a fertile ground for developing neuroses. In developing her thesis, Benedict had placed these cultures on the Freudian

⁶²⁰ Ibid.

⁶²¹ Ibid.

⁶²² Ibid., 92, 93.

⁶²³ Ibid., 93.

couch, so to speak, but neglected to analyze the possible repercussions of their psychological makeup on the society as a whole.

In her preface to the 1958 edition of *Patterns of Culture*, Mead also wrote that the book was “concerned” with the “relationship between each human being, with a specific hereditary endowment and particular life history, and the culture in which he or she lived,” i.e., identity.⁶²⁴ Mead found a connection between Benedict’s insights into the personality of culture and the interests of Karen Horney, a German immigrant psychoanalyst who was also preoccupied with the interaction between culture and personality, and she arranged for Benedict and Horney to meet.⁶²⁵

Karen Horney, a Freudian-trained analyst, was a founding member of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society. In 1932 Horney decided, much as Erikson had, that it was time to escape the rising National Socialist movement in Germany and she emigrated to the United States. She arrived in New York in September 1932, coincidentally the same month that Dorothy Dunn took up her new position at the Santa Fe Indian School, and joined the New York Psychoanalytic Society. Horney’s biographer, Susan Quinn, surmised that Horney adjusted well to American culture since “she was bringing a European tradition to America rather than adjusting to an American one.”⁶²⁶

In her prolific body of writings and lectures, Horney never addressed the stressful effects on the psyche of straddling cultures, but she did promote an understanding of how

⁶²⁴ Ibid., xiii.

⁶²⁵ Friedman, *Architect of Identity*, 137.

⁶²⁶ Susan Quinn, *A Mind of Her Own: A Life of Karen Horney* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1987), 47.

the “conception of what is normal varies not only within the culture but also within the same cultures, in the course of time.”⁶²⁷ To this understanding she brought the notion that Freudian psychoanalysis, with its foundation in biological instincts, ignored the impact of cultural conditions on the formation of personality, and it was inadequate to describe the psychic workings of individuals from cultures outside the one in which it had arisen. These insights arose from Horney’s critique that Freud erroneously devalued the role that the ego played in mental functioning and in human interaction; in opposition to Freud, Horney insisted that the ego was not irreducibly subject to libidinal, instinctual drives. While not ignoring the libido, Horney firmly believed that individual and cultural conditions also influenced the development of neurosis in a personality, and her insights into this interaction fit right into the Culture and Personality Movement. Horney addressed her 1937 book, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*, in part to these new confreres: “The book is addressed to...those groups of anthropologists and sociologists who have become aware of the significance of psychic factors in the study of different cultures.”⁶²⁸

Horney defined a neurosis as being “a psychic disturbance brought about by fears and defenses against these fears, and by attempts to find compromise solutions for conflicting tendencies,” and she argued that “the term neurotic, while originally medical, cannot be used now without its cultural implications.”⁶²⁹ She provided as examples

⁶²⁷ Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1937), 15.

⁶²⁸ Ibid., xi.

⁶²⁹ Ibid., 28, 14.

hypothetical cases of a girl without “competitive drives” or an artist who is satisfied with a subsistence income in order to indulge himself in whimsy; such individuals were considered “neurotic” in Western cultures, but in Pueblo Indian culture the girl would be “considered entirely normal,” and in Mexico or Southern Italy the artist would also “be considered normal.”⁶³⁰ Likewise, a young man who claimed to have experienced a vision, or a person who was grievously offended by the mention of a dead ancestor, would be considered “neurotic” in Western thought, but among the Plains Indians the former would be revered for his experience, and the latter’s reaction would be considered entirely appropriate among the Jicarilla Apaches.⁶³¹ Horney insisted that “The conception of what is normal varies not only with the culture, but also within the same culture, in the course of time.”⁶³² And although Horney did not totally repudiate Freudianism, she critiqued it as being not only culture-bound, but inelastic in its conception of how the ego influenced the psyche, and how one’s personality or identity was formed in the process.

Much as Horney also freed the psyche from Freudian biological determination, in the 1930s the English biologist Julian Huxley also re-examined the concept of race. Writing at a time when racism was being propounded in catastrophic measures by the National Socialist Party in Germany, Huxley proposed that the “race concept as employed by the politician, or even in most cases by the anthropologist,” was a

⁶³⁰ Ibid., 13-14.

⁶³¹ Ibid., 14-15.

⁶³² Ibid., 15.

dangerously outmoded product of the “pre-Mendelian era” of genetics.⁶³³ Huxley argued that the term “race” represented an “attempt to apply the biological concept of variety or geographical race to man,” and as such was “so loose” that it was “unworkable” since “variation in man has taken place on quite other lines than those characteristic of other animals.”⁶³⁴ Huxley instead proposed that the “noncommittal phrase ‘ethnic group’” be substituted for that of the “question-begging term ‘race’”; ethnicity and culture clearly trumped biology in evolution and understanding of the many faces of mankind.⁶³⁵ Interestingly enough, it should be recalled that Huxley engaged in the discussion of the promotion of American Indian arts and crafts that appeared in the February 1932 issue of *Progressive Education*.

The general thrust of the Culture and Personality Movement’s conclusions about North American Indians was that although they were a “primitive” people in contrast to modern American industrial society, and despite their centuries-long colonial subjugation and the attendant degradation of their cultures, several of their nations had retained cohesive social and cultural elements that continued to sustain them both as individuals and as groups. And collectively and individually, they possessed identities that should not be understood as being racially or biologically determined, but rather as dynamic, elastic formations that arose at the point of interaction between their “inner” and “outer” worlds, between their psyche and their culture. As a group, the members of that

⁶³³ Julian Huxley, “The Concept of Race in the Light of Modern Genetics,” *Harper’s Magazine* (May 1935), 389.

⁶³⁴ Ibid., 698.

⁶³⁵ Ibid.

Movement most probably would have agreed that given this ongoing process of identity formation, Indians needed a conducive, sympathetic forum in which to express themselves. As stated earlier, Erikson, in particular, sought a means to “bridge” the “historical vacuum” between the Sioux people’s past and present, and “make whatever is left of the Sioux’s communal conscience meet reality again.”⁶³⁶ And Erikson also believed that the Sioux methods of childrearing granted them the “inner security and inner personal harmony” which could empower them “to submit to white supervision without surrendering to it.”⁶³⁷ He identified this secure grounding for the child as the origin of the “basic psychological problem of Indian education.”⁶³⁸ Certainly Erikson would have held the same hopeful sentiment regarding inner empowerment to other Indian peoples, and rightly or wrongly, he advanced the notion that this “psychological problem” was “basic” to *all* children in the government’s Indian schools. Of course, there is no way on knowing whether Erikson would have included or excluded this “problem” at the Studio, but one can reasonably argue that he would have expected it to have been applicable to the Sioux artist-students.

The non-Indians in that art world also became engaged in the same process through their engagement with the Indian artist-students – an engagement that influenced the way in which they saw themselves as well. But as Erikson surmised, non-Indians from the Indian Service who crossed over the borders of Indian cultures experienced “psychological strain,” and Sioux employees likewise felt “neurotic tension,” while other

⁶³⁶ Erikson, “Observations,” 151-152.

⁶³⁷ Ibid., 128.

⁶³⁸ Ibid.

members of the Sioux community retained an “inner security.” It is quite possible that a similar scheme of personal difficulties occurred at the Studio. Certainly Dorothy Dunn’s intense engagement there with her students strained her emotionally. Dunn’s inability to understand and manipulate Indian Service politics was undoubtedly also a crucial source of stress, but some of that ineptitude could have been due to her intense identification with the cause of their work. Perhaps the Studio’s artist-students also sometimes experienced degrees of tension as they went about their creative work that involved delving into their individual, tribal, pan-tribal, and American identities. Some of them did display behavioral problems, especially during the first year of the Studio. But it is equally possible that the students retained from their ancestral homes a comforting sense of “inner security” that protected their sense of identity from redefinition by whites. Whatever the case, for Indians and non-Indians alike, the ways in which their respective identities fused cross-culturally must have inspired insights into how they were collectively Americans. But just as Erikson feared that the Oglala would assimilate into the “lowest strata” of American society, the Studio artist-students found that their art would remain segregated and marginalized in the American art world.

Erikson and other members of the Culture and Personality Movement did not have any direct connection with the Studio, but their insights into the dominant influence of culture, rather than race, on American Indian identity certainly did parallel the thinking of individuals such as John Collier and Dorothy Dunn. In a similar fashion, the contributions of Ruth Benedict, Karen Horney, and Erik Erikson to understanding the nature of identity formation are relevant to understanding both the process and product of

artistic creation at the Studio. In the final analysis, the art world of the Studio gave a few youthful representatives of Indian peoples the opportunity to discover an artistic means to express themselves at the juncture of their individual selves and cultural legacies. And it was at this juncture, between their “inner worlds” and their “outer worlds,” that their identity took shape, and infused itself into the modern American Indian painting of the Studio.

Appendix A

LIST OF 150 PAINTINGS IN THE STUDY

Ceremonial Subjects

1. Manuel Trujillo (Peen Tseh), San Juan, *Deer Dance at San Juan*, ca. 1938?, Tempera on paper, 25 1/8" x 17 1/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51448/13.
2. Andrew, Andy Tsahnajjinnie (Yazzie Bahe), Navajo, *Fire Dance*, 1934, Watercolor on paper, 20" x 13 1/2", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53969/13.
3. Steven Vicente (Nehakije), Jicarilla Apache, *Apache Racers*, 1933, tempera on board, 27 3/4" x 18 5/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53944/13.
4. George Keahbone (Asaute), Kiowa, *Kiowa Eagle Dancer*, 1935?, Tempera on paper, 12" x 14 1/2", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51378/13.
5. Lorencita Bird Atencio (T'o Pove), San Juan, *Matachines Dance*, 1937, Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 52863/13.
6. Vicente Mirabal (Chiu-Tah), Taos, *Turtle Dance on New Year's Eve*, 1938, Tempera on board, 13 1/2" x 11", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51397/13.
7. Ignacio Moquino (Waka), Zia, *Corn Dance Ceremony Myth*, 1938, Tempera on board, 18" x 22 5/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51400/13.
8. Mary Ellen, Navajo, *Navajo Yeibechei Gathering Yucca for Dance*, 1941, Tempera on paper, 11 3/8" x 9 1/2", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51390/13/
9. Pablita Velarde (Tse Tsan), Santa Clara, *Santa Clara Corn Dance*, 1940, Tempera on board, 29 1/2" x 17 1/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53943/12.

10. Teofilo Tafoya (Po-Qui), Santa Clara, *Corn Dance*, 1935, Tempera on board, 22" x 16", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 52853/13.
11. Lorenzo Beard, Horse Chief, Cheyenne/Arapaho, *Ghost Dancers*, 1936, Tempera on paper, 19 7/8" x 12 1/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51348/12.
12. Harrison Begay (Haskay Yah Ne Yah), Navajo, *Yeibicai*, 1939, Tempera on paper, 24 1/2" x 19 1/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51806/13.
13. Oscar Howe (Mazuha Hokshina), Yanktonai Sioux, *Sioux Ceremonial*, 1937, Tempera on board, 19 7/8" x 18", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, accession unavailable.
14. Steven Vicente (Nehakajie), Jicarilla Apache, *Races*, 1933, Tempera on board, 20" x 11 1/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51459/13.
15. Harrison Begay (Haskay Yah Ne Yah), Navajo, *Navajos at a Dance*, 1939, Tempera on board, 22 1/2" x 14 1/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51846/13.
16. Stanley Mitchell (Che-Chilly-Tsosie), Navajo, *Navajo Squaw Dance (N'da-a)*, 1936?, Tempera on paper, 10 7/8" x 14", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51397/13.
17. Lolita Torivio, Acoma, *Feast of St. Steven*, 1936, Tempera on paper, 18 3/4" x 13 3/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53966/13.
18. Leandro Gutierrez (Kyoo Ya), Santa Clara, *Comanche Dance*, 1936?, Tempera on paper, 19 7/8" x 18", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, accession unavailable.
19. Rosalie James, Navajo, *Untitled*, 1936, Tempera on paper, 10" x 10 1/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53931/13.
20. Calvin Tyndall (Um-Pah), Omaha, *Horse Tail Dancers*, 1935?, Tempera on board, 23" x 15", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53971/13.
21. Sybil Yazzie, Navajo, *Going to the Yeibichai*, 1937, 27 5/8" x 11 1/2", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54008/13.

22. Preston Keevama, Hopi, *Koyimsi and Wutzi (Hopi Marionette Theater)*, 1936, Tempera on board, 19 1/8" x 12 5/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51379/13.
23. Oscar Bear Runner, Sioux, *Hunka Ceremony 1890*, 1935, Tempera on board, 16 3/4" x 13 1/2", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51351/13.
24. Tonita Lujan (Khup Khu), Taos, *Taos People at a Round Dance*, 1935, Tempera on paper, 19 3/4" x 14 3/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53912/13.
25. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Ghan Dancers*, 1934, Tempera on board, 24 1/4" x 10 1/2", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51807/13.
26. Roger Dickson, San Carlos Apache, *The Sunrise Dance*, 1936, Tempera on board, 22 5/8" x 12", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51361/13.
27. Ben Quintana (Ha A Tee), Cochiti, *Buffalo Dancers*, 1940, Tempera on Board, 22 1/4" x 13 1/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51823/13.
28. Joe Hilario Herrera (See-Ru), Cochiti, *Men's Arrow Dance*, 1938, Tempera on paper, 10" x 14 1/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51371/13.
29. Tonita Lujan (Khup Khu), Taos, *Taos Buffalo Dance*, 1935, Tempera on board, 21" x 14 5/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51383/13.
30. Allen Bushyhead, Cheyenne, *Buffalo Dance*, 1936, Tempera on board, 22 1/4" x 15 1/4", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51811/13.
31. Ignacio Moquino (Waka), Zia, *Buffalo Dance*, 1940, Tempera on board,, 28 5/8" x 19 1/2", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51829/13.
32. Charles Pushetonequa, Sauk Fox, *Woodland Buffalo Dance*, 1942, Tempera on board, 20 3/4" x 17 1/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51803/13.
33. Sybil Yazzie, Navajo, *Navajo Wedding*, 1936, Tempera on board, 19 3/8" x 13 3/4", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53983/13.
34. Chatta Montoya, Jicarilla Apache, *Singers and Sandpainters*, 1936, Tempera on board, 12 3/4" x 10", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51398/13.

35. Ignacio Moquino (Waka), Zia, *Dancers Coming from the Hills*, ca. 1937, Tempera, Katherine Harvey Collection, Museum of Northern Arizona, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
36. Chiu-Tah (Vicente Mirabal), Taos, *Taos Turtle Dance*, ca. 1937, Tempera, William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
37. Sybil Yazzie, Navajo, *Yeibichai*, 1937, Tempera, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Max Kramer, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
38. Ruth Watchman, Navajo, *Navajo Sun*, 1934, Design in sandpainting style, Tempera, Collection of Dorothy Dunn, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
39. Nehakije (Steven Vicente), Jicarilla Apache, *Bear Dance*, 1935, Tempera, Margretta S. Dietrich Collection, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
40. Chiu-Tah (Vicente Mirabal), Taos, *Taos Round Dance*, 1938, Tempera, Margretta S. Dietrich Collection, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
41. Rufina Vigil (Sah Wa), Tesuque, *Mass at Fiesta*, 1936, Tempera, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Max Kramer, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
42. Po-Su-Nu (Geronima Cruz Montoya), San Juan, *Basket Dancers*, 1933, Earth color on plaster, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Max Kramer, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
43. Po-Qui (Teofilo Tafoya), Santa Clara, *Kossa*, 1935, Tempera, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. John Gaw Meem, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
44. Andrew, Andy Tsighnahjinnie (Yazzie Bahe), Navajo, *Navajo N'da-a*, 1934, Tempera, Amelia Elizabeth White Collection, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
45. Keats Begay, Navajo, *Making a Sandpainting*, 1936, Tempera, Collection of Dorothy Dunn, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
46. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Apache Funeral*, 1937, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51804.
47. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Ghan Dancers*, 1934, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51807.
48. Andrew/Andy Tsighnahjinnie (Yazzie Bahe), Navajo, *Feather Dance*, 1935, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51812.

49. Harrison Begay, Navajo, *Night Chant Gods*, ca. 1935, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51354.
50. Pop-Chalee (Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins), Taos, *Peyote Priests*, no date available, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51416.
51. Louis Lomayesva, Lomay, Hopi, *Masked Dancer*, no date available, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51381.
52. Ignatius Palmer, Mescalero Apache, *Before the Gan Dance*, 1937, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51407.
53. Joe Hilario Herrera (See-Ru), Cochiti, *Cochiti Deer Dancer*, ca. 1936-1940, Tempera on colored paper, 13" x 10 ¼", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.2.
54. Ben Quintana (Ha A Tee), Cochiti, *Buffalo Dance*, ca. 1937-1940, Casein in illustration board, 15 7/8" x 22 1/8", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.18.
55. Pop-Chalee (Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins), *Peyote Chief*, ca. 1934-1936, Tempera on bristol board, 11" x 8", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.162.
56. Teofilo Tafoya (Po-Qui), Santa Clara, *Yandewa*, ca. 1933-1934, Casein on tan-colored paper, The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.154.
57. Leandro Gutierrez (Kgoo Ya), Santa Clara, *Thanksgiving Ceremonial*, ca. 1932-1936, Tempera on cream-colored paper, 12" x 16 5/8", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.153.
58. Lewis Lomayesva (Lomay), Hopi, *Poqungwkatsina*, ca. 1932-1934, Tempera and watercolor on cream-colored paper, 13" x 10", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.52.
59. Kyrate Tuvalhoema, Hopi, *Sikyahote*, ca. 1933-1934, Tempera and watercolor on tan-colored paper, 11 5/8" x 8 ¾", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.112.
60. Kyrate Tuvalhoema, Hopi, *Hooli*, ca. 1933-1934, Tempera and watercolor on tan-colored paper, 11 ½" x 8 ¾", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman

- Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.113.
61. Kyrate Tuvahoema, Hopi, *Kwaakatsinat (Eagle Katsinas)*, ca. 1933-1934, Tempera and watercolor on cream-colored paper, 12 ¾" x 18", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.116.
62. Kyrate Tuvahoema, Hopi, *Masawkatsina*, ca. 1933-1940, Tempera and watercolor on cream-colored paper, 18" x 11 7/8", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.119.
63. Kyrate Tuvahoema, Hopi, *Ahola (Second Mesa) or Mongkatsina (Third Mesa)*, ca. 1933-1940, Tempera and watercolor on cream-colored paper, 17" x 11", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.120.
64. Wilson Dewey, San Carlos Apache, *Mountain Spirits and the Gray One*, 1937, Tempera on cream-colored watercolor paper, 21 ½" x 29 ¾", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.266.
65. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Gaan (Mountain Spirit)*, 1936, Casein on paper, 13 ½" x 10 ½", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.267.
66. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Gaan (Mountain Spirit Dance)*, ca. 1936-1938, Tempera on dark brown-colored paper, 14 ½" x 25 5/8", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.269.
67. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Warrior's Funeral Procession*, ca. 1936, Tempera on watercolor paper, 13 5/8" x 30", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.268.
68. Harrison Begay (Haskay Yah Ne Yah), Navajo, *Ye'ii Bicheii Dance*, 1936, Tempera on bristol board, 10 3/8" x 14 ¾", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.273.
69. Keats Begay, Navajo, *Rainbow Ye-ii*, 1937, Tempera on bristol board, 13 7/8" x 15 1/8", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.274.
70. Gerald Nailor (Toh Yah), Navajo, *Ye-ii Clown and Masks*, ca. 1935, Tempera on cream-colored paper, 14" x 11 ½", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman

Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.282.

71. Gerald Nailor (Toh Yah), Navajo, *The Coming of the Ye-ii Bicheii*, 1937, Tempera on bristol board, 13 ½" x 16 ½", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.279.

Non-ceremonial or Lifeway Subjects

1. Ben Quintana (Ha A Tee), Cochiti, *In the Mountains*, 1935, Tempera on Board, 14" x 15 1/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51418/13.
2. Mary Ellen, Navajo, *Navajo Women with Corn*, 1941, Tempera on board, 16 5/8" x 12 ¼", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54003/13.
3. Rosita Martinez, Acoma, *Acoma Women Selling Potteries*, 1936, Tempera on board, 23" x 18 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54010/13.
4. Geronima Cruz Montoya (Po Tsunu), San Juan, *Pueblo Crafts*, 1938, Tempera on board, 29 ¼" x 12 1/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54002/13.
5. Joe Evan Duran, Tesuque, *Cleaning the Ditch*, 1937, Tempera on board, 24 ¼" x 18 1/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53938/13.
6. Joe Evan Duran, Tesuque, *Playing Shinny*, 1936, Tempera on board, 20 5/8" x 13 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51367/13.
7. Hansen Twoitsie, Hopi, *Hopi Man with Burro (Climbing Polacca Hill)*, 1933, Tempera on paper, 15" x 12", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51451/12.
8. Lolita Torivio, Acoma, *Acoma Woman Picking Chili*, 1934, Tempera on paper, 13 ¼" x 10 5/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51446/13.
9. Ignacio Moquino (Waka), Zia, *Untitled*, 1936, Tempera on board, 21 ¼" x 13", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53979/13.
10. Tonita Lujan (Khup Khu), Taos, *Taos Women Husking Corn*, 1934, Tempera on paper, 13 ¼" x 10 3/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51385/13.
11. Geronima Cruz Montoya (Po Tsunu), San Juan, *Gathering Peppers*, 1935, Tempera on board, 12 1/8" x 9", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy

- Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 52752/13.
12. Tony Tenorio (Csom-Ma-Th-Ya), Santo Domingo, *Chicken Pull*, 1934, Tempera on paper, 25" x 13", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51442/13.
 13. Wilson Dewey, San Carlos Apache, *Picking Cactus Fruit*, 1936, Tempera on board, 12 ½" x 10 7/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51359/13.
 14. George Keahbone (Asaute), Kiowa, *Returning from the Warpath*, 1936, Tempera on paper, 22 7/8" x 14 2/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51824/13.
 15. Eileen Lesarley, Zuni, *Zuni Girls with Ollas*, 1935, Tempera on board, 19 3/8" x 12 ¾", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54009/13.
 16. Gerald Nailor (Toh Yah), Navajo, *Untitled*, 1938?, Tempera on board, 12 ¾" x 14", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51404/13.
 17. Rita Martinez, Taos, *Taos Ladies Getting Water*, 1935?, Tempera on board, 13 ¼" x 9 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53919/13.
 18. Agnes Bird, Chippewa, *Chippewa Woman Stripping Birch Bark*, 1932, Watercolor on paper, 15 ½" x 13 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51357/13.
 19. Rufina Vigil, (Sah Wa), Tesuque, *Women Gathering Guaco*, 1935, Tempera on board, 11 7/8" x 11 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53954/13.
 20. Lolita Torivio, Acoma, *Washing the Boys' Hair*, 1937, Tempera on paper, 15" x 11 ¼", Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53946/13.
 21. Mary Montoya (De-See-My), Santa Ana, *Carrying Water*, 1935, Tempera on board, 12" x 9", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 52714/13.
 22. Phillip Zeyouma, Hopi, *Hopi Woman Weaving Basket*, 1933, Tempera on board, 16" x 13", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53985/13.
 23. Quincy Tahoma, Navajo, *Riders Resting*, 1937, Tempera on board, 16" x 13", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51435/13/
 24. Calvin Tyndall (Um-Pah), Omaha, *Travois*, 1934, Tempera on board, 8" x 7", 51454/13, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology,

25. Paul Tsosie, Navajo, *Horse Race*, 1937, Tempera on board, 18" x 11 ½", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53970/13.
26. Wilmer Dupree, Sioux, *Sioux Warriors Coming Home*, 1935, Tempera on paper, 21 ¾" x 13 1/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51362/13.
27. Pablita Velarde (Tse Tsan), Santa Clara, *Dressing Young Girl for First Ceremonial Dance*, 1939?, Tempera on paper, 12 ½" x 14", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54355/13.
28. Rufina Vigil (Saw Wa), *Women Firing Pottery*, 1935?, Tempera on board, 19 ½" x 15", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53955/13.
29. Cecil Dick (Dagadahga, Da-'Ga-Dah'Ga), Cherokee, *Cherokee Hunter with Game*, 1935?, Tempera on paper, 12 ½" x 12 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51360/13.
30. Geronima Cruz Montoya, San Juan, *Picking Plums*, 1934, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51399/13.
31. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Buffalo Hunter*, 1935, Watercolor on paper, 13 3/8" x 10 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53992/13.
32. Emiliano Yepa, Jemez, *Hunting the Deer*, 1937, Tempera on paper, 20 5/8" x 16 ½", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51802/13.
33. Ben Quintana (Ha A Tee), Cochiti, *Rabbit Hunt*, 1933, Tempera on paper, 10 1/8" x 8 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54007/13.
34. Narcisco Abeyta, Navajo, *Antelope Hunt*, 1938, Tempera on paper, 25 ¼" x 19 1/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 54006/13.
35. Calvin Tyndall (Um-Pah), Omaha, *Omaha Buffalo Hunt*, 1934, Tempera on board, 11 ½" x 9 ¼", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51453/13.
36. Caroline Coriz, Tesuque, *Textile Patter from an Acoma Motif*, 1934, Tempera on board, 19 ½" x 26", Courtesy Etel Kramer.
37. Jose J. Garcia, Santo Domingo, *Sunflowers*, 1937, Tempera on paper, 19 7/8" x 15 5/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51368/13.
38. Juan B. Medina, Zia, *Zia Birds on a Tree*, 1935, Ink on paper, 9 ¾" x 12 5/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53933/13.

39. Pop-Chalee (Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins), Taos, *Running Deer*, 1937?, Tempera on paper, 12 1/8" x 10 3/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51417/13.
40. Belarde Nieto, Santo Domingo, *Untitled*, 1936?, 11 1/8" x 15 1/4", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51405/13.
41. Narcisco Abeyta (Ha So De), Navajo, *Grazing Horses*, 1940, Tempera on board, 14 1/8" x 12 5/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51822/13.
42. Gerald Nailor, Navajo, *Wild Horses*, 1937, Tempera on board, 14 1/8" x 12 5/8", Margretta Dietrich Collection, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51822/13.
43. Filbert Martinez, Picuris, *Two Horses*, 1938?, Tempera on board, 12 1/2" x 10", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53918/13.
44. Gerald Nailor, Navajo, *Deer and Fawn*, 1936, Tempera on board, 12" x 15 1/8", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53922/13.
45. Eloisa Bernal, Taos, *Taos Indian Pueblo*, 1936, Tempera on board, 20" x 14", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51805/13.
46. Quincy Tahoma, Navajo, *Three Bears*, 1936, Tempera on paper, 13 1/2" x 14", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51437/13.
47. Wade Tadeschine, Navajo, *Wild Animals in the Woods*, 1935?, Tempera on paper, 13 1/2 x 11 1/2", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, no accession number available.
48. Pop-Chalee (Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins), Taos, *Tree and Animals (Forest Scene No. 3)*, 1935?, Tempera on board, 255 1/8 x 11", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51414/13.
49. Stanley Mitchell (Che-Chilly-Tsosie), Navajo, *Along the Lake*, 1936, Tempera on board, 19 3/8 x 12 1/2", The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51396/13.
50. Marcelina Herrera (Ha-we-la-na), Zia, *After the Deer Hunt*, 1937, Tempera, Collection of Dorothy Dunn, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
51. Avelino Arquero, Cochiti, Arroyo, 1937, Tempera, Collection of Dorothy Dunn, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
52. George Keahbone (Asaute), Kiowa, *The Mud Bath*, 1935, Tempera, The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the

- Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
53. Rufina Vigil (Sah Wa), Tesuque, *Mass at Fiesta*, 1936, Tempera, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Max Kramer, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
54. Ned Notah, Navajo, *Canyon de Chelly*, 1936, Tempera, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Max Kramer, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
55. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Apache Warriors*, 1937, Tempera, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alden C. Hayes, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
56. Lorencita Bird Atencio (T'o-Pove), San Juan, *Women Getting Water*, 1935, Tempera, Margretta S. Dietrich Collection, Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
57. Andrew/Andy Tsighnahjinnie (Yazzie Bahe), *Antelope Hunt*, 1933, Mural, oil on canvas. Santa Fe Indian School, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
58. Juan B. Medina, Zia, *Tired Chicken*, 1937, Tempera, Collection of Mrs. Thomas E. Curtin, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
59. Juan B. Medina, Zia, *Be-Have Yourself*, 1936, Tempera, Margretta S. Dietrich Collection, Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
60. Oscar Howe, Yanktonai Sioux, *Sioux Warriors*, 1936, Tempera, Margretta S. Dietrich Collection, Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
61. Cecil Dick, Cherokee, *The Rabbit's Game*, 1935, Tempera, May Carrothers Llewellyn Memorial Collection, in Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*.
62. Narciso Abeyta (Ha-So-De), Navajo, *Spanish Horses*, 1938, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51346
63. Narciso Abeyta (Ha-So-De), Navajo, *Antelope with Yucca*, 1937, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53958
64. Ben Quintana (Ha A Tee), Cochiti, *Flying Antelope*, 1936, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51420

65. Narcisco Abeyta (Ha-So-De), Navajo, *Chicken Fight*, 1934, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51833
66. Narcisco Abeyta (Ha-So-De), Navajo, *Woodcutter*, 1934, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51344
67. Narcisco Abeyta (Ha-So-De), Navajo, *Navajo Boys Racing*, 1933-34, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53957
68. Allan Houser (Ha-Oz-Ous), Chiricahua Apache, *Leaving Camp*, 1937, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51376
69. Andrew/Andy Tsighnajinnie, Navajo, *Racing Around the Hogan*, 1934, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51828
70. Wilmer Dupree, Sioux, *Sioux Village*, 1935, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51366
71. Wilmer Dupree, Sioux, *Taming the Colts*, 1933, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51365
72. Steven Vicente (Nehakije), Jicarilla Apache, *Apache Racers*, 1933, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 53944
73. Narcisco Abeyta (Ha-So-De), Navajo, *Navajo Silversmith*, no date available, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51345
74. Wilmer Dupree, Sioux, *Buffalo Calling*, 1935, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51363
75. Wilmer Dupree, Sioux, *Zintka Mato (Bearbird Conquers a Pawnee)*, no date available, The Dorothy Dunn Kramer Collection in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology, 51365
76. Mary Ellen, Navajo, *Keshjee (Shoe Game or Moccasin Game*, 1936, Tempera on bristol board, 12 x 16", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.276.
77. Mary Ellen, Navajo, *Man with Corn*, ca. 1936, Tempera on bristol board, 10 ½ x 16 5/7", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.277.
78. Jose J. Garcia, Santo Domingo, *Birds and Butterfly*, ca. 1936, Tempera on tan-colored paper, 12 x 18", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of

- Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.159.
79. Pop-Chalee (Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins), Taos, *Hounds Chasing a Deer*, ca. 1934-36, Tempera on bristol board, 11 3/8 x 17 1/4", The William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection of Native American Paintings of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, W-68.56.161.

Appendix B

SIXTY-SIX ARTISTS REPRESENTED IN THE SELECTION OF STUDIO PAINTINGS AND NUMBER OF PAINTINGS

SOUTHWEST CULTURE AREA

PUEBLOS – 30 ARTISTS FROM 12 PUEBLOS, 63 PAINTINGS

ACOMA:

1. Rosita Martinez
2. Lolita Torivio, (3)

COCHITI:

1. Ben Quintana, Ha-A-Tee (5)
2. Joe Hilario Herrera, See-ru, (2)
3. Avelino Arquero

JEMEZ:

1. Emeliano Yepa

PICURIS

1. Filbert Martinez

SAN JUAN:

1. Geronima Cruz Montoya, Po Su Nu, (4)F
2. Lorencita Bird Atencio, T'o Pove, (2)
3. Manuel Trujillo (Peen Tseh)

SANTA ANA

1. Mary Montoya, De-see-my

SANTA CLARA:

1. Pablita Velarde , Tse Tsan, (2)

2. Teofilo Tafoya, Po-Qui, Po Qui Tsireh/Clear Water of White Lake, (3)
3. Leandro Gutierrez, Jose Leandro Gutierrez, Kgoo Ya, (2)

SANTO DOMINGO

1. Tony Tenorio, Csom-ma-th-ya
2. Jose J. Garcia, (2)
3. Belardo Nieto

TAOS:

1. Vicente Mirabal, Chiu-Tah, Chi-u-tah/Dancing Boy (3)
2. Tonita Lujan, Khup Khu, (3)
3. Rita Martinez
4. Eloisa Bernal
5. Pop-Chalee, Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins (6)
6. Eva Mirabal, Eah Ha Wa/Fast Growing Corn

TESUQUE:

1. Joe Evan Duran, Joseph Duran, Po-ve Pien, (2)
2. Rufina Vigil, Sah Wa, (3)
3. Caroline Coriz

ZIA:

1. Ignacio Moquino, Waka, Waki Yeni Dewa, (4)
2. Juan Medina, (3)
3. Marcelina Herrera, Ha-we-la-na, Hawaleana

Zuni

1. Eileen Lesarlley

HOPI PUEBLO – 5 ARTISTS, 10 PAINTINGS:

1. Hansen Twoitsie
2. Preston Keevama
3. Phillip Zeyouma. Phillip Zeyouma

4. Louis Lomayesva, Lewis Lomayesva, Lewis Lomayesva, Lomay, Louis Lomay, Coma Pesva, (2)
5. Kyrate Tuvahoema, (5)

NAVAJO, DINE, THE PEOPLE – 14 ARTISTS, 40 PAINTINGS:

1. Mary Ellen (4)
2. Andrew Tsahnajjinnie, Andrew Van Tsahnajjinnie, Andy Tsahnajjinnie, Tsinajjinnie, Yazzie Bahe/Little Grey, (5)
3. Gerald Nailor, Toh Yah/Walking by the River, (5)
4. Harrison Begay, Haskay Yah Ne Yah/Warrior Who Walked up to His Enemy, (4)
5. Stanley Mitchell, Che-Chilly-Tsosie/Slim Curly Hair (2)
6. Rosalie James
7. Sybil Yazzie, (3)
8. Quincy Tahoma, Tahoma/Water Edge, (2)
9. Paul Tsosie
10. Wade Tadischine
11. Narcisco Abeyta, Ha So De, (8)
12. Ruth Watchman
13. Ned Notah
14. Keats Begay, (2)

APACHES – 4 TRIBES, 6 ARTISTS, 17 PAINTINGS

CHIRICAHUA:

1. Allan Houser, Ha-oz-ous, (9)

JICARILLA:

1. Steven Vicente (Nehakije), (4)
2. Chatta Montoya

MESCALERO

1. Ignatius Palmer

WESTERN APACHE, SAN CARLOS SUBTRIBE:

1. Wilson Dewey, (2)
2. Roger Dickson

PLAINS – perhaps 6 tribes/nations, 7 artists, 16 paintings:

CHEYENNE (UNKNOWN WHETHER NORTHERN OR SOUTHERN CHEYENNE)

1. Allen Bushyhead, Nakowhoadoniulzi/Bear Feathers

KIOWA

1. George Campbell Keahbone, Asaute, (3)

CHEYENNE/ARAPAHO

1. Lorenzo Beard, Horse Chief

SIOUX (UNKNOWN WHETHER LAKOTA, NAKOTA, OR DAKOTA NATION)

1. Oscar Bear Runner
2. Wilmer Dupree, Wilmar DuPree(5)

DAKOTA SIOUX, YANKTONAI

1. Oscar Howe, Mazuha Hokshina/Trader Boy, (2)

OMAHA

1. Calvin Tyndall, Um-pah/Elk (3)

SOUTHEAST – 1 artist and nation, two paintings

CHEROKEE

1. Cecil Dick, Dagadahga, Da'-Ga-Dah'-Ga/Standing Alone (2)

NORTHEAST/WOODLAND – 2 tribes/nations, 2 artists:

CHIPPEWA

1. Agnes Bird

SAUK FOX

1. Charles Pushetonequa, Charlie Push, Pushetonequa, Wawabano Sata/Dawn Walker, Mesquakie/Red Earth People (Note: His painting is dated 1942, but has been included to augment representation from the Northeast culture area.)

Appendix C

LIST OF STUDENTS AT THE STUDIO, FALL 1932 THROUGH SPRING 1937 SEMESTERS⁶³⁹

PUEBLOS⁶⁴⁰

ACOMA, “People of the White Rock,” Traditional name: Haaku; Language: Keresan

1. **Horace Valle, Yo-W-Tw;** at Studio 1932-37.
2. **James Louis;** at Studio 1933-37; Mr. Louis was still living at Acoma Pueblo in the summer of 2004, but he had not painted since leaving the Studio and was still a sheepherder.
3. **Lolita Torivio;** at the Studio 1936-37.
4. **Pedro Vallo;** at the Studio 1934-35; paintings in collection of MNM.
5. **Rosita Martinez.**

COCHITI, Traditional name: KO-TIYT; Language: Keresan

1. **Ben Quintana, Ha A Tee, Ha-A-Tee;** born in 1923 and killed during World War II on November 9, 1944 in Leyte, Philippines; at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of GM, IACB/DC, MAI, MNA/KHC, MRFM, OU/MA, PAC, UPA, SM, WWM; awards in the New Mexico State Coronado Quadracentennial Celebration in 1940, *American Magazine* poster contest; and National Youth Forum Art Contest.
2. **Joe Hilario Herrera, See-Ru, Blue Bird;** b. 1923 d. Oct. 2001; at Studio 1936, graduated SFIS 1940; served in WWII; B.A., University of New Mexico, 1953; M.A.Ed., University of New Mexico, 1962; attended University of Puerto Rico;

⁶³⁹ The biographical information was pieced together from the following sources: Patrick D. Lester, *The Biographical Directory of Native American Painters* (Tulsa, OK: Sir Publications, 1995); Dorothy Dunn, *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1968); Tryntje Van Ness Seymour, *When the Rainbow Touches Down* (Phoenix, AZ: The Heard Museum, 1988); Lydia L. Wyckoff, ed., *Visions + Voices: Native American Painting from the Philbrook Museum of Art* (Tulsa, OK: Philbrook Museum of Art, 1996; Bruce Bernstein and W. Jackson Rushing, III, *Modern by Tradition: American Indian Painting in the Studio Style* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1995); and *Tequayo*, the newsletter for The Santa Fe Indian School.

⁶⁴⁰The name listed in capital letters is the identifying tribe the individual used while a student at the Studio, and translations of these names, as well as notations of traditional names, were obtained from the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico, website at <http://indianpueblo.org/> [accessed July 1, 2010].

- retired Director of Indian Education, New Mexico State Department of Education; paintings in collections of AF, CGPS, DAM, FAC/CS, IACB, IACB/DC, MAI, MNA/KHC, MRFM, OU/, MA, PAC, SDMM, SM, TM.
3. **Avelino Arquero;** studied at the Studio 1936-37.
 4. **Justino Herrera, Stimone, A Bird;** b. 1920, in 2006 living in a nursing home in Albuquerque, NM; at the Studio 1936-40; served in WWII; paintings in collections of CAMSL, GM, HCC, MAI, MNM, MRFM, PAC, WWM.
 5. **Cipriana Romero;** at the Studio 1936-37; was still alive and living in Cochiti Pueblo in summer of 2005.
 6. **Joe A. Quintana;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collection of MNA/KHC.
 7. **O-te-la-te-ya; Otelaleya;** at the Studio 1934-35; paintings in collections of AIEC, MNA.
 8. **Antonio Naranjo;** at the Studio Fall, 1936.

JEMEZ, Traditional name: Walatowa; Language: Tewa (Tanoan)

1. **Emeliano Yepa;** at the Studio 1933-37.
2. **Jose Toledo (the younger), Jose Rey Toledo, Sho-bah-who-hon/Morning Star, Tia Na/Northwest Place, Aluh Hochi/Lightning, Mus Truwi/a little mountain creature with great power;** 1915-1994; at the Studio 1936-37; B.A., University of New Mexico, 1951; M.A., University of New Mexico, 1955; M.P.H., University of California at Berkeley, 1972; careers as art instructor, education health specialist, administrator of Indian health programs, actor, educator, lecturer, muralist, and painter; paintings in collections of CGPS, GM, HM, IACB/DC, ITIC, MAI, MNA, MNM, MRFM, OU/MA, OU/SM, PAC, SAR, SDMM, SI, SIM U of NM/AM, WOM, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, Norman, OK; Muskogee (OK) Public Library; Awards at HM/G, ITIC, MNM, NMSF, PAC, SM.

LAGUNA, Traditional name: Ka'waika; Language: Keresan

1. **Robert Thompson, Pai-Tu-Mu;** at Studio 1933-37; paintings in collection of SM.
2. **William Sarracino;** at Studio 1933-35.
3. **Joseph L. Martin;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collection of IACB/DC.
4. **Felice Cheromiah;** at the Studio 1934-35.
5. **Walter Johnson;** at the Studio 1936-37.

OHKAY OWINGEH, the traditional name; formerly San Juan; Language: Tewa (Tanoan)

1. **T'o-Pove, Lorencita Bird Atencio, T'o-Pove, Flowering Pinon, 1916-1995;** at the Studio 1936-37; worked as crafts instructor and painter; painting in collection of WWM.
2. **Sa-Pa, Emeliano Abeyta;** at Studio 1932-33, 1936-37; paintings in collections of MAI, OU/MA.
3. **Po-Su-Nu/Shell, P'otsunu, Geronima Cruz Montoya;** b. 1915; student at Studio 1933-35 when she graduated, then a teacher there from fall of 1935 until it the Studio and SFIS were closed in 1962; attended University of New Mexico, 1935-1936, Claremont in 1945; B.S., U. of Albuquerque, 1958; career in education and as artist; paintings in collections of AAID, BIA, IACB, IACB/DC, ITIC, MAI, MNM, MHDYMM, MRFM.
4. **Bennie Manzanares;** at Studio 1933-35.
5. **Santiago Garcia;** at the Studio 1936-37.
6. **Manuelita Trujillo;** at the Studio 1936-37
7. **Maria Abeyta;** at the Studio 1936-37.
8. **Rebecca Chavez;** at the Studio 1936-37.
9. **Manuel Trujillo, Peen Tseh/White Mountain;** b. 1927; served in WWII; paintings in collections of MNM, MRFM; was at Studio in 1938.

PICURIS, no traditional name obtained; Language: Tiwa (Tanoan)

1. Filbert Martinez.

SAN ILDEFONSO, Traditional name: Po-who-ge-oweenge, “Where the water comes from”; Language: Tewa (Tanoan)

1. **Popovi Da/Red Fox, Tony Martinez;** 1923-1971; at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; careers as art and crafts shop owner, Governor of San Ildefonso Pueblo, ceramics painter and designer, silversmith, and painter; paintings in collections of EM, GM, IACB, IACB/DC, ITIC, MAI, MNA, MR, MRFM.
2. **Juan Pedro Pino, Juan Isidro Pino, Juan the Elder;** d. ca. 1953; at the Studio 1936-37; career as graphic artist; work in collections of DAM, MNM, SM, U OF CA/LMA.
3. **Tomacito Vigil;** at the Studio 1936-37.
4. **Jose Vicente Aguilar, Suwa, Sua Peen/Warm Mountain;** b.1924; at the Studio 1936-37; was still painting at least until 1950s.

SANTA ANA, Traditional name: TAMAYA; Language: Keresan

1. **Mary Montoya, De-See-My;** at the Studio 1934-37.
2. **Blas Sanchez;** at the Studio 1936-37.

SANTA CLARA, Traditional name: Kha'p'oo Owinge, “Valley of the Wild Roses”; Language: Tewa (Tanoan)

1. **Pablita Velarde, Tsan, Tse Tsan/Golden Dawn;** b. 1918- d. 2006; at Studio 1932 – 1936; sister of Po-ve (Po-ve and Pablita were the only female students during the Studio’s first year); career as painter, muralist, doll-maker, illustrator, author, teacher, and lecturer; paintings in collections of AC/RM, AF, BIA, DAM, GM, HCC, HM, IACB, IACB/DC, JAM, KM, LMA/BC, MAI, MHDYMM, MNM, OU/MA, PAC, SDMM, SMNAI, UPA, U OF CA/B, State of New Mexico; awards include French Government Palmes d’Academiques in 1954, book *Old Father, The Story Teller* voted one of the Best Western Books of 1961, New Mexico Governor’s Award for Outstanding Achievement in the Arts in 1977.
2. **Po-ve, Velarde:** at Studio 1932-33; sister of Pablita Velarde.
3. **Teofilo Tafoya, Po-Qui, Po Qui Tsireh/Clear Water or White Lake;** b. 1915; at Studio 1933-37; B.A., University of New Mexico in 1941; career as teacher and artist; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, MAI, MKMcNAI, MMA, MNM, NMSF, SWAIA, U of NM, WRTD.
4. **Kgoo-Ya, Kygoo Ya, Leandro Gutierrez, Jose Leandro Gutierrez, Jose Leandro;** 1918-1977; at the Studio 1935-37; served in WWII; paintings in collections of CMA, OU/SM.
5. **Juan B. Gutierrez;** at the Studio 1936-37.
6. **Joe La Cruz Gutierrez;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of HM, WRTD.
7. **Clarence Gutierrez;** at the Studio 1936-37.
8. **Joseph L. Gutierrez;** at the Studio 1936-37.
9. **Rosita Tafoya;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of MNM, OU/MA.
10. **Oku-Wa-tsa, Joseph Tafoya;** at the Studio 1936-37.
11. **Moses Tafoya;** at the Studio 1936-37.
12. **Marcus Silva, Mark Silva;** b. 1921; at the Studio 1936-37
13. **Eugene Silva;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of MNA, MRFM.

SANTO DOMINGO; the Tribal Government asked that the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center not publish the traditional name; Language: Keresan

1. **C-Som-Ma-Thya, Tony Tenorio;** at the Studio 1934-37.

2. **Lorenzo Garcia**; at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; paintings in collection of GM.
3. **Jose J. Garcia**; b. 1914; at the Studio 1936-37; career as silversmith after 1942; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, MNA, SM.
4. **Belardo Nieto, Balardo Nieto**; died in WWII; at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of MNM, MRFM, SM.
5. **Leo Reano**; at the Studio 1936-37.
6. **Santiago Garcia**; at the Studio 1936-37.
7. **Juan Pedro Garcia**; at the Studio 1936-37.
8. **Jim A. Coriz**; b. 1904- d. 1990.

TAOS, Traditional name: Tuah-ah; Language: Tiwa (Tanoan)

1. **Vicenti Mirabal, Vicente Mirabal, Chiu-tah, Chi-u-tah, Dancing Boy**; b. 1917- d. 1945 in WWII Battle of the Bulge; at Studio 1933-37; worked as teacher and artist; paintings in collections of CAMSL, CGPS, IACB/DC, MAI, MFA/O, MNA, U of OK, WOM.
2. **Tonita Lujan, Khup Khu**; at the Studio 1934-37; short career in 1930s as painter and illustrator, married fellow Studio artist George Campbell Keahbone.
3. **Pop-Chalee/Blue Flower, Merina Lujan, Merina Hopkins**; b. 1906- d. 1993; at the Studio 1935 and graduated in 1937, and although she was older than the age limit of 21 years for entering the Studio, with the aid of her aunt Mabel Dodge Luhan she obtained special permission from the BIA in Washington, D.C.;⁶⁴¹ lifelong career as painter, textile designer, art instructor, lecturer, radio personality, and singer; paintings in collections (partial list) of AC/RM, CMA, DAM, EM, GM, HM, IACB/DC, IAIA/M, MNM, MNA/KHC, MMA, MRFM, RMC/AZ, SAR, SM, SU, U of NM; Albuquerque International Airport Art Collection, Pueblo Community College in Pueblo, CO, Stanford Fine Arts Museum in Stanford, CA.
4. **Eva Mirabal, Ea-Ha-Wa, Eah-Ha-Wa/Fast Growing Corn/Green Corn**; 1920-1968; at the Studio 1936-7; artist-in-residence at Taos Pueblo; paintings in collections of GM, MAI, MNM, MRFM, PAC, UPA, WOM.
5. **Jerry Lucero**; at the Studio 1936-37.
6. **Eloisa Bernal**; at the Studio 1936-37.
7. **Rita Martinez**; at the Studio 1936-37; was still alive in summer of 2004.

⁶⁴¹ Margaret Cesa, *The World of Flower Blue Pop Chalee: An Artistic Biography* (Santa Fe: Red Crane Books, 1997), 53.

TESUQUE, Traditional name: TET-SUGEH; Language: Tewa (Tanoan)

1. **Po-Ve Pien, Joe Evan Duran, Joseph Duran;** at the Studio 1936-37
2. **Juan Suazo/Swazo;** at the Studio 1934-37; paintings in collection of WWM.
3. **Rufina Vigil, Sah-wa;** at the Studio 1934-37; careers as painter and draftswoman; paintings in collection of IACB/DC, MNM, OU/MA.
4. **Joe Vigil, Jo Vigil, Jo Gabriel Vigil;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of ASM, OU/MA, U of CA/LMA.
5. **Pete Vigil, Peter Vigil;** b. 1919; at the Studio 1936-37; careers as technician, painter, silversmith, and woodcarver; works in collections of GM, IACB/DC, OU/SM, U of CA/LMA.
6. **Utimio Vigil, Utimo Vigil, Jose Eutimio Vigil, Ultimio Vigil;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of MRFM, SM, U of CA/LMA.
7. **Pat Suazo/Swazo;** at the Studio 1936-37.
8. **Caroline Coriz.**

ZIA; no traditional name available; Language: Keresan

1. **Ha-we-la-na, Hawaleana, Marcelina Herrera;** at the Studio 1934-37.
2. **Waka, Waki Yeni Dewa, Ignacio Moquino;** b. May 7, 1917, d. ca. 1982; at the Studio 1934-37; served in WWII; careers as teacher, silversmith, and artist; paintings in collections of DAM, HM, IACB/DC, MAI, MNA/KHC, MNM, MRFM, U of OK, USDI
3. **Juan B. Medina;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of MAI, SM.
4. **Andreita Salas;** at the Studio 1936-37.
5. **Jose C. Herrera;** at the Studio 1936-37.

ZUNI, Traditional name: SHE-WE-NA; Language: probably Ute Aztecán

1. **Eileen Lesarley;** at the Studio 1933-37, and according to Dorothy Dunn she was 15 years old when she arrived during the second year.
2. **Nor-My-Se-Ye;** at the Studio 1933-35.
3. **Dempsey Chopito;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collection of IACB/DC.
4. **Alfred Dosedo;** at the Studio 1936-37.
5. **Jack Bobelu;** at the Studio 1936-37.
6. **William Lewis;** at the Studio 1936-37.
7. **Reginald Dewa;** at the Studio 1936-37.
8. **Tony Chopito;** at the Studio 1936-37.

HOPI

1. **Phillip or Philip Zeyouma;** at Studio 1932-37; paintings in collection of DAM, MRFM.
2. **Dahouta:** at Studio 1932-33, 1936-37.
3. **Walter Joshongeva, Joshongeva:** at Studio 1932-37; paintings in collections of CAM/OH, MV.
4. **Riley Quoyavema, Quoyavema, Quiyavema, Riley Sunrise; Sun Rise;** according to Dunn at the SFIS 1933-35 when he worked on murals, but not clear that he was in the Studio; paintings in collections of CIS, DAM, GM, MAI, MKMcNAI, SM.
5. **Lewis Lomayesva, Louis Lomayesva, Lewis Lomay, Coma Pesva;** b. 1913; at Studio 1933-37; careers as house painter, silversmith, shop owner, and painter; paintings in collections BM/B, IACB/DC, MAI, MKMcNAI, MNA/KHC, MNM, OU/MA, PAC, SM, U of CA/LMA.
6. **Honyesva;** at the Studio 1933-35.
7. **Roselee James;** at the Studio 1934-37.
8. **Hansen Twoitsie, Twoitsie;** at the Studio 1934-37; paintings in collections of MNA, MNM/DD.
9. **Tom Jay;** at the Studio 1936-37.
10. **Eddie Nequatewa, Edward Nequatewa, Edmond Nequatewa;** at the Studio 1936-37; careers as painter and carver; works in collections of HM, OU/MA, SM.
11. **Bert Poneoma;** at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, MRFM, SM (? Signed W. Poneoma, 1934).
12. **Preston Keevama;** at the Studio 1936-37.
13. **Robert Lomadafkie;** at the Studio 1936-37.
14. **Homer Grover;** at the Studio 1936-37.
15. **Kyrate Tuvalhoema, Kyrat Tuvalhoema;** b. 1914 – d. 1942; at Studio approximately 1933-1935; paintings in collections of CGPS, EM, GM, IACB/DC, MAI, MNA.
16. **Walter Mootzka, Waldo Mootzka, Mootska/Point of Yucca;** b. 1910 – d. 1940; according to Dorothy Dunn, he was at the Studio 1936-37, but Lester only notes that he was educated in Albuquerque; careers as painter, illustrator, and silversmith; paintings in collections of AF, BA/AZ, BM/B, GM, IACB/DC, MAI, MKMcNAI, MNA/KHC, MRFM, PAC, SM, U of OK, WOM, WWM.
17. **Peter Shelton, Jr., Peter Henry Shelton, Jr., Hoyesva, Wherever the Arrow Lands, Sekaho/Yellow Arrow;** b. 1920 - d. 1993; careers as painter, free-lance artist, and jewelry designer; paintings in collections of GM, IACB/DC, LMA/BC, MAI, MNM, PAC.

NAVAJO

1. **Narciso Abeyta, Narciso Platero Abeyta, Hoskiel Ha-So-De/Fiercely Ascending, Cecil, Cisso;** b. Dec, 15, 1918, d. June 22, 1998; served in WWII; at the Studio 1934-39, attended Sumerset Art Institute in Williamsburg, PA; B.F.A., University of New Mexico painter; paintings in collections of ASM, MAI, MNM, MNA, OU/MA, PAC, WOM, WWM; numerous awards.
2. **Andrew Tsishnahjinnie, Andrew Van Tsishnahjinnie, Andy Tsishnahjinnie, Yazzie Bahe/Little Grey;** b. Feb. 16, 1916; according to Dunn at Studio 1933-37, Lester says 1932-36; served in WWII: full-time painter and illustrator after WWII service; paintings in collections of AF, BA/AZ, BIA, CGA, CGPS, CMA, GM, HCC, HM, IACB, IACB/DC, LMA/BC, MAI, MNM, MKMcNAI, MNA, MNCA, MNH/A, MRFM, OU/MA, OU/SM, PAC, RMC/AZ, SMNAI, WWM; numerous awards including French Government, Palmes d'Academiques, 1954, and Arizona Indian Living Treasure Award, 1991.
3. **Sybil Yazzie;** at Studio 1933-37; paintings in collection of SM.
4. **Ruth Watchman;** at Studio 1933-37.
5. **Mary Ellen;** at the Studio 1934-37; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, OU/MA, MNM, MNA, SM.
6. **Quincy Tahoma, Tahoma/Water Edge;** b. 1920- d. 1956; at the Studio 1934-37; was a code-talker in WWII; lifelong career as painter and some work in movies; paintings in collections of AF, GM, HM, KM, MAI, MNM, MNA/KHC, MRFM, PAC, RMC/AZ, SM, U of CA/B, U of CA/LMA; U of OK, UPA, WOM, WWM, Encyclopedia Britannica.
7. **Wade Hadley, To'dachine, Wade Tadischine;** at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; career as trading post clerk and painter.
8. **Ned Notah;** at the Studio 1936-38.
9. **Keats Begay;** b. ca. 1920; at the Studio 1936-37; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, MNA, MNM, MNA/KHC, SM.
10. **Stanley C. Mitchell, Che-Chilly-Tsosie/Slim Curly Hair;** b. 1912 or 1920?; at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; career as painter and owner and operator of silversmith shop in Las Vegas, NV; works in collections of AF, IACB/DC, MNA/KHC, PAC, U of OK.
11. **Harrison Begay, Haskay Yah Ne Yah/Warrior Who Walked Up to His Enemy,** b. 1917; entered SFIS in 1934, at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; lifelong career as painter; paintings in collections of AR, ASM, BA/AZ, BIA, CGPS, DAM, EM, GM, HCC, HM, IACB, IACB/DC, MAI, MAM, MKMcNAI, MNA/KHC, MNM, MRFM, OU/MA, PAC, RMC/AZ, SAR, SM, SMNAI, WOM, WWM.
12. **Gerald Nailor, Toh Yah/Walking by the River;** b. 1917- d. 1952; at the Studio 1936-37, graduated from Albuquerque Indian School and University of Oklahoma; served in WWII; careers as painter, illustrator, designer, and rancher;

- paintings in collections of BIA, CMA, GM, IACB/DC, MAI, MNA, MNM, MRFM, PAC, SM, U of OK, WOM.
13. **Amie Duncan**; at the Studio 1936-37.
 14. **Winnie Chee**; at the Studio 1936-37.
 15. **Kee Yazzie**; at the Studio 1936-37.
 16. **Timothy Begay, T. B. Begay**; at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; continued painting until at least 1950; painting in collection of WOM.
 17. **Paul Tsosie**; paintings in collection of MRFM, SM.

APACHE

CHIRICAHUA APACHE

1. **Allan C. Houser, Allan Haozous, Ha-oz-ous, Haozous/Pulling Roots, The Sound of Pulling Roots**; b. June 30, 1914 – d. August 22, 1994;⁶⁴² attended Haskell and Chilocco, at the Studio 1934-37; careers as pipe fitter, boxer, educator, public speaker, painter, and after 1975 full-time sculptor; paintings and sculptures in collections of AF, BA/AZ, BIA, DAM, FSM, GM, HCC, HM, IACB, IACB/DC, HIM, MAM, MNM, MNA/KHC, OU/MA, OU/SM, PAC, PAIC, RMC/AZ, SDMM, SM USDI, WWM, Arizona State Capitol Building in Phoenix, British Royal Collection in London, Dahlem Museum in Berlin, Linden Museum in Stuttgart, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, United States Mission to the United Nations; extensive honors.

MESCALERO APACHE

1. **Ignatius Palmer**; b. 1921 or 1922- d. 1985; at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; careers as illustrator, painter, and construction worker; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, LMA/BC, MAI, MNM, UPA, WOM, WWM.
2. **Alfred Kayitah**; at the Studio 1936-37.
3. **Walter Balatache**; at the Studio 1936-37.

SAN CARLOS APACHE

1. **Wilson Dewey, Sun Dust**; b. 1915- d. 1969; at the Studio 1936-38, graduated Albuquerque Indian School in 1939; served in WWII; careers as football and

⁶⁴² "Allan Houser, A Tribute," <http://www.allanhouser.com/tribute.php> [accessed December 7, 2010].

- basketball player, rodeo contestant, and painter; paintings in collections of IACB/DC, ITIC, GM, MNA, MNM, MRFM, PAC.
2. **Roger Dickson**; paintings in collections of MNA, MNM/DD.

JICARILLA APACHE

1. **Nehakije, Steven Vicenti, Stephen Vicenti**; b. 1917 – d. 1948; at Studio 1933-37, and according to Dorothy Dunn was the only Apache there during the second year; paintings in collections of CGFA, IACB/DC.
2. **Chatta Montoya**.

PLAINS

SIOUX

1. **Oscar Bear Runner**; at Studio 1933-37.
2. **Chase**; at Studio 1933-34.
3. **Dan Quiver**; at the Studio 1934-37; paintings in collection of MAI.
4. **Wilmer Dupree, Wilmar Dupree**; at the Studio 1936-37.
5. **Tony Guerue**; at the Studio 1936-37.

OMAHA

1. **Calvin Tyndall, Um-Pah/Elk**; at Studio 1933-37 and Dorothy Dunn recorded that the Omaha were represented at the Studio during the 1934-35 school year; paintings in collection of IACB/DC.

YANTONAI SIOUX

1. **Oscar Howe, Mazuha Hokshina/Trader Boy**; b. May 13, 1915- d. Oct. 7, 1983; at the Studio 1935 until graduation in 1938;⁶⁴³ served in WWII; careers as art instructor and professor, painter; paintings in collections of AC/OH, BIA, CGPS, DAM, FAC/D, HCC, HM, IACB, IACB/DC, JAM, MAI, MAM, MFA/A, MNA, MNM, OU/MA, OU/SM, PAC, SCAC, SIM, SM, U of SD, Civic Fine Arts Center in Sioux

⁶⁴³ Oscar Howe Memorial Association, <http://www.oscarhowe.org/about.php#santafe> [accessed December 7, 2010].

Falls, Eisenhower Library, in Abilene, KS, Evansville Museum in Indiana, Robinson Museum in Pierre, SD, South Dakota Memorial Art Center in Brookings, SD.

CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO

1. **Lorenzo Beard/Horse Chief;** at the Studio 1934-37; Dorothy Dunn recorded that the Arapaho were represented at the Studio during the 1934-35 school year.

CHEYENNE

1. **Allan Bushyhead, Nakowhoadoniulzi/Bear Feathers;** b. 1917- d. 1991; at the Studio 1936-37; served in WWII; paintings in collections of MNM, MNA, OU/MA, PAC.
2. **Paul J. Goodbear, Ahmehate/Flying Eagle** – b. 1913, death unknown; Dunn refers to him as if he attended the Studio during its first year, but Lester states that he was in Santa Fe in 1936; served in WWII; studied at the Municipal University of Wichita, University of New Mexico, and Art Institute of Chicago; careers as teacher and singer; paintings in collections of GM, MNA/KHC, MNA, MNM, SAR, U of OK.

KIOWA

1. **George Keahbone, George Campbell Keahbone, Asaute/New Berry;** b. 1916; at the Studio during the 1936-37 year, and Dorothy Dunn recorded that the Kiowa were represented at the Studio during the 1934-35 school year, and as far as is known he was the only Kiowa student at the Studio during her tenure; served in WWII, however Lester recorded that Keahbone attended the BC High School in 1934; paintings in collections of CGPS, GM, IACB/DC, JAM, MAI, MNA/KHC, MNH/A, MNM, MRFM, PAC, U of OK.

COMANCHE

1. **Josephine Myers Wapp;** 1933-34; introduced Indian arts and crafts to Chilocco Indian School in Oklahoma from 1934-1963, then taught at Santa Fe Indian School.⁶⁴⁴

⁶⁴⁴ Susan Labry Meyn, *More Than Curiosities: A Grassroots History of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and Its Predecessors, 1920-1942* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2001), 66.

WOODLAND

SAUK AND FOX/MESQUAKIE

1. Charles Pushetonequa, Charles Pushetonequa, Sr., Charlie Push, Pushetonequa/
Bear with the Eyes of an Old Man, Wawabano Sata/Dawn Walker;
Mesaquakie/Red Earth People; b. 1915 – d. 1987; served in WWII; attended
Haskell and SFIS.

CROW

1. **Reba Yarlotte;** at Studio 1932-33.

CHIPPEWA

1. **Agnes Bird;** at the Studio 1932-35.
2. **Domak;** at Studio 1932-33.

CHEROKEE

1. **Cecil Dick, Dagadahga, Da'-ga-dah'-ga/Standing Alone, Stands Alone in the Forest;** b. 1915 - d. 1992; at the Studio 1934-37 and Dorothy Dunn recorded that the Cherokee were represented at the Studio during the 1934-35 school year; attended Bagley High School in Tahlequah, OK, and Bacone College; careers as art instructor, illustrator, artist, draftsman, sign painter, and tool designer; paintings in collections of FCTM, GM, HM, MAI, PAC, SI.

NORTHWEST

Chehalis, “People of the Sand”; Salish language

1. Hazel Pete; b. 1914 – d. 2003; Dorothy Dunn recorded that the Salish were represented at the Studio during the 1934-35 school year. However, the SFIS newspaper, *Teguayo*, Vol. 4, No. 4, January, 1935, stated that Hazel Pete was a 1934 Advanced Art graduate (presumably at the end of the spring semester) and that she

was moving to Warm Springs, Oregon to teach art; later established the Hazel Pete Institute of Chehalis Basketry.

CALIFORNIA

KLAMATH

1. **Woodrow Ball;** at the Studio 1934-35. Dorothy Dunn recorded that the Klamath were represented at the Studio during the 1934-35 school year.

UNKNOWN TRIBAL AFFILIATION

1. **Mrs. Jessie Jumping Eagle:** 1934 arts graduate, obtained arts-related job in Pine Ridge, South Dakota.
2. **Lupe Sando;** 1934 arts graduate, obtained job at San Juan Day School.
3. **Alma Chosa;** 1934 arts graduate, obtained job at Wheelock Academy, Millerton, Oklahoma.
4. **Margaret Mondragon;** 1934 arts graduate, obtained job at Leupp Reservation Boarding School, Leupp, Arizona.
5. **Brownie Toahy;** at Studio Spring, 1934.

Abbreviations

- AAID – *All American Indian Days*. Sheridan, WY (annual in August)
- AC/OH – Oscar Howe Art Center, Mitchell, SD
- AC/RM – Roswell Museum and Art Center, Roswell, NM
- AF – Amerind Foundation, Dragoon, AZ
- ARC – Atlantic Richfield Corporation
- ASM – Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ
- BA/AZ – Bank of America, Phoenix, AZ
- BIA – Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.
- BM/B – Brooklyn Museum of Art, Brooklyn, NY
- CAMSL – City Art Museum, St. Louis, MO
- CGPS – Center for Great Plains Studies, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE
- CIS – Cranbrook Institute of Science, Bloomfield Hills, MI
- CMA – Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, OH
- DAM – Denver Art Museum, Denver, CO
- EM – Eiteljorg Museum, Indianapolis, IN
- FAC/CS – Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center, Colorado Springs, CO
- FAC/D – Dahl Fine Arts Center, Rapid City, SD
- FCTM – Five Civilized Tribes Museum, Muskogee, OK. *Competitive Show*, annual.
- GM – Thomas Gilcrease Institute of American History and Art, Tulsa, OK
- HCC – Heritage Center Inc. Collection, Red Cloud Indian School, Pine Ridge, SD
- HM – Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ. Formerly Heard Museum of Anthropology and Primitive Art.
- HM/G – *Heard Museum Guild Indian Fair and Market*. Phoenix, AZ
- IACB – Indian Arts and Crafts Board, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.
- IACB/DC – Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Denman Collection, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.
- ITIC – *Inter-Tribal Indian Ceremonials*. Gallup, NM. Now held at Church Rock, NM.
- JAM – Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, NE
- KM – Kiva Museum of the Koshare Indian, Boy Scouts of America, La Junta, CO
- LMA/BC – Logan Museum of Anthropology, Beloit, WI
- MAI – Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York, NY. Currently the National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- MAM – Montclair Art Museum, Montclair, NJ
- MFA/O – Owensboro Museum of Fine Arts, Owensboro, KY
- MHDYMM – M. H. DeYoung Memorial Museum, Fine Art Museums of San Francisco, CA
- MKMcNAI – Marion Koogler McNay Art Museum, San Antonio, TX, formerly Marion Koogler McNay Art Institute
- MMA – Museum of Modern Art, New York, NY

MNA – Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff, AZ. Separate Hopi, Navajo, and Zuni exhibits.

MNA/KHC – Museum of Northern Arizona, Katherine Harvey Collection, Flagstaff, AZ

MNCA – Museum of Navajo Ceremonial Art, Santa Fe, NM

MNH/A – American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY

MNM – Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, NM

MR – Museum of the Rockies, Browning, MT

MRFM – Millicent Rogers Foundation Museum, Taos, NM. Currently the Millicent Rogers Museum.

NMSF – New Mexico State Fair, Albuquerque, NM

OU/MA – Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. Currently known as the University of Oklahoma Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art

OU/SM – Willis Stovall Museum of Science and History, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. Currently known as the Oklahoma Museum of Natural History.

PAC – Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, OK. Currently Philbrook Museum of Art.

RMC/AZ – Read Mullan Chevrolet Corporate Collection, Phoenix, AZ

SAR – School of American Research, Santa Fe, NM.

SCAC – Sioux City Art Center, Sioux City, IA

SDMM – San Diego Museum of Man, San Diego, CA

SI – Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

SIM – Sioux Indian Museum and Craft Center, Indian Arts and Crafts Board, U. S. Department of the Interior, Rapid City, SD

SM – Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, CA

SMNAI – Southeast Museum of the North American Indian, Marathon, FL. The collection is now housed in the Denver Museum of Natural History, Denver, CO.

SU – Stanford University, Stanford, CA

SWAIA – Southwestern Association on Indian Affairs, Inc. Known as Southwestern association for Indian Arts since 1993. Indian Market, Santa Fe, NM.

TM – Tweed Museum of Art, Duluth, MN

U of CA/B – University of California, Berkeley, CA

U of CA/LMA – The Robert Lowie Museum of Anthropology, University of California at Berkeley, currently the Phoebe Apperson Hearst Museum of Anthropology.

U of NM – University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM

U of NM/AM – University Art Museum, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM

U of OK – University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK

U of SD – University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD

UPA – United Pueblo Agency, Albuquerque, NM

USDI – U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

WAI -

WOM – Woolaroc Museum, Bartlesville, OK

WRTD – *When the Rainbow Touches Down.* Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ (exhibit, tour).

WWM – Wheelwright Museum of the American Indian, Santa Fe, NM. Formerly The House of Navajo Religion and Museum of Navajo Ceremonial art

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Dorothy Dunn Archives, Laboratory of Anthropology/Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Kenneth M. Chapman Papers, School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Mable Morrow Archives, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture/Laboratory of Anthropology.

Tequayo, student newspaper at Santa Fe Indian School.

Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the interior, 1928-1940

Report of the Executive Council on the Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of the Society of American Indians. Washington, D.C. 1912.

The Problem of Indian Administration. Institute for Government Research. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928.

Santa Fe New Mexican.

^ *United States v. William S. Rogers*, 45 U.S. 567, 4 How. 567, 11 L.Ed. 1105 (1846). The University of Tulsa College of Law. http://www.utulsa.edu/law/classes/rice/ussct.cases/US_V_Rogers_45_567.HTM [accessed November 15, 2008].

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Herrera, Justino, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. July 30. Interview tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

Abeyta, Tony, 2004. Interview conducted by Milanne S. Hahn. August 8. Interview and tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

Velarde, Pablita, 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Interview and tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ancestry.com.

<http://search.ancestry.com/cgi-bin-sse.dll=35&rank=1&gsfn=Dorothy&gsln=Dunn&81004010=1903&msbpnftp=Ka>

nsas&msrpnftp=Chicago&8000C000=Frank%20Seaburg&80008000=Harriet&gs_s=angs-i&ti=0 [accessed March 22, 2010].

Angelo, Gui de. *Jaime in Taos: The Taos Papers of Jaime de Angulo*. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1985.

Archuleta, Margaret L., Brenda J. Child and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, eds. *Away from Home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences, 1879-2000*. Phoenix, AZ: The Heard Museum, 2000.

Archuleta, Margaret L. and Dr. Rennard Strickland, eds. *Shared Visions: Native American Painters and Sculptors in the Twentieth Century*. New York: The New Press, 1991.

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. 1934. Reprint, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989.

Benes, Rebecca C. *Native American Picture Books of Change: The Art of Historic Children's Editions*. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2004.

Berlo, Janet and Ruth N. Phillips. *Native North American Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Bernstein, Bruce and W. Jackson Rushing III. *Modern by Tradition: American Indian Painting in the Studio Style*. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Broder, Patricia Janis. *Hopi Painting: The World of the Hopis*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1978.

Brody, J. J. *Indian Painters and White Patrons*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971.

_____ *Pueblo Indian Painting: Tradition and Modernism in New Mexico, 1900-1930*. Santa Fe: School of American Research, 1997.

Caffrey, Margaret M. *Ruth Benedict: Stranger in this Land*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989.

Calloway, Colin G. *First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History*. 2nd. ed. Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

Cesa, Margaret. *The World of Flower Blue Pop Chalee: An Artistic Biography*. Santa Fe: Red Crane Books, 1997.

Chapman, Janet and Karen Barrie. *Kenneth Milton Chapman: A Life Dedicated to Indian Arts and Artists*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008.

Chapman, Kenneth. "America's Most Ancient Art." *The School Arts Magazine*. 30, No. 7 (March 1931): 387-402.

- Chase, Katherine L. *Indian Painters of the Southwest: The Deep Remembering*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 2001.
- Chauvenet, Beatrice. *Hewett and Friends: A Biography of Santa Fe's Vibrant Era*. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1983.
- Coke, Van Deren. *Taos and Santa Fe: The Artist's Environment, 1882-1942*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Pres for The Amon Carter Museum of Western Art and The Art Gallery, University of New Mexico, 1963.
- Collier, John. *From Every Zenith: A Memoir and Some Essays on Life and Thought*. Denver: Sage Books, 1963.
- “Mexico: A Challenge.” *Progressive Education*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932).
- Collins, Gary C. “Art Crafted in the Red Man’s Image: Hazel Pete, the Indian New Deal, and the Indian Arts and Crafts Program at Santa Fe Indian School,” *New Mexico Historical Review*, Vol. 78, No. 4.
- Cords, Nicholas and Patrick Gerster, eds. *Myth and the American Experience*. Vol. Two, 2nd Ed. Encino, CA: Glencoe Publishing Co., Inc., 1978.
- Course of Study for the Indian Schools of the United States. Industrial and Literary*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.
- Cuba, Stanley L. *Olive Rush: A Hoosier Artist in New Mexico*. Muncie, IN: Minnetrista Cultural Foundation, Inc., 1992.
- Cunliffe, Marcus. *George Washington, Man and Monument*. Rev. ed. New York: New American Library, 1982.
- DeCora, Angel. “An Autobiography.” In *The Red Man*. 1910. Reprint *The Red Man, by Red Men*, 279-285. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Deloria, Philip J. and Neal Salisbury. *A Companion to American Indian History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.
- Dietrich, Margretta Stewart. *New Mexico Recollections, Part I*. National Museum of the American Indian, Vine Deloria, Jr. Library, 1959.
- Dollartimes. <http://www.dollartimes.com/calculators/inflation.htm> [accessed March 12, 2009].
- “Their Culture Survives.” *Indians at Work*. Vol. III, No. 17 (April 15, 1936), 18.
- Douglas, Eric. “Denver Art Curator Reviews Indian Exhibit at Museum.” *Santa Fe New Mexican*. May 4, 1935.
- Douglas, Frederic H. and Rene D’Harnoncourt. *Indian Art of the United States*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1941.

- Dunn, Dorothy. *American Indian Painting of the Southwest and Plains Areas*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- 1877: *Plains Indian Sketchbooks of Zo-Tom and Howling Wolf*. Flagstaff, AZ: Northland Press, 1969.
- “Going to School with the Little Domingos.” *The School Arts Magazine*, 30, No. 7 (Mar. 1931): 469-474.
- “Indian Painting Can Progress.” *El Palacio*, 57, No. 4: 99-108.
- “Indian Children Carry Forward Old Traditions.” *School Arts*. Vol. 34, No. 7 (March 1935).
- “The Development of Modern American Indian Painting in the Southwest and Plains Areas.” *El Palacio*, 58, No. 11 (Nov. 1951): 331-353. *Arts Magazine*, 34, No. 7 (Mar. 1935): 426-435.
- “Nenakije: Apache Artist.” *El Palacio*, 59, No. 1 (Mar. 1952): 71-76.
- “The Art of Joe Herrera.” *El Palacio*, 59, No. 12 (Dec. 1952): 367-373.
- “America’s First Painters: Indians, Who Once Painted Rocks and Buffalo Hides, Now Use Paper and Canvas to Preserve Ancient Art Forms.” *The National Geographic Magazine*, 107, No. 3 (Mar. 1955): 349-377.
- “The Artists of Taos Pueblo,” *The Taoseno* (March 27, 1941).
- “The Studio of Painting, Santa Fe Indian School,” *El Palacio*, Vol. 67, No. 2 (Feb. 1960).
- “Why Was the Course in History of Art Given?” *Tequayo*. Vol. 5, No. 5 (April 1936), 13.
- Dutton, Bertha P. *American Indians of the Southwest*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983.
- Sun Father’s Way: The Kiva Murals of Kuaua, A Pueblo Ruin, Coronado State Monument, New Mexico*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1963.
- Eldridge, Laurie. “Dorothy Dunn and the Art Education of Native Americans: Continuing the Dialogue.” *Studies in Art Education*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Summer 2001): 318-332.
- Erikson, Erik H. *Childhood and Society*. 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1963.
- Childhood and Society*. 35th Anniversary ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1985.
- “Observations on the Sioux.” *Journal of Psychology*, 7, 1939. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.openu> [accessed February 27, 2008].

- Fassnacht, Annette. "Exhibition Shows How Indian Artists Profits by Contact with Ancient, Modern Art." *Santa Fe New Mexican*. May 9, 1936.
- Fergusson, Erna. *New Mexico: A Pageant of Three Peoples*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1951.
- Fine, Lisa M. "Between Two Worlds: Business Women in a Chicago Boarding House 1900-1930," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Spring 1986). <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/stable/3787862> [accessed February 17, 2009]
- Friedman, Lawrence J. *Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Gardner, Helen. *Understanding the Arts*. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1932.
- Garmhausen, Winona. *History of Indian Arts Education in Santa Fe: The Institute of American Indian Arts with Historical Background, 1890 to 1962*. Santa Fe: Sunstone Press, 1988.
- Gilmore, Roger., ed. *A History of The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 1866-1981* (Chicago: The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, 1982).
- Goetzmann, William H. and William N. Goetzmann. *The West of the Imagination*. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Co., 1986.
- Goodman, Elaine Goodale. *Pratt, the Red Man's Moses* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935).
- Gritton, Joy L. *The Institute of American Indian Arts*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Hayman, Ronald. *A Life of Jung*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.
- Hertzberg, Hazel W. *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971.
- Highwater, Jamake. *Song From the Earth: American Indian Painting*. Boston: New York Graphic Society, 1976.
- The Primal Mind: Vision and Reality in Indian America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.
- The Sweet Grass Lives On: Fifty Contemporary North American Indian Artists*. New York: Lippincott & Crowell, 1980.
- Horney, Karen. *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1937.
- Howard, Kathleen L. and Diana F. Pardue. *Inventing the Southwest: The Fred Harvey Company and Native American Art*. Flagstaff: Northland Publishing, 1996.

- Hoxie, Frederick E. *The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920.* 2nd. ed. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Ed. *Talking Back to Civilization: Indian Voices from the Progressive Era.* Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.
- Ed. *Encyclopedia of North American Indians.* Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996.
- Huxley, Julian. "The Education of Primitives Peoples." *Progressive Education*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932).
- "The Concept of Race in the Light of Modern Genetics." *Harper's Magazine.* May 1935, 689-698.
- Hyer, Sally. *One House, One Voice, One Heart: Native American Education at the Santa Fe Indian School.* Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1990.
- Institute for Government Research. *The Problem of Indian Administration.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928.
- Jacobs, Margaret D. *Engendered Encounters: Feminism and Pueblo Cultures, 1879-1934.* Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.
- Jung, Carl G., M.-L. von Franz, Joseph L. Henderson, Jolande Jacobi, and Aniela Jaffe, eds. *Man and his Symbols.* New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.
- Recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffe, translated by Richard and Clara Winston. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections.* Rev. ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- Kubler, George. *The Shape of Things: Remarks on the History of Things.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.
- LaFarge, George. "An Experimental School for Indians." *Progressive Education*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932): 87-94.
- Lemos, Pedro J. "Our First American Artists." *The School Arts Magazine*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Sep. 1933): 10-37.
- Lepper, Mildred Dunn. "Tell Me About the Old Days, Grandma." Ackley, IA: Ackley Publishing Company.
- Lester, Patrick, ed. *The Biographical Directory of Native American Painters.* Tulsa: Sir Publications, 1995.
- Leupp, Francis E. *In Red Man's Land: A Study of The American Indian.* 1914. Reprint, Glorieta, NM: The Rio Grande Press, Inc., 1976.
- Lloyd, Robin. "Why We Lie." LiveScience. http://www.livescience.com/health/060515_why_lie.html [accessed March 27, 2010].
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. "Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority over Mind and Body." *American Ethnologist* 20, no. 2 (May 1993).

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?siici+0094-0496%28199305%2920%3A2%3C227%3ADITFIS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E>
[accessed Feb. 4, 2007].

“Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1898-1910.” *Journal of American Indian Education*, 35, Spring 1996. <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.azproxy.lib.utexas.edu/hww/results/getResults.jhtml?DARGS=/hww/results.results.common.jhtml.21#record.2> [accessed July 31, 2008].

“Estelle Reel.” In *Away from Home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences, 1879-2000*, edited by Margaret L. Archuleta, Brenda J. Child, and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, 31. Phoenix: Heard Museum, 2000.

McKittrick, Margaret. “Lost: A Tradition.” *The School Arts Magazine*, Vol. 30, No. 7 (Mar. 1931): 449-453.

Maloof, Alfreda Ward. *Recollections from My Time in the Indian Service 1935-1943, Including My Primer Maria Martinez Makes Pottery*. Klamath River, CA: Living Gold Press, 1997.

Mead, Margaret. *The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Meyer, Carter Jones and Diana Royer. *Selling the Indian: Commercializing and Appropriating American Indian Cultures*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2001.

Meyn, Susan Labry. *More Than Curiosities: A Grassroots History of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and Its Precursors, 1920-1942*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2001.

Miller, Angela. *The Empire of the Eye: Landscape Representations and American Cultural Politics, 1825-1875* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Millington, C. Norris. “American Indian Water Colors.” *The American Magazine of Art*, 25 (Jul. 1932 – Dec. 1932): 83-92.

Monthan, Guy and Doris Monthan. *Art and Indian Individualists: The Art of Seventeen Contemporary Southwestern Artists and Craftsmen*. Flagstaff: Northland Press, 1975.

Mooney, James. *The Ghost-Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890*. 1896. Rev. ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Mullin, Molly H. *Culture in the Marketplace: Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001.

Nagel, Joane. *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

- Nichols, John D. "Ojibwa." In *Encyclopedia of North American Indians: Native American History, Culture, and Life from Paleo-Indians to the Present*, edited by Frederick E. Hoxie. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996.
- Oneida Indian Nation. Oneida Indian Nation Treaties Project, Treaty with the Indians Living in the Country of the Oneidas or Veterans' Treaty, 1794. <http://oneida-nation.net/treat-VETERAN.html> [accessed August 9, 2008].
- Ortiz, Alfonso. "Ritual Drama and the Pueblo World." In *New Perspectives on the Pueblos*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972.
- Paterek, Josephine. *Encyclopedia of American Indian Costume*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994.
- Petroglyph National Monument, Las Imagenes Visitor Center, <http://www.nps.gov/petr/planyourvisit/vchistory.htm> [accessed March 30, 2010].
- "Proceedings of the 25th Annual Convention of the American Federation of the Arts, Washington, D.C., May 14, 15, 16, 1934," *The American Magazine of Art* 27, No. 9, Anniversary Supplement (Sept. 1934).
- Prucha, Francis Paul. *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. Abridged ed. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.
- Quinn, Susan. *A Mind of Her Own: The Life of Karen Horney*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1988.
- Rehnstrand, Jane. "Young Indians Revive The Native Arts," *School Arts*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (November 1936).
- Reyner, Jon and Jeanne Eder. *American Indian Education, A Survey* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004).
- Robertson, Edna and Sarah Nestor. *Artists of the Canyons and the Caminos: Santa Fe, The Early Years*. Santa Fe: Ancient City Press, 1976.
- Roediger, Virginia More. *Ceremonial Costumes of the Pueblo Indians: Their Evolution, Fabrication, and Significance in the Prayer Drama*. 1941. Reprint, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1991.
- Ruch, Marcella J. *Pablita Velarde: Painting Her People*. New Mexico Magazine: 2001.
- Rush, Olive. "Indian Students Show Work." *Santa Fe New Mexican*. May 4, 1933.
- "Prominent Santa Fe Artist Reviews Exhibit of Indian School Students Aged 11 to 20." *Santa Fe New Mexican*. May 8, 1937.

- “Remarkable Paintings by Indians at Art Museum.” *Santa Fe New Mexican*. May 7, 1934.
- Rushing, W. Jackson, III, ed. *Native American Art in the Twentieth Century: Makers, Meanings, Histories*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Native American Art and the New York Avant-Garde*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.
- “Marketing the Affinity of the Primitive and the Modern: Rene d’Harnoncourt and ‘Indian Art of the United States,’” in Janet Catherin Berlo, ed. *The Early Years of Native American Art History: The Politics of Scholarship and Collecting*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1992.
- Ryan, W. Carson, Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education*. Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932): 81-86.
- Saenz, Moises. “The School and Culture.” *Progressive Education*. Vol. IX, No. 2 (Feb. 1932): 99-111.
- Sando, Joe S. *Pueblo Nations: Eight Centuries of Pueblo Indian History*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 1992.
- Pueblo Profiles: Cultural Identity through Centuries of Change*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 1998.
- Schrader, Robert Fay. *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983.
- Seymour, Tryntje Van Ness. *When the Rainbow Touches Down: The Artists and Stories Behind the Apache, Navajo, Rio Grande Pueblo and Hopi Paintings in the William and Leslie Van Ness Denman Collection* (Phoenix, AZ: The Heard Museum, 1988).
- Shutes, Jeanne and Jill Mellick. *The Worlds of P'otsunu*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.
- Simeone, William E. *Rifles, Blankets, and Beads: Identity, History, and the Northern Athapaskan Potlatch*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.
- Smith, Peter. “The Unexplored: Art Education Historians’ Failure to Consider the Southwest.” *Studies in Art Education*, 40 (2) (Winter 1999).
- Snodgrass-King, Jeanne. “In the Name of Progress: Is History Being Repeated?” *American Indian Art Magazine*, 10, No. 2 (Spring 1985): 27-35.
- Stark, Gregor and E. Catherine Rayne. *El Delirio, The Santa Fe World of Elizabeth White*. Santa Fe: The School of American Research Press, 1998.
- Szabo, Joyce, Ed. *Painters, Patrons, and Identity: Essays in Native American Art to Honor J. J. Brody*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001.

- Szasz, Margaret Connell. *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination Since 1928*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.
- Taylor, Graham D. *The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1980.
- Tanner, Clara Lee. *Southwest Indian Painting: A Changing Art*. 2nd. ed. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1973.
- Teguayo*. Santa Fe Indian School newsletter.
- Trennert, Robert A., Jr. *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced Assimilation in Arizona, 1891-1935*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.
- Trump, Erik. “‘The Idea of Help’: White Women Reformers and the Commercialization of Native American Women’s Arts.” In *Selling the American Indian: Commercializing & Appropriating American Indian Cultures*, edited by Carter Jones Meyer and Diana Royers, 159-189. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2001.
- Tyler, Hamilton A. *Pueblo Gods and Myths*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964.
- Udall, Sharyn Rohlfsen. *Modernist Painting in New Mexico, 1913-1955*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.
- Underhill, Ruth. *Life in the Pueblos*. 1946, as *Workaday Life in the Pueblos*. Reprint, Santa Fe: Ancient City Press, 1991.
- University of New Mexico, University Libraries, Center for Southwest Research, Sophie D. Aberle Photograph Collection, Biography/History, <http://rmoa.unm.edu/docviewer.php?docId=nmupict000-509.xml> [accessed March 30, 2010]
- Velarde, Pablita. 2004. Interview by Milanne S. Hahn. August 4. Tape and transcript, The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA.
- Vickers, Scott B. *Native American Identities: From Stereotype to Archetype in Art and Literature*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- Wade, Edwin L., ed. *The Arts of the North American Indian: Native Traditions in Evolution*. New York: Hudson Hills Press, 1986.
- Weigle, Marta and Kyle Fiore. *Santa Fe & Taos: The Writer’s Era 1916-1941*. Santa Fe: Ancient City Press, 1982.
- Wyckhoff, Lydia L., ed. *Visions + Voices: Native American Paintings from the Philbrook Museum of Art*. Tulsa: Philbrook Museum of Art, 1996.

Turabian, K. L. 1987. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations.*
5th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.]

Vita

Milanne Shelburne Hahn has a B.A. in Government from the University of Texas at Austin, a M.A. in Russian Area Studies from Georgetown University, and a M.A. in American History from the University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent address (or email): msh@mail.utexas.edu

This dissertation was typed by the author.