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ABSTRACT

The chief objective of this study is to examine the post-1948 life of forty-six paintings, originally a part of the United States Department of State’s *Advancing American Art* collection. When given a second life after the collection’s aborted international tour and subsequent auction, these paintings helped shape the university/museum collections and identities of four regional academic institutions: Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama; the University of Georgia, Athens; the University of Oklahoma, Norman; and the University of Washington, Seattle. No one has yet treated the domestic aftermath of the *Advancing American Art* exhibition and the fate of the State Department’s collection. Yet the acquisition of paintings from *Advancing American Art* by colleges and universities formed the nuclei of their collections of American art. In the process, the acquired works vivified the study of American contemporary art in the 1940s and 1950s, helped develop the modernist canon in the United States, advanced the careers of American artists associated with the exhibition, and contributed to the development of prominent regional cultural facilities, and by extension the universities’ respective identities. In addition, an analysis of the post-exhibition lives of these paintings amplifies the socio-political context of the exhibition beyond what has been written.

Traditional study of American art has focused on the artists and stylistic movements emerging from major metropolitan areas, particularly in the northeastern U.S., thus marginalizing other sections of the country. Little has been written about the role played by regional fine art collections and the museums that house them in defining the nation’s art history. The *Advancing American Art* exhibition offers an important opportunity to study that role. Instead of making the controversial paintings disappear into the depths of storage vaults,
universities displayed them as important examples of avant-garde American art. Furthermore, the dissemination of the paintings to the South, Midwest, and Northwest broadened the audience for vanguard art domestically. Thus, this study of regional collections, using the wealth of virtually untapped archival resources available, aids understanding of the reception of contemporary art outside larger metropolitan areas. A rigorous reconsideration of the subject demonstrates that the dispersal of paintings to four forward-thinking regional public academic institutions contributes to our more nuanced understanding of the regional reception of modernist art.

More important, a study of the unanticipated consequences of the cancellation of the touring exhibition also provides insight into the institutional histories of regional American museums. Regional universities had a critical need for original paintings, as they developed new curricula in contemporary visual arts to accommodate increased student enrollment due to returning military personnel from World War II. Thus, the dispersal of the collection contributed to the growth of academic programs, the stimulation of interest in current American art, and the development of the prominent fine art museums now located on these campuses. Based in part upon previously untapped archival resources, this study considers for the first time these four institutional recipients of paintings from the *Advancing American Art* collection and paves the way for future scholarship on the exhibition’s regional impact.
In May and June of 1946, an exhibition of contemporary art entitled *Advancing American Art* was organized by the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (OIC) and circulated under the auspices of United States Department of State. Seventy-nine oil and seventy-three watercolor paintings showcasing current artistic trends were to tour venues in Europe and Latin America for a period of five years. The previous summer, Richard H. Heindel, Chief of the Division of Libraries and Institutes and supervisor of the program, had hired J. LeRoy Davidson, former associate director and curator at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, as curator of *Advancing American Art* and visual arts specialist for the State Department.¹ Within two years, however, the entire collection had been recalled, sold, and dispersed. In one of the most infamous examples of red-baiting and censorship in the pre-McCarthy era United States, the Hearst press, an incited American public, and members of the United States Congress had challenged the show’s vanguardism and its Americanness. Once back in the United States, the paintings were transferred to the War Assets Administration (WAA) and re-classified as war surplus, to be sold. Public institutions received a ninety-five percent priority discount at the auction held on June 19, 1948. Within a month, the collection had been distributed, and *Newsweek* had reported the result of sale (and debate) as “Retired American Art.” But what impact did this collection have on the academic institutions that acquired its paintings? This

¹ William Benton to Fred E. Busbey, 2 April 1947, RG 59, Records of Assistant Secretary of State, 1947-49, subject file, box 7, Art folder, National Archives and Records Administration.
dissertation will focus upon the post-1948 life of this artwork as a study of the origins and shaping of museum collections and identity, and the means by which a “retired” selection of paintings was able to revivify the study of American art in regional centers.

The War Assets Administration’s auction was not a public event. Instead, interested parties submitted sealed bids prior to the June 19 deadline. The bids were opened, tallied, and the awards made. Priority was given to educational institutions, 31 of which were among the 148 bidders. Other bidders included museums, veterans, and private citizens. Those individuals or organizations offering fair market value received the largest number of works. The collection was dispersed all over the United States with the majority of the paintings going to Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, and the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. Others went to the Honolulu Academy of Arts, Honolulu, Hawaii; Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey; University of Washington, Seattle, Washington; New Trier Township High School, Wilmette, Illinois; and New York Mills Union Free School District, New York Mills, Minnesota. The remainder is held in public and private collections. Four regional institutions, receiving a combined eighty-eight of the paintings, benefited from the 1948 auction: Auburn University (36), the University of Oklahoma (36), the University of Georgia (10), and the University of Washington (6). What was the impact of these acquisitions to their collections and respective communities? Several scholars have considered the political ramifications of the organization and aborted touring of the State Department’s exhibition. No one has yet treated the domestic aftermath of the exhibition and the fate of the collection. Yet the acquisition of paintings from Advancing American Art by colleges and universities formed the nuclei of their collections of American art. In the process, the acquired works vivified the study of American contemporary art in the 1940s and 1950s, helped develop the modernist canon in the United States, advanced the careers of American artists associated with the exhibition, and contributed to the development of prominent regional cultural facilities, and by extension the universities’ respective identities. In addition, an analysis of the post-exhibition lives of these paintings amplifies the socio-political context of the exhibition beyond what has been written.

---

Traditional study of American art has focused on the artists and stylistic movements emerging from major metropolitan areas, thus marginalizing other sections of the country. Little has been written about the role played by regional fine art collections and the museums that house them in defining the history of art of the United States of America. The *Advancing American Art* exhibition offers an important opportunity to study that role. Instead of making the controversial paintings disappear into the depths of storage vaults, universities displayed them as important examples of avant-garde American art. Furthermore, the dissemination of the paintings to the South, Midwest, and Northwest broadened the audience domestically. Thus, this study of regional collections and the documentation concerning their acquisitions aids our understanding of the reception of contemporary art outside larger metropolitan areas. A rigorous reconsideration of the subject demonstrates that the dispersal of paintings to four forward-thinking regional public academic institutions contributes to our more nuanced understanding of the regional reception of modernist art.

More important, a study of the unanticipated consequences of the cancellation of the exhibition also provides us with insight into the institutional histories of regional American museums. Regional universities had a critical need for original paintings, as they developed new curricula in contemporary visual arts to accommodate increased student enrollment of returning military personnel. Thus, the dispersal of the collection contributed to the growth of academic programs, the stimulation of interest in current American art, and the development of the prominent fine art museums now located on these campuses. Furthermore, these paintings helped to shape the museums’ identities, and, on a broader level, the host universities.

To date, this compelling history has been studied from a limited viewpoint of social history, the most important being Virginia Mecklenburg and Margaret Lynn Ausfeld’s exhibition catalogue *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-48* (1984).³ My aim is to examine the paintings’ reception in more depth and with more sensitivity to regional diversity. My study concerns how the collection was perceived from the national to the local level. For example, I will look at how the State Department defined the exhibition as American; how the Hearst Press argued that the exhibition misrepresented

---

American life and lacked a signature American artistic style; and how some politicians attacked the paintings for their radicalism. Using direct local responses to the exhibition, media representations of the paintings, public reaction to the printed image, and academic responses to comments, I will demonstrate that the ways the paintings were perceived were contingent on how they were presented.

Other recent publications have shed new light on the subject of Advancing American Art, such as historian Michael Krenn’s Fallout Shelters for the Human Spirit (2005). Krenn demonstrates how the collection served as propaganda in the United States government’s efforts to promote cultural diplomacy. He contextualizes the exhibition within a larger problem of how American cultural production was perceived overseas during a forty-year span. His main point is the idea that few nations knew of America’s artistic output because there did not exist an established and continual program for its distribution. His book is useful for several reasons. First, elaborating on Mecklenburg and Ausfeld’s narrative, he devotes the better part of a chapter to the exhibition’s history. Second, he provides a concise but thorough history of State Department-sponsored overseas exhibitions, beginning with the founding of the Division of Cultural Relations in 1938 and continuing through the 1970s. Third, he creates a framework for understanding the purpose of United States propaganda, and the government’s support of it, or lack thereof, over time. Consequently, Krenn’s work is invaluable for piecing together the United States government’s attempts at cultural diplomacy and explaining why some programs worked and some did not.

Lindsay Pollock takes a different approach to the exhibition in her recent book, The Girl with the Gallery: Edith Halpert and the Making of the Modern Art Market (2006). Here, Pollock, a journalist and founder of the influential blog “Art Market Views,” tells the story of Halpert’s role as art dealer in promoting the careers of modern artists, from the early 1930s to the 1960s. Throughout Halpert’s career, she advocated for government support of the arts and participated in efforts to benefit her clients financially. One example is included in the chapter “Art for Mr. and Mrs. America,” which explains how she sold approximately twenty paintings to Davidson specifically for inclusion in Advancing American Art.4

4 Metropolitan Museum of Art, “List of Paintings in the Advancing American Art Exhibition,” summer 1946, Exhibitions 1946 file, Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives, New York. This list is reproduced in the appendices of this dissertation.
Few sources discuss the collection’s dispersal, and only two are significant. The aforementioned catalogue, *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-1948*, condenses the sale to a paragraph mentioning the acquisition of the paintings by public institutions, but names only Auburn University and the University of Oklahoma as the recipients of the largest number of works, each obtaining thirty-six. The second is *Advancing American Art: Painting, Politics, and Cultural Confrontation at Mid-Century* (1989, 2005). Here, Taylor D. Littleton and Maltby Sykes, Auburn professors of science and art, respectively, delve more deeply into the dispersal of the collection, but they do so only as it relates to Auburn’s acquisitions. These authors’ purpose was to elevate the visibility and status of Auburn’s collection beyond the local level. Rather than using the university’s archives at their disposal to tell their story, however, they tried to contextualize the collection on a national level by justifying why Davidson made the choices he did from an aesthetic point of view. As a result, Littleton and Sykes fail to consider how the paintings functioned within their community.

If the collections that were formed from the remnants of *Advancing American Art* have not received the sort of attention proposed for this dissertation, other museum collections have benefited from such studies. Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, is one such example that I will use as a model. In 1949, Georgia O’Keeffe gave one hundred and one works of art, from her husband Alfred Stieglitz’s collection, to Fisk University.\(^5\) Much like the universities that acquired pieces from *Advancing American Art*, Fisk sought to integrate the works into the curriculum. How the administrators were able to do so is the subject of an article by Marybeth Gasman, a professor of educational policy at Georgia State University, and Georgia artist Edward Epstein. “Modern Art in the Old South: The Role of the Arts in Fisk University’s Campus Curriculum” uses historical inquiry to determine how an interdisciplinary program enhanced learning.\(^6\) Following this same premise, I seek to show the intentionality of the faculties at the institutions under consideration in using art in the classroom.

---

\(^5\) The collection was featured in the 1999 traveling exhibition, *To Conserve a Legacy: American Art from Historically Black Colleges and Universities*. The significance of the contribution and the collections’ value to the university has been the subject of numerous recent articles debating the sale of paintings in the collection.

The Samuel H. Kress Study Collection at the University of Missouri (1999), edited by art historian Norman E. Land, is a second, if looser, model for this dissertation. The catalogue details the life of the collector, gives an overview of the collection, and explains how the collection came to the university. More importantly, it discusses Kress’s interest in placing portions of his collection in colleges and universities for instructional use. The process through which the schools went to purchase paintings from the Department of State demonstrates, on one level, their belief in arts education. Though the factors involved in the acquisitions of paintings from the Kress Collection are different from those surrounding Advancing American Art, all of the schools that received paintings have one thing in common—the desire to use the paintings to educate students.7

While I am arguing for the use of these paintings in higher education, I must also address the multiplicity of ways that the paintings functioned outside the academy. Central to this paper is how the visual arts function when used as propaganda, perceived as controversial, suppressed through censorship, and then later recognized for their value. The use of the collection as overseas propaganda has been covered in the literature, as has discussion of the Congressional actions that forced the exhibition’s cancellation within the context of the broader struggle between government and the arts. What has not been addressed is how the universities used the paintings to propagandize their schools as forward-thinking institutions with an interest in the liberal arts. Following that idea, how the collections’ roles changed within those places that collected them will be explained. In order to make my argument, I must first introduce influential sources on the topics of propaganda and censorship on the federal level to establish a precedent that was repeated, albeit in a different way, on the local level.

---

7 I have chosen the collections given to Fisk University and the University of Missouri at Columbia as examples because they are both university museums that explicitly stated in their publications that the collections are to be used to teach students. There are, of course, numerous other examples from which to choose. I recognize the discrepancies between these two collections and the paintings from Advancing American Art in the four schools being considered here. The objects at Fisk University and the University of Missouri were donated to the schools, not purchased for them. Also, the size of these collections is much larger than the modest number of paintings purchased by the four universities at the heart of this study. My intention in singling these two schools out for comparison is that their collection catalogues provide the type of contextual information that I wish to present.
The dissemination of United States propaganda overseas is the subject of several publications over the last twenty-five years. Political scientist Ralph Purcell’s *Government and Art: A Study of American Experience* (1956) recounts the Department of State’s numerous cultural relations activities before and after *Advancing American Art*. Historian Frank Ninkovich’s *The Diplomacy of Ideas: U. S. Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950* (1981) explores the United States Department of State’s cultural programs, criticisms of them, and action taken against them. Gary Larson’s *The Reluctant Patron: The United States Government and the Arts, 1943-1965* (1983) focuses more closely on the exhibition. A specialist in public policy and the arts and then National Council Coordinator of the National Endowment for the Arts, Larson includes a section tracing the public and political responses to the show in what he calls “the art world’s biggest controversy since the close of the New Deal.”

Other authors discuss the different types of propaganda distributed overseas, the methods used, and what agencies were involved. For instance, historian Laura Belmonte’s chapter “Exporting America: The U.S. Propaganda Offensive, 1945-1959” in *The Arts of Democracy: Art, Public Culture, and the State* (2007), edited by Casey Nelson Blake, explores the types of propaganda, from religion to capitalism, exported around the world to combat Communism. Her recent book *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War* (2008) provides an in-depth look into the post-World War II information program. She begins by critiquing President Truman and President Eisenhower’s propaganda programs. Next, she analyzes propagandistic images of consumerism, family, gender, and race to explore how they were used in the construction of national identity. She concludes by offering her opinions on what the Cold War cost the United States.


---

Richard Pells’ *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture Since World War II* (1997) looks at how the American government thought their propaganda efforts were perceived compared with the actual European response. A historian specializing in the global impact of American culture, he covers the subject of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and those in Europe from the 1920s through the 1980s. Focusing most of his attention on the period after 1945, he provides rich examples of how the United States was viewed as an imperialist superpower driven by the consumption of material goods, with little interest in cultural production.

Each of the above sources addresses how the United States was marketed to overseas audiences. Collectively, they provide the contextual basis for understanding *Advancing American Art* and other cultural programs in their full political significance. They show how the State Department’s exhibition was not an isolated event, but part of a larger initiative that began years before and accelerated in the years after World War II. However, all of these sources fail to address fully the American citizens’ reactions to these programs. I do not mean to diminish the importance of the government’s establishing a leadership role in foreign policy after World War II. Rather, I turn my attention to what was happening in the United States during this period. Using *Advancing American Art* as my example, I will show how Cold War propaganda sent abroad had an adverse effect on the visual arts at home.

To better understand why Americans reacted negatively to what was included in *Advancing American Art*, we must first understand the stylistic trends of American avant-garde painting from the 1940s. As Brooklyn Museum curators Brooke Kamin Rapaport and Kevin L. Stayton discuss in *Vital Forms: American Art and Design in the Atomic Age, 1940-1960* (2001), the catalogue to the exhibition of the same name, the anxiety of the period permeated the creative minds of artists and influenced their productive output. Many experimented with styles that they believed reflected the human condition and its frailty. Some looked to the Surrealists for inspiration and began to create simplified, non-representational forms based on biomorphic shapes. Others were socially conscious artists, who were criticized for their depictions of how they viewed the world. These last artists are also discussed in Bram Djikstra’s *American Expressionism: Art and Social Change, 1920-1950* (2003). In this book, this cultural historian focuses on politically active immigrant artists who became targets for eradication during the McCarthy period. If Djikstra’s book has had its share of negative reviews, it does shed light on a
number of artists whose contributions to the period are frequently undervalued. These same artists showed their work in the *Advancing American Art* exhibition.

Mainstream Americans took more of an interest in the work of the Regionalists. Focusing on the American scene, artists such as Thomas Hart Benton and Grant Wood romanticized the land and the people who worked it. They believed that a true, national art would emerge from those who depicted their homeland. Grant Wood shared his ideas in his essay “Revolt Against the City” (1935). In it he argues for his desire to see art centers established in rural regions around the United States. He speaks of the city, and specifically those along the eastern seaboard, as places of migration, where artists have settled to pursue their craft. He views their production as diluted by overseas influences, especially in their traveling to Europe or interacting with European artists working in the United States. He believes that such exposure has kept Americans from creating a native art. Wood calls for a return to the country, or the place from which artists came. He argues that the best work will come from the artist who tries to capture a sense of place. And the place that he or she knows best is his or her home. Thus, Wood cites the economic depression as a positive impetus for the return to a simpler life. He champions the success of the Public Works of Art Project and suggests that developing regional art schools, affiliated with universities, are a more appropriate way for the government to continue supporting the arts, as opposed to sending propaganda overseas. He persuaded others to adopt his conservative viewpoint, which he believed would result in an independent, national style.9

Wood’s comments struck a chord with those beyond Iowa’s borders. As we will see, Republican John Tabor of New York and Karl Stefan from Nebraska agreed that European influences hindered the creation of a national American art. More important, they considered the large number of immigrants settling in the United States, and their first generation off-spring, as producers of “radical” art.

The reaction to modern art as “radical” and un-American did not begin with *Advancing American Art*. Rather, the idea was rooted in responses to the Depression era’s New Deal programs. Most of the artists included in the exhibition had been employed by the government through the Works Progress Administration’s relief program. During the 1930s, several were

criticized because of their politics and the messages conveyed through their imagery. From Diego Rivera’s mural of *Man at the Crossroads* for the Rockefeller Center, New York, unfinished at the time of its destruction in 1934, to Anton Refregier’s WPA commission of *Raising the Bear Flag* (1948) for the Rincon Annex Post Office in San Francisco, savvy viewers had learned how to identify leftist iconography. Furthermore, they saw the same stylistic devices that were used in the murals repeated in easel paintings, such as a lack of natural colors or accurate likenesses of the people portrayed. Even though the paintings included in *Advancing American Art* were not inherently propagandistic, controlling what was exported became a major concern to those at home. People saw the paintings as too closely linked to past federally sponsored art programs. Indeed, both the exhibition and the New Deal were similar in that they were criticized by Congress from their inception, both were reliant on Congressional appropriations, and both included artists with politics objectionable to many members of Congress.

The controversy surrounding *Advancing American Art* was fueled by fear, combined with conservatism, which became the recipe for a witch-hunt, targeting some of the most creative minds of the twentieth century. The political views to which some visual artists subscribed a decade or so earlier and their subjects produced as part of the New Deal art programs caused them to be as closely investigated as their counterparts in film, music, and literature. In an effort to control how the world viewed the United States, a series of actions were taken to moderate perceptions by censoring what was distributed abroad and by vilifying suspicious citizens who were believed to be communist sympathizers or Communists themselves.

Current scholarship on exhibition controversy addresses how extreme action is taken either to edit or shut down hotly debated shows. Cultural historian Michael Kammen’s *Visual Shock: A History of Art Controversies in American Culture* (2006) contextualizes *Advancing American Art* by placing it within a chronological framework of American art controversies over individual artworks, collections, and exhibitions. Neil Harris, a social and cultural historian
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specializing in museums, wrote the article “Exhibiting Controversy” (October 1995), for *Museum News*, which traces the history of major exhibition controversies, including *Advancing American Art*, but also comments on what happens when individual art objects are exposed to judgments of morality, politics and taste. Specializing in the study of cultural institutions, art historian Alan Wallach writes about exhibitions in *Exhibiting Contradictions: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States* (1998) to show the evolution of interpretive models from the nineteenth to the end of the twentieth century. He questions the purpose of American art museums by exploring how museum interpretation either falls short of visitor expectations or is met with a negative response. His book is a reminder that exhibition controversy is not a new phenomenon, curating exhibitions is often complex, and not all responses can be anticipated. Political scientist Timothy Luke picks up where Wallach leaves off in *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition* (2002). He leaves the art museum behind by focusing instead on exhibitions of history, natural science, and technology.

More important to this dissertation is the controversy over *Advancing American Art* that played out in the contemporary, popular media. The Hearst press, *New York Times, Washington Post, Baltimore American, The New York Journal-American*, and *Look* magazine, among others, provided coverage reflecting the politics of their editors. *Art Digest* offered a more balanced explication of the events, while the traditional art journals and magazines, such as the *Magazine of Art, American Artist*, and *Art in America*, defended the artists included in the exhibition with articles like “Art and Democracy” and “Freedom of Expression.”

Regional responses to the paintings include newspaper articles from when the works were first exhibited upon their arrival at the universities, such as the February 10, 1949, issue of *The Birmingham News*, which featured a story about the paintings’ display at the local library. From club members to school teachers, the exhibition garnered high praise. Later sources, such as Dave White’s article “Auburn Art Once Viewed as ‘Communist Vulgar’” in *The Birmingham News* (1981), renewed interest in the subject by reminding readers of the paintings’ semi-permanent installation at the Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts. Also significant is the inclusion of individual paintings from *Advancing American Art* in traveling exhibitions or collection handbooks. For example, the University of Georgia partnered with the American Federation of Arts in 1969 to circulate an exhibition entitled *A University Collects: Georgia Museum of Art*, in which three paintings from *Advancing American Art* were included.
Exploring what has been written about the *Advancing American Art* controversy, and exhibition controversies in general, is only one side of the equation. We must also consider sources on censorship that discuss why art became part of the chosen method to combat Communism during the Cold War era. Books that inform this study include post-World War II historian Gary A. Donaldson’s *Abundance and Anxiety: America, 1945-1960* (1997). This aptly titled book explores the rise of the United States as a wealthy superpower at the end of World War II and how the perceived threat of Communism and the developing Cold War undermined its dominance. In his chapter “Domestic Fears and the Red Scare,” he explains the reasons for the “hysteria” and the corrective actions taken, primarily by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). Jane de Hart Mathews, a historian of art, public patronage, and politics, offers a more general overview of anti-modernism in “Art and Politics in Cold War America” (1976), where she proposes three parts to the anti-Communist attack. They are a refusal to accept art with a social commentary, or modern art for that matter, and disapproval of any artist with ties to questionable political parties.¹² Art historian Dario Gamboni’s *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism since the French Revolution* (1997) looks at how specific examples of art have been targeted for censorship because governing bodies considered the works subversive. Through a myriad of examples, including *Advancing American Art*, the author explains how authorities (patrons, government bureaus, or legal agencies) dealt with the offenders, often violating their civil rights. Many of the books listed in the propaganda section also belong under the category of censorship because they touch on how the former oftentimes became a target of the latter.

A well-known example of censorship is Michigan Senator George A. Dondero’s speech *Communists Maneuver to Control Art in the United States*, which targeted many *Advancing American Art* participants, and is documented in the 80th and 81st Congress’ *Congressional Record*. Margaret Lynne Ausfeld, Virginia M. Mecklenburg, and William Hauptman have dedicated ample ink to interpreting Dondero’s tirades. But while art was Dondero’s primary target, he was not the instigator calling for *Advancing American Art*’s cancellation. Rather, it was Illinois Representative Fred Busbey who probed into the biographies of the artists looking for

pro-communist activity. Congressmen John Taber, New York, chair of the House Committee on Appropriations, and his colleague Representative Karl Stefan, Nebraska, led the charge to cut the budget to the State Department’s art program forcing Secretary of State George C. Marshall to issue the order to cancel the exhibition. Following my use of correspondence housed at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), I focus on the individuals who worked to have the exhibition cancelled and the State Department’s cultural program destroyed. I will offer a more detailed account of the subject than has been published to date. I will argue that the exhibition was doomed to fail because of the ties many of the artists had to New Deal art programs; but more importantly, because of many of the artists’ former political affiliations.

Because this dissertation addresses how the four art departments and their university museums functioned in educating students, one looks to the role of the Museum of Modern Art’s traveling exhibition program in educating students at each of these four universities in that they all borrowed exhibitions prior to purchasing paintings from the State Department. In “The Mass Museology of the Modern,” from Haidee Wasson’s book Museum Movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema (2005), she argues that the Museum of Modern exemplified President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s definition of a “living museum” because of its embrace of mass media, print media, radio, and television, as tools for disseminating information. In her brief history of extension programs, she discusses the role of the New Deal in developing community art centers in underserved regions of the country, mostly the South and the West. Because her book takes the cinematic arts as her subject, she gives a cursory mention of the Circulating Exhibitions department of the museum. She fails to discuss how the Circulating Exhibition’s service also served the public’s needs in these same regions.

Issues of public trust are a core concern for museum professionals, as is evidenced in recent publications such as James Cuno’s Whose Muse? Art Museums and the Public Trust (2004) and Stephen Weil’s Making Museums Matter (2002). What is argued in current scholarship is the need for institutions to earn the public’s trust, but more important is the museum’s need to trust that the public is willing to participate in what the museum has to offer. This idea follows John
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Cotton Dana’s mandate that museums should enrich their visitor’s lives, as outlined in *The New Museum* (1917) and *The New Museum: Selected Writings* (1999).

A pivotal model for discussing museum collections and their relationship to communities is Ivan Karp and Steven Levine’s *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture* (1992), an early work in assessing relations between an institution, its objects and its visitors. Offering case studies, this volume highlights different methods used to better the link the museum to its community. Equally important is the work of John Falk and Lynn Dierking, especially *The Museum Experience* (1992), which is a practical guide to defining visitor needs. People choose to visit museums to see art, to study the objects on view, and to learn something about them. Falk and Dierking acknowledge that there are different levels of engagement. Therefore, they forsake the elitist hierarchy of curators as the knowledge source. Instead, they argue that people are more receptive to learning from one another in an environment where they feel at ease.

An important source for my purposes on museums and communities is Amy Levin’s anthology *Defining Memory: Local Museums and the Construction of History in America’s Changing Communities* (2007). She focuses on the small, lesser-known museums and argues for their importance in contributing to an understanding of national identity. More important, she suggests that local museums offer the visitor a glimpse into the history of the community the institution serves. I will attempt to do much of what Levin has already done, although my focus is on academic art museums, rather than small independent history museums I too will demonstrate how the collections at Auburn University, the University of Georgia, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Washington are significant to their communities and capture a historical moment in American history.

Also important to this discussion are articles about the role art and art history plays in education at American universities. Then director of the Museum of Modern Art, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., wrote several articles on the subject: "The American Art Research Council and the Colleges" (November 1944), "Modern Art Makes History, Too" (November 1941), and "A Statement on the Place of the History of Art in the Liberal Arts Curriculum," (March 1944), all published in the *College Art Journal*. John Coolidge’s “The University Art Museum in America” (Autumn 1966) gives a mid-century read on the growth and significance of university museums that
resonates today. Rudolf Wittkower in “The Significance of the University Museum in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century” (Winter 1967-68) discusses the functions of university museums and suggests their contributions come from freedom of experimentation not often permitted in civic or private institutions. These sources outline opinions about and purposes for the existence of university museums in the twentieth century.

Howard Singerman’s Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University (1999) focused on the education and professionalization of the artist. My study also considers the university museum’s role as an interpreter of culture and educational “muse” in light of Philip Fisher’s Making and Effacing Art: Modern American Art in a Culture of Museums (1997). Each of these sources is relevant to contextualizing the intended functions of the university museum.

Although the role of the regional university museum and its use of paintings from Advancing American Art is the focus of this study, further background concerning the federal government’s actions is necessary. The United States Department of State’s interest in building cultural diplomacy through art exhibitions was not a new idea at the time of Advancing American Art, nor was this the first exhibition or the only show of visual arts that the Department toured overseas. Prior to establishing its own collection, the State Department contracted with major corporations and museums to organize and travel artworks. One popular example was 60 Artists After 1800, drawn from the International Business Machines (IBM) Corporation’s fine art collection. The show, comprised of nineteenth and twentieth century examples by American artists, first opened in New York on November 19, 1946, and then traveled to the United States Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. Other shows included those sponsored by the National Gallery of Art, which organized surveys of historical American painting, Native American art, and nineteenth-century French prints that all traveled to countries in Latin America. In 1945, the

14 John Coolidge, "The University Art Museum in America," Art Journal 26, no. 1 (Autumn 1966): 9-12, 21. The periodical Parnassus was continued as the College Art Journal in 1941 and in 1960 became the Art Journal, which explains the different titles used in the text referring to articles from the 1940s and those cited in footnote 11 and 12 from the 1960s.


16 The International Business Machines Corporation and Grand Central Art Galleries, New York, published a catalogue in 1946.
United States’ State Department created a new section to house an art program, the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, within the Division of Libraries and Institutes. The large number of requests justified the need for an art program that would travel exhibitions of contemporary American art to embassies overseas. *Advancing American Art* was one of the products to meet the need. After its demise, the United States government continued its cultural efforts finally having some success. One of the best examples occurred in 1959 when the United States Information Agency sent an exhibition of fine art to Moscow. The show followed much of the same pattern as *Advancing American Art*, facing scrutiny by Congress and questioning from the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This time, however, Representative Francis E. Walter failed in his attempts to have the exhibition cancelled.

Davidson’s role with the State Department was to curate exhibitions of modern art, which would travel to multiple overseas venues in the Europe, Asia, and South America. The works of art would not show an encyclopedic survey of the history of United States art, as was done in the past. Instead, Davidson endeavored to show artists who were actively working in current stylistic trends. Thus, he went to the center of the American art world to make his selections—New York City. Knowing how expensive borrowing, shipping, and insuring art would be, the State Department stood firm in supporting Davidson’s decision to purchase paintings. Exhibition costs were one reason, but not the only one. Owning the paintings could allow for longer tours, which would increase visibility and strengthen cultural diplomacy. The paintings were paid for with allocations left over from the now defunct Office of War Information (OWI) and the Office of
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17 Prior to Davidson’s tenure at the State Department, David Finley, Chief Curator, and John Walker, Director, National Gallery of Art, administered the international art exchange program from 1944 to 1946. Because of comments made about the lack of “Americanness” displayed in exhibitions circulated in Britain and France, the State Department decided to take back the responsibility, and consequently, hired Davidson. Michael Krenn, *Fallout Shelters for the Human Spirit: American Art and the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 18-26.


the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA).

Paintings were purchased directly from individual artists and more than fifteen galleries. The majority came from the Downtown Gallery, while others came from reputable dealers still selling artwork today, such as A.C.A. Gallery and C. W. Kraushaar Art Galleries.

The staff at the State Department took a chance in organizing *Advancing American Art*, and they knew this at the start of the project. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to whom Richard Heindel reported, believed that the exhibition could do much to promote a broader understanding of what America was about and perhaps humanize the nation to counter perceptions of it as a military and financial superpower. He and his colleagues were not ignorant of the fact that personal opinion played a large role in how modern art was received. Yet, Benton embraced the exhibition, at least initially.

*Advancing American Art* was first displayed at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City from October 8 to October 18, 1946. After garnering favorable reviews, the exhibition was divided into two parts and prepared for travel. Forty-nine paintings were shipped to Paris for the first United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) exhibition. The other thirty went to Cuba, Haiti, and Guatemala in Latin America. Even though the exhibition was praised in New York and overseas, opposition was mounting to it. The American Artists Professional League (AAPL) began the initial protest, and it was
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23 Davidson to Lillian Green, 10 October 1946, Exhibitions 1946 file, Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives, New York.

24 Metropolitan Museum of Art, “Object Loan Form,” September 1946, Exhibitions 1946 file, Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives, New York. Correspondence in the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s archives discusses October 18 as the closing date for the exhibition. The date was included in the press release, and consequently, October 18 was advertised. The loan form on file is stamped “returned October 18” as well. However, the October 1946 issue of *Art News* states the closing date as October 27. While the loan form is the legal document, it is common for exhibition closing dates to be extended. Logical speculation would suggest that the Musée d’Art Moderne, Paris, could not receive and store the collection any earlier in the month. Opening dates for the Latin American venues may or may not have been effected.
Congress that changed the exhibition’s fate by withholding funding. Chapters two and three show how the Department of State succumbed to pressures put forth by the national media, the American public, and Congress. The staff had little choice but to act after Congress cut appropriations for the exhibition. People, positions, and programs were sacrificed. The disjunction between governmental agencies wanting to promote the arts and the individuals within the government who opposed them could not be reconciled. The art program as it existed in 1947 was destroyed.

In chapter two, I will argue for the crisis over American identity that came out of the *Advancing American Art* controversy. How the print media’s politicization of the collection affected the reception of the works by people in the United States is one area considered. To make my points, I will analyze specific publications, including *The New York Journal American*, *Look* magazine, and *The Republican News*, to show how each propagandized the paintings in ways counter to those intended by the State Department. These magazines and newspapers skewed information to serve their needs and, consequently, influenced reader’s opinions of the art program’s intentions. Drawing on the large volume of primary correspondence not covered in any depth in the current literature, I will personalize the conflict by looking at how American citizens on both sides of the debate took action by writing letters to their elected officials expressing their concerns. This chapter will shed light on many of the details that continue to shape our understanding of the conservative ideologies gripping the nation at the beginning of the Cold War.

Chapter three looks at how leaders from small, regional arts organizations to museum administrators across the country made counter appeals to the government on behalf of the *Advancing American Art*. Politics aside, they accused Congress of violating the artists’ first amendment rights. Through a letter-writing campaign, several pleaded for the reversal of the decision to cancel the exhibition. Through a close reading of the correspondence, I will demonstrate how arts professionals were equally as vocal as those who were against the exhibition, a side to the controversy that has been under-developed.

The main goal of this dissertation is to demonstrate how *Advancing American Art* has survived in the collections of four university museums. Each school used the paintings in ways that ultimately reflects on institutional identity. Tracing the histories of the paintings at their respective institutions, using the lens of perception, will present a new perspective as to how the
paintings functioned at their respective schools. Many of the details mirror the history of regional university collections. However, few institutions were as fortunate as these in being able to acquire such important paintings so early in the university’s development.

Focusing first on the southern United States, chapter four is devoted to Auburn University. In it, I will trace the evolution of the paintings from when they were acquired by Auburn, where they began as a study collection, to their position as the centerpiece of the Jule Collins Smith Museum of Art. Specific issues related to the acquisition, storage, and presentation of the paintings will be presented to explain the challenges this collection faced. I will conclude by demonstrating how the university champions the paintings today as its signature collection.

This author’s research into archival materials indicates that in Auburn University’s special collections there are permanent art collection papers consisting of acquisitions records, inventories and surveys of the paintings purchased in 1948. In addition, records of *The Plainsman*, the student newspaper that covered the arrival of the paintings at Auburn, are also held there. The University of Georgia’s holdings contain some information on the collection within the context of the university museum’s history. The same holds true for the University of Oklahoma and the University of Washington.

The Lamar Dodd School of Art and the Georgia Museum of Art at the University of Georgia is the subject of chapter five. Some of the same issues addressed in chapter four will reemerge, such as the history of this collection’s acquisition, its reception, and its function within the confines of the university. However, accessioning the State Department paintings into an existing museum collection presents a different set of challenges from those at Auburn. A comparison of how each institution used the collections in establishing its identity will be discussed. In this case, I will show how the collection enhanced other examples of American art in the permanent collection. Furthermore, I will demonstrate how the collection was immediately used in educating students, and is still used for that purpose today.

Chapter 6 looks at the University of Oklahoma and chapter 7 focuses on the University of Washington. Again, I will discuss the benefits and challenges specific to the paintings being sited in Norman, Oklahoma, and Seattle, Washington, respectively. I will follow a similar outline to the previous chapters by analyzing the acquisition, reception, and use of the collection by university administration, faculty, students, and public.
The conclusion will bring my discussion full circle as I stress the significance of each university museum’s segment of the *Advancing American Art* collection to their respective arts institutions, their universities, and their region. Furthermore, I will demonstrate how negative national attention brought to a small, unconventional exhibition caused a surprisingly positive outcome by saving culturally significant artworks from being destroyed. What is more, decades later the objects not only have historical value, but they are invaluable as educational tools. Thus, I will show how the paintings themselves, and the collections of which they are a part, make a significant contribution to American cultural identity and American art history.
CHAPTER 2

SLANDER BY THE POPULAR PRESS:
A READING OF HOW THE MEDIA MARGINALIZED ADVANCING AMERICAN ART

The Advancing American Art controversy was a single event, among many, that contributed to the American identity crisis of the 1940s. It is one of many cases where the government attempted to support the arts and failed.\(^1\) The failure, in this instance, can be attributed in part to the media. The conservative press distributed information about the show, making it available to a nationwide audience. They created a story within a story by asking and answering a series of questions. Who were the artists? Were they American? Why did the paintings look the way they did? Who bought the paintings? Why were they purchased? Answering their own questions, they politicized the subject and went beyond what most middle-class Americans were willing to accept as representations of themselves. Thus, the media changed the focus of the exhibition from one of goodwill, promoting America’s cultural achievements abroad, to policing who should generate the visual imagery that would represent the United States. Many of these same questions had been posed decades before, but in this case, Advancing American Art caught the media’s attention during a period in which newspapers and magazines were vying for increased readership for financial stability. To that end, formats were changing to include photo essays, as well as to embrace the sensational bordering on being

unethical. Through careful manipulation of imagery, supplemented by rhetoric as old as John Ruskin’s in the famous trial over Whistler’s art, the conservative press, represented here by the New York Journal American, Look magazine, and The Republican News, sought to shape public opinion concerning federal patronage of the visual arts. Desiring no return to pre-war liberal relief programs for artists, and fueled by fears over the “Iron Curtain,” christened for a popular audience earlier in 1946, conservative publications employed long-successful tactics to energize and unify their base. To gauge the persuasiveness of the media, I must first discuss the techniques employed by the three aforementioned publications. Then, by drawing on the large volume of primary correspondence, not covered in any depth in the current literature, I will personalize the conflict by looking at how American citizens expressed their concerns over what they saw and read by writing letters to their elected officials. The result will be an extension of the work begun by Ausfeld and Mecklenburg in Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-48 (1984) by contributing new information that adds to our understanding of the conservative ideologies gripping the nation at the beginning of the Cold War.

In many ways history repeated itself with Advancing American Art. The exhibition was federally funded, the paintings were criticized, the artists maligned, and the works dispersed. Yet this time there were fewer artists, all formally trained and having established reputations. Furthermore, several had changed their political views in light of revelations of the revelations of the Stalinist purges, the Hitler-Stalin pact, and the opening of the Second World War. For example, according to historian Joan Saab, Stuart Davis left the American Artists’ Congress in 1940 when he came to the realization that military action was stronger than art in fighting totalitarianism. Still the damage had been done. Artists were derided for their work with the WPA, their previous social and political affiliations, and even their ethnicity. Many of the same concerns voiced in objection to Roosevelt’s New Deal were raised again, only on a smaller scale.

When Advancing American Art first opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, art magazines and major newspapers with dedicated arts sections covered it. Included on the list
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were the *Art Digest*, *Art News*, *The New York Times*, the *New Yorker*, and *MKR’s Outlook*.³ Produced as the main marketing tool for the exhibition, the October 1946 issue of *Art News* served as the exhibition’s catalogue.⁴ That is, the magazine was not only sold in the United States, but it was sent along with the exhibition to venues in Europe and Latin America. The issue included an introduction to the exhibition by William Benton and J. LeRoy Davidson.⁵ Editor Alfred Frankfurter contributed the article “American Art Abroad: The State Department’s Collection,” in which he outlined the exhibition’s goals, noting its strengths, as well as its uniqueness. Perhaps trying to appeal to the overseas audience rather than discouraging their interest, Frankfurter did not claim that this exhibition asserted a national identity. Written as a promotional piece, the author favored the exhibition, but he tempered his praise so as not to sound overtly propagandistic. His article was not a critique so much as an introduction for the viewer.

In addition to the coverage in the major national newspapers and fine arts magazines, respected art critics voiced their opinions of *Advancing American Art*. Maude Kemper Riley gave a glowing review of the exhibition, with unfailing support for the tour. In her *MRK’s Art Outlook*, she took time with the paintings, writing engaging descriptions, which sought to support the initiative and entice viewership. For example, focusing on the universal meaning offered by several of the paintings, she asserted that “Ben-Zion’s *Strangled Tree* (figure 1) and his *Perpetual Destructor* (figure 2) could be read in any tongue and speak of things equally
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³ Metropolitan Museum of Art, “Clippings,” 1946, Metropolitan Museum of Art Scrapbook for Exhibitions, Watson Library, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Other newspapers ran the story. They ranged from those with large circulations in major American cities, such as the *Chicago Tribune*, to state and small town newspapers. Examples include the *Miami Herald*, the *Washington Star*, the *Seattle Times*, the *St. Louis Post Dispatcher*, the *Houston Texas Chronicle*, the *San Diego Union*, the *Elmira Sunday Telegram*, the *Orlando Sentinel*, and the *Des Moines Register*.


known to all today.” She remarked on the contributions of Stuart Davis and Werner Drewes as “intellectual.” Finally, she explained that this was not an art competition with award winners. Instead, these painters were hand selected to promote a “helpful propaganda abroad.”

Clement Greenberg was less impressed with the quality of the paintings than he was with the show’s conception. A proponent for abstraction, he expressed his concerns over “not enough good painting being done in this country.” His disappointment came from encyclopedic exhibitions of academic art. In his review of the season’s shows, he first commented that Pepsi-Cola’s “Paintings of the Year” needed a curator. The curator needed to be someone who was willing to be selective and not inclusive or pluralistic. In addition, it should be someone who would defend his or her position and not make apologies. He found such an approach with Davidson’s selections for Advancing American Art. Greenberg commended Davidson for making choices based upon the curator’s understanding of the preferences of his overseas audiences, who favored non-representational art. Furthermore, he saw the exhibition as different from those in the past because of the paintings’ “organic relation to each other.” He stated, “Mr. Davidson’s exhibition is in a way a remarkable accomplishment, and its moral should be taken to heart by others who control the public destiny of art in our country.” Of the exhibition he remarked, “In my opinion it was the best group show of this nature to be held in New York for years.”

New York’s art community did not embrace Advancing American Art wholeheartedly. Some artists did not appreciate being excluded from the exhibition, and they voiced their objections. The single act that first got the conservative media’s attention was a declaration drafted by members of the American Artists Professional League (AAPL) opposing the exhibition. On November 6, 1946, the AAPL, a group of realist painters working mostly in
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7 Ibid.


9 Ibid., 594.

10 Ibid., 593-94.
portraiture, sent it to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes in protest. The copy they sent to *Art Digest* appeared in the November 15 issue. In it, the group outlined concerns over what they perceived was the biased selection of paintings, representing a single style. They accused the government of creating a monopoly and giving one group preference over the others. Furthermore, they suggested that the State Department did not support its mission of offering democratic representation when trying to cultivate an appreciation of American art. Finally, they argued the objects selected for *Advancing American Art* fell under European influence and were, therefore, un-American. The author, Albert Reid, asked Secretary Byrnes to reconsider the collection and the credentials of his staff. After receiving the State Department’s response, Reid, on behalf of the AAPL, rebuked the department. Writing an editorial for *Art Digest*, he again characterized the collection as “unrepresentative” and shamed the agency for using taxpayers’ dollars inappropriately.

Many factors went into selecting the paintings for acquisition, and Davidson was quick to explain them. He outlined his reasons in the December 1946 issue of *The American Foreign Service Journal*. First, a deliberate goal of the exhibition was to feature “experimental” examples of modern art. The collection and exhibition would not offer an encyclopedic survey of styles or a chronological representation of the history of United States art. Responding to demands from overseas, he endeavored to show those Americans who were actively working in current stylistic trends. Thus, to make his selections, he went to the center of the American art world—New York City. Knowing the expenses related to borrowing, shipping, and insuring art, the State Department stood firm in supporting Davidson’s decision to purchase the paintings. Owning the paintings could also allow for longer tours, which would increase visibility and strengthen
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13 Reid, “A Letter from the State Department,” *Art Digest* 21 (December 15, 1946): 32. I could not determine if Reid corresponded with the Hearst Press as well, or if they picked up the story on their own.
cultural diplomacy. Furthermore, this small exhibition was one of many ongoing projects within the department’s art program, to facilitate the promotion of American art overseas.

The three publications most threatening to *Advancing American Art*, and adding to the history of anti-modernistic rhetoric, were the Hearst press’s *New York Journal American*, the popular periodical *Look* magazine, and the partisan political publication *The Republican News*. A brief background about each provides some idea of the editorial approach taken to the way content was presented.

Consumed by greed and competition, William Randolph Hearst bought the *New York Morning Journal* in 1895. He used it as the vehicle to outsell his direct competitor, Joseph Pulitzer’s *New York World*. He began by pricing the paper at a penny per issue. Not concerned with propriety or journalistic integrity, he took his paper to the extreme by printing extra large, eye-catching images and headlines, as well as featuring sensationalistic stories. His stories differed from other papers in the blatant manipulation of information, which was partly for personal gain but also in support of his politically conservative stance.

Hearst’s disdain for Communists motivated his actions. Anyone he suspected of participating in or promoting an anti-democratic agenda became a target. For example, in response to the Roosevelt administration and its New Deal programs, Hearst planned an offensive to unseat the president. He supported Governor Alf Landon of Kansas as his candidate. Leading up to the elections, Hearst used his newspapers to blaspheme Roosevelt. The heated
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16 Margaret Lynne Ausfeld similarly chose to cite these publications in her essay “Circus Girl Arrested: A History of the *Advancing American Art* Collection, 1946-1948,” in *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-1948* (Montgomery: Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, 1984), 11-32. While we have selected many of the same articles for the extremity of their positions, my purpose and interpretation differs. In particular, rather than looking at these articles as background information against which the chronological history of the exhibition is played out, I am looking at these articles as active agents in directing the course of the exhibition and its reception.

debate between the two was waged in the media through a series of editorials.\textsuperscript{18} Individual murals created for the Federal Art Project were attacked and the artists blamed.\textsuperscript{19}

Another favorite target was the American education system. Hearst’s concern for the corruption of students prompted an ambitious attack on college and university professors. The plan involved requiring all faculty taking an American history course, those suspected of Communist leanings either being fired or signing a loyalty oath to the institution stating that they were not teaching radical ideals. Suspected offenders were vilified by having their pictures printed along with a list of their alleged transgressions. To secure the needed information, writers posed as prospective students and interviewed professors at Syracuse University, New York University, and Columbia Teacher’s College. Newspaper staff drafted editorials, which were reprinted nationally. The academic community responded in two ways. The first group mounted a campaign against Hearst, which included writing editorials and letters and signing petitions. The second group discounted the attack for its anti-intellectual stance and an oversimplification of the facts.\textsuperscript{20}

By 1936, Hearst’s actions earned him the dubious distinction as one of the most hated men in the United States. The reality, however, was that by the mid-1940s the Hearst Corporation was the largest media enterprise in the world, operating regional newspapers all over the country. When \textit{Advancing American Art} came to the fore, Hearst no longer ran the newspapers, yet his muckraking approach to journalism continued through his staff.\textsuperscript{21} When discussing \textit{Advancing American Art}, one can see that the related articles employed the same subversive tactics of the “Red-Scare Crusade” from the World War I era. Only this time, the impact was just too great. The newspaper coverage brought the subject to the attention of \textit{Look} magazine, a general lifestyle magazine and competitor to \textit{Life}, and to members of Congress, which resulted in the termination of the exhibition.


\textsuperscript{19} McKinzie, \textit{The New Deal for Artists}, 110.


In the early to mid-1940s Look magazine co-founder, and former editor of the Des Moines Register, Gardner “Mike” Cowles and his colleagues vacillated between educating readers with “how-to” articles and reporting current events. Stories ranged from domestic interests to entertainment news. Taking on a picture-book format, Look appealed to a family audience. In 1947, however, the magazine experienced a makeover when Cowles hired Merle Armitage as the art director. Not only was the cover design changed, but also the contents expanded. Cowles’ wife, Fleur, brought her advertising background to the magazine. She insisted on the addition of “special departments,” which she directed, on subjects of interest to women, such as food and fashion. These additions contributed to an increased readership that reached just under three million by 1948.22

The Republican News was the newsletter of the national Republican National Committee. The newsletter provided information to subscribers on topics of interest in Washington, D.C., and around the nation. The conservative news media’s ultimate goal was self-serving. They published sensationalistic stories for financial gain. Furthermore, the New York Journal American, Look magazine, and The Republican News made clear their agenda to end the Advancing American Art exhibition and to get the government out of the art collecting business. To do so, they wanted public support, and they got it. By reproducing and altering visual images, which affected the perception of the works, they challenged the tradition of high art. They removed the paintings from the realm of aesthetics, questioned their function as examples of American identity, and made them the center of a political debate. To prove my point, I will examine both the strategies behind the manipulation of the imagery and the rhetoric.

Works of art are created with a certain audience in mind (aristocracy, religious figures, and royalty) to be viewed in very specific venues (homes, galleries, museums) and to function as ritualistic symbols of power and status. Prior to the advent of art history as an academic discipline and the gallery system as a free-market enterprise, art was not easily accessible. Art served a very specific function, as a commodity of the affluent classes. In Walter Benjamin’s “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” he argued that as such tradition was altered because technical advances allowed for the mechanical reproduction of original objects.

---

The function was changed, the quality of the original was compromised, and the power was diminished. Thus, mechanical reproduction created a crisis in the realm of high art because reproducibility equated with accessibility. Mass reproduction, in the form of printing, served a different purpose than displaying a painting in a museum. The object became a multiple and appeared in locations not suitable for a work of art--on newsstands, on posted bills, in cars, and on trains. Most newspaper reproductions were black and white. As a result, much of the surface texture was lost, as well as the contrast and clarity. With the loss of quality came the loss of authenticity, as the following example will show.

In August of 1947, the Republican National Committee, chaired by former Tennessee representative and recent member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution B. Carroll Reece, took up *Advancing American Art* as the subject of its newsletter, *The Republican News.* Consistent in format with a tabloid newspaper, the page was filled with images printed in black and white (figure 3). The title, “Art for Taxpayers,” was printed in all capital letters. White lettering on a black background, which mimicked a paintbrush stroke, stood out and was easily read. Each letter in the three words was different, reminiscent of individual blocks used in hand printing. A dollar sign replaced the “s” in the word “taxpayers.” The combined visuals of block lettering on top of a paint stroke suggest that the lines of fine art are blurred. Seven paintings were reproduced in varying sizes. Each image overlapped another, distinguished by a thin, white border. Superimposed on the pictures were the artists’ names and the paintings’ titles, covering more of the image. Furthermore, the images were enlarged, cutting off the edges and abstracting the subjects, making them less recognizable.

In the example presented above, readers were repeatedly asked to decide if what they were viewing was art. The text of the article was limited to less than a quarter of the page. A standard typeface was used. The majority of space was filled with black and white photographs.

---


24 At the top of the page was printed: “Mats of this page available for republication. Write Republican National Committee.” The committee was soliciting republication of its newsletter. *Newsweek* magazine ran its own article “It’s Striking, but Is It Art or Extravagance?” in the August 25, 1947, issue. The committee used the “Art for Taxpayers” article as the illustration. See “Art for Taxpayers,” *The Republican News,* August 1947, and “It’s Striking, but Is It Art or Extravagance,” *Newsweek,* August 25, 1947, 17.
of the original paintings. The reproductions themselves were of poor quality, in part from the mechanical nature of newspaper printing. More to the point, the paintings were meant to look as bad as they were being described in the text. They were grainy, with little distinction between the darks and lights. Their likenesses were manipulated, with the images sometimes positioned at odd angles and often cropped. Such devices changed the way the paintings were viewed, in marked contrast to their being seen hanging in a museum or gallery. Consequently, the perception was different and the meaning altered. Over each image minimal information was presented: the artist’s name, the work’s title, and in a few cases, a sentence of commentary. The caption font was sans serif and easily readable. The format was deliberate in trying to have the same psychological impact as a print ad, which influences readers to buy products. Only in this case, the articles were not selling a tangible object, a painting. Instead, the product was an anti-modernist ideology.

In February of 1947, Look magazine ran a story on the subject. Filling two pages in their February 18 issue (figure 4) was a pictorial essay of seven paintings, all reproduced in high-quality color. Each was identified by artist’s name and title. None of the images was cropped nor did any appear to be manipulated; they were equal in size. Yet, the artists were accused of using stylistic devices of “symbolism, trick perspective and bold colors” that deviated from “conservative” and “popular” norms. The article title was in boldface type, larger than the text beneath. Only the lower left corner of the page was reserved for the typescript. Like the newspaper format, the pictures spoke in place of the words, which were limited to two paragraphs. No broad context was given, and selected facts were outlined. The title delivered a harsh blow with the provocative statement, “Your Money Bought These Paintings.” The narrative did not discuss the paintings individually. Rather, it criticized the State Department for using American tax dollars to purchase paintings that would serve an overseas audience instead of an American one.

Yasuo Kuniyoshi’s Circus Girl Resting (figure 5) was featured in the two examples above, and in countless other publications. Its popularity as a target came because of the

25 Ausfeld, “Circus Girl Arrested,” 11-32. Ausfeld made this point in her essay, though it is apparent to anyone studying the newspaper articles.

26 “Your Money Bought These Paintings,” Look, February 18, 1947, 80-81.
provocative subject. The figure wears a loose-fitting red dress, trimmed with white lace along the top edge. One of the thin straps has fallen from her shoulder, down onto her arm. The curve of her breast is clearly exposed, and a hint of cleavage is seen. Her shoulders are broad and her torso thick. She is disproportionately large on top, as her legs taper below the knee. They are partially covered by opaque black thigh-high hosiery, which exposes the upper portion of her leg, between where the nylons stop and the dress begins. Her face is expressionless, as she stares out making eye contact with the viewer. The space is framed with a curtain, as if it has just been drawn and she is being presented on stage.

She invites the viewer’s gaze, but in return the viewer stares uncomfortably. She is an outcast relegated to the periphery; she represents people who fall below the poverty line and are potentially morally corrupt. The spectator is then trapped in the game of spectatorship. And those in the media, they have a distaste and disgust for the subject being rendered at all. Yet, the voyeurism continues, as the image is reproduced over and over in mainstream conservative publications. Consequently, it reaches an unprecedented number of readers, far beyond those who would have seen the original paintings on exhibit. Rather than ending the cycle, it is perpetuated by the media, who are seeking reaction from the middle class. They ask, is this what American art should represent? They quickly answer their own question with a resounding no. When visual imagery does not fit within the traditional conception of beauty, then the writer assumes the role of the critic and petitions to remove the artist’s freedom. Another point is that the viewer may not be seeing the artist’s subject at all. As Ernest Van Den Haag reminds us, “It is true that most people do not see paintings so much as themselves looking at the paintings.”

The rhetoric used in the articles added another layer to the attack. The New York Journal American was known for its propensity to provoke. Writers were encouraged to use sensational headlines, copious images, and scathing commentary, regardless of the facts. Perhaps not to appear too one-sided, staffers at the New York Journal American sought comments from artists. In these cases, the intent was to show that the newspaper had their support. For example, “Debunking State Department’s Art” featured quotes by Connecticut landscape painter David

---


Reasoner, who declared the State Department collection “a bunch of junk.” He saw three main problems with the exhibition. The paintings were mediocre, the purchase price of $43,000 for the entire collection was indicative of poor quality, and the content was un-American. These general statements were made without any discussion of the paintings as evidentiary support. Reasoner’s declarations left little room for questions or outside opinions. Apart from his comments, the article pointed out that eight of the artists participated in the United American Artists, a membership organization allegedly for people interested in Communism.  

In this instance, the media’s reaction was not merely a response to the paintings. Rather, the visual image became a substitute for the artist, who was a target of scrutiny. As much an issue as the artworks themselves was the prior political activities of some of the artists included in the exhibition.

In the above article four paintings were reproduced. They were Stuart Davis’s *Still Life with Flowers* (1930), O. Louis Guglielmi’s *Tenements* (1939), Ben Shahn’s *Renascence* (1946), and Max Weber’s *Two Vases* (1945). Each image was captioned with sardonic comments. One might assume the most biting remarks were made about the abstractions. On the contrary, the figural *Renascence* and the architectural *Tenements* were the prime targets. Using slang phrasing such as “whodunit?” as if the identity of the maker is unknown, the writer suggested an abnormal four-year-old could have painted the Shahn. He had more to say about Guglielmi’s piece.

O. Louis Guglielmi’s *Tenements* is one of several scenes of the urban environment included in the exhibition. The subject is a row of multi-story brick buildings set on the corner of a city block. The intersection is the painting’s central focus. The corner of the tallest building divides the painting in two. The main building has no obvious point of entry. On its left side, however, a tall staircase leads up to a door. The doorway and windows’ rectilinear shapes emphasize the structure’s verticality. On the right side of the painting, a wooden coffin lies in the street. One interpretation is that the building equals death. Thus, the artist appeared to be offering a social commentary on the poor housing conditions of the time.

The author captioned the image, “If you contemplate adding to the suicide rate, we recommend this picture for your guest room.” The article suggested that this could not be the best of American art because it was not uplifting. Therefore, commentary on social issues did not

---

30 Ibid.
make for popular images. Readers were invited to follow the story, as the statement “additional paintings will be published soon in this newspaper” was printed below Tenements. Creating a scenario of triviality was the author’s intention, yet these paintings were not frivolous at all. Had they been, they likely would not have been the subject of this or other articles published in the New York Journal American. The Hearst Press continued its tradition of generating a small news story, giving it repeated coverage, and thus elevating the topic to a national level. The goal of the New York Journal American was to create a mob mentality that would shame the State Department into canceling the exhibition. This idea was not new. However, the newspaper abused the paintings and the artists in a reprehensible manner.

By taking Advancing American Art as its subject, the conservative media created fervor among the middle class. The New York Journal American, Look magazine, and The Republican News propagated the exhibition so that its intent, its content, its organizers, and the politics and patriotism of its participants were called into question. The middle-brow was unwilling to accept the avant-garde nature of current artistic trends, as influenced by European models. Simply stated, some members of the middle class did not see themselves or their America in the State Department paintings. Thus, how could the collection assert an American identity if it was not an identity with which they shared? This was a question asked repeatedly by the media. Citizens asked the same questions and then took action.

Congress mounted its own attack on Advancing American Art, focusing on personal politics above aesthetics. Republican Representative John Taber of New York led the charge to sanitize the federal agency by removing any leftists from the payroll. He first served on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on relief bills in 1939. Alongside Clifton Woodrum, a Virginia Democrat, the two pushed to end the New Deal. In working to do so, they studied the Dies report named for Martin Dies, a Texas Democrat who chaired the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) that found members of the Communist Party had infiltrated Federal One. By 1948, Taber headed the House Committee on Appropriations with Karl Stefan, a Republican from Nebraska, who chaired the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on the State Department. Congressman Fred Busbey chaired this search for “reds” among the

31 Ibid.

Advancing American Art ranks. He testified that twenty of the forty-five artists were Communists. Part of his report, which was detailed in the Congressional Record, included six pages citing the offenders and their offenses. Most occurred prior to 1945; nevertheless, the dates for every exhibition and art auction are included along with publications dates for periodicals featuring illustrations. What was so striking was the level of detail in which the pro-Communist organizations were described from the more familiar publications the Daily Worker and the New Masses and groups like the John Reed Club and United American Artists to the more obscure Champion publication or the Artists’ Front to Win the War. The final component of the brief showed the checklist of the seventy-nine oil paintings and their purchase price. The primary painting discussed by Busbey was Circus Girl Resting. Most of his comments were similar to those made in the media. As a general statement, he classified the works as boring, weird or intentionally melancholic to suggest an apathetic acceptance of a new leader. The Committee on Un-American Activities put together files on the Voice of America participants at the same time as they investigated. Both programs were targeted because they were housed in the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (OIC) and their participants accused of spreading propaganda. Again Congress’ containment strategy involved dissolving the programs. The point is that the federal government and its agencies faced repeated attacks from Congress, the media, and the general public.

While the controversy that swirled around Advancing American Art, many of artists participated in other exhibitions in the United States. The activity of the selected artists should come as no surprise, for Davidson chose the works from experience and through the guidance of New York gallerists. His approach appeared to be generational. The artists can be classified into two groups. First were the modern masters, Arthur Dove, Marsden Hartley, Georgia O’Keeffe, John Marin, and Max Weber, who were affiliated with the Stieglitz Circle and whose names brought attention to the show. Second were the descendents of the Federal Art Project, whose careers were launched after work at the WPA ended. Such artists as Raymond Breinen, Philip Evergood, and Jack Levine won painting awards at annuals and biennials after work at the WPA

33 93rd Congressional Record (1947), 5221-5226.

ended. These and others contributed works to group shows at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts. The timing of the State Department’s exhibition marked the pinnacle of some of its participants’ careers. For instance, the Museum of Modern Art hosted a retrospective of Ben Shahn’s work in the fall of 1947, and Yasuo Kuniyoshi was selected as the first living artist to receive a retrospective at the Whitney Museum of American Art in March 1948. So what happened with *Advancing American Art* is one short episode in the ever-expanding story of art as the subject of political controversy.

---

CHAPTER 3
RESPONSES FROM THE ART WORLD: ACTION AS REACTION

The decision to recall the *Advancing American Art* exhibition placed the State Department under attack again, this time by proponents of modern art and cultural production. To these supporters, Secretary of State George C. Marshall’s and Congress’s actions were devastating. Ultimately, the entire art world was put on the defensive. John D. Morse, editor of the *Magazine of Art*, said it best when speaking before the Progressive Citizens of America (PCA), “We are really protesting a wave of reaction.” Los Angeles Times’ critic Arthur Millier exclaimed, “The value of art is never decided by majority vote but by the perception of those sensitive to it.” Consequently, groups mobilized, but their most effective weapon was pen and ink. Pleading to save the State Department’s painting collection, as well as the art program, hundreds of letters were addressed to President Harry Truman, Marshall, Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, and numerous elected representatives. Advocates used their positions as individuals and as affiliates of museums, universities, and arts organizations to assert their authority. Many offered to purchase the paintings outright for personal or institutional collections. The art elite spoke out on behalf of the artists’ autonomy. Rather than arguing for the merits of the works, based on their visual representations, which would only perpetuate negative

---

1 In 1947, when *Advancing American Art* was recalled, the relationship between the art world and the government was fractured. Years after this specific instance, the two would go on to create some successful projects together. For more information, see Michael Krenn, *Fallout Shelters for the Human Spirit: American Art and the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).


comments, they used sophisticated language to assert their ideology. They did not debate the content of the individual paintings. Petty discussions grounded in personal taste were omitted. Instead, protestors sought to show the reality of the situation: artists’ first amendment rights were being violated. Consequently, art supporters brought the larger issue of censorship to the forefront. Whatever the opinions about the paintings were, everyone agreed that removing them from circulation was wrong.

This chapter traces how the members of the visual art’s community reacted to the cancellation of *Advancing American Art* and what was perceived as a violation of artists’ rights. Museum administrators and art educators attempted to counter what had transpired when they believed the government went too far in asserting its authority. Proponents attempted to cause the pendulum to swing back towards the middle, striving for equal representation by American artists and their different styles. Archived correspondence shows how different groups of art professionals persuasively argued against the cancellation of *Advancing American Art*. Pressure influenced the State Department staff to convene a panel of art experts, who would assess the collection and make recommendations on how to proceed. Thus, the State Department found itself in the middle of a struggle between those who were for and those who were against modern art.

Many of the museum administrators discussed throughout this chapter worked with the government prior to *Advancing American Art*. For example, several lent expertise to the State Department as early as 1941, when art collector and philanthropist Nelson Rockefeller, chairperson of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA), underwrote the first show to travel overseas. The National Gallery of Art (NGA) took over the art exchange program in 1944, after the establishment of the Inter-American Office (IAO). Responsibilities were divided according to specialty. The State Department staff implemented policies and secured funding, while the connoisseurs organized the exhibitions. Representatives of the two sides came together in February 1945, acting as the Advisory Committee on Art to the Department of State. The committee discussed utilizing American art in foreign diplomacy, now that the war had ended. What resulted was a plan to have the State Department assume all
responsibility for the government’s art program. The department would select, purchase, and send the art around the world to carefully researched destinations.⁴

Serving on the advisory committee provided art experts with an understanding of the goals of the State Department’s Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (OIC), as they shared in creating them, which would have caused them to be more invested in the program than the average person. I posit that those involved took the greatest exception to the cancellation of Advancing American Art, but they faced a problem. Even if they objected to the handling of the exhibition, those serving on the committee did not wish to jeopardize their relationship with the government, from whom they could benefit in the future. The State Department, too, was at a crossroads. The government respected the authority held by these influential representatives of the arts, many of whom had wealth and power.

Still, the subject was so prevalent, as the controversy intensified, that it became a topic for the “national affairs” section, rather than the art section, of mainstream news magazines, including Time and Newsweek. Comments were directly attributed to major political figures, demonstrating their partisanship. The painters were cast out for not conforming to the general public’s conception of American identity in their work. For example, Senator Karl Stefan remarked on the paintings in the February 24 issue of Time, “Millions of foreigners…would see these horrible things and wonder if it isn’t true about Americans being so crazy.”⁵ President Truman’s comments were in line with his constituents. Speaking to reporters on the subject of art, the president placed the February 18 issue of Look magazine before his audience, pointed to a picture of Circus Girl Resting by Yasuo Kuniyoshi, and exclaimed, “If that’s art, then I’m a Hottentot.”⁶ Truman made his opinion known again in a letter to Benton: “I don’t pretend to be

⁴ Krenn, Fall-Out Shelters for the Human Spirit, 18-20.

⁵ “National Affairs: Congress Week,” Time, February 24, 1947, 24. See also “Art: The Secretary as Critic,” Time, April 14, 1947, 53. Professor Edgar Albin of the University of Tulsa was insulted and referenced Stefan’s statement in his letter. He claimed that the senator missed the point, as he had “a rather shallow understanding of the whole development of art since Cezanne.” Edgar A. Albin to George C. Marshall, 30 April 1947, RG 59, Records of Assistant Secretary of State, 1947-49, subject file, box 7, Art folder, National Archives and Records Administration.

an artist or a judge of art, but I am of the opinion that so-called modern art is merely the vaporings of half-baked, lazy people. An artistic production is one which shows infinite ability for taking pains and if any of these so-called modern paintings show any such infinite ability, I am very much mistaken.”

Comments such as these ridiculed the paintings, and humiliated the artists. Yet, the overwhelming resistance against canceling the tour spurned the art world not to give up. From March through July, the more the subject appeared in the news, the more letters were mailed to Washington. To make sense of the volume of correspondence submitted, and the points made, the letters have been grouped into the following categories: arts organizations, museum administrators, and academic institutions.

The first group under consideration is membership-based arts organizations, with one of the most active being the American Federation of Arts (AFA). In response to the suspension of the art program, the AFA, which originally purchased thirty-five watercolors for the State Department, took action. The organization used its own publication, Magazine of Art, to solicit readers to write letters. They also invited members to attend their annual meeting on May 28, 1947, where artists’ rights would be discussed. At the same meeting, three important resolutions were adopted. The first directly addressed the Advancing American Art controversy. Here, the AFA called on Congress to restart the State Department’s art programs. Furthermore, they recommended the involvement of art professionals to ensure its success. The second and third resolutions were not about Advancing American Art, but they did relate to cultural exchange. The AFA lobbied for better United States representation of the visual arts at the next UNESCO meeting in Mexico City. Also, they advocated for the repatriation of over two hundred paintings to Germany, originally brought to the United States after the war. The paintings were not named.

The organization with the most influence was the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD). Its members decided to take action during the annual meeting, in response to the State
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Department’s cancellation of the exhibition. The group drafted a resolution and submitted it to Secretary Marshall. Using similar terminology to the AFA, the AAMD expressed its support of the State Department’s overseas activities, asked Congress to draft legislation that would provide for the art program in the future, and offered its services to supply whatever was needed.\(^\text{10}\)

Museum directors also submitted approximately thirty individual letters in favor of the show, to which some added personal condemnation of those who were against it. One of the first institutions to respond was the Walker Art Center, Davidson’s former employer. Director Defenbacher’s letter accused the secretary of state of being easily influenced by public opinion. He then went on to describe the type of people protesting the exhibition as average citizens.\(^\text{11}\) He reminded Secretary Marshall of what year it was, and suggested his regressive behavior was reminiscent of 1847. Attempting to speak about something more familiar to his audience, Defenbacher made a case for the importance of forward thinking by comparing art to science. Trying to balance his criticisms, the director explained his own dislike for some of the paintings. Then he described things to which he had a stronger aversion, such as war and other problems of greater significance. His point was that taste should not impact personal expression. When it does, we compromise the freedoms on which our nation was founded. Defenbacher concluded by comparing *Advancing American Art*’s cancellation to the censorship of art in Germany in the 1930s.\(^\text{12}\)

The Museum of Modern Art’s Board Chairman, John Hay Whitney, made it clear that he was writing on behalf of his board of trustees. Trying to sound diplomatic, he remarked that the board was reserving judgment, giving the State Department a chance to make a statement. He cited reasons for the need and value of modern art, based on the museum’s mission. He stated that his institution showed contemporary art and embraced avant-garde styles. Furthermore, he believed all art should be available to audiences nationwide and abroad, even examples that were

\(^{10}\) William M. Milliken to Marshall, 20 June 1947, RG 59, Records of Assistant Secretary of State, 1947-49, subject file, box 7, Art folder, National Archives and Records Administration.

\(^{11}\) D. S. Defenbacher to Marshall, 9 April 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
unfamiliar or not readily accepted.\textsuperscript{13} This belief was grounded in the success the institution had with its Office of Circulating Exhibitions, which had been touring exhibitions to museums, colleges, and universities in the United States since 1933. In addition, during the early 1940s the MOMA organized overseas’ exhibitions for the Office of War Information, which was the predecessor to the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.\textsuperscript{14} Therefore, a precedent was already set for exhibiting American artistic production abroad.

James S. Plaut of the Institute of Modern Art, Boston, thought it reprehensible when the media raised suspicions as to the artists’ politics. In May 1947, he suggested that the media and Congress were wrong to go on a witch hunt. He claimed that such endeavors were pointless because without individualism there would be no creative expression.\textsuperscript{15} Plaut’s comments summed up the beliefs held by museum directors, who echoed those same sentiments.

As important as it was to have every association protest, those with considerable numbers of members attracted the most attention. A good example is the Progressive Citizens of America (PCA), who were able to solicit participation from the country’s leading arts proponents, including artists, arts groups, writers, educators, and museum professionals. The PCA held a high-profile meeting on May 5, 1947, at the Capitol Hotel in New York. The event was co-sponsored by An American Group, Artists Equity, Artists League of New York, Audubon Society, New York Society of Women Painters, Serigraph Society, and the Sculptors Guild.\textsuperscript{16} At the assembly a resolution was drafted, much like the one submitted by the AFA, protesting the tour’s cancellation. Over six-hundred people signed the document, which was sent to both President Truman and Secretary Marshall. The roster included museum administrators Juliana Force of the Whitney Museum of American Art, and D. S. Defenbacher of the Walker Art

\textsuperscript{13} John Hay Whitney to Marshall, 9 May 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.


\textsuperscript{15} James S. Plaut to Marshall, 22 May 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.

Center. Other important figures included writers Edward Alden Jewell and John D. Morse. More than half of the artists featured in the exhibition signed the statement, as did the dealers from whose galleries the paintings were purchased. The hope was to effect change by obtaining and presenting the signatures of so many highly influential individuals. Additionally, the meeting was significant because of its press coverage.

In addition to the unified voice against cancellation of the exhibition, high profile converts to the cause dramatized the controversy. The Florida Federation of Art openly condemned *Advancing American Art* in a letter to Senator Claude Pepper dated March 26, 1947. Just two months later, on May 28, the group retracted its initial statement, writing this time in support of continuing the tour. The members realized that it was better to have an exhibition of contemporary American art, rather than none at all. They claimed the *Look* photo essay was the reason for their disapproval; however, they conceded that the Hearst press had too much of an impact on members of Congress and the State Department. Consequently, they acknowledged the value of making cultural contributions to audiences overseas as a method of balancing the skewed perception of the United States. Therefore, members of the Florida Federation of Art altered their stance. They recognized how something happening miles away could impact their personal artistic production.

Another example of a change in stance came from Naomi Lorne, an officer in the Audubon Society, who targeted President Truman with a letter in which she referenced previous correspondence from Truman in support of the group. Unlike other letters where protests were directed at the State Department, Lorne focused on how the American Artists Professional League (AAPL) endeavored to end *Advancing American Art*. She claimed the AAPL had monopolized most civic projects over the years, and she believed someone else deserved a turn. She said that the organization solicited her participation in asking representatives to cut all funding to the art program. Requesting her support was not out of the question, but the phrasing
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17 Mildred Constantine to Marshall, 13 May 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.

in the letter from the AAPL alarmed her. The letter’s contents read like something produced by
the Third Reich suggesting that museums, art schools, and federal departments be fumigated to
kill off the perpetuation of any foreign or liberal ideas.\textsuperscript{19} Such vehement rejection and pervasive
scrutiny alienated the artists. The idea of cleansing cultural and educational institutions alarmed
Lorne. Rather than joining the crusade, she argued against the prejudice and the invasion into
people’s personal beliefs. She singled out Senator Styles Bridges and Congressmen John Taber
and Karl Stefan as the individuals responsible for cutting appropriations. What is more, she
chastised these men for failing to uphold justice. In closing, she requested the president rectify
the situation by having Secretary Marshall reinstate the tour.\textsuperscript{20} Lorne spoke passionately,
admitting her mistake of getting caught up in the initial frenzy over the painting collection. She
recognized what so many had not, that the artists went from being the finest living painters to
Communist sympathizers. Many of them were immigrants, and were then rebuked as foreigners.
Trying to correct her error, she used her standing in the Audubon Society to persuade Truman.

The next group to challenge the State Department consisted of colleges and universities,
both public and private. Some of the nation’s top art schools responded, such as Smith College
and Stanford University. Criticisms were made against the federal agency for disrespecting the
artists, stifling artistic freedom, and preventing further cultural exchange.\textsuperscript{21} Most of the letters
came from department chairpersons or individual instructors, while others contained signatures
of the entire departmental faculty.

Mary Schneiders, chairperson of the Union Gallery Committee at the University of
Wisconsin, dealt regularly with complaints about the subject matter of student work shown at her
venue. She offered insight based on her experience: acknowledge that everyone has a different

\textsuperscript{19} Naomi Lorne to Truman, 22 April 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49,
box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{21} Dr. Clarence Kennedy to Dean Acheson, 18 March 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department
of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration; Ray Faulkner to
Marshall, 20 June 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708,
National Archives and Records Administration.
opinion, realize that consensus will not be reached, and accept that tolerating free expression is better than fearing it.\textsuperscript{22}

Regionalist painter Alexandre Hogue, Head, Department of Art at the University of Tulsa, made the point that he represented an entire population who seldom wrote letters protesting government actions. He remarked that the seriousness of this case warranted a response because he believed the artists’ first amendment rights were in jeopardy. Drawing a parallel between freedom of speech using words and freedom of speech using one’s hands, Hogue argued that constraining expression is the same. By disallowing people to see what the artists were trying to say, the State Department acted as “fascists.”\textsuperscript{23}

As the above examples suggest, letters came from other art enthusiasts, and their concerns were the same. Each objected to the cancellation of the tour, expressed support for contemporary art, and this exhibition in particular, and voiced fear of censoring free expression. Each agreed that a person’s political beliefs were as sacred as his or her religious beliefs. In addition, many found fault with elected officials, especially former military figures, for any decisions about the fate of the art program. Furthermore, the quickness with which decisions were made showed uncertainty, almost panic, about how to resolve this impasse. The influence of the media was apparent. Supporters thought that the artists should have been spared persecution, so they chose to assert their beliefs of equal rights for all, over their personal politics.

Liberal thinkers throughout the United States rallied around \textit{Advancing American Art}. One reason was because of its inclusion in the first UNESCO fine art exhibition in Paris. Although the art program was not created specifically to serve UNESCO, the two were inextricably linked in some people’s minds. For example, Edgar Albin, Associate Professor of Art, University of Tulsa, referred to the show as “the UNESCO exhibition” in his letter to Secretary Marshall. He chose language closely reflecting United Nations’ goals of global

\textsuperscript{22} Mary E. Schneiders to Marshall, 2 May 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.

\textsuperscript{23} Alexandre Hogue to Marshall, 30 April 1947, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, 1945-49, box 4708, National Archives and Records Administration.
unification to make his point.\textsuperscript{24} William Bostwick, of the Detroit Institute of Arts, expressed similar sentiments. He viewed the \textit{Advancing American Art} crisis on a global scale, not a national one.\textsuperscript{25} Both individuals characterized art as a visual representation of civilization. Also, they recognized the significance of art as a relatable subject that could cross cultural boundaries. Consequently, other art intellectuals, like these men, did not simply write letters of protest, but intentionally made reference to UNESCO to add validity to their case. People affiliated with the arts had a clear conception of UNESCO’s goals of bridging cultures using universal themes. Consequently, many people used the strategy of linking the exhibition to the broader mission of UNESCO in their letter-writing campaigns. The appeal to participate in UNESCO sponsored exhibitions came out of our inherent competitive spirit—to showcase our achievements and to not be left out. Those who appreciated the vanguard nature of American art were not threatened by the perception of its standing for our national identity. They recognized the political significance of participating in UNESCO programs, reminded the department of the successes achieved thus far at international venues, and admonished the secretary of state for reneging on global obligations. If the State Department lost its art program, it would signify the loss of a cultural identity outside of our borders. America would continue to be perceived as a land of industrialism and militarism.

Arts organizations and museum administrators nationwide protested the State Department in writing, but one group was noticeably absent—the artists. Many of their names appeared on the Progressive Citizens of America’s resolution, but any letters that might have been written do not survive. In a speech at the American Federation of Arts’ May 1947 meeting, artist Peppino Mangravite offered suggestions to his fellow artists on how to maneuver through the current political climate. He cautioned his colleagues about entering a political debate as a means of defense. He maintained that the meaning of the art is often lost when the artist’s politics come to define his personal identity, more so than his cultural contributions. He proposed that rather than giving in to the pressure to conform to a government dictated artistic style, artists should stand

\textsuperscript{24} Albin to Marshall, 30 April 1947, RG 59, Records of the Assistant Secretary of State, 1947-1949, subject file, box 7, Art folder, National Archives and Records Administration.

\textsuperscript{25} William A. Bostwick to Marshall, 24 March 1947, RG 59, Records of the Assistant Secretary of State, 1947-1949, subject file, box 7, Art folder, National Archives and Records Administration.
their ground. Rise above the attacks and respond through visual expression, thereby keeping art and politics separate. He asked artists to continue making art that was personal, without compromise. Mangravite’s speech reached a wider audience when it was published in the September 1947 issue of *American Artist.* His comments can be considered a call to action, a rally cry for those whose reputations had been harmed. Whatever the chosen method, members of the arts’ communities maintained a level of professional decorum in their responses to and interactions with the government.

All of the efforts seemed to be in vain because on April 1, 1947, Heindel eliminated Davidson’s position as Visual Arts Specialist. Termination would take effect April 30. Heindel’s tone sounded regretful, questioning the future of the art program without someone to lead it. The bulk of the letter praised the curator’s achievements. Davidson, being a primary target as curator of *Advancing American Art,* had verbally offered his resignation on several occasions thinking it might help save the program, but had not yet tendered it in writing. Upon receiving Heindel’s letter, he responded that he would not resign any earlier than April 30, but would leave when the position was abolished.

A solution to the absence of a staff art specialist was to form a panel of art experts, much like the Advisory Committee on Art earlier in the decade. Prior to the exhibition’s cancellation, discussions were already underway in Washington about how to deal with the paintings once they were returned to the United States. In March of that same year, Heindel and Kenneth Holland composed a list of art specialists as prospective panelists. The panel’s primary purpose was to avoid prolonging congressional scrutiny of the department’s cultural program. The experts would assess the current collection. Additionally, they could suggest strengths and weaknesses, to be corrected prior to circulating future exhibitions. Finally, the group could make recommendations for how best to dispose of the paintings, if necessary.


27 Richard H. Heindel to J. LeRoy Davidson, 1 April 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art.

28 Ibid.

The names included professionals, many of whom already had a working relationship with the OIC. They were Juliana Force, director, Whitney Museum of American Art; Hudson Walker, president, American Federation of Arts; Henry Hope, chairman, Department of Fine Arts, Indiana University; James J. Sweeney, former director of paintings, Museum of Modern Art; Daniel Catton Rich, director, Chicago Art Institute; Grace L. McCann Morley, director, San Francisco Museum of Art; Duncan Phillips, director, Phillips Memorial Gallery; Perry T. Rathbone, director, City Art Museum, St. Louis; and a member of the advisory board of the Encyclopedia Britannica Collection. Before convening the committee, two things needed to happen. The first was to obtain security clearances. The second was to transfer the paintings back to New York, so that the originals would be available for review.

William Benton became responsible for the collection after Davidson’s departure. His actions, detailed below, lead me to believe that he tried to shirk responsibility and assign blame to others so that he could avoid being the scapegoat for the controversy. By the beginning of May, no action had been taken to convene a meeting, which made Benton anxious. On May 3, 1947, he wrote a memorandum questioning why the art review committee had not met. His impatience was met with the explanation that security clearances had not yet been granted; yet he did nothing to speed up the process. Instead, he made a notation of the reason and passed it on to his superiors. The answer seemed insufficient and prompted Holland’s staff to the call the security office each day, which did not seem to expedite the matter. On May 28, Benton again

---


32 Benton to Sargeant and Holland, 3 May 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art.

33 Ibid. This copy has handwritten notations of the reasons for the delay. The top left corner has a hand-written date, which I believe is 5/20, so I am presuming that Benton wrote on the original memorandum and then resubmitted it to his colleagues as a follow up.
asked for answers to take to the Senate Appropriations Committee’s June meeting.\textsuperscript{34} A response came on the same day indicating that all prospective panelists were cleared, and they were being contacted via telephone to confirm their participation.\textsuperscript{35} The final committee was reduced to five. They were Force, Phillips, Sweeney, Rathbone, Morley, and Rich. A memorandum suggested that the group either meet immediately or wait until the fall. As it turned out, many of the panelists were spending the summer in Europe and were unavailable. State Department officials believed that a fall meeting would be better because Congress would have decided on appropriations by then. Consequently, the future of the art program and the parameters within which the advisory board could work would already be established.\textsuperscript{36} Benton agreed with the rationale for having the panel meet later in the year, but he was concerned that the delay would be perceived as procrastination.\textsuperscript{37}

Because the art panel would not meet until fall, Benton suggested a press release be published over the summer to demonstrate the department’s efforts to salvage the art program. He wanted to include the names and credentials of the participants, the panel’s purpose, and when they would convene.\textsuperscript{38} However, his suggestion was challenged. Holland believed that more publicity would spark more controversy, and that Congress needed to be informed on an inquiry-only basis. Furthermore, his disagreed that the art panel should be a permanent group of advisors. Depending on the appropriations, or lack thereof, there may not be a need for the committee.\textsuperscript{39} Holland’s comments implied that the fate of the exhibition had been sealed, or

\textsuperscript{34} Benton to Sargeant, 28 May 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art.

\textsuperscript{35} Sargeant to Benton, 28 May 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art, Washington, D.C.

\textsuperscript{36} Holland to Stone and Benton, 3 June 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art.

\textsuperscript{37} Benton to Sargeant and Holland, 4 June 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{39} Holland to Benton, 3 July 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American Art.
perhaps he just wished the ordeal would end. Benton conceded to Holland’s suggestion and
tabled any public announcement until the meeting was scheduled. However, he continued to
advance his agenda by asking if the committee could be announced in early August.\textsuperscript{40} A press
release was drafted by Holland’s office and was circulated for review.\textsuperscript{41} John Howe, assistant to
Benton, stopped distribution this time. He envisioned that a release would draw more attention to
the State Department because the media would solicit comments from the individual panelists.
His greatest fear was the further reproduction of the paintings with new, but equally negative
captions. Thus, he believed the department should err on the side of caution either by not
publicizing the meeting, or, if necessary, by making the release brief and uninteresting.\textsuperscript{42}

While delays became the standard mode of operation, there is one more document to
consider. A confidential memorandum with the subject line “Decision on the show ‘Advancing
American Art’” was circulated, undated and unsigned. Three names appear at the top: William
Benton, Stewart Brown, and Howland Sargeant. It is assumed that these three men were the
recipients, but the author is unknown. The opening offers an alternative to convening the panel.
The author suggests disbanding the committee, soliciting feedback from approximately fifty arts
professionals, and then selling the paintings.\textsuperscript{43} But then the author contradicts himself itemizing
the reasons the art panel must meet. His first reason came from Benton’s testimony in the
congressional hearings. There Benton stated that a panel of experts would meet to help the State
Department come to a resolution about the painting collection. His sworn testimony was a
promise to art supporters. Next, assurances were made in responses signed by Secretary
Marshall. Thus, the meeting was obligatory.\textsuperscript{44} Yet the panel did not meet. During September and

\textsuperscript{40} Benton to Holland, 15 July 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of American
Art.

\textsuperscript{41} Holland to Sargeant, 25 August 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of
American Art.

\textsuperscript{42} Howe to Sargeant 8 September 1947, Advancing American Art (microfilm), Archives of
American Art.

\textsuperscript{43} Memorandum to Brown, Sargeant, and Benton, n.d., Advancing American Art (microfilm),
Archives of American Art.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
October, Holland spoke to the panelists individually. He conveyed the sentiments of the president, secretary of state, and congress that the collection was to be sold and the art program disbanded. Having already voiced their opinions against the show’s abrupt end, there was no choice but to concede to the sale.\textsuperscript{45} By November 28, 1947, the paintings were stored in a Manhattan warehouse, where they were obscured from view.

The State Department’s efforts to form a panel of experts can be viewed as a positive sign of compromise. Because the art panel never convened, we cannot know if its members could have saved the paintings. When one considers the entire body of correspondence related to the \textit{Advancing American Art} and the creation of the art panel, evidence emerges demonstrating that the department staff could do little to defend the exhibition. The underlying tone of the memorandums indicates that employees were instructed to put off scheduling a meeting for as long as possible. Benton made sure of this. His last act in office was to investigate how the War Assets Administration would handle the sale.\textsuperscript{46} He submitted his findings and then resigned, effective Tuesday, September 30, 1947.\textsuperscript{47} Other staff members were dismissed as the art program came to an end. Thus, the State Department’s efforts fell short of the administration’s expectations. Art advocates lost this round, but they were not defeated.

By October 1947 the flame standing for what was \textit{Advancing American Art} was snuffed out. The paintings were no longer accessible to anyone, until the auction. As the events of the year came to a close and the sale of the paintings was being planned, the controversy diminished. Though ardent supporters of the arts did not succeed in influencing the State Department to reverse its decision, this chapter is a testament to the strength of individual and collectives voices in support of modern American art. Without the strength in numbers and the stature of many in the art world, the outcome for \textit{Advancing American Art} may have been different. Because art experts lobbied on behalf of the collection, the paintings did not completely disappear nor were

\textsuperscript{45} Holland to Brown, 29 October 1947, RG 59, Records of the Assistant Secretary of State, 1947-1949, subject file, box 7, Art folder, National Archives and Records Administration.

\textsuperscript{46} Benton to Marshall, 30 September 1947, Exhibitions section, Advancing American Art file, United States Information Agency Historical Collection.

they destroyed. Instead, the auction provided an opportunity for those seeking to reclaim the paintings and to restore the diminished reputations of the artists involved.
CHAPTER 4

THE USES OF ADVANCING AMERICAN ART IN BUILDING AN ART DEPARTMENT AND ESTABLISHING AN IDENTITY FOR AUBURN UNIVERSITY

The focus of this and the next chapter is on the second life of the *Advancing American Art*. I am investigating the topic of how Southern universities developed their fine art collections, and more specifically, those universities who acquired paintings from the *Advancing American Art* exhibition. I want to find out why the paintings were acquired (because of their price, as educational tools), how they were used at these universities (for university propaganda, to establish an identity, to enhance teaching, to bring the paintings to a wider audience), and the challenges these universities faced in owning pieces from the collection. I want to help audiences understand that universities, as institutions of higher learning, were not exempt from prevailing 1940s ideologies. Consequently, this and the following chapter demonstrate what happens when the private enterprise of artistic production is presented to a democratic public. My study reemphasizes the extreme conservatism subscribed to by many Americans during the mid-twentieth century. As we will see, regional differences affected the collection’s reception, as did the ways in which the paintings were programmed.

In the case of Auburn University, formerly Alabama Polytechnic Institute, the school faced great challenges in making the artworks known to a broad audience. Unlike the University of Georgia, also under consideration, Auburn acquired thirty-six paintings from the War Assets Administration without a plan for how to use them or a place to house them. Rather than creating a repository that would house encyclopedic examples of America’s cultural production, the
faculty and staff were faced with what to do with a small collection of modern art. Using the paintings for educational purposes was obvious, but without an exhibition space, the faculty devised an alternate plan. I will argue that they utilized the paintings as university propaganda to promote the progressiveness of the art department and to make those outside of academics aware of Auburn University’s cultural offerings. Members of the art department endeavored to display the collection to a wider audience, thus positioning themselves as proponents for contemporary art. Founder of the Art Department, and department head, Frank Applebee sought to raise the stature of the program, and Auburn University, to a national level. He did so by trying to change the school’s identity from an agricultural school to one that promoted a liberal arts education. In doing so, he sought to fill a void in the cultural landscape by taking advantage of an opportunity to bring examples by nationally recognized urban artists to the Southeastern United States. Indeed, two of the most recognized images from the collection were obtained by Auburn. At the same time, the collection served to advance the curriculum at a time of institutional growth due to returning veterans. Furthermore, the attention given to these paintings aided in expanding the art historical canon to include more examples of American art, as well as to develop a broader audience for it. A discussion of the uses of the paintings, and subsequent responses to them, both positive and negative, over a span of fifty years, will demonstrate the above points showing how the paintings came to be identified with Auburn University.

Advancing American Art became the subject of an exhibition in 1984, organized by the Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts. The catalogue featured two essays by Margaret Lynne Ausfeld and Virginia Mecklenburg. Ausfeld studied the collection’s tumultuous history from its acquisition by the United States State Department, its tour, and finally, its dispersal. A discussion of the paintings being purchased by universities is given cursory attention. Mecklenburg’s essay adeptly situates the paintings within the larger framework of twentieth-century artistic movements. My role is to amplify the sociopolitical context of Ausfeld and Mecklenburg’s essays by taking the dialogue from a national focus to a local one. What happened to the paintings once they arrived in the Southeast? What was the response to the content presented? How did the universities attempt to make the works meaningful to their audiences?

Unlike the other universities in this study, Auburn has the most complete records of the school of art’s activities from which a fairly comprehensive picture of the Advancing American Art collection’s second life can be traced. The collection at Auburn was the subject of a book
written in 1986, and republished in 2005, by Taylor Littleton and Maltby Sykes. They provide a brief history to the social and political climate of the nation, and specifically public universities in the 1950s. They situate the collection within the context of major stylistic trends of the early twentieth century. Finally, they offer a general framework as to how the paintings were acquired by the university. However, the authors failed to utilize the archival resources held by the university in order to provide a comprehensive history of the collection at Auburn. Important details of the administration and faculty’s role in obtaining the paintings were omitted. Additionally, they were unsuccessful in demonstrating how the collection was significant to the university. In sum, their book offers a romanticized history of and praise for the collection. My investigation delves more deeply into the collection’s history and function.

In order to understand how the Advancing American Art paintings contributed to the cultural identity of this regional university, a review of the art department’s history provides a starting point. Auburn’s School of Architecture and Allied Arts was established in 1927, but real growth did not come until the 1940s. Like other institutions who accepted the G. I. Bill, Auburn saw enrollments increase after the Second World War. Records indicate that the School of Architecture and the Arts had one hundred sixty-three students in the 1941-42 academic year. By the summer of 1945, the numbers dropped to fifty-seven, only to skyrocket to five hundred sixty-six in 1948 (figure 6). Of the five hundred plus students in the school, one hundred seventeen were applied art majors.\(^1\) The school was unprepared to accommodate the sudden influx of students, seventy-five percent of whom were veterans.

Art department administrators and faculty were interested in strengthening the program to become competitive. Consequently, an investment in discipline specific resources was required to serve students’ needs. For example, the school added nine thousand five hundred slides to the visual resources collection. They also purchased texts such as *Summa Artis*, *Propylaean Kunstgeschichte*, *Enciclopedia Italiana*, and twenty-six volumes of *The Builder* magazine. Beginning in 1945, Professor Joseph Marino-Merlo worked with the director of Student Affairs

---

\(^1\) Alabama Polytechnic Institute Art Department, “Criteria for the Design of a Building for the School of Architecture and the Arts, Alabama Polytechnic Institute,” 12 January 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.
to coordinate a program to borrow traveling exhibitions (figure 7).2 It was only a matter of time before the department would develop a collection of original objects from which to teach.

In the spring of 1948, the university acquired its first fine arts collection made up of graphic arts. Donations were given by students, alumni, and faculty.3 The media ranged from etching, dry point, woodcut, and engraving to serigraphy and lithography. Well-known American artists were represented, such as Thomas Hart Benton, George Biddle, Adolf Dehn, William Gropper, Wolfe Kahn, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, and John Sloan.4 In that same year, the school expressed interest in the auction of the State Department collection.5

Applebee saw the value of the State Department Collection to Auburn University by virtue of the stature of the artists within it. Acquiring the paintings would enhance the department’s teaching goals, while also serving as a marketing tool for the university. Actions taken to acquire, promote, and circulate the collection demonstrate Applebee’s belief that the paintings would be valuable to other institutions as well. To obtain his goal, he persuasively conveyed his ideas to Turpin C. Bannister, the school’s dean, asking that Auburn request to purchase the entire collection. Honoring the request, Bannister wrote to George Decker of the United States Office of Education. He outlined the school’s plan for becoming a destination for the study of American art, of which this collection would become the “nucleus.” Furthermore, he talked about the importance of bringing such a collection to the South and the effect it would

---

2 Turpin C. Bannister, “Four Years of Growth in the School of Architecture and the Arts,” 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, school history file, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

3 Ibid.

4 Auburn University Department of Art, “First Acquisitions Permanent Print Collection Alabama Polytechnic Institute,” 16 May 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, exhibition brochure, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

5 Applebee learned of the sale from Dorsey R. Barron, the Surplus Property Agent for the university. Frank W. Applebee to Mitchell D. Kahan, 27 April 1982, Frank W. Applebee Papers, Auburn University Library.
have on the university community, and especially the students, as well as residents of the State of Alabama and beyond.\textsuperscript{6}

Next, Applebee secured university president Ralph B. Draughon’s support. In doing so, he knew he could rely on the president to call upon his contacts, which included Ernest V. Hollis, Chief of the Veterans Educational Facilities Program, the United States Office of Education; George W. Andrews, representative from Alabama; and Joseph Lister Hill and John Jackson Sparkman, senators from Alabama. The hope was that these four gentlemen could persuade George H. Field, commissioner of the Federal Works Agency, and Jess Larson, War Assets Administrator, to award Auburn University the entire collection. Each of the elected officials took action based on the recommendation.\textsuperscript{7} Congressman Andrews wrote, “I … have issued a forceful plea as to your need for these paintings,” and “it is my intention to leave no stone unturned in an effort to help you.”\textsuperscript{8} In response, John C. Ten Eyck, deputy administrator for Personal Property Disposal, assured Andrews that he would forward all correspondence regarding Auburn University’s interest in the State Department collection to the New York Regional Office, which was conducting the sale. He guaranteed, “Every consideration consistent with existing regulations is given to the bids which may be submitted by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute.”\textsuperscript{9}

Unfortunately, Auburn did not secure an advantage over other bidders. Both the War Assets Administration and the Federal Works Agency confirmed that the sale would be “in full

\textsuperscript{6} Bannister to George Decker, 20 May 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

\textsuperscript{7} Based on later reactions to the paintings once acquired, I posit that Applebee neither disclosed the subjects of the paintings, if he even knew them, nor their styles to university administrators or to state politicians. I believe Andrews, Hill, and Sparkman would have given more consideration to supporting the acquisition had they possessed more information.

\textsuperscript{8} Quoted material comes from George Andrews to Applebee, 4 June 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library. See also Andrews to Ralph B. Draughon, 1 June 1948; John Sparkman to Draughon, 2 June 1948; and Lister Hill to Draughon, 2 June 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

\textsuperscript{9} John C. Ten Eyck to Andrews, 8 June 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.
accordance with the Surplus Property Act.\textsuperscript{10} Public Law 697 and Amendment 3 to Order 7 of the War Assets Administration’s Regulation 14 stipulated that public universities could purchase the artworks at auction for a ninety-five percent discount.\textsuperscript{11} The laws made it clear that colleges would likely receive priority bidding because few private collectors would pay fair market value for the paintings.\textsuperscript{12}

Applebee worked diligently in preparation for the auction. He drafted a list of artworks the school would be interested in owning. Anticipating competition, he made an initial list of fifty-three.\textsuperscript{13} Next, he offered an approximation of how many paintings he believed Auburn could obtain and for how much. He estimated the school could afford to buy about forty artworks, if priced around twenty-five dollars each. Once the discount was taken, the university would be spending about one thousand dollars in all. After the auction ended, the event managers notified Applebee that Auburn was awarded thirty-six paintings.\textsuperscript{14} Applebee requested a check
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\textsuperscript{14} Barron to P. R. Yurkiewicz, 20 June 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library. The letter mentioned a previous telephone conversation regarding coordinating payment and shipping. The paintings included twenty-four oils and twelve watercolors: The oil paintings were Ben-Zion, \textit{End of Don Quixote} (no date); Ben-Zion, \textit{The Strangled Tree} (no date); Byron Browne, \textit{Still Life in Red, Yellow, and Green} (1945); Paul Burlin, \textit{News from Home} (1944); George Constant, \textit{Rock Crabs} (no date); Ralston Crawford, \textit{Plane Production} (no date); Julio De Diego, \textit{Under Stiff Rearguard Action} (1942); Joseph De Martini, \textit{The Ravine} (no date); Arthur Dove, \textit{Grey Greens} (1942); Werner Drewes, \textit{A Dark Thought} (1943); Werner Drewes, \textit{Gaiety in Times of Distress} (1943); Philip Evergood, \textit{Fascist Leader} (1946); William Gropper, \textit{Home} (no date); O. Louis Guglielmi, \textit{Subway Exit} (1946); Robert Gwathmey, \textit{Worksong} (1946); Frank Kleinholtz, \textit{Bank Night} (no
be issued to the treasurer of the United States for one thousand seventy-two dollars and sixty-five cents.\textsuperscript{15} Monies were withdrawn from the art department’s current budget, and any overage came out of the next year’s budget.\textsuperscript{16} Applebee later commented that his part “consisted of making the selections of the paintings, which I thought were of the most valuable significance.”\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, many of the artists whose works were included in the State Department collection were the same artists whose prints Auburn University already owned. Consequently, the school became keeper of multiple examples by America’s leading contemporary artists.

With the paintings in the university’s possession, Applebee publicized the collection with fervor and the media responded with interest. The resulting articles included: “34 Paintings added to API Collection.” \textit{Lee County Bulletin}, Auburn, June 24, 1948; “Auburn College Purchases 34 Oil Paintings from War Assets Group,” \textit{Daily News}, Opelika, June 25, 1948; and “Auburn Will Get Two More Paintings from Famed State Department Collection,” \textit{Auburn Plainsman}, Auburn, June 30, 1948. The \textit{Birmingham News}’ headline read, “Auburn Gets Art Bargain: API One of Six Colleges to Bid on Collection Held by WAA.” The stories focused on
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the collection’s history, including the controversy, the low price paid for the paintings, and their importance to the university. For instance, the Plainsman compared the market value of the collection, at approximately eighteen thousand dollars, against what was paid for it, which was an average of twenty-nine dollars and thirty cents per painting.\(^{18}\) Applebee was again quoted: “Through the obtaining of these paintings, A.P.I. will have a contemporary painting collection that probably will not be surpassed by that of any other school in the nation.”\(^ {19}\) Writing to George E. Lewis of the Alabama Art League, he said, “It is our belief that these paintings will do more good here than they would have done in some of the big centers.”\(^ {20}\)

One way in which Applebee strove to counter stereotypes of provincialism in the South was by seeking national media attention. For instance, Applebee wrote to Peyton Boswell, editor of The Art Digest, stating, “We need such a collection and it will be of tremendous importance in stimulating appreciation for contemporary American art in the Deep South.”\(^ {21}\) His press releases read like a heroic tale suggesting that Auburn’s efforts to acquire the paintings saved them from an uncertain future. He boasted that the reasons for Auburn’s success at auction were the large number of veterans enrolled at the college, the faculty’s readiness to pay fair market value, and the administration’s willingness to accept a controversial collection.\(^ {22}\) Through his comments, Applebee asserted that the university embraced contemporary art, recognized its importance in teaching its students the skills necessary to make them professional artists, and supported developing a cultural life for the community.

\(^{18}\) “Auburn Will Get Two More Paintings from Famed State Department Collection,” Auburn (AL) Plainsman, June 30, 1948.


\(^{20}\) Applebee to E. L. Homan, Jr., 5 July 1948; Applebee to George E. Lewis, 1 July 1948; RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

\(^{21}\) Applebee to Peyton Boswell, Jr., 24 June 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
Applebee and his faculty faced significant challenges when it came to the new painting collection. The art department prepared to accommodate the influx of veteran students and expanded resources to facilitate their education. In 1945, administrators called upon the War Assets Administration to provide surplus buildings to be used as classrooms and workshops.\(^{23}\) Still the university did not have a museum or designated exhibition space making accessibility to the collection difficult. Rather than putting the paintings in direct service to the students in Auburn’s classrooms, Applebee decided to travel the paintings around the state.

Touring the collection around the state would expose Alabamians to contemporary art, teach them about current stylistic trends, and at the same time demonstrate Auburn University’s participation in and support for the arts. The first stop on the paintings’ tour was in the state’s largest city, Birmingham, at the public library. Sponsored by the Birmingham Art Club, the collection was shown from February 5 through 27, 1949.\(^{24}\) The library made an ideal venue as it was free, pluralistic, and community based. It did not infer any of the elitist connotations often associated with art museums. Therefore, the exhibition had the potential to reach the greatest number of citizens at this location. The *Birmingham News* reported on the event by summarizing the audience’s response as ranging from “high praises” to those who “denied this to be art.”\(^{25}\) The dialogue about the paintings had begun.

Two days after the opening staff writer Walling Keith wrote “Is It Art or Is It Red Propaganda? Question Asked About A.P.I. Exhibit.” Rather than discussing the individual paintings or how the collection came to Alabama, he localized the not-so-distant national controversy. For those who were uninformed, he referenced a 1948 article in *Washington News* titled “Scrambled Egg Art Sale” by questioning if the paintings were “a mess of scrambled eggs on canvas.” He then cited President Truman’s famous quote, “If that’s art, I’m a Hottentot.”\(^{26}\)

---

23 Bannister, “Four Years of Growth,” 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

24 Rosalie Pettis (Mrs. William Price) to Applebee, 29 July 1948, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

25 Ibid.

Keith claimed that art students could “view the paintings as simply paintings,” while others could not. He assumed that the current audience could not substitute aesthetics for their ideological beliefs. Still, his article drew added attention to the exhibition. He may have created doubt in the mind of his readers, but keeping the subject alive in the media would have prompted increased visitation based on curiosity.

Several art club members spoke in defense of the exhibition when being interviewed by Keith for his article “Please, M’am, Lay That Easel Down! I’m Neutral.” President Price refuted any accusation that the paintings represented Communism. She asked viewers to come and see the exhibition before deciding if the paintings were good or bad. Mrs. F. W. McDonald admitted to not liking every painting in the show, but she found the display exciting. Other community leaders championed the exhibition. Mary Elizabeth Ard submitted an article to the *Birmingham Post* in which she contextualized the show by providing facts about the collection’s inception. She also addressed the American Artists Professional League’s objection, which led to political pressure ending the original exhibition. The second part of her article focused on the accolades given to the national show. She made her case by repeating *Los Angeles Times*’ Arthur Millier’s statement, cited earlier, about the value of art being decided by those sensitive to its aesthetics. She also pointed out that all of the artists represented in the original State Department collection were included in the 1949 *Look* magazine survey of the nation’s top artists. Thus, she tried to cultivate an audience based on the collection’s stature and the artists’ reputations. She invited readers to take advantage of the opportunity to see avant-garde paintings.

The exhibition continued to prompt a positive response, as evidenced in an editorial printed in the February 17, 1949, afternoon edition of the *Birmingham News*. Here, the unnamed author explained that the paintings may be difficult to understand at first, but they should still be given consideration. Using Shahn’s *Hunger* as example, the writer emphasized a retired army colonel’s compassion for the humane subject. “That’s the best painting in the show. I know that

---


child. I saw it all over Europe.”\textsuperscript{29} The author then suggested that visitors would take interest in other, more familiar artworks, such as Marin’s \textit{Seascape} and Gwathmey’s \textit{Worksong}. Finally, it was suggested that those interested in learning about modern art, or in supporting the “cultural development” of Alabama, should see Auburn’s collection.\textsuperscript{30}

Despite the efforts of the Birmingham Art Club, the Birmingham Library, and the local newspaper to promote the Alabama Polytechnic Institute Collection of Contemporary Paintings’ exhibition, some groups failed to recognize the didactic purpose of the exhibition. One group, the Qui Vive Club, a literary organization with ties to the Alabama Federated Women’s Clubs, protested the show. They drafted a resolution denouncing the \textit{Advancing American Art} collection, its acquisition by the government, and its accession into a public university collection. Their greatest concern mirrored objections to the State Department’s initial acquisition. That is, these women objected to spending state money on paintings that “would only be appreciated by those who do this type work, and not by the American public.” They singled out two paintings as their examples. \textit{Hunger} was “by no means typical of our American life, but is typical of foreign countries,” and \textit{Circus Girl Resting} was considered “repulsive.” Mrs. James E. Strong, chairperson, Resolutions Committee, Qui Vive Club, signed the pronouncement and intended it be presented at the Alabama Federated Women’s Clubs 1949 state convention. A draft copy of the letter addressed to the governor, the university’ president, and two city commissioners exists, but no evidence proves its circulation.\textsuperscript{31}

Continuing its educational mission, the collection went on to its next scheduled venue, the University of Alabama Art Gallery in Tuscaloosa. While the paintings were on display in there, Maltby Sykes sent a telegram stating the paintings would not continue to travel, but they would be shipped back to Auburn at the exhibition’s close.\textsuperscript{32} Fearful of any more controversy, Applebee drafted a two-page statement to the school’s new dean, Frank Marion Orr. He began

\textsuperscript{29} Keith, “Please M’am, Lay That Easel Down!,” February 10, 1949.


\textsuperscript{31} Qui Vive Club, “ Resolution,” 1949, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

\textsuperscript{32} Maltby Sykes to Richard Zoelliner, 26 March 1949, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.
by placing the collection in the context of other artists whose work was controversial, such as Millet, Monet, and Van Gogh. Using the same examples cited in editorials published in Birmingham newspapers, he referenced the 1949 *Look* magazine survey, where several of the represented artists were ranked as the top artists in America. He disputed claims that *Hunger* was un-American. He stated that the subject of a starving young European boy solicited empathy, and therefore the painting promoted acceptance of the Marshall Plan to aid individuals like the one depicted. Applebee asked Orr to be objective and to consider differing opinions. He said:

Naturally there will be much disagreement over the artistic merits of various works. I dislike or fail to understand half of our collection myself. However, I think it is important that we try to see all sides of any big question and that we should not try to suppress modern art and modern thought in the way it has been done in Germany and Russia. If we dislike contemporary painting too violently it is very easy not to look at it. There are many that see it as the beginning of very fine things.\(^{33}\)

Applebee understood both sides of the debate, but he believed in the democratization of art. “Nothing is more American than our collection in that it is proof to the world that we still have free expression in our country.”\(^{34}\) Wanting to deter censorship, Applebee reiterated the need for a university to have such a collection as a service to its current students and the State. He asserted that the collection would aid in recruiting art students and give the school a competitive edge in the region. He expressed concern over the difficulty of promoting the university without publicizing and circulating the paintings. Apart from its educational role, Applebee asserted the acquisition was a sound business decision. He maintained that Auburn made a shrewd investment paying only one thousand dollars for all thirty-six artworks, because the paintings’ value would increase from twenty thousand to forty thousand dollars over the next ten years.\(^{35}\) Thus, he implied that if the painting collection became a burden at any time, the university could sell it and reap financial benefit. The initial expenditure to obtain the paintings was not in vain, but the longer they were held, the better.

\(^{33}\) Applebee to Frank Marion Orr, 10 March 1949, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.
Advocating for the collection and asserting its value to the university and the Southern region of the United States proved a difficult task. The incidents surrounding the show at the Birmingham Public Library in February 1949 confirmed that no amount of positive publicity could make everyone embrace modern art. What Applebee learned was that just placing a collection in a certain location does not make it significant. The divided response to the paintings, however, did start a dialogue about contemporary art within the state. The conversation was tabled as the collection was sequestered, albeit temporarily.

Returning the paintings to the university proved to be a strategic move that would enhance Auburn’s reputation and give the school national recognition. To circumvent further scrutiny from Alabamians, Applebee considered loan requests from venues outside the state. As soon as the paintings had arrived at Auburn, letters from galleries, museums, and universities all over the country were received asking to borrow individual paintings. The requests verified that there was interest in these artists and their artworks. Only good could come from putting the paintings back in circulation, which would expose new audiences to Auburn’s collection. Furthermore, traveling individual paintings would provide viewers the opportunity to see them in a new context, apart from their controversial history. The lack of interpretation allowed for a pure, aesthetic appreciation. Finally, loaning paintings to exhibitions would increase the value by adding to the objects’ provenance. Examples will also demonstrate that recontextualization of the paintings rehabilitated the artists’ reputations. The following paragraphs will highlight one case of the most sought-after painting and how it was used.

Ben Shahn’s *Hunger* was the most recognizable image from *Advancing American Art* in terms of its exhibition and reproduction history. It has become an iconic image whose meaning shifted depending on its presentation. For example, when it was first painted, it was used in the 1946 “We Want Peace, Register to Vote” poster produced by the Congress of Industrial Organizations (C.I.O.) Political Action Committee, the country’s first political action committee, founded in 1944 to raise money for the re-election of Franklin Roosevelt. In this context, the boy in the image symbolized the innocent victims of war, for whom a vote for peace promised respite. The figure appears to illustrate a passage in Roosevelt’s 1944 state of the union address, in which he said that peace is inextricably linked to freedom from want.\(^{36}\) Within Shahn’s own

\(^{36}\) Congress of Industrial Organizations, “We Want Peace, Register to Vote,” 1946, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives,
oeuvre, the figure of the boy hauntingly invokes the poverty of the children in his 1935 series of documentary photographs of the mining community of Omar, West Virginia. In the context of the *Advancing American Art* exhibition, at least as the Hearst papers and others wanting to put an end to the exhibition portrayed it, the painting symbolized an Eastern European boy impoverished by the war. In service of Auburn University, however, perceptions of the painting changed.

Art museums, large and small, requested *Hunger* for their group exhibitions. The University of Wisconsin mounted *Significant American Painting: A National Summary 1951*, in which they chose twenty-three paintings as representative of contemporary art. Recognized as one who observes his surroundings and documents them in paint, Shahn was chosen, along with Louis Bouché, Edward Hopper, Charles Sheeler and Andrew Wyeth, for the 1955 exhibition *Five Painters of America* organized by the Worcester Art Museum. 1957 brought a request from the Museum of Arts and Crafts, which was realized in 1963. *Hunger* was featured in *American Traditionalists of the 20th Century* to celebrate the opening of a new wing of the museum. In 1969, the University of Georgia’s Cultural Affairs Committee, along with the Department of Art, produced an exhibition that was circulated by the American Federation of Arts called *American Painting: The 1940s*. No longer a target of national conservatives, *Hunger* resumed its rightful place in the museum and gallery. Politics aside, viewers focused on the painting as representative of 1940s American art, pre-Abstract Expressionism, and the artist.

---


38 Worcester Art Museum, *Five Painters of America* (Worcester: Worcester Art Museum, 1955), 1-4. See letter requesting to borrow paintings, George L. Stout to Draughon, 8 November 1954, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library. The loan’s approval and the negotiated terms are included in Stout to Applebee, 15 November 1954; Applebee to Stout, 29 November 1954, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library. *Hunger* was one of fourteen paintings by Shahn included in the exhibition.

as a canonical figure because of the painting’s inclusion within the exhibition. Although Auburn was unable to cultivate a local appreciation for the collection initially, other institutions around the country were more open to showing works from the collection.

Lending paintings for exhibitions increased their audience, but doing so still offered limited exposure. A wider public could have access to the paintings if reproduced as book illustrations. *Hunger* was the first object from Auburn’s collection to be chosen for this purpose. Oliver W. Larkin, chairperson of and professor in the Department of Art, Smith College, wrote *Art and Life in America*, a Pulitzer Prize-winning textbook, published in 1949. This tome was marketed as a new way to study the history of American art, taking a thematic rather than a chronological approach. Reflecting his philosophical origins in the leftist rhetoric of the 1930s, the author prided himself on not providing the standard artist’s biography to help describe paintings. Instead, the works selected for inclusion were placed within the context of American history. The book had a long life. A series of twelve filmstrips based upon the illustrations in the book, accompanied by twelve brochures written by Larkin, was released in 1952 by the Herbert E. Budek Company as the *History of American Art: Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture in the U. S. A. from the Colonial Period to the Present*. The same year, the book was translated into French and published by the Parisian company J. and R. Wittman. The original book was revised and enlarged in 1960 to include coverage of more recent art and to include color reproductions, and it remained in use as a textbook well into the 1960s.

---


42 Larkin to Applebee, 21 September 1951, RG 442, Records of AU Permanent Art Collection, 88-28 and 89-37, Auburn University Archives, Auburn University Library.
Other publishers quickly followed suit by seeking reproduction rights to use the image in their textbooks. In February 1954, Henry Holt and Company of New York requested the painting for *The New United States*, written by historian George H. Knole of Stanford University. Following shortly thereafter, Scott, Foresman and Company, Chicago, drafted a general, open request to use *Hunger*, without naming the book in which it would be included. In 1972, Leland D. Baldwin wrote a book on the history of the United States to be published by the California-based Wadsworth Publishing. He too wanted to include Shahn’s painting. The most surprising request came from the Tennessee Board of Education, Editorial Division. The Methodist Church of Tennessee wanted to incorporate the image into the curriculum materials created for their elementary education textbooks.

Given the painting’s subject, one can understand its desired use in teaching people to learn to respect and help each other. There is no question that these books would have been highly circulated to a general, mass audience. However, it seems ironic that an image that prompted fear and ridicule could now be seen as inspirational. I attribute this change in reaction to the passage of time, but more importantly to a recontextualization of the work. For instance, in Larkin’s book the reproduction, the last in the book, became a potent symbol wrapping up a chapter on the state of the arts during World War II. Given the political climate of the Cold War era, the painting acted as a potent symbol wrapping up a chapter on the state of the arts during World War II. The painting was not discussed as an example of the Red Scare or anti-Americanism. Instead, Larkin invokes the image’s most recent life as the basis for a widely-distributed 1945 poster encouraging people to register to vote. Just above the call to register...
appeared the words “We want peace.” Although the poster itself is not reproduced, Larkin calls upon the reader’s memory and identifies this latter text as almost irrelevantly redundant, as the boy’s dark, sunken eyes and hunger-aged face already bespoke the need for an end to war. The book ends quoting Roosevelt’s 1945 warning that the world stood at a point full of promise and of danger, that Americans had the opportunity to use their influence to bring forth a united world for their descendants. Larkin cites this as a call for artist-citizens to act for just such a cause. Shahn’s image—invoked as it appeared in the poster, as a call for voting for peace—was a fitting complement to the author’s concluding words.47

Like textbooks, museums continue to recontextualize, and sometimes repress, objects to make them more acceptable to the public. Often this practice is often taken too far. For example, the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s 1987 exhibition American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School was based purely on aesthetics, devoid of any social history.48 In fact, scholars such as Andre Hemingway work to reconstruct the original histories by restoring objects to the political framework that gave birth to them in the first place.49 Yet Hunger continues to take on new life because of the painting’s intertwined relationship to the controversies over Advancing American Art. It has become a signifier of controversy in the arts itself. Neil Harris’s use of the image in his 1995 article “Museums and Controversy: Some Introductory Reflections” is a case in point.

Today, the painting represents the founding collection of Auburn University’s Jule Collins Smith Museum of Art.50 Although some of the paintings reached a broader audience through exhibition and publication, Auburn still faced the challenge of what to do with the paintings on campus. Unfortunately, traveling took its toll on many objects, and the ones that...
stayed behind did not fair any better. Due to insufficient storage space, the works were hung in offices around campus, leaving them inaccessible to students. For those items stored in damp basements, lack of sufficient climate control adversely affected them. Still no space had been dedicated to housing and maintaining the collection. By the mid-1970s, assistant professor Vern Swanson took action to try to repair the damage and preserve the collection. With the support of the department head and the dean, Swanson made application to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) for a conservation grant. The request was denied citing that if the paintings had been repaired, then there was no guarantee that their condition would be maintained. The NEA suggested that Auburn secure appropriate housing for the collection and then reapply.51 The university approached the fine arts museum in nearby Montgomery for help.

Auburn University’s share of Advancing American Art found a temporary home at the Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts (MMFA) in 1981. An arrangement was made between the two institutions so that the paintings would remain in the custody of the MMFA for five years.52 The MMFA agreed to store and exhibit the paintings, as well as allot three thousand dollars towards conservation. Once stabilized, the paintings would remain at the MMFA, until Auburn could build a museum.53

The MMFA saw an opportunity to use the collection, beyond helping out their neighbors. Recognizing that the paintings would again be able to travel once conserved, the museum wasted no time in making plans. Hoping to recreate the original Advancing American Art exhibition for a new audience, the curators organized a traveling exhibition funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, the Alabama State Council on the Arts and Humanities, the Committee for the Humanities in Alabama, the Blount Foundation, and Auburn University. Seventy-three of the


52 The National Endowment for the Arts’ conservation grant requirements influenced the length of time for the loan.

State Department’s original one hundred seventeen paintings were included. *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-1948* opened at the Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts on January 10, 1984. A yearlong tour followed. The exhibition traveled to the William Benton Museum of Art, the National Museum of American Art, now the Smithsonian American Art Museum, and the Terra Museum of American Art. The paintings had come full circle, the original show opened at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in 1946, and then was shown at the National Collection of Fine Arts (now the Smithsonian American Art Museum), where some of the nation’s finest examples of cultural production were housed. The question of these artists’ ethnicity or politics was not raised. Instead, the paintings gave insight into the plurality of styles and subjects explored prior to Abstract Expressionism. Consequently, the paintings from Auburn, and the other university collections, reached the broadest national audience. Undoubtedly visitors now knew the universities discussed in this dissertation as repositories for mid-century American art. Yet, the question still remained, how did the collection function at Auburn and in Alabama? Was it ever used to educate students as Applebee claimed it would be?

The collection’s history at Auburn was a rocky one fraught with public rejection, lack of resources for storage or exhibition, and threats to sell the paintings when viewed as a burden. The university administration pressured the Art Department about what to do with the paintings. In 1976, the collection’s future was bleak, as talk turned to selling the collection. Long talked about and long overdue, the university foundation made an art museum one of its priorities of the 1987 Auburn Generation Capital Campaign. Unfortunately, sufficient funds were not raised during this effort, prompting suggestions that individual paintings be sold to facilitate making the art museum a reality. In 1991, the Art Department faculty expressed their objection citing the efforts of their predecessors as “a triumph of courage over the social and political hysteria

---

54 Margaret Lynne Ausfeld and Virginia M. Mecklenburg, *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department, 1946-1948* (Montgomery: Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, 1984), 4. Grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, the Alabama State Council on the Arts and Humanities, the Committee for the Humanities in Alabama, the Blount Foundation, and Auburn University funded the exhibition and tour.

55 McPheeters to Hiers, 12 October 1976, Papers of the History of the Jule Collins Smith Museum of Art, Auburn University.
preceding the McCarthy era.” A sale would go against those who “sacrificed their own salary increases to acquire the collection.”

Losing the keystones of the collection, such as Shahn’s *Hunger*, Kuniyoshi’s *Circus Girl Resting*, O’Keeffe’s *Small Hill near Alcade*, and Marin’s *Seascape*, would diminish the collection’s value. It stands to reason that without the most popular paintings, some of those people backing the museum might withdraw their financial support. To Auburn’s credit, they managed to maintain the integrity of the collection and increase its value by keeping it together.

No one would have imagined that it would take almost twenty more years before Auburn would open its own museum. For that reason, the collection remained on view as a permanent installation at the MMFA until the Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art opened to the public in 2003 (figure 8). While in Montgomery, the collection became as popular as the museum’s own permanent collection. Additionally, Auburn’s paintings complemented the museum’s own Blount collection, which featured some of the same artists, such as Marsh, Shahn, and Marin. Furthermore, abstractions by modernists’ Dove and Pereira filled in stylistic gaps, which resulted in the combined collections giving a more complete picture of nineteenth- and twentieth-century American art. During the last few years the collection was at the museum, annual attendance topped one hundred and sixty thousand visitors. Situated in a proper venue, the collection was finally accepted by an audience consisting of tourists, school groups, and museum members to social organizations, thus meeting Auburn University’s original goal of educating the population of Alabama and the Southeast about fine art.

The positive response to the paintings at the MMFA solidified Auburn’s resolve to have its own museum, but could it have the same impact as a civic museum situated in the state capital? As the museum has been open only five years, only more time can answer this question.

56 James Martin to Jerry Smith, 21 October 1987, Papers of the History of the Jule Collins Smith Museum of Art, Auburn University.
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Because the museum is so young, it is too soon to determine its effect on the university. Other obstacles to be overcome include the museum’s location, which is off campus; the museum being named for an individual, which may muddy its affiliation with the university; and its reputation as a regional art museum, whose current focus is exhibiting the permanent collection, Alabama subjects, Alabama artists, or gifts from donors affiliated with the university. While state and regional art are important, if the museum wants to be perceived as a national art museum, then the staff needs to create a strategy for programming that not only meets the needs of the art department and the university, but one that also follows new museological trends.

Paintings have value in their own right but also increase the prominence of the institution where they reside. Auburn’s collection is extremely valuable to the university because the school was able to keep the paintings together. Thus, its significance comes from the collection’s quality and quantity. However, one drawback to retaining the Advancing American Art moniker is its link to the past controversy. The drawback is that these narratives were created in the same way as the news stories that affected this collection in the past. Instead of relying on the controversy, the museum’s staff can create new narratives that offer multiple meanings through tours, lectures, didactics, and catalogues. They can suspend the perception that the collection only has historical significance. Situated in the protective environment of a university museum, where experimental ideas are expected, unlimited intellectual interaction is possible. No longer are the paintings hidden in storage for fear of a negative reception or lack of display space.

Embedded in Auburn University’s history, the Advancing American Art collection became available at a time when efforts were being made to change the university’s identity. Known primarily as a mechanical and technical institute, the school aspired to become a comprehensive institution that emphasized a liberal arts education. Because of the work of advocates Sykes, Applebee, and Littleton in obtaining, promoting, and preserving the collection, the paintings stand as a historical marker for the progressiveness of the art department and the cultivation of the visual arts by the university. Now that sixty years have passed, the paintings have become synonymous with the art department and the university as a whole. What is more, the artists are familiar to anyone studying American art. Without strong-willed advocates and this important collection, Auburn would not be identified as the repository for cultural artifacts that it is today. The collection’s identity has historically centered on the State Department controversy, which has helped individual paintings reach iconic status because of the way they
were maligned in the press. Now that the paintings are exhibited permanently in their own
gallery, the collection supports Applebee’s goal of educating Auburn University students, as well
as the community.
CHAPTER 5

ADVANCING AMERICAN ART AS THE BASIS FOR A FINE ARTS CURRICULUM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

One hundred and eighty-five miles separate Auburn, Alabama, from Athens, Georgia, but with regard to how the *Advancing American Art* paintings functioned at these universities, they were worlds apart. The greatest difference was that Georgia had a plan for collecting and the advantage of a benefactor, while Auburn did not. Head of the Department of Art and chair of Fine Arts Lamar Dodd had the desire to build a permanent art collection for the university; Alfred Holbrook had the resources to make it happen. Through a study of Dodd and Holbrook’s philosophies, this chapter demonstrates how the University of Georgia, the art school, and the Georgia Art Museum used the paintings from *Advancing American Art* in teaching. Careful planning vivified the curriculum in the classroom and developed museum programs on par with those implemented by John Cotton Dana at the Newark Museum of Art. The university became identified as the home of a premier art school and as a cultural destination in the southeastern United States. Artists whose works were collected by the museum benefited from enhanced careers and more secure inclusion in the art historical canon.

Before delving into the ideology that shaped the university’s fine arts program, the pivotal figures must first be introduced. Hired in 1937, Dodd (figure 9) began shaping the art department long before Holbrook’s arrival in Athens. First acting as an artist-in-residence, Dodd, an unconventional candidate, was hired despite his absence of an academic degree. What he lacked in formal education, he made up for in practice. He had won many painting awards, including the Chicago Art Institute’s Norman Waite Harris Medal and Prize, which was followed
by a one-artist show in New York. Dodd taught art as a profession but also used it as a vehicle for personal enjoyment. Those outside the region took notice of how the university embraced his methods. His efforts resulted in unifying the visual arts into one school, expanding course offerings, and increasing enrollment. Furthermore, he established a graduate program in painting during a time when other institutions were developing programs in commercial and industrial arts.¹

Alfred Heber Holbrook (figure 10) began building his personal art collection in the late 1930s.² He desired to acquire objects worthy of a museum, which resulted in his taking a methodical and practical approach. He wanted one hundred paintings by one hundred prominent artists to represent the stylistic progression of one hundred years of American art.³ For three years, he considered the offerings available through New York’s East 57th Street galleries. He purchased American art rather than European examples because they were less expensive.⁴ By the summer of 1944, he had succeeded in putting together a collection that ranged from mid-nineteenth century Hudson River School examples by Thomas Cole and Ashur B. Durand, to the Impressionists William Merritt Chase and Mary Cassatt, to gritty urban examples by all members of The Eight. More than half of the works were contemporary, as represented by American


³ Alfred H. Holbrook to Dorothy Jachens, 26 October 1951, Georgia Museum of Art founding file, University of Georgia Archives, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries. Cahill may have advised Holbrook to collect American art. The two men were friends, and as is shown in the next paragraph, Cahill was an advisor of sorts. As Curator of the Newark Museum, Cahill was actively acquiring American art. Having worked with the artists for about fifteen years prior to becoming national director of the WPA Federal Art Project, he knew the living artists on the project, many of whom were still painting when Holbrook began collecting. Furthermore, Cahill knew the writings of his mentor, the Newark Museum’s director during his tenure there, John Cotton Dana, whose 1914 book American Art: How it Can Be Made to Flourish emphasized the need to give artists time to work and to pay them for their efforts. Cahill had done just that during his tenure with the Federal Art Project. John Cotton Dana, American Art: How it Can Be Made to Flourish (Woodstock, Vermont, 1914).

⁴ Georgia Museum of Art, Georgia Alumni Record, October 1969, Articles file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.
Modernists Milton Avery, Byron Browne, Ralston Crawford, Marsden Hartley, and Georgia O’Keeffe.⁵

A passion for the arts linked Dodd and Holbrook. Compared to Dodd, Holbrook began appreciating the arts before trying his hand as a technician. He was an attorney first and a collector second. He had spent forty-six years in New York, but after his wife’s death, he was ready to retire and try something new, to study painting. Furthermore, he wanted to relocate to a warmer environment due to health issues. Holbrook first visited the University of Georgia in October 1944, on Holger Cahill’s recommendation. According to Holbrook, Cahill, former National Director of the Federal Art Project, spoke generally about the state of the arts at southern universities. When it came to the University of Georgia, he suggested it was the best location for Holbrook. He explained, “They have no museum of art for over four thousand students and possess a fast growing Art Department under Dodd, who is an excellent artist, as well as art teacher and lecturer.”⁶ During Holbrook’s visit, he agreed that the university had great potential for growth in the area of fine arts. Consequently, he retired to Athens in January 1945 and enrolled in studio art classes. As his relationship with Dodd strengthened, he decided to give his personal art collection to the university, in memory of his wife, Eva Underhill Holbrook.⁷ As part of the gift, Holbrook stipulated that an art museum be opened with his paintings as the foundation. Thus, he was credited as the museum’s founder and was appointed as its first director and curator.⁸

---


⁶ Holbrook, “Founding an Art Museum,” n.d., Georgia Museum of Art Founding file, University of Georgia Archives, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.

⁷ The collection was first shown during April of 1945 to an audience of three thousand. The official acquisition occurred on May 15, 1945.

Holbrook procured additional works, using his own financial means, and in turn donated them to the museum. He kept his contacts in the New York art market current, and targeted pieces as they came available, an example of which were the State Department paintings. Holbrook’s original collection already included at least one painting by many of the artists. He encouraged the university to submit a bid because he had seen some of the paintings first hand and could speak to their quality. Acting on Holbrook’s recommendation, the university expressed interest in purchasing fifty paintings from the War Assets Administration’s auction in 1948. Of those objects receiving bids, ten were awarded to the school. The University of Georgia spent a total of two hundred forty-six dollars and twenty-five cents for the paintings.
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9 The Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection of the Georgia Museum of Art (Athens: The University of Georgia, 1953), 5.

10 Holbrook to George C. Marshall, 12 May 1947, Holbrook file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.

11 John E. Sims to Associate Regional Director for the War Assets Administration, 4 June 1948, Ben Shahn file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.

12 “University Gets Ten Additions to Art Group: Memorial Exhibit Totals More Than 200 Pieces; Art Caused National Stir,” Red and Black, July 2, 1948. Because the national controversy had subsided and the acquisition was just one in a continuous stream of gifts, press coverage of the paintings’ acquisition and arrival in Athens was minimal. Instead, the topic was couched within reports of the original donation and the plans for building a museum. For example, the article cited above outlined the expansion of the Holbrook collection. A brief history of the State Department’s collection was given, which included a list the paintings and their makers. Thus, the acquisition was documented publicly, but much less was made of the subject than at Auburn University. Lack of focus on the prior controversy supports the notion that the size of Holbrook’s collection, combined with his force of character, overshadowed the acquisition of the State Department paintings. Instead, the Advancing American Art paintings were appreciated for their role in strengthening the university’s founding collection.

Upon delivery, the *Advancing American Art* paintings became a part of the Eva Underhill Holbrook collection.14

With the foundation collection in place, the next step was to devise a plan on how to use it. This next section will explore the education philosophy of Dodd and Holbrook, its influences, and how the curriculum developed from it. Here, I argue that the vision for the art school followed the writings of Albert C. Barnes, John Cotton Dana, and John Dewey. Like these men, both Dodd and Holbrook believed in the democratization of art, so they took an approach that focused on student-centered learning through the creation of a holistic environment in the South.

In December 1947, Dodd submitted a strategic plan for the department’s growth over the next twenty-five years. Extremely comprehensive, the plan accounted for all the department’s functions. Provisions were requested for an expanded museum, increased studio facilities, and the addition of graduate programs with concentrations in sculpture, art history, commercial art, art education, interior design, industrial design, and the other minor arts. He proposed the appointments of additional staff to accommodate the growing student population, a continuation of the visiting scholar program, the creation of an annual juried exhibition, and an art library. His holistic approach concentrated on meeting the needs of all the university’s students.15

Dodd’s primary goal was to teach students aesthetic perception, as defined by John Dewey. Dewey maintained that in order to make meaning of something, one must experience it intellectually and physically. Then the student, in this case, must make connections among shared components, thereby leading to an understanding of how the parts unify to create the whole.16 Dodd classified students into two categories the general college student, of which about

---

14 Proof of that designation was found in a letter requesting that the ten paintings be added to the insurance policy for the Holbrook collection. The paintings were also included in a checklist of the Holbrook collection in the 1953 and 1958 permanent collection catalogues. Millie Dearing to Thomas M. Tillman, 6 July 1948, Lamar Dodd Collection University Correspondence file, Special Collections Division, University of Georgia Libraries. See also *The Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection*, 6; *Georgia Museum of Art Dedication Exhibition* (Athens: Georgia Museum of Art, 1958), 7-8.

15 Lamar Dodd, “Report and Recommendation for the Department of Art, University of Georgia,” 15 December 1947, Museum History file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.

one thousand took art classes, and the specialist in art, of which there were two hundred twenty-five majors. For the general population he hoped that they would develop “an understanding of those qualities that characterized art products and art production. It [the program] should bring the student into as direct contact as possible with inspired work past and present. . . . It should develop a vision of the future and a desire on the part of the students to make the eventual art contributions of their world as vital as those of any culture of the past.”¹⁷ For those majoring in art, he wanted all of the above, as well as a deeper appreciation and mastery of the discipline comprehensive enough for graduates to contribute to the field.¹⁸ Indeed, Dodd had a different set of learning outcomes for each group, but overlapping existed. In requiring the students to work with original source material, ranging from the study of objects to making them, Dodd employed Dewey’s learning model. Developing a curriculum that combined contemplation with action, in the forms of reading about, writing about, and making art, students would receive the full experience, the aesthetic experience Dewey advocated.

Holbrook’s vision for the school was in accordance with Dodd’s plans. He, too, wanted to serve the university’s students by exposing them to the cultural production of American artists, but he also wanted to reach the broader population of the state and the region. He wanted to meet the needs of the underserved by bringing art to those outside of large cities. Furthermore, he aspired to present contemporary artistic production in a way that was unassuming and accessible. He believed that focusing on a century of American art, rather than one specific style, made it easier for audiences to follow the progression of art. Emphasis was not placed on the political, social, or economic concerns. Instead he was one man who was interested in sharing his personal collection with others, and all he asked for in return was that they try to identify with something in the pictures, something that could bring enjoyment to their lives.¹⁹ His New York friends lauded his efforts. For instance, Francis Henry Taylor, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, paid Holbrook a compliment during a visit to Athens. He asked, “Why is it that every rich collector seems to think he will not enter Heaven unless he gives his art works to the

¹⁷ Dodd, “Report and Recommendation for the Department of Art, University of Georgia,” 15 December 1947, Museum History file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.

¹⁸ Ibid.

Metropolitan? Why does he overlook the thousands of smaller museums where such a gift would be like an infusion of lifeblood? Well, it may be the philanthropist feels that his gift will bear more prestige for himself.  

Taylor noted that Holbrook deviated from the type of blueblood thinking prevalent in New York social circles. He recognized that Holbrook put others ahead of his social status. More importantly, he based his approach on his conversations with Cahill and on his knowledge of the writings of John Cotton Dana.

When it came to the facility in which the collection would be stored, Holbrook had his own ideas, which I suggest were linked to the ideas outlined by Dana in his series *The Changing Museum Idea: The New Museum Series* (1917-1920). *The Changing Museum Idea* was a series of four essays self-published by Dana that offered ideas on how to make the museum experience more experimental, interactive, and engaging. His approach was all encompassing from the qualifications of staff to the design of the building to what should be collected and how it should be exhibited, promoted, and used in instruction.  

Holbrook drafted a four-page proposal of suggestions that read as though he was building a museum in an urban environment. For example, he emphasized the importance of hiring an architect with a modern sensibility, someone who would be willing to design a contemporary structure. This seems odd given the historic architecture of the campus. Rejecting traditional classical styles, the interior of the building was to be constructed with little or no architectural embellishment, devoid of pilasters and cornices. Galleries were not meant to be static, but were to employ moveable walls. For practical purposes, he wanted the museum to be situated in proximity to the art school, but also near street level.

The justification for his ideas is found in Cotton’s *Plan for a New Museum: the Kind of Museum it will profit a city to maintain* (1920), which he likely read. It is also likely that Holbrook visited the Newark Museum, and therefore had first-hand knowledge of its educational offerings, continued after Dana’s death in 1929. In either case, Holbrook put Dana’s

---
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ideas to good use when planning for a building that would promote learning and inclusion of a diverse population.

Holbrook imagined the museum would be used by two distinct groups of visitors, the students and the general public. He claimed that the difference in these groups’ expectations affected how they utilized the museum. For example, he compared the students’ needs to view objects up close in a contemplative space to the general public’s desire to be given more direction on how to view the art. Rather than building a monument to the art, he put the needs of his audience first, focusing on the functionality of a public space. While Holbrook’s ideas reference the past, many of them also resonate within current museological scholarship on visitor services, such as John Falk and Lynn Dierking’s many books dedicated to the subject, but especially *The Museum Experience* (1991).

In Dodd’s case, he solicited ideas from his colleagues in the field and came to the same conclusions as Holbrook. For example, he wrote to Thomas C. Colt, Jr., director of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, during the spring of 1947 to inquire about Colt’s thoughts on building a museum. In response, Colt drafted a lengthy document outlining his recommendations for what a newly constructed museum should be, which included his perception of the existing conditions at American universities. He commented on the potential to create a meaningful institution in a region of the country deficient in the arts that would serve the art department, as well as the community. To do so, he suggested developing an encyclopedic collection of historical styles and subjects not easily accessible to people living in the South. Additionally, he believed a temporary exhibition program focusing on contemporary art and artists would be essential for the students’ education. As far as the building itself, Colt thought the museum should be housed in an existing structure that could be modified to meet the unique needs of a museum. He suggested temporary exhibitions should be displayed on the first floor near the entrance, while objects from the permanent collection should be shown on the second floor. An emphasis was placed on displaying study collections within intimate galleries separated from the permanent collection. What is more, he commented repeatedly about using the facility to educate graduate students about the museum profession. Colt also generated a budget that proposed one million dollars be spent to renovate one third of the existing building. Another fifty thousand a year should be set aside for acquisitions, and twenty thousand should be expended on temporary exhibitions. The suggested budget was ambitious, including a state of the art conservation lab and a fine arts
library. Because these ideas resonate so closely with Holbrook’s ideas and with the content of Dana’s museum series books, especially *The Gloom of the Museum* (1917) and *The Plan for a New Museum* (1920), one might conclude that these books were widely read and highly influential on the development of some Southern museums.

While Dodd and Holbrook planned for the future, they also had to face the present challenge of where to store and display the growing collections. A discussion of the steps taken to prepare a building for use as a museum will lead to the justifications as to why changes needed to be made. Because a different patron had established a considerable endowment for the construction of a new library building, the Peabody Library was chosen as the museum’s first location. Initially, the Museum of Fine Arts occupied two rooms of the building’s basement. Originally built in 1907-1908, the Peabody Library was plagued with structural issues. Furthermore, the paintings were crowded into a small storage room, not conducive for display. Visitors could not be accommodated in such a space, limiting interaction with the collection. Holbrook wrote to President Caldwell on January 30, 1946, expressing his concern about the building’s condition. He argued for a new gallery, which would provide better storage conditions for the collection, and would also allow individuals, community school groups, and university students the opportunity to gain a deeper familiarity and understanding of the objects. The president was persuaded to approve renovations, which were estimated to take three years.

---

23 Thomas C. Colt, Jr. to Dodd, 4 March 1947, Lamar Dodd Collection University Correspondence file, Special Collections Division, University of Georgia Libraries.


26 Holbrook, “Value and Use of the Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Art Collection in Teaching,” n.d., RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.

27 Holbrook to Caldwell, 30 January 1946, RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.
In order to fund the renovation project, Sims, Assistant to the President, submitted a grant proposal to the General Education Board. This is significant because of the conditions attached to the award: the university would have to match funds, justify the benefit to students, and give a detailed report of final expenses. The justification detailed the specific learning outcomes.

Together Dodd and Holbrook drafted two documents, “Value and Use of The Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Art Collection in Teaching” and “The Holbrook Collection as a Service to Schools.” At the outset of the former and at the end of the latter, the authors referred readers to
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28 Sims to Robert D. Calkins, 12 January 1948, RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries. I do not have copies of the letters dated September 13, 1948, or December 12, 1948, but both are referenced in a letter from Calkins to Sims, 9 January 1948. Frederick T. Gates and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. of the Rockefeller Foundation to make grants to post-secondary educational institutions, primarily public universities and colleges, in support of general operating expenses, special programs and scholarships, founded the General Education Board in 1902. In 1903, Congress approved the Board and it continued until the resources were depleted in 1964. See the paper titled Select Rockefeller Philanthropies at http://archive.rockefeller.edu/philanthropy/pdf/philanthropy.pdf (accessed June 22, 2006). The university requested $10,000 from the General Board of Education to fund construction costs. On February 5, 1948, the agency offered $7,500, with the condition that the university match the grant, justify the benefit to students, and give a detailed report of final expenses. The deadline for having raised matching funds and having spent the money was June 30, 1948. Fred M. McCuistion to Caldwell, 5 February 1948, RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries. By March 8, the University Board of Regents and the Governor released the additional subsidies and construction began immediately. Caldwell to McCuistion, 8 March 1948, RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries. On August 20, the General Education Board excused the university for not complying with the June 30 deadline, because the project was not completed. Thus, construction continued with the remaining money. An itemized list of construction costs was submitted to the General Education Board on December 10, 1948, a little more than a year after the University of Georgia made its initial grant request. Robert W. July to Sims, 10 December 1948, RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.

the scholarship on the topic of art and education produced by Albert C. Barnes, Thomas Munro, and reports produced by the Toledo Museum, Ohio, the Minneapolis Institute of Art, and the Walker Art Center, both in Minnesota. Each paper argued for the necessity of requiring college students to have direct access to original art. They referred to paintings as “source material” for the immediacy they brought to a student’s understanding of application and texture. Furthermore, students could better comprehend the differences in media and develop specialized skills, which would prove more difficult if looking at reproductions. Consequently, all students who enrolled in the university’s painting and drawing classes were required to “make technical use of the collection.” Additionally, those enrolled in art appreciation courses were also exposed to the collection. To understand just how many people were reached, it is important to know that one art appreciation course was required for all students in the College of Arts and Sciences. The second course counted as an elective for majors outside of the college. Consequently, administrators saw the value of the collection as significant because it was programmed into the curriculum for arts and sciences students and beyond. Dodd and Holbrook made a strong case, and the project was funded.

The Museum of Fine Arts, now the Georgia Museum of Art, opened its doors November 8, 1948. The museum’s inaugural event made the front page of the school’s newspaper, *The Red and Black*. The first exhibition featured selections from the Eva Underhill Holbrook Collection, shown in a gallery of the same name, and the second highlighted pieces from southern museum collections. In attendance were both the Acting Governor and Governor Elect M. E. Thompson and Herman Talmadge, respectively. Other dignitaries included university administrators from colleges and museums around the region. Over five hundred people attended the opening party,
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30 Barnes and Dewey influenced each other’s methods on art education. Because Dodd and Holbrook cite Barnes, I believe that they knew of Dewey’s work and current trends in museum education.
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with approximately fifty visitors each day during the first month. In the following months, attendance dropped to about two hundred guests per week or twenty-eight per day.\textsuperscript{34} These figures provide evidence of the popularity of the museum in its first year, but would it have a long-term impact on students? Holbrook and Dodd ensured that it would.

As soon as the museum opened, its inaugural exhibition became the basis for a class assignment. Graduate students in the university’s art department were asked to submit exhibition critiques. Although the show featured an overview of one hundred years of art, most of the students reviewed the contemporary paintings, focusing on those from the State Department. Peggy Pat Horne observed that the curator made his selections based on the narrative quality of the paintings. She focused her attention on those that she believed conveyed a strong message. About Shahn’s \textit{The Clinic} (figure 11) she wrote, “Outstanding for its sociological idea is Ben Shan’s gouache of ‘The Clinic.’ Here, two apathetic, near-middle-age females sit near an obstetrics room under a sign bearing a child’s picture and the words ‘Do I Deserve Prenatal Care?’ Recognizable as a typical Shan, this experiment shows use of unusual color harmonies, close in value.”\textsuperscript{35} Clearly, the student had studied Shahn’s social realism and his technique as well. She also appreciated Spruce’s \textit{Owl on the Rocks} saying it, “…sticks in my mind for its wit and also because I think the artist was extremely successful in the use of his medium as an interpretation of his subject.”\textsuperscript{36} Upon her departure from the exhibition she stated: “I passed back into the Memorial room for a few moments to take another look at my favorites and left unintentionally carrying with me a last impression of brilliant color from Karl Zerbe’s \textit{Rooster}. I felt saturated but knew I would want to come back again the next day.”\textsuperscript{37}

Student Margaret Johnson was drawn to a variety of examples representing the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She remarked on Robert Henri’s mastery of line and color in his portrait


\textsuperscript{35} Peggy Pat Horne, “Response to the Opening Exhibition: Selections from the Holbrook Collection,” December 1948, Museum History file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
of Sissy. Next, she found the color juxtapositions in James Abbott McNeill Whistler’s *Rose and Red, The Barber’s Shop* impressive. Finally, demonstrating her analytical skills, she compared Moller’s *The Cow* to the paintings of Paul Klee, because of the similar use of line and color by both artists.\(^{38}\) Such careful study, as demonstrated in the critiques above, required students to engage with and learn from original artworks, thereby meeting the museum’s mission.

Dodd also required undergraduates to utilize their critical thinking skills. He had students fill out three by five index cards interpreting an object of their choice. The comments were then typed and posted below the artwork. Lisa Paul’s explanation of *The Cow* by Moller read: “The simplicity of this painting, as well as the warm and pleasing colors makes it all an excellent picture for an exhibition. Anyone can enjoy it whether they do so at face value or whether they wish to delve into the complications of the structure. The subject matter, although somewhat subdued catches the eye and is rather amusing. But the observer, to fully appreciate the mood, must contribute his imagination.”\(^{39}\) A task such as this one served to educate visitors seeking varied experiences. First, the author had to evaluate the artwork, interpret it, and then put his or her thoughts into a concise statement. Once posted, the comments could serve others who were untrained in the arts. On the other hand, those students outside the class who felt confident in their own opinions could begin a dialogue with their cohort based on what was written. What is more, beyond the didactic use of these interpretations, there was a practical use. Giving the viewer something to read might encourage him or her to spend more time in front of the painting. Additionally, it was doubtful that the staff of two would have had an opportunity to write descriptive labels for each painting, so these statements would have served in place of a professional’s interpretation. An exercise such as the one described here benefited the students because of its analytical approach, requiring them to think for themselves rather than be told what the paintings meant. Students applied the skills learned in their classes. On a broader level, understanding that the students chose to write about the paintings from the State Departments’

\(^{38}\) Margaret Johnson, “Response to the Opening Exhibition: Selections from the Holbrook Collection,” December 1948, Museum History file, Georgia Museum of Art, University of Georgia.

collection, even when those paintings were integrated with the work of other modernists, speaks
to their significance as part of the art historical canon.

Because the school of art took a holistic approach to education, students were provided
with other means of learning outside of the museum, such as access to noted artists and scholars.
The university started a visiting artists program, funded by the General Education Board. Invited
guests artists and scholars came to Athens to teach for the duration of one week to a full
semester. The faculty selected the most important people working in the field at the time. For
example, New York painter Yasuo Kuniyoshi, whose *Circus Girl Resting* had caused an uproar
during the tour of *Advancing American Art*, was welcomed without incident in 1947.40

Between 1945 and 1948, the school of art experienced rapid growth. The addition of
Holbrook’s collection brought recognition to the university, especially from his friends and
colleagues in the Northeast. However, when Holbrook implemented a community outreach
program, he strengthened the school’s reputation and solidified its identity as a cultural
destination. Providing access to the community outside campus borders fell well within the
university’s mission. Holbrook, especially, worked diligently to solicit involvement from those
attending other colleges and universities. Student groups visited the museum from nearby
Piedmont College, also in Athens, Brenau College in Gainesville, and the University of
Georgia’s satellite campus in Atlanta.41 Because towns in the South tended to be more spread
apart than cities in the North, it was difficult for many students to travel to the Georgia Museum
of Art. In order to serve those who could not visit, the museum partnered with the Division of
General Extension of the University to create an outreach program. As a result, Holbrook
traveled to schools around the state, such as Wesleyan College in Macon and Emory University
in Atlanta, to speak about the museum and its holdings. He often took with him as many as
twenty-five paintings from the collection.42 Personal correspondence confirms that Holbrook

40 “Visiting Art Yasuo Kuniyoshi,” 1947, Yasuo Kuniyoshi file, Georgia Museum of Art,
University of Georgia.

41 Georgia Museum of Art, “New Paintings on View at the Georgia Museum of Art,” news
release, December 1948, Lamar Dodd Collection University Correspondence file, Special
Collections Division, University of Georgia Libraries.

42 *Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection*, 6; Holbrook to Dorothy Jachens, 26 October
1951, Georgia Museum of Art founding file, University of Georgia Archives, Hargrett Rare
made one hundred eighty visits around the Southeast, including multiple visits to the cities of Rome, Macon, Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus, and Savannah. During his travels, he often addressed civic groups and was a featured speaker at the Georgia Federation of Women’s Clubs Convention. He even made a presentation to inmates at the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary. Dividing his time between working at the museum and traveling, Holbrook worked tirelessly to bring his collection to the public. On February 5, 1949, three months after the museum opened, President Jonathan C. Rogers honored the school’s achievements:

There are very few art galleries and museums in the South and especially is this true of Georgia. The Georgia Museum of Art on our university campus therefore brings to our 6500 students an exceptional cultural stimulus in a period that seems to be placing over emphasis upon ‘practical’ values. Upon each of my visits to the museum I note that students are thoughtfully ‘browsing around,’ quietly absorbing the inspiration of the masters past and present. Increasingly the gallery is a center of enrichment for the cultural and intellectual life of the university, and indeed of the State through the frequent off-campus lectures and exhibitions of Mr. Dodd and Mr. Holbrook.

After years of marketing to the Southeast, the museum became recognized nationally by lending paintings to traveling exhibitions. One significant example was a partnership with the American Federation of Arts (AFA). Beginning in 1969, the University of Georgia’s Cultural Affairs Committee, along with the Department of Art, organized three exhibitions of contemporary art, which were circulated by the AFA. Because of the museum’s strengths in modern American art, it seemed fitting that it would be involved in such an undertaking. Each
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Holbrook, “Founding an Art Museum,” n.d., Georgia Museum of Art Founding file, University of Georgia Archives, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.

Jonathan C. Rogers to Holbrook, 5 February 1949, RG UGA 97, Art Museum file, Erskine Caldwell Papers, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.
exhibition took a specific decade as its subject: the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s.\textsuperscript{46} The curators limited participation from universities, of which Auburn University and the University of Georgia were two selected. Borrowed from Auburn was Ben Shahn’s \textit{Hunger}. The objects from the University of Georgia were from the Holbrook Collection, but they were not selections from the State Department’s collection.

The exhibition series \textit{American Paintings: The 1940s}, \textit{American Paintings: The 1950s}, and \textit{American Paintings: The 1960s} presented a learning opportunity for University of Georgia graduate students. Preparations gave students and faculty a chance to actively learn about objects within a variety of collections. For example, Professor Dodd selected objects for \textit{American Paintings: The 1940s}, Associate Professor of Art History Lester C. Walker, Jr. contributed the essay, and graduate student Grace M. Walsh compiled the catalogue’s bibliography.\textsuperscript{47} This process allowed students to gain valuable practical experience in preparation for a professional career in museums, an idea that Dana implemented at the Newark Museum.\textsuperscript{48}

In the 1960s and 1970s, the educational role of museums and universities was called into question. The struggle between the perception of these institutions as elitist was not a new idea, but pressure was placed on them to serve a broader constituency.\textsuperscript{49} While the University of Georgia had excelled in outreach, they responded to public sentiment with the establishment of the friends of the museum group in 1972. Thus, the museum began offering educational programs, led by docents, to primary and secondary school children. As museums became destinations for school field trips, volunteers gave many school groups their first exposure to original arts.\textsuperscript{50} By committing to K-12 teachers, the institution became a valuable part of the compulsory school curriculum. Furthermore, maintaining an active docent core meant that the

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{46} \textit{American Paintings: The 1940s} (New York: American Federation of Arts, 1967), 4-5, 20-29.
\item\textsuperscript{47} The same pattern was followed for \textit{American Painting: The 1950s} and \textit{American Painting: The 1960s}, also produced by the American Federation of Arts.
\item\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 4-17.
\end{itemize}
people who volunteered also found value in the collection and wanted to share it with others, meeting the needs of a demanding public.

The museum began with the gift of one hundred paintings in 1945. By the time the museum opened in November 1948, the collection had increased to two hundred fifteen objects.\textsuperscript{51} The Holbrook collection reached around seven hundred in 1958 when the museum occupied the entire library.\textsuperscript{52} By 1974, the collection reached three thousand four hundred pieces. What is remarkable is that the University purchased only ninety-one objects, and the rest were gifts. Still, the most significant collections included the Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection of American Art, along with the Kress Study Collection of Renaissance work, nineteenth-century prints of the L’Estampe Originale Collection, a proof set of Piranesi’s \textit{Prison Series}, and forty paintings from Lamar Dodd.\textsuperscript{53} The late twentieth and early-twenty first centuries brought about more growth. Collection areas expanded to include the decorative arts of Georgia and works on paper. The institution also became a repository for the complete works of British portrait painter Gerald Brockhurst and Catalan-American artist Pierre Daura. Additionally, the West Foundation gave a collection of British watercolors, which focused on the Victorian era.\textsuperscript{54} While it was and is common for university museums to have limited acquisition budgets, and therefore to rely primarily on gifts, it was Holbrook’s twenty-year tenure of active collecting that set the pace for building the vibrant and accessible collection that exists today. No longer referred to as the Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection, the American paintings remain the core of the permanent collection. They are synonymous with the name Holbrook; they do not need a separate identity. The same is true for the paintings from the State Department. Because of their strength as fine examples of modernism, these paintings
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\textsuperscript{52} Georgia Museum of Art, \textit{Georgia Museum of Art Dedication Exhibition} (Athens: University of Georgia, 1958), 2. Of the seven hundred objects, about four hundred were paintings and the remaining three hundred were decorative arts, sculpture and works on paper.
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contributed to the overall collection’s value, which was estimated at over ninety thousand dollars in 1948, and today is in the millions.\footnote{Holbrook, “Annual Report for the Georgia Museum of Art for the Year 1948-1949,” in \textit{Academic Reports for the Year 1948-1949, Part 21} (Athens: University of Georgia), 7.}

Just as the collection has grown, so has the institutional footprint. The span of twenty-six years had taken its toll on the museum building, rendering its small, cramped quarters inadequate. In addition, the museum suffered from severe problems of leaking air conditioning units that vibrated violently enough to shake gallery walls. More traditional problems existed as well, such as having pipes hanging in storage spaces. Because of the dilapidated climate control system, the Kress Study Collection was rarely displayed. Additionally, valuable gifts, such as a collection of Pre-Columbian art, were refused due to the lack of proper storage and care facilities.\footnote{Georgia Museum of Art, \textit{The Resource, The Need, The Challenge}, 10-11.} Consequently, in 1974, to meet new research goals of an expanding academic institution and to properly preserve the collection, the faculty and staff sought a new building. They drafted a proposal titled “The Georgia Museum of Art: The Resource, The Need, The Challenge.” Citing the institution’s leadership role in fine arts and museum education through exhibitions, lectures, and outreach, the narrative stressed the importance of the museum to the campus, the town, and the region.\footnote{Ibid., 1.} More usable space was requested, including a lecture hall, seminar rooms and better galleries. The committee indicated that the museum’s mission of instruction and research could only be met through accessibility to the collections, thereby continuing to enrich the university.\footnote{Ibid., 9-13.} In 1996, the Georgia Museum of Art, which became the state art museum of Georgia in 1982, relocated to the East Campus to become a part of the Visual and Performing Arts Complex.\footnote{Jenny Williams (Public Relations Department, Georgia Museum of Art), in discussion with the author, November 4, 2010.} The current building boasts fifty-two thousand square feet in which to house its collection of eight thousand plus objects. The museum closed in the spring of 2009 as renovation on phase two began. It will reopen in 2011. In order to access the
collections, the museum has implemented new media with the creation of a site using the Second Life software. The Lamar Dodd School of Art moved into a new facility, near the museum, in the fall of 2009. The purpose of detailing the growth plan here is to demonstrate the conscious and continual efforts made to position the museum and the school as major contributors to the university’s educational mission.

Two very different approaches were taken by the University of Georgia and Auburn University in acquiring the State Department collection. Both saw the collections as a way to build their institutions. Both had individuals who advocated for the collection. In the case of Auburn, Frank Applebee, a faculty member and department chairperson, worked diligently to persuade the administration of the need for the paintings. On the other hand, Holbrook, a former New York attorney and art collector, retired to Athens to become a painter, and also became the museum’s primary benefactor. He founded the Georgia Museum of Art, provided it with a collection, and served as its first director for twenty-four years, retiring at the age of ninety-three. The goals of both universities were the same: to make a name for each institution as a cultural repository, to make the institution richer because of the acquisition, and to counter the perception of each school as primarily serving students interested in agricultural and scientific technologies. In the case of the University of Georgia, the Georgia Museum of Art, and with the Advancing American Art paintings as part of its collection, has had a more permanent and lasting effect on the university and its surrounding communities. Furthermore, the strength of the American art collection surpassed that of others in the Southeast. With an emphasis on modernism, the collection stands out when compared with other public universities’ collections around the country. For instance, Robert Gwathmey’s Hoeing Tobacco was similar to the University of Oklahoma’s Workers on the Land; Stuart Davis’ Snow on the Mountain, was comparable to the University of Washington’s Trees and El; and Yasuo Kuniyoshi’s She Mourns, which was very different in subject, was related stylistically to Circus Girl Resting at Auburn University.

Holbrook, like his colleagues, was not only concerned with developing an encyclopedic

---

60 Bill Eiland (Director, Georgia Museum of Art), in discussion with the author at the Association of College and University Galleries and Museums annual conference, May 2, 2009.

collection of American art, but he was also participating in the trend of investing in contemporary art for education purposes, which paid off. Holbrook and Dodd made an indelible mark. Their names live on at the Lamar Dodd School of Art and the Georgia Museum of Art, just as the State Department paintings’ legacy continues in its role as part of one of the best received American art collections in the South.
CHAPTER 6

MODERNISM MEETS THE AMERICAN WEST AT THE FRED JONES JR. MUSEUM OF ART, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

The University Art Museum, now the Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, is the only western school being considered in this study.¹ What separates this museum from the others is the size of the collection, which is encyclopedic in scope. More importantly, the collection of American art is vast, including categories of United States art, Native American art, and Art of the American West. The diversity of the objects representing America in this institution allows for broader contextualization than is possible with a more limited collection as at the other three universities. The placement of the Advancing American Art paintings in Oklahoma amplified the study of American art at mid-century, as the paintings contributed to the identity of the institution and made it more prominent as a cultural destination.

The Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art is another example of how a regional museum had to create its own identity as a center for the arts. As I will demonstrate, university faculty and administrators saw early on the need to develop a collection to serve the students’ needs. Oscar Jacobson, hired in 1915 as an assistant professor of studio art, spoke about his desire for the university to have its own art collection. He became director of the School of Art, where he

¹ In 1992, the art museum was renamed the Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art. First called the Fred Jones Jr. Memorial Art Center, when constructed in 1971, the museum was named in honor of a student who died in an airplane crash while attending the university. His parents donated the funds for the building. Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, “Museum History,” http://www.ou.edu/content/fjjma/home/main/visit/museum_history.html (accessed October 22, 2010).
served until 1945. He also helped found the university art museum in 1936 and served as its
director until 1950. When Jacobson came to Oklahoma he observed the following:

There were no art museums or collections in the state available to the public, although a
few men of wealth had paintings and other works of art in their homes. Norman,
Oklahoma was at that time far from any art center, the nearest being St. Louis. Yet I felt
that art students should have the opportunity to see good painting and sculpture as part of
their cultural education.²

Jacobson’s goals were three-fold: to instruct students about proper artistic methods and
techniques, to provide them with exhibition opportunities, and to expose them to contemporary
and historic works of art. To that end, he formed the Association of Oklahoma Artists in 1916
and organized the first exhibition of Oklahoma artists on the university’s campus that same
year.³

Jacobson started the collection by amassing large numbers of Native American and North
African works. During the 1920s and 1930s the collection expanded through the acquisition of
the American Indian Arts and Crafts Collection.⁴ Early gifts included a collection of original
drawings from the Saturday Evening Post, given by University President Stratton D. Brooks, and
a series of paintings donated by the student art club, Les Beaux Arts.⁵ The University’s Board of
Regents established the Museum of Art in 1936, prompted by a gift of seven hundred fifty-eight
pieces of East Asian art from collectors Lew Wentz and Gordon Matzene.⁶ The collection totaled
two thousand five hundred by the museum’s founding.⁷

Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries.

Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid. The first work donated from Les Beaux Arts was Foothills of the Rockies made by Birger
Sandzen, Jacobson’s art professor at Bethany College and an artist of the American West.

Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries. The initial Matzene-Wentz gift was only a
portion of the collection, given while they were still living. Talks were held about leaving the
remainder of the collection to the university after their deaths, but improper care and insufficient
The 1940s saw continued growth in the area of American modernism with a gift from the United States Treasury of thirty-nine paintings from the Works Progress Administration and New Mexico Federal Art Project in 1943. In 1948, the university purchased thirty-six paintings from the War Assets Administration’s Advancing American Art exhibition, for at total of $1,061. Jacobson worked closely with University administrators to make sure funds were available to buy paintings from Advancing American Art, if the bids were successful. In May and June of 1948, he submitted several requests to move money from one account to another. He decreased the budget for hourly staff by five hundred dollars in order to increase the amount dedicated to equipment and maintenance. By the time the auction ended and the winners were

---

storage space prompted the donor’s to will the collection to the Ponca City Library in Mr. Wentz’s hometown.


9 They are: Flower Head (c. 1940s) by William Baziotes; Figures (no date) by Gifford Beal; At Five in the Afternoon (1946) by Romare Bearden; Evening Glow (1945) by Rainey Bennett; Clown (1945) by Cameron Booth; Gallery K (no date) by Louis Bouche; Boston (no date) by Douglas Brown; Woman with Bird (1945) by Byron Browne; Wing Fabrication (1946) by Ralston Crawford; Shapes of Landscape Space (1939) by Stuart Davis; Nocturnal Family (1944) by Julio de Diego; The Couple (1946) by Adolph Gottlieb; Night Passage (1946) by Adolph Gottlieb; They Fought to the Last Man (1945) by William Gropper; Prey (no date) by William Gropper; Workers on the Land (Dirt Farmers) (1946) by Robert Gwathmey; House in Provincetown (1930) by Edward Hopper; The Medusa (1945) by Charles Howard; Wagnerian Opera (no date) by Mervin Jules; Piqua, Ohio (1948) by Dong Kingman; White Flowers (no date) by Frank Kleinholtz; Three Clowns (1948) by Benjamin Kopman; Cemetery (1946) by Edmund Lewandowski; The White Horse (1946) by Jack Levine; Blue Dunes (1940) by Loren MacIver; Monhegan Cliffs (no date) by Joseph de Martini; New England Church (1935-46) by George L.K. Morris; Shipbuilding Composition (1940) by George L.K. Morris; Cos Cob (1926) by Georgia O’Keeffe; Newspapers (no date) by Gregorio Prestopino; Birds Bathing (no date) by Abraham Rattner; The Yellow Table (1945) by Abraham Rattner; End of the Conference (1945) by Anton Refregier; Renascence (1946) by Ben Shahn; Two Vases (1945) by Max Weber; Columbus Avenue (1945) by Karl Zerbe. See School of Art, 1940-1960.
announced, Jacobson had collected fifteen hundred dollars.\textsuperscript{10} Accounting records indicate that the money be used to purchase art from the War Assets Administration.\textsuperscript{11} At the risk of spending the museum’s entire equipment and maintenance allotment for the year, Jacobson acted within the confines of his budget and the university and its art museum reaped the benefits by building the American art collection.

News of the museum’s acquisition spread quickly around campus and to the local media. Newspaper articles around the State briefly recounted the collection’s history and announced the purchase, such as a report in the June 24, 1948, edition of the \textit{Daily Oklahoman}. Oklahoma’s former director for the art section of the WPA, Nan Sheets, wrote an article commenting on the value of the paintings in educating students. “The pictures will be invaluable to the art students who will have the privilege of studying originals by artists whose names are found in all national exhibitions. Congratulations to whoever had the foresight to send in a bid.”\textsuperscript{12} The August 1948 \textit{Sooner Magazine} mentioned the works in an article entitled “O. U. Purchases ‘Condemned Art,’” where the author commented favorably on buying good art at a good price. The author then went on to point out the irony that the artists represented in the \textit{Advancing American Art} exhibition were in fact advancing, a year after the shows’ closing.\textsuperscript{13} Commendations from the university community and the press about putting the paintings in service of the students were well intended. What is missing from the university’s history, however, is a full explanation of how the collections were used in education. Yet fragments of the story still exist.

In late September 1948, the first exhibition of the State Department paintings was announced. Photographs of an art student and librarian holding Jack Levine’s \textit{The White Horse}

\textsuperscript{10} Jacobson to George Lynn Cross, 19 May 1948, George Lynn Cross Papers, box 38, Art Museum folder, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries. The requests for budget revision are sequentially numbered 314 and 315. Neither request gave a justification for the money transfers, but it is logical to assume that they were for the purpose of purchasing the State Department paintings.

\textsuperscript{11} Jacobson to Cross, 26 July 1948, George Lynn Cross Papers, box 38, Art Museum folder, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries.


and Georgia O’Keeffe’s Cos Cob were featured in The Daily Oklahoman.\textsuperscript{14} The exhibition opened in the art building on September 25 and ran for two weeks. Jacobson was interviewed for an article, which was published in the Norman Transcript under the title, “Modern Art is Too Gloomy O.U. Professor Maintains.” He spoke candidly offering his opinion of modern art, not just the works in his museum’s collection. He explained how the painters construct “gloomy” images, as if they were “the displaced persons of Europe.” He preferred expressions of joy and happiness, but stated that was not the case with most modern art, and he claimed the works bought from the State Department works will prove his point. At the same time he discussed how the paintings were “typical” of American art and the painters were some of the most famous working at the time.\textsuperscript{15}

Indeed, what better way to teach students techniques than by offering contemporary artists solo exhibitions and placements as visiting artists. For instance, watercolorist Dong Kingman came to the University in 1947.\textsuperscript{16} His participation as an instructor in the Art Department demonstrates the accessibility of national artists and their willingness to visit regional institutions. While his residency was short term, students had the benefit of learning from an important artist. Because the museum collected Kingman’s work, the dialogue continued between the artist, his work, and university students.

Developing new curriculum, however, seemed less of a priority than finding storage space, a problem that paralleled Auburn University’s. By 1949, the art building had two rooms dedicated to the art museum, which was not nearly ample enough to show a collection that numbered well over one thousand objects.\textsuperscript{17} The collection kept growing, but space for it did not increase. Jacobson meet with frustration over housing the Wentz-Matzene collection. He

\textsuperscript{14} The Daily Oklahoman, “OU to Give Public First Peek Today at ‘Ham and Eggs’ Art,” September 25, 1948.

\textsuperscript{15} Riley Wilson, “Modern Art Is Too Gloomy O.U. Professor Maintains,” Norman Transcript, September 1948.


\textsuperscript{17} “General Course Catalog,” 1948-49, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries.
exhibited a portion of the collection and used a storage room for the remainder, only to have the School of Art take it away. Struggling to find any space at all, the objects were first moved to a hot attic, and then down into the dank basement. It was common for universities to store objects in the basements of academic buildings. However, the results often ended badly, as they did in this case, where many items suffered water damage during heavy rains. Faculty and staff recognized the peril in which they placed works of art, but standardized collections policies and practices were not mandated at the time, and even then, were not always heeded.

The art collections were moved from the School of Art’s basement in June 1950 and placed in the former administrative center for Naval Air Technical Training. This renovated structure became the first designated exhibition space of the museum, allowing for greater interaction between the students, the public, and the art. With this new location came the official naming of the institution as the University Art Museum, a name that would remain for twenty years.

The school continued to grow, and in 1966 an evaluative self-study was conducted in order to prepare long-range goals for future expansion and advancement. Two areas emerged as outstanding: painting and art education, with design, sculpture and art history receiving average rankings. Of greatest concern was the lack of a graduate program, especially in art history, the state of the facilities, and the poor teacher-to-student ratio. At the time, there were seven drawing classes, seventeen design courses, four painting classes, five sculpture classes, four printmaking courses, fifteen art history courses, and one art education class offered. Enrollment caps per section ranged from twelve to forty in the studio classes and from five to one hundred thirty in the art history courses.

18 Walter Kraft to Roscoe Cate, 31 May 1949, George Lynn Cross Papers, box 38, Art Museum folder, Western University Collection, University of Oklahoma Libraries. The letter discusses water damage to the art collection with recommendations that it be moved.


20 “School of Art Evaluation,” n.d., Correspondence of Deans/College of Fine Arts file, box 4, McCarter folder, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries.

The 1966 assessment of the Museum of Art showed that the institution did not have an acquisition’s fund, making purchases for the collection non-existent. Additionally, the facilities were lacking adequate exhibition galleries, storage, and climate control. Like the other universities in this study, the staff was comparable in size, being only three, again making it difficult to use the collection effectively.

In 1971, an art center was erected to accommodate the University’s Museum of Art, the School of Art, as well as the offices for the College of Fine Arts. The museum’s interior was renovated in the 1980s to make more and better equipped exhibition galleries.

In the 1980s, former curator Leonard Good wrote about the State Department paintings: “These, over forty years later, are still major attractions usually displayed as the core of the Museum’s permanent acquisitions.” Little did he know how prophetic his statement would be as the museum moved into the twenty-first century. Increased attention has been given to the thirty-six paintings, originally displayed as part of the Advancing American Art exhibition over the years, especially from the mid-1980s to the present. For example, in 1990, the Amarillo Art Center mounted an exhibition entitled Changing Times: American Art in Transition, which showcased modern art styles from the 1930s and 1940s and featured thirteen paintings from the University of Oklahoma.

Construction on a new wing was completed in 2002 with the addition of the Howard and Mary Lester Wing, comprised of a series of connected house-shaped buildings. The wing has become the museum’s new entrance, for it features an orientation space, auditorium, museum store, education classroom and galleries, doubling the museum’s size.

Apart from loaning works to traveling exhibitions, the museum kept a portion of the State Department Collection on view in the permanent collection galleries, as is evidenced by the volume of interpretation materials written by staff and interns. For instance, twelve paintings from the collection were installed after they returned from the 1984 tour for Advancing American

---


Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the US State Department Exhibition, 1946-1948, organized by the Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, Alabama.\textsuperscript{24} Engaging audiences through video technology became a new area of interpretation in the spring of 1985 when the museum produced a scripted video tour of twenty-one State Department paintings under the title \textit{Advancing American Art}. Recorded commentary includes biographic information about the artists, stylistic interpretations, and art historical context.\textsuperscript{25} A decade later curators mounted a combined showing of the Works Progress Administration and State Department Collections held by the museum in the summer of 1995. Educators created a brochure detailing the history of government projects, the university’s involvement, and the significance of the collections. In 1999, a summer intern created what appears to be the text of an instructional packet for teachers. This fifteen-page document provides a brief history of the collection, social context about the state of affairs in the 1940s, a vocabulary list of art-related terms, such as abstraction and avant-garde, longer definitions of styles, page-long biographies of six featured artists and their paintings, questions for classroom discussion, a social studies lesson, and a bibliography. The document is extremely useful for incorporating the collection into the state standards set for K-12 curriculum.

Following similar guidelines, staff members created an outline for a Freedom of Expression Focus Tour held on September 11, 2002. This special event was a part of the American Association of Museums’ “Museums Celebrate America’s Freedom: Joining Communities in a Day of Remembrance” on the first anniversary of one of the nation’s worst catastrophes. The State Department collection was the focus of this teachable moment as


\textsuperscript{25} The video was not available, but the typed manuscript for the tour was included in the collection’s file held by the museum’s curatorial office. It was written by Lyn Rowdes.
organizers took the opportunity to point out the struggles of American artists in trying to freely express their creativity.26

The paintings purchased from the War Assets Administration have always kept their autonomous designation as the State Department Collection, and today, that collection hangs in the museum’s Lester Wing. The preceding examples support the notion that the State Department Collection at the Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art is actively exhibited and utilized as the core of the museum’s American art collection by students and visitors of all ages. The museum has positioned itself as a formidable institution with a strong emphasis in modern American, Native American, and Southwest art.

CHAPTER 7

ADVANCING AMERICAN ART’S PLACE IN THE HENRY ART GALLERY, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The University of Washington’s Henry Art Gallery is the oldest museum of the four included in this study. It differs from the three other universities because of its origins, its collecting direction, and its geographical location. Situated on the campus of the University of Washington, the museum was built by one of Seattle’s elite. Horace C. Henry, a railroad magnate and art collector, gifted the museum to the city and the university. In 1926, he gave $100,000 to finance the building’s construction and a collection of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century paintings, prints, and sculpture, totaling 172 objects.¹ The museum opened to the public on February 10, 1927, as Washington State’s first fine arts museum.²

¹ Frederick P. Thieme to Gervais Reed, 28 February 1966, WU Henry Art Gallery Collection, box 4, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.

² Reed, “Notes on the History of the School of Art,” 2 February 1966, WU Henry Art Gallery Collection, box 6, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries. See also Joseph N. Newland, Henry Art Gallery: University of Washington, 1927-1986 (Seattle: Henry Art Gallery, 1986), 17. The governing body of the Henry Art Gallery from its inception was the College of Fine Arts, established in 1912. The Chairperson for the Department of Painting, Sculpture and Design served as gallery director. Through university restructuring, the College of Fine Arts was transferred to the College of Liberal Arts (University College). In 1939, the College of Arts and Sciences was established to become the home for the newly named School of Art. Its director also continued to serve as the head of the gallery. In 1968, Spencer Moseley, Chair of the School of Art since 1966, made associate director Gervais Reed the gallery’s director. After Reed’s resignation, Moseley became acting director and remained as such for several years with different assistant and associate directors beneath him. Then, two major events occurred in the
Since its founding, the Henry Art Gallery at the University of Washington has positioned itself as a resource for contemporary art and new media. As it looks forward to the twenty-first century, one wonders what this might mean for its historical collections, and specifically for those works that were a part of *Advancing American Art*. In this chapter, I argue that the six paintings purchased from the State Department played an important role in the institution’s development. The gallery acquired the paintings at the same time as an influx of students occurred through the G.I. Bill, staff was hired with important contacts and reputable experience, and a new building was constructed to house the School of Art. The confluence of these events made the works pivotal in furthering the academic mission of the university. I will conclude that the six paintings hold value for the institution today because they fit within its current mission by providing examples of 1940s avant-garde American art by important twentieth century painters.

Before exploring how the paintings functioned at the University of Washington, they must be contextualized within the history of the Henry Art Gallery and its other collections.

After Henry gave the founding collection, the museum experienced decades with little collecting activity, in part because he did not establish an endowment as part of his gift. The museum’s only purchase, prior to a period of rapid growth in the 1970s, were the six paintings from *Advancing American Art*. Otherwise, the collection developed through the gallery’s relationship to the University of Washington’s School of Art by the acquiring works of its own faculty and their personal collections. What resulted were a number of donations making a fractured collection with little cohesion. With reliance upon bequests and gifts, the collection grew slowly in four directions. In the 1950s, the focus was on regional art, with the popularity of the Northwest Craftsman’s Annual Exhibition beginning in 1953. Pacific Northwest artists, including Morris Graves, Mark Tobey, and others, presented gifts of paintings and drawings.

---

mid-1970s. The American Association of Museums accredited the Henry Art Gallery in 1974, which was followed by an emancipation of sorts. 1975 brought an administrative restructuring where the Gallery was removed out from under the School of Art and became its own academic entity within the College of Arts and Sciences.


4 Judy Surokali (Curator, Henry Art Gallery), in discussion with the author, July 2005.

Former curator Betty Willis gave her collection of Mingei Japanese pottery in 1960.\(^6\) Around that same time, more than eight hundred Indian textiles were donated by the School of Home Economics’ Costume and Textiles Department.\(^7\) The American and European collections grew from several gifts of works on paper. The range of artists spanned from Robert Motherwell, Robert Indiana, and George Rouault to William Hogarth, James Abbott McNeill Whistler, and Rembrandt van Rijn.\(^8\) The point of the above is to demonstrate how varied the collections were during the gallery’s first thirty-eight years of existence, which is not uncommon when an institution is almost solely reliant on gifts.

Although the University of Washington has extensive university archives, the Henry Art Gallery holds what little information exists about the logistics of acquiring pieces from *Advancing American Art*.\(^9\) What is known is that Walter F. Isaacs, Chairman of the College of Fine Arts’ Department of Painting, Sculpture and Design and Director of the Henry Art Gallery from 1924 to 1954, and a painter himself with an interest in international modernism, purchased them.\(^10\) The paintings were purchased for $295 dollars. Isaacs wrote to curator Melvin Kohler


\(^7\) Newland, *Henry Art Gallery*, 16.


\(^9\) Richard S. Hart, Jr. to L. R. Durkee, 19 July 1965, Museum History files, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington. In 1965, Richard S. Hart, Jr. recorded his version of the paintings’ acquisition. Hart, Executive Assistant to the Dean of the School of Art, recounted the events in a letter to his friend L. R. Durkee, with a copy sent to Reed, and recommended that the story be documented in writing. Hart wrote that he was instigator of the venture, having seen an announcement of the sale of the paintings. He claimed that he expressed interest in purchasing all of the paintings, but that his offer was met with surprise for the War Assets Administrators did not expect one institution or one person to bid on the entire lot. Hart believed that the paintings were extremely valuable to the university and he took pride in being a part of the acquisition team.

\(^10\) The six paintings acquired by the University of Washington from the United States government’s War Assets Administration were Ben-Zion’s *Perpetual Destructor*, 1944; Stuart Davis’s *Trees and El*, 1931; Werner Drewes, *Balcony*, 1945; Mardsen Hartley’s *Whale’s Jaw, Dogtown Common, Cape Ann, Massachusetts*, 1934; Robert Motherwell’s *Figuration*, circa 1945; and Max Weber’s *Discussion* (also known as *Conversation*), 1935. “List of Paintings Received from War Assets Administration,” n.d., Museum History files, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington.
announcing his excitement over the acquisition. He went on to explain the total cost was a “break” to the university because of the discount to academic institutions.\textsuperscript{11} The question then becomes how did the paintings bring life to the study of contemporary art? How did they contribute to the educational mission of the institution? There is no doubt that the University of Washington recognized the importance of the Advancing American Art collection and the opportunity for an automatic return on investment if they ever sold the paintings. Similar to the case of the University of Georgia, however, this also became an opportunity to build the Henry collection. Furthermore, similar to what was being done at Auburn University, the faculty of the School of Art and the staff of the Henry Art Gallery sought to fill a void in the cultural landscape by taking advantage of an opportunity to bring examples of paintings by recognized artists to the northwest coast of the United States.

In order to demonstrate the programmatic outcomes, we must first consider the demographics of the university in the late 1940s to understand who was served. Enrollment at the university increased by 11,000 students between 1945 and 1948 because of returning war veterans. In the spring quarter of 1948, there were four hundred and twenty majors in the School of Art in the disciplines of general curriculum, art education, interior design, industrial design, painting, and sculpture.\textsuperscript{12} What is important is that this period of growth coincided with the acquisition and display of the State Department paintings.

A year after the State Department paintings were acquired, a meeting was held to discuss developing a curriculum in art history. The initial course topic would be an introduction to the fine arts. The course was to be offered to students in cooperation with the Henry Art Gallery, which would provide announcements of events on topics related to the course. Instruction would

\textsuperscript{11} Newland, \textit{Henry Art Gallery}, 13, 14. Only a handwritten note about the purchase from Issacs to Kohler survives. Walter F. Issacs to Melvin Kohler, 24 June 1948, Henry Art Gallery Donor files, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington. The only other document is a letter addressed to the University of Washington, Department of Art, from Charles W. Johnson, Secretary, W.S. Budworth and Son, Inc., New York, notifying the department that the paintings had been shipped to the War Assets Administration’s Surplus Property Warehouse in Seattle. Charles W. Johnson to University of Washington, Department of Art, 1 July 1948, Henry Art Gallery Donor files, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington.

\textsuperscript{12} The numbers of students and faculty presented in the 1947-1949 School of Art Annual Report are double that from before the war. See Newland, \textit{Henry Art Gallery}, 14.
take the form of slide lectures utilizing materials purchased from the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and other vendors. Instruction on defining style and recognizing technique were goals of the course. Students would be taught to raise such questions as whether subject matter affects aesthetic value, and what is fit and unfit in art? Expanding the number and topics of art history courses was also talked about, as was the need to hire an art historian. The point of discussing a sample course syllabus and broader plans to add additional courses is to illustrate that the University of Washington participated in the growing trend of integrating art history within programs of study in studio art, architecture, and art education. Although art history did not become an undergraduate major until 1964, the comments mentioned above were inline with the developing discipline at universities around the country. In fact, once the art history program began, it was less than a decade before the art history master’s and doctoral degrees, as well as a museum studies master’s degree, were being offered.

The Henry Art Gallery’s administration proved crucial to the development of museum educational programs from the 1940s to the 1960s. Three people in particular made effective use of the collections, which contributed to the institutional identity as a place where contemporary art could be studied. They were Elizabeth Bailey (Betty) Willis, Melvin O. Kohler, and Gervais Reed. Willis served a brief two-year stint as curator from 1946 to 1947 before Kohler took over. He then directed the museum from 1948 to 1952. In 1952, Gervais Reed settled in and managed the institution until 1966. Each contextualized the collection within broader trends in American art by showing the collection alongside traveling exhibitions of modern art, and developing programs based on the gallery’s holdings.

Willis came with a wealth of New York gallery experience, strong professional contacts, and knowledge of current trends in American art. Reed credited her for reviving the institution.

13 Marion Burness, “Minutes, Committee Meeting, General Education Course in the Introduction to the Fine Arts,” 5 July 1950, WU Art School Collection, box 1, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.

14 Several paragraphs were devoted to defining art history as a discipline arguing for its place in an art school rather in the department of history or archaeology. “Biennial Report, School of Art, 1947-1949,” n.d., WU Art School Collection, box 1, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.

16 Newland, Henry Art Gallery, 15.
on a shoestring budget, after the Depression caused Halley Savery’s position as curator to be cut to part time. Willis was an able-bodied audience developer, an educator, and an influential curator. One example of her interest in showcasing contemporary art at the museum was when she displayed Charles Eames’s furniture in 1947, the year after it debuted at the Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Another venture to benefit and promote the School of Art was the formation of the Office of Circulating Exhibitions, as part of the Division of Adult Education and Extension Services on July 1, 1948, as a directive from University President Raymond Allen. Its purpose was to create community service programs, with outreach through instructive exhibitions, which were funded by surpluses accumulated during the war. Kohler assumed a dual appointment as curator for the gallery and administrative officer for the Office of Circulating Exhibitions. Most of the exhibitions developed for multiple venues were the traditional poster panel types, showing photographic reproductions of fine art and architectural examples, either organized by the university or purchased from the Museum of Modern Art or Life magazine, for example, to show in Seattle and then travel around the State. They featured the works by painter Marsden Hartley, sculptor Henry Moore, photographer Cartier-Bresson, and architect Mies van der Rohe. The original objects for loan included student prints, faculty paintings, and, probably the most important, the six State Department paintings, which showed at the Tacoma Art League Galleries at the College of Puget Sound in February 1949, less than a year after their arrival in the state. An important exhibition curated by Kohler and traveled by the Henry Art Gallery was a UNESCO exhibition on view at the University of Washington from June 25 through August 6.

17 The Office of Circulating Exhibitions was created to serve all departments of the university. “Annual Report 1948-49,” n.d., WU Henry Art Gallery Collection, box 5, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.

18 “Annual Report 1948-49,” n.d., WU Henry Art Gallery Collection, box 5, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries. Inside the annual report is a section titled “Circulating Exhibitions and Specially Arranged Exhibitions.” The report outlines several “specially arranged exhibitions” put together for specific events or conferences. Examples include a collection of ceramics created by School of Art instructor Paul Bonifas, a weaving demonstration by the School of Home Economics at the Lake City Pioneer Days, a show of artwork by children for the Adult Education Center’s Creativity Conference.
1950. Included were loaned paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, the San Francisco Museum of Art, the Seattle Art Museum. The Henry’s own War Assets Collection was a significant addition to the checklist because these paintings were previously exhibited at the Musée d’Art Moderne, Paris, as part of the first UNESCO general conference in November 1946.

Interspersed between traveling shows from IBM, Life Magazine, the Museum of Modern Art, the Seattle Art Museum, the Western Association of Art Museum Directors, and the Office of Circulating Exhibitions were changing exhibitions of objects from the permanent collection. As recorded in the 1948 to 1949 annual report, the six State Department paintings were exhibited from August 9 to September 30, 1948, shortly after they arrived on campus. Attendance for the two-month period totaled 2,857. This number is significant because it is a remarkable increase from the prior year. In 1947, the total number of visitors in twelve months was 483 people. Because of Willis and Kohler’s efforts in programming events at the gallery, ranging from concerts to lectures to films, the numbers skyrocketed.

In reviewing the volume of literature produced by the school and gallery from 1947 to 1949, the culminating event seems to have been the opening of a new facility for the School of Art in the fall of 1949. Staff person Hope Foote rather boastfully described the building as having the best facilities in the country after having been neglected for years. The construction of a new building for the school would have provided another opportunity for the Advancing

---

19 Reed, “Schedule of exhibitions including titles and dates from 1950 to 1968,” n.d., Papers of Gervais Reed, box 6, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.

20 Newland, Henry Art Gallery, 14, 79.


24 Hope Foote to Edwin Guthrie, 7 November 1949, WU Art School Collection, box 103, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.
American Art collection to be shown. The new building also linked its art, art history and museum programs to one another to provide students with a competitive edge in obtaining the knowledge, skills and techniques of contemporary and historical subjects needed a career in the fine arts.

Reed became curator in 1952, after serving the university as a lecturer on art history topics and as acting director of the Instructional Materials Center.25 What he inherited was a staff of two and a half: an assistant curator, a secretary and a part-time student assistant. Consequently, there was little manpower to mount exhibitions or develop programs, no revenue coming in to support the institution, and no one to maintain the building and grounds. He took the opportunity to work on the infrastructure. As the budget rebounded, he invested in equipment to support museum operations, such as exhibition preparation, storage, and documentation. His greatest contribution was in recognizing museological practices and implementing them by making better use of storage areas, devising strategies for exhibition installation by a small staff, and attempting to catalog the entire collection in an accession book and in card catalog format.26 Another significant contribution Reed made was in rotating objects from the permanent collection so that they were shown at least once per year, between 1953 and 1966. 27 For example, in 1966 the Henry Art Gallery began its academic year by filling its galleries with a permanent collection installation. The selected objects highlighted the Horace Henry Collection of nineteenth- and twentieth-century American paintings, the contemporary paintings of the War Assets Collection, the European prints of George Rouault, and the decorative arts of Japanese folk pottery. The exhibition was on view from September 1 through October 2, 1966. Attendance for the two-month period was 2,436.28 Because documentation proves how the collections were used, I maintain that the six paintings from AAA were

25 Newland, Henry Art Gallery, 15.

26 Reed to Boyer Gonzales, 15 October 1964, WU Henry Art Gallery Collection, box 4, Art School folder, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries.

27 Newland, Henry Art Gallery, 15.

significant to the museum’s programming when they were first acquired, even if they are less so today.

Before vacating his position, Reed decided to build on the collection’s strengths for future acquisitions. For example, two sizable gifts of ethnic textiles and costumes substantially increased the variety and volume of the museum’s domestic craft collection. 29 He also concentrated on expanding the collection into new media and contemporary art. With the founding of the Monsen Study Collection of the History of Photography by Professors R. Joseph and Elaine R. Monsen in the 1970s, photography became a primary institutional focus. In the 1990s, the gallery continued to collect photography, and added film, digital productions, and large-scale installations. 30 What is important to recognize is that as the institution’s collecting direction changed, it still held contemporary art at its core. The War Assets Collection fit into this vision because it was accessioned shortly after they were produced. Their value increased as the paintings were used in programming exhibitions, lectures, and curriculum development that continue today.

29 Newland, Henry Art Gallery, 18. The textile collection at the gallery grew when the Department of Costume and Textiles collection’s contents were transferred to the Henry in 1982.

30 Judy Surokali (Curator, Henry Art Gallery), in discussion with the author, July 2005.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The *Advancing American Art* exhibition is an example of the federal government’s failed attempt at cultural diplomacy during the Cold War, a project from which much was learned and later successes achieved. In this instance, the administration looked beyond the United States’ borders for its audience. The goal was to introduce viewers in other countries to variety of works to demonstrate the success and diversity of the arts in the United States under capitalism. The underlying intent was to use art as cultural diplomacy, to counter negative perceptions of the United States. As well intentioned as the project seemed, it faced relentless scrutiny at home. Yet, until this dissertation, no one has yet fully treated the domestic aftermath of *Advancing American Art*. Thus, the first few chapters focused on how pressure from the American media, politicians, and the general public forced the State Department to cancel the exhibition and sell the paintings. I then used the War Assets Administration’s auction as a new starting point to explore the second life of these paintings when they became the property of several public institutions, four of which were studied here. What this manuscript does, then, is explore the role played by regional fine art collections and the museums that house them in defining the history of art of the United States. The remaining four chapters provide some insight into how the dissemination of the paintings to the South, Midwest, and Northwest broadened the audience domestically. Consequently, this study of regional collections and the documentation concerning their acquisitions aids our understanding of the reception of modernist art outside larger metropolitan areas.
Building on exhibiting scholarship and using previously untapped archival sources, this dissertation paints a nuanced look at regional museums—the difference in how they used the paintings and how their communities responded to them. In doing so, I have greatly expanded upon what Ausfeld and Mecklenburg, and others, have done by changing the focus from the national exhibition to the local level. Using Amy Levin’s *Defining Memory: Local Museums and the Construction of History in America’s Changing Communities* (2007) as a model, I have taken her argument of how small history museums contribute to national identity and applied it to academic museums. I attempted to demonstrate that the collections at these four universities are significant to their communities and capture a historical moment in American history.

Thanks to the cancellation of *Advancing American Art* in 1947 and the War Asset Administration’s auction in 1948, Auburn University, the University of Georgia, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Washington occupied the enviable position of receiving masterworks of modern art for their collections. Each of the institutions represented regions of the country where the populations did not have the opportunity to see current art works and understand trends at first hand. The acquisition of the paintings gave schools primary resources from which to teach. Looking at each university individually, I tried to show how the paintings contributed to the academic study of contemporary American art at mid-century. In turn, the paintings became the nuclei of their respective collections, thus bringing attention to these regional campuses. Consequently, the once maligned State Department examples now participate in a national dialogue of what defined American art of the 1940s. Hanging next to masterpieces by canonical figures such as Franz Kline, Jackson Pollock, Thomas Hart Benton, and Willem de Kooning, paintings by those artists who participated in *Advancing American Art* earn their rightful place in American art history. Furthermore, the museums that house them play a significant role in cultivating each respective university’s identity through branding campaigns and recruiting appeals. Tracing the function of the paintings within an academic setting contributes to a greater understanding of the evolution of museum education in theory and practice.
Figure 1: Ben-Zion, *The Strangled Tree*, oil on canvas, 26 7/8 x 36, no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 3: “Art for Taxpayers,” The Republican News, 1947.
Figure 4: “Your Money Bought These Paintings,” Look magazine, February 18, 1947, 80-81. Library of Congress.
Figure 5: Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Circus Girl Resting, oil on canvas, 39 ¼ x 28 ¾ in., c. 1945. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Margaret Lynne Ausfeld and Virginia M. Mecklenburg, Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-48 (Montgomery: Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, 1984), 10.]
Figure 6: Art class in front of Samford Hall at Auburn University, March 1946. Auburn University Libraries, Auburn University Special Collections and Archives. [http://content.lib.auburn.edu/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/aunumphoto&CISOPTR=403&CISOBOX=1&REC=3.]
Figure 7: ‘Life’ Exhibit of War Paintings, February 1946. Auburn University Libraries, Auburn University Special Collections and Archives. [http://content.lib.auburn.edu/cdm4/item_viewer.php?CISOROOT=/aunumphoto&CISOPTR=159&CISOBOX=1&REC=4.]
Figure 8: Exterior, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama, 2005. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 9: Artist Lamar Dodd at Marys Lake, Big Thompson Project, Colorado. [Photo courtesy of http://www.usbr.gov/museumproperty/art/dodd2.jpg.]
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Figure 13: Ben-Zion, *End of Don Quixote*, oil on canvas, 30 x 25 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 14: Ben-Zion, *The Strangled Tree*, oil on canvas, 26 7/8 x 36 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 17: George Constant, Rock Crabs, oil on canvas, 20 x 16 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Margaret Lynne Ausfeld and Virginia M. Mecklenburg, Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-48 (Montgomery: Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, 1984), 55.]
Figure 18: George Constant, *Seated Figure*, watercolor on paper, 12 x 7 ¼ in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Margaret Lynne Ausfeld and Virginia M. Mecklenburg, *Advancing American Art: Politics and Aesthetics in the State Department Exhibition, 1946-48* (Montgomery: Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, 1984), 87.]
Figure 21: Joseph de Martini, *The Ravine*, oil on canvas, 35 1/2 x 27 3/8 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 23: Werner Drewes, *A Dark Thought*, oil on canvas, 13 x 33 in., 1943. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 27: William Gropper, *Home*, oil on canvas, 16 1/16 x 20 1/4 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 30: John Heliker, *Landscape*, watercolor on paper, 14 7/8 x 18 15/16 in., 1941. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jules Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 31: Frank Kleinholz, *Bank Night*, oil on masonite, 23 7/8 x 31 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. Advancing American Art Collection. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 34: Jacob Lawrence, *Harlem*, watercolor on paper, 28 x 21 in., 1946. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama. [Photo by L. Burgess.]
Figure 35: Lewis Jean Liberté, *Rock Forms and Boats*, gouache on composition board, 20 1/2 x 26 3/8 in., no date. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama.
Figure 36: Herman Maril, *In the Hills*, gouache and pencil on paper, 12 1/16 x 18 1/16 in., 1944. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama.
Figure 44: Nahum Tschacbasov, *Fish*, oil on canvas, 20 x 15 3/4 in., 1945. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama.
Figure 45: Nahum Tschacbasov, Mother and Child, oil on masonite, 23 7/8 x 20 in., 1945. Advancing American Art Collection, The Jule Collins Smith Museum of Fine Art, Auburn University, Alabama.
APPENDIX B: IMAGES FROM THE
ADVANCING AMERICAN ART COLLECTION AT
THE GEORGIA MUSEUM OF ART, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS
APPENDIX C: IMAGES FROM THE ADVANCING AMERICAN ART COLLECTION AT THE FRED JONES JR. MUSEUM OF ART, THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, NORMAN
Figure 47: William Baziotes, *Flower Head*, oil on canvas, 36 x 42 in., c. 1940s. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/baziotes-flower_head.html.]
Figure 48: Gifford Beal, *Figures*, watercolor, 10 x 16 3/4 in., no date. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/beal-figures.html.]
Figure 49: Romare Bearden, *At Five in the Afternoon*, oil on board, 30 x 38 in., 1946. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/bearden-afternoon.html.]
Figure 52: Louis Bouche, *Gallery K*, oil on canvas, 20 x 23 in., no date. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/bouche-gallery.html.]
Figure 56: Stuart Davis, *Shapes of Landscape Space*, gouache on paper, 15 x 11 1/2 in., 1939. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/davis-shapes.html.]
Figure 57: Julio de Diego, *Nocturnal Family*, oil on panel, 23 1/4 x 29 1/4 in., 1944. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/deDiego-1718.html.]
Figure 60: William Gropper, *They Fought to the Last Man*, oil on canvas, 30 x 40 1/4 in., c. 1945. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman.
[http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/gropper-1720.html.]
Figure 62: Robert Gwathmey, *Workers on the Land (Dirt Farmers)*, oil on canvas, 30 1/4 x 40 1/4 in., 1946. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman.
[http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/gwathmey-workers.html.]
Figure 70: Jack Levine, *The White Horse*, oil on canvas, 30 x 36 in., 1946. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/levine-white_horse.html.]
Figure 71: Loren MacIver, *Blue Dunes*, oil on canvas, 40 x 30 1/8 in., 1940. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/macIver-blue_dunes.html.]
Figure 72: Joseph Martini, *Blue Dunes*, oil on canvas, 40 x 30 1/8 in., 1940. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/martini-cliffs.html.]
Figure 75: Georgia O’Keeffe, *Cos Cob*, oil on canvas, 16 x 12 in., 1926. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/okeeffe-cos_cob.html.]
Figure 76: Gregorio Prestopino, *Newspapers*, oil on panel, 36 1/2 x 45 1/2 in., no date. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/prestopino-newspapers.html.]
Figure 82: Karl Zerbe, *Columbus Avenue*, gouache and watercolor on flocked paper, 20 x 26 in., 1945. State Department Collection, Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art, University of Oklahoma, Norman. [http://www.ou.edu/artcollections/collections/state_department/zerbe-columbus.html.]
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Figure 83: Ben-Zion, *Perpetual Destructor*, oil on canvas, 26 x 37 in., 1944. War Assets Collection, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, Seattle. [http://henryartcollections.org/detail.php?t=objects&type=all&f=&s=War+Assets&record=3.]
Figure 85: Werner Drewes, *Balcony*, oil on canvas, 30 x 34 1/16 in., 1945. War Assets Collection, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, Seattle. [http://henryartcollections.org/detail.php?t=objects&type=all&f=&s=War+Assets&record=0.]
Figure 86: Marsden Hartley, *Whale’s Jaw, Dogtown Common, Cape Ann, Massachusetts*, oil on academy board, 18 x 23 15/16 in., 1934. War Assets Collection, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, Seattle. [http://henryartcollections.org/detail.php?t=objects&type=all&f=&s=War+Assets&record=5.]
Figure 87: Robert Motherwell, *Figuration*, tempera and ink on wove paper, 13 1/4 x 9 9/16 in., 1944. War Assets Collection, Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, Seattle. [http://henryartcollections.org/detail.php?t=objects&type=all&f=&s=War+Assets&record=2.]
other trashy paintings sent on tour by the State Department, with the taxpayers footing the bill, have done our country harm abroad. Foreigners must be wondering what kind of crooks assembled such a jumble of paintings, which has shocked the American people, most of whom at least are a group of paintings that the State Department sent abroad as beautiful examples of American art.

The State Department's catalog on its painting monstrosities says that Circuit Girl Resting was painted by Yasuo Kuniyoshi. Kuniyoshi was born in Okayama, Japan, in 1894 and came to the United States in 1925. He is of Japanese ancestry.

This gives furthers us that his art is directed toward a fusion of the East and West. I do not profess to be an authority on painting. Secretary Marshall frankly admitted that the Subcommittee that he did not consider himself such an authority. But he has shown the good judgment to date paintings on the so-called art exhibit, his subcommittee did not do any thing unless it was in response to what is known as an "artcise" set out in the so-called Weekly Roundup of the Press and Publications Division, OEC. I looked over these so-called requests for the art exhibit, and it was plain to see that the State Department did not care to drum up requests for exhibits abroad.

Mrs. Hannah Goldman, the author of the Airman's Tale, told me she got her material from the Mr. Davidson. Mrs. Goldman is in the Press and Publications Division, OEC. In other words, Mr. Davidson was responsible for creating the demand under which the program was developed to exhibit these pictures abroad.

The 59 paintings which comprised the two exhibits were the works of 45 artists. I have seen pictures of the paintings. Some of them are so weird that one cannot tell without prompting which side should be up. I believe that the background of some of the artists who painted them will throw considerable light upon the reasons why such strenuous objections were raised against the pictures. I asked the House Committee on Un-American Activities to give me a report on the artists. The records of more than 20 of the 45 artists are definitely New Deal in various shades of communism. Some were found to be definitely connected with revolutionary organizations.

The exhibition is billed by its promoters as "Advancing American Art." Mr. Davidson defended the pictures as being what he termed modernistic. From my discussions with Mr. Davidson, I came to these conclusions:

The pictures of those artists who have been admitted down through the years as old masters are too dour, uninteresting, and too natural. The movement of modern art is a revolution against the conventional and material things of life as expressed in art. The artists of the radical school are not interested in art. Institutions that have been venerated through the ages are ridiculed.

Without exception, the paintings in the State Department group that portray a person, make him or her unnatural. The skin is not reproduced as it would be a fuller, ash gray. Features of the face are always depersonalized and melodramatic.

That is what the Communists and other extremists want to portray. They want to tell the foreigners that the American people are disinterested, broken down into a shape-thoroughly dissatisfied with their lot and eager for a chance of government.

The Communists and their New Deal fellow-travelers have selected art as one of their avenues of propaganda. Their game is to use every field of information and entertainment in an effort to shelter all that conflicts with despotic communism.

When the taxpayers' money is used to buy pictures painted by Communist artists we not only distribute their propaganda, we also put money in their pockets and thereby enable them to further their efforts to make America Red Comm.

I believe there should be in the State Department an Office of Information and Cultural Affairs, but it should be free of communist influence, fascistic, and other alien influences.

There is need for facilities to answer lies against our country by propagandists of other nations, but not notably the Moscow radio. However, I submit that the State Department can exhibit these pictures as part of our American culture and is foreign to the American way as is the Moscow radio.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES WASHINGTON, March 24, 1947

Hon. Fred E. Burke
House Office Building Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Burke: In response to your letter of March 18, I am enclosing herewith a report which contains information from the files and personnel of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Stimson
Chief Investigator

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 24, 1947


Milton Avery

Milton Avery was one of the 19 artists who were accepted into the United States Artists exhibition which opened on September 18-30, 1939 at the ACA Galleries, New York, N.Y. His portrait of a man was rejected from the artist organization.

Ben Zion was also an exhibitor at the United States Artists' exhibition, September 18-30, 1939, ACA Galleries, New York City, at which his painting, the Prophet and the Crowns, was shown.

Ben Zion was one of the signers of a letter sent to Franklin Roosevelt by the United American Artists which urged help to the U.S.B.R. and Britain, after Hitler attacked Russia. (See Daily Worker, New York, Thursday, September 16, 1941.)

Bryan Brown's paintings entitled "Figure" were one of the 20 exhibited at the United States Artists' exhibition, September 18-30, 1939, ACA Galleries, New York City.

The program, Artists' Proof to Win the War, October 16, 1943, page 1, 2, 3. This Paul Burkin was a sponsor of this organization, which consisted of a group of pro-

Chief Investigator
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A person named Gropper has been associated with New Masses as an artist and cartoonist, with the Sunday Worker as a cartoonist, and with the New Pioneer as a correspondent, critic, and illustrator. (See New Masses, March 14, 1946, p. 10; April 14, 1946, p. 10; February 24, 1946, p. 9; February 17, 1945, p. 12; July 9, 1945, p. 10; July 2, 1945, p. 13; June 26, 1945, p. 9; June 16, 1945, p. 13; January 20, 1948, p. 8; and January 11, 1948, p. 8.) Sunday Worker, September 1, 1946, sec. 2, New Pioneer, Communist Children's magazine, March 30, 1946, p. 20; December 18, 1945, p. 1; March 24-25, 1947; July 15, 1947, p. 13; February 17, 1945, p. 10; and March 30, 1946, pp. 9-10.)

A Bill Gropper was a speaker for the American Friends of the Chinese people, which included the Communist Party of China, as revealed by the Daily Worker, June 8, 1939, page 7.

Bill Gropper is also associated with the Communist Party as a cartoonist and speaker. (See Daily Worker, February 15, 1950, page 8.)

An article in the Daily Worker, February 16, 1939, page 9, tells of a mural which was done for the Department of the Interior by Bill Gropper.

Bill Gropper was a contributor to the New Pioneer, December 13, 1941, page 10, and an illustrator for the New Pioneer. (See New Pioneer, December 13, 1941, page 10; January 23, 1942, page 9; and June 8, 1939.)

He was also a member of the organizing committee of New Pioneer, according to the Daily Worker, May 7, 1940, page 5.
member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School.
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Mr. Gropper’s association with the United American Artists is shown by the Daily Worker, October 27, 1940, page 7. Mr. Gropper was an exhibitor with that organization and by New Masses, May 20, 1941, page 27, which named him as a sponsor and participant in the testimonial to Rockwell Kent, New York City, May 17, 1941.

The Daily Worker of July 23, 1940, page 3, column 3, reveals that William Gropper was a signer of the statement to the Soviet Secretariat of State to save anti-Fascist refugees in France which was sponsored by the United American Spanish Aid Committee. An unsigned form letter also reveals he was a sponsor of that organization, which was Communist supported.

Mr. Gropper was also an artist for the Workers New Masses Co. art studio magazine. (See the Working Woman, May 1933, p. 9.)

REGINALD MAZER

Reginald Mazer has been affiliated with the Liberator and New Masses as an artist and cartoonist. (See the Liberator, August, 1939, pp. 25, 29; October, 1939, p. 25; November, 1939, p. 34; and we refer to his letter to the President (New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21.) In addition to the affiliations already listed, Mr. Mazer was a member of the committee for the elections of the New Masses, April 1, 1941, p. 20, and a member of the committee for the annual art auction. (See New Masses, Feb. 23, 1941, p. 8; Feb. 24, 1941, p. 27; Mar. 31, 1941, p. 27; and Mar. 31, 1941, p. 27.)

Mr. Mazer has been associated with the Communist newspaper, New Pioneer, as a member of the editorial board (New Pioneer, Feb. 23, 1941, p. 2; Dec. 32, 1942, p. 2; and Aug. 1, 1943, p. 2), and as an illustrator (New Pioneer, Mar. 5, 1943, p. 3; Oct. 1943, p. 3; and Sept. 1943, p. 10, 11, and 14.) He was also mentioned in the New Pioneer of September 1935, p. 2.

Mr. Mazer has been affiliated with the Communist party since 1936. He has been active in the National Committee of the American Labor Party, his Rights, which defended Communist cases.

1. NICE PRESTINO

A person named Prestino was a contributing artist to the Third New Masses Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 29, 1942, p. 2.)

2. CONRAD FERRERO

A person named Ferrero was a contributing artist to the Third Annual Art Auction of New Masses. (See New Masses, April 29, 1942, p. 2.)

3. GEORGE L. L. MURPHY

According to News You Don’t Get, November 15, 1936, George L. L. Murphy was a member of the National Committee of the American Labor Party, His Rights, which defended Communist cases.

4. RICE PRESTON

A person named Preston was a contributing artist to the Third Annual Art Auction of New Masses. (See New Masses, April 29, 1942, p. 2.)

5. ANTON REIFERGER

A person named Reiferger was a contributing artist to the Third Annual Art Auction of New Masses. (See New Masses, April 29, 1942, p. 2.)

6. AUGUSTO ALVAREZ

The Daily Worker of March 21, 1932, page 2, column 2, discloses that an A. Refriger was a pamphlet artist for the League of Struggle for Zionism. A. Refriger was also a contributor to New Masses of September 2, 1931, page 25, as well as a contributing artist to the New Masses Second Annual Art Auction. (See New Masses, April 1, 1941, page 25.)

7. ARTIST’S FRONT TO WIN

The program, Artists’ Front to Win the War, October 19, 1940, page 5, reveals Anton Reiferger to be a sponsor of that organization.

The affiliation of Anton Reiferger with the American League Against War and Fascism : shown by the publication. Fight, for which he was an illustrator. (See Fight, August 1937, p. 4.)

New Masses of March 15, 1938, page 19, discloses that Anton Reiferger was a signor of a statement of the International situation which was issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy.

As an artist, Anton Reiferger contributed to the Champion of June 10, 1936, page 1, and to the Daily Worker of April 2, 1936, page 5. Mr. Reiferger was associated with the John Reed Clubs as an artist of revolutionary themes (Daily Worker, March 21, 1944, p. 7, in the John Reed Club School. (Daily Worker, Feb. 14, 1938.)

The Call to the Congress of American-Bolshevik Friendship, November 6-8, 1938, page 4 (caption), and a memo of the Social Democratic and the council, dated March 14, 1940, both serve to show that Anton Reiferger was a sponsor of
of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

A bill entitled “Six Hundred Prominent Americans,” page 27, discloses that
Max Weber was a signatory to an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for
Constitutional Liberties, an organization specialized in defense of American
and Communist rights. Max Weber was a member of the advisory board of the John Reed Club School. (See Daily Worker February 14, 1936, page 8.)

A memorandum to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, dated
March 19, 1948, discloses that Max Weber was a sponsor of this organization.

Max Weber’s affiliation with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is re-
vealed in that he was a signer of an appeal on behalf of Darrow, a Communist (Daily
Worker, December 17, 1940, p. 5), a signer of a statement halting the War Department
order on commission for the Communists (Daily Worker, March 16, 1945, p. 3), a signer of a
message to the House of Representatives (leaflet attached to an unaddressed letterhead),
and a signer of an open letter (booklet, Six Hundred Prominent Americans, p. 21). All
of these were sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Max Weber was a speaker and sponsor of the New Masses’ anti-Cliveden rally. See
New Masses, April 7, 1942, p. 27, and April 14, 1942, p. 25.) He was also an author
and contributor for New Masses. See New Masses, May 26, 1942, p. 27; July 22,
1944, p. 53; November 9, 1943, p. 13; and August 12, 1941, p. 10.)

Max Weber was a speaker at the First Annual New Masses Art Exhibition, November
15-27, 1938 (New Masses, October 26, 1938, p. 2), and a member of the New Dance
League as an artist for the publication New Norway, New Dance, August, 1938, p. 36, and
September, 1938, p. 11.)

The Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, page 4, reveals that Max Weber was a signer of the
open letter in defense of Harry Bridges. According to a letterhead, dated February
24, 1942, Anton Refregier was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugees Appeal of
the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Ben Shahn was a contributing artist to
New Masses’ third annual art auction. (See
New Masses, March 21, 1942, p. 25; March 24,
1942, p. 27; April, 1942, p. 27; and April 28,
1942, p. 2.)

MAX WEBER

A named person Tschecabosky was the donor of a painting to the Abraham Lincoln
Branch, Fourth Assembly District, Brooklyn, N. Y. (Communist Party). This information
was obtained from the Daily Worker of May 16, 1942.

Tschecabosky was an artist and cartoonist for
the New Masses, February 1, 1938, p. 16; April 30, 1937, p. 22; and January 26, 1937, p. 39.) He was also a con-
tributing artist for the second annual art auction of New Masses. (See
New Masses, April 1, 1931, p. 35; March 31, 1942, p. 27; and April 7, 1942, p. 27.)

Nahum Tschecabosky was a cartoonist for
New Masses of February 18, 1941, page 51.

MAX WEBER

An undated letterhead which summarizes
1940 work and a letterhead, dated September
11, 1941, both reveal that Max Weber was a
spokesman of the American Committee for
Protection of Foreign Born.

A letter dated March 7, 1947, page 26, discloses that Max Weber was a guest of honor
at the Mexican-American Friendship City.

Max Weber was a member of the Commit-
tee of Professional Groups for Broder and
Ford. Communist candidates, according to
a letterhead of September 22, 1938, and the
Daily Worker of September 2, 1938, page 2.

Max Weber was a signer of the Golden
Bread and Potato Friendship. This infor-
mation was obtained from Soviet Russia To-
day, November 1937, page 79.

Max Weber has been associated with the
International Workers’ Order in the capac-
ity of a judge for the American Artists’ School
Competition according to New Masses of
March 9, 1937, page 2.

American League Against War and Fasc-}
ism. Cited as a Communist by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. This was also cited as a Communist-front organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle, in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, page 2. General Francis Biddle also said it was “established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adopted to the interests of the Soviet Union.” (Attorney General Francis Biddle, Communist Activities, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.)

American League for Peace and Democ-
racy, noted as a cited group on the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and September 24, 1942. (See p. 7442.)

American Peace Mobilization. Cited as a
Communist front by the Special Committee on
Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This was also said to be a Communist-front organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle “established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adopted to the interests of the Soviet Union” (Communist Activities, September 24, 1942, p. 7442), and further, “The most conspicuous activity of American Peace Mobilization was the picketing of the White House which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national-defense program.” (Attorney General Francis Biddle, Communist Activities, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.)

Artists’ Front To Win the War: Cited as a
Communist front by the Special Committee on
Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Champion: Cited as a Communist front by the
Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The House report of June 25, 1942, page 17,
cites the Champion as the official organ of the Young Communist League and also of
the International Workers Order.

Committee of Professional Groups for
Broder and Ford. Cited as a Communist
front by the Special Committee on
Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

Coordinating Committee to Lift the Em-
bargo: Cited as a Communist front by the
Special Committee on Un-American Activ-
ities on March 29, 1944.

Friends of the Soviet Union: Cited as a
Communist front by the Special Committee on
Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Flight Magazine: Cited as a Communist
front by the Special Committee on
Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. This was the publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Golden Book of American Friendship: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

International Labor Defense: Cited as a
Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 30, 1942, and March 29, 1944. (See p. 7442.)

International Workers Order: Cited as a
Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942. Attorney General
Open letter to American liberals: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942. Public Use of Artistic Freedom: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 30, 1944. Refugee and Peace campaign: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. School for Democracy: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. Soviet Bloc Today: Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

### Advancing American Art—list of oil paintings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Painting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avery, William</td>
<td>Fish Basket...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxters, William</td>
<td>Flower Head...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beardsley, Bevris</td>
<td>As Five in the Afternoon...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Zion</td>
<td>Perpetual Destroyor...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demuth, Charles</td>
<td>The Stranger Tree...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Zion</td>
<td>End of the Quasar...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach, Cameron</td>
<td>Crown...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bose, Louis</td>
<td>Marburg, Queens...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galitzky, K.</td>
<td>Our Lover's Return...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevan, Byron, Georgia</td>
<td>Still Life in Red, Yellow, and Green...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burling, Paul</td>
<td>News from Home...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogdell, Georgia</td>
<td>Rock Crab...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Rachel</td>
<td>Wing Fabrication...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Rachel</td>
<td>Finish Preparation...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Stuart</td>
<td>Tree and Ki...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Stuart</td>
<td>Still Life with Flowers...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doig, Jello, Lila</td>
<td>Natural Family...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doig, Jello, Lila</td>
<td>Under Still Rejewski Atrium...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doig, Jello, Lila</td>
<td>The Ravine...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Arthur</td>
<td>Another Armamentary...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Arthur</td>
<td>Grey Greed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewar, Werner</td>
<td>A Real Thought...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewar, Werner</td>
<td>Gallery in Times of Lilac...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Philip</td>
<td>Fantias Collection...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow, Paul</td>
<td>Old and Cook...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow, Paul</td>
<td>Friends in a Garden...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>House...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>They Fished in the Last Man...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Subway Exist...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Teapot...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Portrait of Shapshall...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Workers on the Land...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Working...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Wild Sun Rose...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Rose...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>The Material...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Afternoon...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Back Yard...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Pine at Five O'clock...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Still Life with Bananas...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Deserted Brickyard...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Citrus Veil Reeling...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Still Life...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Water and Image...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>White Horse...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Blue Landscape...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Sea and Rust...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Source...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Lighthouse...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Shipbuilding Composition...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>New England Church...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Dusk...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>New England Church...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Fair...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Can Cool...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Alienation...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>43rd...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Forming...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Yellow Tote...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>End of the Century...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Remains...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Remain...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Own on Rocks...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Turkey...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Canyon at Night...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Cloud Seeds...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Lauchnow, Nahun...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Mother and Child...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Duck...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Lauchnow, Nahun...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Twilight...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Portrait of Old Woman...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Fruit and Wine...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Conversation...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Two Vases...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Fisherman on What...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Clown and Ass...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>The Owl...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger, William</td>
<td>Around the Lighthouse...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Date of DC-12, departmental report for supplies, equipment, or services, preceded by negotiations of various lengths.
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WASHINGTON (undated)—An exhibition of Advancing American Art, prepared by the Department of State, is now open and designed to show the scope and progress of contemporary experimental and creative painting in the United States. It is scheduled to open on October 4 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. In response to requests from United States missions abroad for a showing of the newest trends in American art, the Art Department has chosen these 79 paintings by 48 artists as representative of fine quality, originality, artistic breadth, distinction, and variety of style.

After a sojourn at the Metropolitan in New York, the exhibit will be divided into two parts: 30 paintings will tour the other American Republics; while 49 will go to Europe on a nine-month showing, beginning in Paris in November (UNESCO month) then moving through the other large cities of Europe. Less extensive but self-sustaining and representative units of the exhibition will later circulate through the smaller European cities.

The exhibit is planned to acquaint the world with recent developments in American painting and presents therefore a national cross-section of the work of the most active and forward-looking of contemporary artists. Included in the canvases by well-known artists and established painters like John Marin, Max Weber, Stuart Davis, Marsden Hartley, and Georgia O’Keefe, as well as those of such comparatively new arrivals in the field as Jack Levine, Robert Gwathmey, Gregorio Ferretti, and Ben Shahn.

The paintings in this show transcend in these paintings important social and cultural influences and traditions, fresh ideas and techniques. Art amateurs will find interest and pleasure in the broad range and variety of subject, style, and approach—the classic precision of Charles Sheeler; the brooding moods and memories of Loren MacIver; the fantasy of John Marin; the abstractions of Stuart Davis; the somber intensity of Ben Shahn; the social commentary of William Gropper; the biting analysis of Jack Levine and Robert Gwathmey.

Paintings designated to tour the Eastern Hemisphere include Still Life With Flowers, by Stuart Davis; Fascist Leader, by Philip Evergood; Dog and Apple, owned by the Last Man, by William Gropper; Tenebrous, by Louis Guglielmi; Horse, by Jack Levine; Sexscape, by John Marin; Trolley Car, by Gregorio Ferretti; Small Hill Near Alcada, by Georgia O’Keefe; Stream, by Charles Sheeler; and Circus Girl Resting by Yasuo Kuniyoshi.

A parallel selection of artists and paintings for the other American Republics include Robert Gwathmey’s Workers on the Land, Yasuo Kuniyoshi’s Deserted Brickyard, Ben Shahn’s Hunger, Max Weber’s Fruit and Wine, and Reginald Marsh’s Life-guard.

While this is the most ambitious project of this type yet undertaken by the State Department as part of its worldwide cultural activities program, other smaller exhibits of original prints, water colors, and photographs already on view are reported to have met with cordial response. This exhibit and others now being planned are part of a widespread program of peaceful cultural interchange between the United States and the rest of the world.

HANNAH GOLDMAN

Sources: United States State Department advance release, interview, photographs, art periodicals.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SEELY-BROWN).

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make two very brief observations. As a result of the debate which we have had on the floor of the House the past 2 weeks, I think all of us are well aware of the dangers that lie in the path of legislation of a foreign policy in a piecemeal fashion.

It was my opportunity during the war to observe propaganda being manufactured. I know something of its effectiveness. I recognize the definite need for a pro-American propaganda program at the present time. I recognize the power and possible effectiveness of such a program. A weapon of this type can be made to be all-powerful that I feel it might be well to have a program of this type more directly under the control of the Congress.

If we are not careful, the tail may wag the dog.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this concludes the general debate on the bill, and I suggest that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read, to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee Amendment be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL 938—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, S. 938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. HORAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Racoon and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri and Mr. DURKIN (at the request of Mr. HORAN) were given permission to extend their remarks in the Racoon, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSHEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list of the artists I mentioned in my speech, along with the amount paid for each painting and the date of purchase and in addition a copy of the Artcast dated September 20, 1946, which created the so-called demand for this exhibition of art, as well as a report from the House Committee on Un-American Activities on 24 of the artists from whom the paintings were purchased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in his Committee of the Whole report. His remarks include certain excerpts from broadcasts and digest of broadcasts furnished him by the State Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. Leave of absence.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BULTWICK, for 10 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 54, An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; 302, An act to increase the collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tobacco duties and light money, and for other purposes; S. 21, An act to change the name of the Located-Burdened Irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project; S. 273, An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 669, An act to amend title 237, An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMpte, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 12, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 450, An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marshfield, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marshfield Military Reservation, for public use; and

H. R. 509, An act to authorize the reclassification and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications are referred to the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

676. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

677. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States With Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.
Truman Gives Benton for His "Art" Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL

OF

INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947:

TRUMAN GIVES BENTON FOR HIS "ART" EXHIBITION—RESERVES "MODERNISM" AS DE-FENSE BY NUNS

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

WASHINGTON, June 6—Disapproval that President Truman rebuffed, albeit gently, Assistant Secretary State Secretary Benton for his peripatetic exhibition of so-called modern American art, has exploded in a new trend to the scandal of Communist influenced State Department policy.

Presidential disapproval was evoked by the examples of "modern art" which Benton purchased with $200,000 of Department funds and sent on a tour to acquaint other countries with "America's so-called modern art." Mr. Truman now says in a letter to Benton, called the so-called modern act "the vaporousness of half-baked, lazy people." On the eve of下周 action this week on the Munde bill to continue the State Department's propaganda broadcasts and other cultural activities the White House republication stirred speculation that Benton may not be in charge of the reorganized set-up.

BENTON WON'T TALK

Benton declined today, to discuss the President's letter. An assistant felt sure Benton will not resign as a result of the Presidential rebuke.

Center of the furor over the Benton art exhibit was a painting called "Circus Girl Busting" by Yosmo Kuniyoshi, a native of Japan, who came to this country in 1909 and became connected with Communist-front organizations. Representative Burgess, told the House this picture had "knocked the American people" and with the other paintings had done some foreign harm around. President Truman agreed with Burgess. When Benton, on March 18, voted the President defending the art exhibit and other features of his cultural program, Mr. Truman took the letter of April 2: "I appreciated very much your letter of the 28th in regard to the American art exhibit, which is going the rounds of various countries. I don't pretend to be an artist or a judge of art, but I am of the opinion that so-called modern art is merely the vaporousness of half-baked lazy people. An artistic production is one which shows infinite ability for taking pains and if any of these so-called modern paintings show any such infinite ability, I am very much mistaken.

MODERN "NO ART AT ALL"

"There are a great many American artists who still believe that the ability to make things look as they are the first requisite of a work of art. They do not belong to the so-called modern school. There is no art at all in cooperation with the modernists, in my opinion."

"Without exception," said Burgess in his House speech, "the paintings in the State Department group that portrays a person make him or her unnatural. The skin is not reproduced as it would be naturally, but as a yellowish gray. Features of the face are always depressed and melancholy."

"That is what the Communists and other extremists want to portray. They want to tell the foreigner that American people are decadent, broken down, or of hideous shape—thoroughly disillusioned with their lot and eager for a change of government."

"When the taxpayers' money is used to buy pictures painted by Communist artists we not only distribute their propaganda, we also put money in their pockets and thereby enable them to influence efforts to make America Red Communists."

SOUGHT TO PROVE "CULTURE"

Testifying before the House appropriations committee, Mr. Burgess said the art collection had not been properly handled but the theory of it was to counteract impressions abroad that Americans are a "materialistic, money mad race, without interest in art and without appreciation of art or culture." Many think, he added, that "modern art, so-called, is a better illustration of four current artistic interests than the more orthodox or traditional forms of art."

Burgess said he believes an office of information and cultural affairs "but it should be free of communist, fascist and other alien influence." Reynolds, Rep. of New York, chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee which cut off the propaganda funds, and other Republican leaders picture Benton as a "cad" who was playing for a sucker by the Communists and other left wingers who have helped the Department broadcasts to Russia and other activities.

Mixed with the news beamed to Russia by Benton's broadcasting is it is asserted, is a vast amount of New Deal and left-wing propaganda disparaging the capitalist system, American industries, conservative viewpoints and Republican leaders, and supporting Russian views of the American press and other institutions. All this is inter-larded with silly, childish, so-called news features and articles calcified to bring the United States into contempt abroad.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947:

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks on House bill No. 2953, by Mr. MCOWEN, and on all the other bills which provide Federal aid to education and which are before the House Committee on Education and Labor, May 14, 1947, by Merwin H. Kurt, president of the National Economic Council, Inc., New York, N. Y. I oppose all these bills calling for Federal aid to education because: (1) They would continue, result in Federal control over education; (2) They would add just so much to bureaucratic burdens already borne by the people; (3) Their cost would be high at the beginning and would tend to increase almost in; and, lastly, because: (4) American education is not nearly so good as it ought to be, considering the amount of money we spend on it. Hence the Congress, rather than subsidize education, should thoroughly investigate the state of education now being given our youth throughout the land.

The passage of any of these bills would weaken the cause of individual enterprise and of the capitalist system which is the basis of economic quantities on which our whole economy is based, and would tend by just so much to involve us in the maws of collectivism which is the world's greatest threat today.

I shall take up these points in order.

1. These bills would result in Federal control over education.

First of all, all of them have provisions which assert that the passage of the act shall not result in Federal control of education, yet nevertheless Federal control would result. Federal control is, indeed, an inseparable part of any Federal aid bill this Congress would seriously consider.

Thus in the McCown bill, section 7 insists provisions a State must fulfill in order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act. This is control.

Every State is required to report to Congress before November 1 each year a detailed statement of the amount received from the Federal Government, and of its expenditures. This is control.

An audit is required from the State covering expenditure of funds received and apportioned to local school jurisdictions; and there made report of reports from local school jurisdictions. This is control.

Every State must "make reports to the Commissioner with respect to kind of education, on forms to be provided by the Commissioner." This, of course, is control.

Every State must send to the United States Commissioner of Education "certified copies of legislative enactments and the official regulations that may be issued by the State authority in connection with such funds."

This is control.

Furthermore, it is provided, in substance, that Federal funds shall be allotted only to those States that in any given year spend at least as much, both in total amount and per pupil in average daily attendance, as they have spent in the fiscal year 1947. This is certainly control. And how unwise, because today's school costs may, if the depression so many people are warning us about materializes, be far higher than it will be possible for the country to meet when and if the depression comes.

Of course, the McCown bill provides that the Commissioner may recommend to Congress revisions of this act. With particular reference to recommendations arising from changing conditions in our national economy.

That means that States have got to keep running down here to Congress for permission to change the method of spending their own money. For, after all, this money comes from the taxpayers back home.

All these provisions spell control. For it is true in politics as in all else in life that "Wise a breed I eat, my song I sing." And the Federal bureaus in control of education would think of Federal aid as Federal breed.

There is excellent reason to believe that Federal control is the very purpose of those at whose instances these bills have been introduced.
"Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill."
"Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich."
"AEG Ansel, Birmingham, N. Y."
"Raymond Metal Co., Inc., Richmond, Va."
"Blackwell Pullman Co., Rochester 4, N. Y."
"Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., New York 17, N. Y."
"North American Aviation, Inc., Inglewood, Calif."
"Mergenthaler Linotype Co., Brooklyn, N. Y."
"Kaiser-Peter Franza"
"Beverly Copper & Brass, Inc., New York 17, N. Y."
"Phillips Dodge Corp., New York, N. Y."
"General Electric Co., Alton, 11, Ohio."
"Pittsburgh, Pa."
"General Show Corp., Nashville, Tenn."
"General Foods Corp., New York, N. Y."
"Western Electric Co., New York, N. Y."

"STATEMENTS ON SUBJECTS FOR PRINTS AND VOLUMES, OBTAINED BY PICTURES BRANCH, INTERNATIONAL PICTURES AND PUBLICATIONS DIVISION"

The average monthly issue is about 1,200 pictures. These break down as follows: From Government, 250; from private sources, 650; from schools, 200 pictures; from files, 250 pictures; and 100 picture purchases.

The pictures purchased by the Pictures Branch came from (1) small photo syndicates such as Pitt, Cushing, Galloway, Kimmey, and Harris & King. These syndicates are specialists rather than being organizations devoted to general photo distribution, (2) from individual photographers scattered throughout the country from International News Photos and Anne Meeh, and together they make up one of the largest photo stock organizations in the country.

The sources listed in the following page cover private business, schools, colleges, foundations, and public relations groups. These would be added to which telegrams and letters have been directed in the past 9 months. Dozens of other organizations might be added if the list were to include groups contacted by phone or in person both in Washington and New York.

"UNIVERSITIES AND SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED OF 391 Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.
"Butte State College, Alpaca, Texas.
"New York State Agricultural and Technical Institute, Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.
"Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg, Pa.
"University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
"University of Maine, Orono, Maine.
"University of Idaho, Boise, Idaho.
"Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
"University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
"Northwestern University, Evanston, III.
"Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.
"University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.
"Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
"University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
"University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
"Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
"Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, N. J.
"Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
"Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.
"George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
"Claymont College, Hanceville, N. H.
"University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
"University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
"California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.
"Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
"Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind.

"Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
"Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
"University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
"University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
"University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
"University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
"University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
"University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
"University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
"University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
"University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
"Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
"University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
"University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.
"University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
"Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
"Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.
"University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
"University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
"University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
"University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
"University of Colorado, Denver, Colo.
"Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
"University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
"University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
"University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
"State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
"University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
"University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
"Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
"Florida University, Gainesville, Fla.
"University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
"University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
"University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

"EXCHANGE OF ART BETWEEN COUNTRIES"

Mr. HOBSON. Aside from this art exchange, may I ask, what other exchanges of art exist? You can scarce this, if you wish. Mr. BURTON. Yes. Mr. HOBSON. What is the picture of the art exchange between our country and other countries? Mr. BURTON. Our little idea of travelling lithographs also an industrial art exhibit—travelling etchings, and so forth— but I would rather have Mr. Holland answer that more specifically.

Mr. HOBSON. I mentioned before this catalog of 60 American paintings, since 1800, which was made available to us by the International Machine Corporation.

There are also exhibits of water colors, and there are reproduction paintings of our portrait painters, our best painters, from the early days.

Mr. BURTON. Reproductions. Mr. HOBSON. Reproductions, yes; not the originals, of course.

There are collections of photographs, of prints, color slides of paintings to our great museums, and material of that type. In other words, the American Art show was only one in a series of seven. I mentioned before that we had sent literally hundreds of portraits of Washington, Lincoln—

Mr. BENSON. But it was the one that cost the money.

Mr. HOBSON. That is right.

Mr. BENSON. That is the, the Advancing American Art show was the only one of the United States series.

Mr. HOBSON. As I understand, these have been exchanged between American firms and have been a part in the international field; is that correct?

Mr. BENSON. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. What is the history of our private exchanges on mutual education and culture? We have some of that; haven't we?

Mr. HOLLAND. There has been some artists who have gone abroad under state subsidy, but so far as I know there has been no real exchange. Attempts, of course, have been made, but for the first time, I think, have made available some scores and recordings of American music to be used in those countries, but that field—

Mr. HOBSON. Surely there have been exchanges of music. Many of our artists have studied abroad.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is true. Mr. HOBSON. And that sort of thing. That is what I am getting at. I would like to have that supplied for the record, Mr. Burton.

Mr. BENSON. We shall do our best.

(Information requested is as follows:)

"STATEMENT ON PRIVATE EXCHANGE OF MUSICAL EDUCATION AND CULTURE"

"Throughout the world many of the principal orchestras, conductors, performers, choreographic groups, groups of young people, schools of music, national conservatories, radio companies, music publishers, and artists are asking for American music. Neither the music publishers nor organized music life in America has made any contribution of significance in meeting the demand. There are almost no commercial channels through which American music can be obtained abroad except by direct order from the United States, a procedure which has proved entirely impractical and unsatisfactory because of the delays and difficulties of transportation, the problems of money exchange, the lack of knowledge abroad of what is wanted (the music being largely unknown) of where it can be obtained. Very few American music publishers and publishing houses have any agencies whatever in either Europe or Latin America. Mr. Burton, and some representation in New York, N. Y. East. The most important American firm has one foreign agency in London where some of its material may be purchased or rented. The greater proportion of that material consists of the American editions of foreign music, not American music. That London agency, however, does not have a single work of contemporary American music and the American work that its usefulness may be described as of minor importance. The second most important publisher has no foreign agency or outlet, and the music concern controlling the works of an outstanding group of American composers has no distribution service abroad where any of its works can be either bought or rented. The head of the American branch of one of the principal English music publishers which also publishes American music and which is active on the Continent has repeatedly asked the Department to make available in Europe the music of other publishers, rival firms, for he has felt that it was unfair to American music to have such one-sided representation.

"As a result of this situation, no appreciable amount of American music exists abroad in libraries or conservatories—and this in spite of widespread demand to study, perform, and hear American music. There are no clear records of information about
American music, and most of America's fin-
ances, contributions cannot, or prob-
ably will not, for practical reasons, become
generally available abroad in the near future, accor-
ding to the office of the United States Government.
Through these has a large proportion of the significant performances of American music abroad have been arranged and the music distributed.
"Prominent conductors going on European and Latin-American tours have had to call upon the Government for assistance in ob-
taining American music (Karl Kreuger, Leon-
sard Brezitan, Erich Leinsdorf, et al.). Karl Kreuger, conductor of the Detroit Symphony, on his recent European tour before the De-
partment of State, the same American music program was unable to program any American music because there was no music available.,
"Symphonic music is particularly difficult to obtain, for the orchestrations of the ma-
Jority of the important works are unpub-
lished and are obtainable only on rental basis. Many publishers are unwilling to send unpublished material abroad except through the Government. For instance, there are only four sets of the Gershwin Concerto in F. No set has been sent abroad or will be sent abroad except through the Government."  
"The only American organization which is actively engaged in an appreciable exchange of musical products is the American-Soviet Music Society which sends symphonic and popular music. The Department does not send any printed music to Russia.
"American jazz and popular music are known abroad, and in Europe some outlets for such music exist. The Department does not send jazz or popular music abroad except in response to specific requests for music that cannot otherwise be obtained.
"In the past year or half only one important art exhibition has been sent abroad by an agency other than the Department of State. This was the exhibition sent to the Tate Gallery in London by the Na-
tional Gallery of Art during the summer of 1946. The only exhibition planned for the future is an exhibition of modern American paintings to be sent to Copenhagen in the fall of 1947 by the Whitney Museum of American Art. No other exhibitions of any importance have been planned, insofar as the Department is aware."

"Museums constantly approach the De-
partment asking for assistance in interna-
tional art activities which they are unable to undertake because the Department does not provide funds. It intends to cooperate with such museums through sharing of costs of such exhibitions.
"Only one or two significant exchange activities exist. The most important showing along this line was an exhibition of Paris sent by the Metropolitan Museum of New York, which is a direct outcome of the successful showing of paint-
ers from this gallery in the Department's exhibition, "Advancing American Art."  

"Mr. HORAN. It exists in considerable quantity.

"Of course one of the troublesome ones, I presume, is the publishers. You have had some discussions on a certain one that was not very desirable. Have you had exchanges, however, in a field that should be profitable, of training in cultural relations, be-
tween publishing houses of the countries?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes. In contrast to the 30, 35, or 40 percent exports of the French, British, and German book publishers. Our book publishers have never been active in the international field, except in a very minor way."

COORDINATION OF AMERICAN ART FACILITIES

Mr. HORAN. What have you been doing to coordinate, on an active program basis, all of these facilities of American cultural, artis-
tic, and technical life?

Mr. BENSON. We have done a great deal in almost all fields, Mr. HORAN. We will never do enough. We can do more. Mr. HORAN. Just what have you done? Mr. BENSON. In the field of public relations Mr. HORAN. No, not mean all of them. Mr. BENSON. You mean bring them al-
together into one package.

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. BENSON. Congress, as a matter of fact, has made a package, which I hope you will read about in your papers next week, that is actively interested in this coordination, and that is the United States National Com-
mision, which is meeting next week in Phil-
apolis. It may interest all of you to know that I'm told that 560 to 1,500 organizations are sending 3,500 delegates to that meeting, which, under act of Congress, the State De-
partment is ordered to listen to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I just wish to ask the dis-
tinguished gentleman if some question was asked about my distinguished gentle-
man from South Carolina, Mr. Peurifoy, and if the chairman said that he was one of the finest Americans he ever met?

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the gentleman from South Carolina, the question was asked by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Bolton), and I stated that was my opinion and I am again very happy to repeat that in my opinion he is one of the finest Americans I have ever met.

Mr. DORN. We certainly appreciate that.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to share in the Chairman's applause of Jack Peurifoy. We both have a very high regard for him.

Mr. DORN. We appreciate that. We only wish we had more men in the State Department like John Peurifoy from South Carolina.

Mr. STEFAN. So do we.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this about Jack Peurifoy, that he happens to come from my district and that is one of the reasons why he has made such an outstanding Assistant Sec-
retary of State. I have known him and his family for many, many years. I knew his father before him and his entire family. You have so generously stated that the State Department has more Americans like that there would be much less criticism about those who have walked in and walked out of the State.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman very much. We have had very fine co-
aperation from Mr. Peurifoy.

Mr. RIVERS. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BOYKIN. We in Alabama appreciate what you have said about Jack Peurifoy. He is really and truly from Alabama. He just happened to go up to South Carolina but he is very proud of him. I think he is doing a fine job. Nobody knows it better than you. We all have asked you about this, it was already in the Record. We do ap-
preciate it very much.

Mr. BOYKIN. I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot of talk here today about the State Department and its personnel se-
curity operations. It would appear that some of the members of the Appropriations Committee and other Members of the House think that the State Depart-
ment is lax and inefficient in conducting its personnel investigations, in evalu-
ating the completed investigations and that the people in the Department charged with the responsibility of the De-
partmental security do not have the best interests of this country at heart. That, I think, is not true. It is true that the Secretary of State, General Marshall, is a man who needs no defense when it comes to loyalty to his country. I am not saying that we do not have spirited people in defending his record before this body. All of us know of his outstanding achievements in behalf of his country and his unsullied service to his country. Who here would dare question his loyalty?

Now, as Secretary of State, General Marshall has a great deal to say as to who should serve as his assistant secre-
taries. The man in whom he has placed his confidence for the conduct of the security aspects of the Department's op-
erations is Assistant Secretary of State John E. Peurifoy. I happen to know Jack Peurifoy well and have had an op-
portunity to observe his work for some time. Gentlemen, there is no one in whom I have more confidence than Peurifoy. His family has been in this country for well over a century. He has been raised in the traditions of true Americanism and because of his many years of service in the State Department of State, is thoroughly acquainted with the up-to-date methods of the Department and is fully qualified to assume full responsi-
bility for the Department's security and loyalty programs. His appointment to head up the administration of the De-
partment and the Foreign Service is an ideal one and reflects the well-known ability of General Marshall to select competent and capable people to assist him in carrying out his responsibilities regardless of what they may be.

In view of the fact that a man of General Marshall's caliber is the Secretary of State, and in view of statements that Jack Peurifoy, who is well known to many of us, has been selected by the general to head up the security operations of the Department, I am greatly shocked and astonished to read the comments in the committee's report and to hear the criticism I have heard here to-
day.

In fact, I have been so disturbed by this criticism that I have determined to
Walker Art Center
1710 Lyndale Avenue South
Minneapolis 5, Minnesota

April 9, 1947

The Hon. George Marshall
Secretary of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

Acting in behalf of this institution and our Board of Directors, I wish to express our opposition to the discontinuance of the art program of the State Department.

It is strange that a nation shouting freedom of political expression should turn dictatorial in its cultural activities.

You, in reaction to protests of untutored and technically deficient laymen, have killed the most progressive governmental art project of our time. Your action is based on an arbitrary judgment of what art is and means. In making your decision you have evidently ignored the fact that the state department collection has received almost an ovation from the professional art world. Instead, you have permitted yourself to be influenced by sentimental, romantic and uneducated opinion.

The most terrifying aspect of your decision is your disregard for freedom of expression. You have, in effect, decided that artists must create in bondage to preconceived ideas. It is not exactly immaterial that the preconceived ideas to which, by indirection, you have enslaved these artists are outdated, invalid and dehumanized.

This is 1947. Intelligent creators whether in science, education or art cannot limit themselves to the ideology of 1847. In fact they cannot and must not limit themselves or be limited to any ideology. Progressive art is probably less understood than progressive science, but you must certainly know that without progressiveness either would become useless.

There are few enough thinking artists among the tens of thousands practicing in this country. By a miracle, Mr. Davidson and his committee of experts chose the best to represent our nation.

They chose men who are big enough to sense this present moment, to react to it, and think about it. I do not like all of these artists’ works, but neither do I like war, pestilence, suffering, greed and political bigotry. These are of our time, however, and I would be a fool to ignore them. Neither you, nor I, nor Congress can justly say that men cannot think, or writer, or paint of any things which in their minds must be said.
You are making of us the laughing stock of informed people the world over. I urge you and your department to review your decision. Find the courage to fight the blind, thoughtless prejudice that has swayed you.

Your action follows exactly the pattern of treatment given German artists in the 30s. The German government would only recognize “pretty” landscapes, figure studies, genre pieces, and idealized nudes. Art died in Germany. Even the heyday before defeat could not revive it. Your action is a perfect echo of this tragedy.

Respectfully yours,

D. S. Defenbacher
Director
Office of The Chairman of the Board
John Hay Whitney

May 9, 1947

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I write on behalf of the Trustees of the Museum of Modern Art to express to you our concern over the recent withdrawal from tour in Europe and Latin America of the exhibitions of modern American painting purchased by the State Department. Our Trustees cannot ignore the implications inherent in the Department’s action, but have delayed formal protest in the hope that an official statement from you might clarify the matter.

Our Museum is dedicated to the encouragement and presentation of the progressive art of our time. We believe that every period of culture must have its own new forms in art as well as new discoveries in science and technology. We are, of course, aware that innovation and originality in art (and in science, too!) often meet with disapproval until people gradually arrive at acceptance and understanding. Yet this does not alter our conviction that what is new in our art has as much right to be seen here and abroad as older and more academic, conventional forms; indeed, from our own experience we feel sure that it increases our national prestige to show to foreign countries what is most progressive in our culture rather than that which is merely safe and uncontroversial.

Therefore, may we express the hope that in spite of reactionary criticism you may yet find a way to permit the continuation of these touring exhibitions.

Furthermore, Mr. Secretary, may we assure you of our support in your courageous effort to forward the work of the Cultural Division along progressive lines.

I would be very happy to pass on to our Board of Trustees as detailed an explanation of this matter as you ay feel free to give.

Respectfully yours,

John Jay Whitney
The Trustees of the Institute of Modern Art share may concern over the withdrawal from tour in Europe and Latin America of the exhibitions of those American paintings which the State Department had purchased. We have withheld our protest, hoping for some clarification which would divorce this action from the reactionary criticism which had been build (sic) up in certain elements in the press.

Since our institution exists to foster the progressive art of our time, we are inevitably seasoned to the outrites of conventionalism, but there is one argument, the characteristic one, to which we must always reply. There is a constant attempt to identify advanced or modern art with radical and “un-American” political views. Anyone familiar with the conservative literalism of government-encouraged art under non-democratic governments will realize how groundless this is. All progressive art must inevitably be based on individualism, and non-democratic governments have always shown it instinctive hostility.

The State Department’s exhibitions were put together, we assume, to increase our cultural prestige abroad. They were a most appropriate means to this end. They were sent off with the acclaim of serious critics in the press. Those who requested them in foreign countries asked expressly to see what was new in America. They looked to us for the same authoritative leadership in the arts that they expect in science and in statesmanship. We hope that the Department has weighed the impression made abroad by this abrupt withdrawal, and that some arrangement can be made, some formula found, which will continue the tour of these exhibitions.

I shall be glad to convey to our Trustees any statement of clarification which you may feel at liberty to give us. Meanwhile, may I assure you of our warm support of your effort to sustain the work of the Cultural Division?

Yours most respectfully,

James S. Plaut
Director
June 20, 1947

The Honorable George C. Marshall
Secretary of State
Washington 25, D. C.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

I am enclosing herewith, for your consideration, copies of three Resolutions adopted at the thirty-ninth Annual Member’s Meeting of the American Federation of Arts, held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City on May 28th.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Parker
Secretary
June 20, 1947

The Honorable William Benton
Assistant Secretary of State
Washington 25, D. C.

My dear Mr. Benton,

Your attention is called to the attached copies of three Resolutions adopted at the thirty-ninth Annual Member’s Meeting of the American Federation of Arts, held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City on May 28th.

This is the first opportunity, during the past year, that the membership of the Federation has had to take official action endorsing the objectives of the Department of State in furthering the knowledge and understanding of American art in foreign countries. May I point out that it was the sense of the Meeting that the visual arts group had been inadequately represented at previous meetings on UNESCO, and your earnest consideration of the recommendations made regarding the Mexico Conference of UNESCO is asked.

Very sincerely,

Thomas C. Cooper
At the Annual Convention of the American Federation of Arts held at New York, New York on May 28, 1947.

The following Resolution was unanimously adopted:

   The American Federation of Arts strongly endorses the objectives of the Department of State in furthering the knowledge and understanding of American art in foreign countries.

   Moreover, the Federation earnestly urges that the State Department be authorized by Congress to resume these activities and that their effectiveness be increased through a broad utilization of the professional resources of the nation.
At the Annual Convention of The American Federation of Arts held at New York, New York on May 28, 1947.

The following Resolution was adopted:

1. That a recognized representative of the visual arts group be included in the membership of the U. S. Delegation to the Mexico Conference on UNESCO.

2. That the UNESCO unit of the Department of State include within its framework an active program planning section for the arts, to provide the machinery through which art museums and organizations interested in aiding and undertaking international programs may work.

3. That, as soon as possible, UNESCO call a world-wide conference of national art groups interested in furtherance of the visual arts to promote the ends of UNESCO.

4. That the Federation seeks means to cooperate closely with UNESCO in its own field as appropriate opportunities arise.
The American Federation of Arts
Office of the Secretary
Barr Building
Farragut Square
Washington, D. C.

At the Annual Convention of The American Federation of Arts held at New York, New York on
May 28, 1947.

The following Resolution was unanimously adopted:

The original protest, signed by 97 art leaders, against United States action in bringing 202
paintings, formerly property of the Prussian State, and now in United States government custody,
to Washington for temporary safe keeping, be endorsed, and that it be urged anew that promised
to return them to appropriate art authorities representative of the German people be fulfilled as
soon as practicable.
The Cleveland Museum of Art
Cleveland 6, Ohio, U.S.A.
University Center Station

William Mathewson Milliken, Director

Cable Address: Musart Cleveland

June 20, 1947

The Honorable George C. Marshall
Secretary of State
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

In accordance with the authority vested in me as President of the Association of Art Museum Directors, I have this honor to send you the following Resolution:

“RESOLVED, that the United States members of the Association of Art Museum Directors express their thorough endorsement of the recent programs of the Department of State in furthering the cause of international understanding by disseminating American art in foreign countries. They urge upon the Congress of the United States the desirability of initiating legislation which will encourage the Department of State to enlarge on these activities. Moreover, they offer, collectively and individually, their professional advisory services in whatever manner may be most useful to this end.”

This was unanimously passed at the annual convention of the Association held in Montreal on May 29, 1947.

Respectfully yours,

William M. Milliken
President
Association of Art Museum Directors
Smith College
Department of Art
The Hillyer Art Gallery
Northampton, Massachusetts

March 18, 1947

Honorable Dean Acheson
Acting Secretary of State
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

It has come to the notice of the Smith College Department of Fine Arts that there has been some journalistic opposition to the program of exhibitions of works by living American artists circulated abroad under the auspices of the Department of State.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our emphatic approval of the cultural aims of these circulating exhibitions. They serve to show to the world the rich variety of artistic expression in contemporary America. Not only is the existence of these exhibitions an encouragement to American artists, but is also a real contribution to world-wide cultural understanding in a period of dangerously mounting international tension.

As a department dedicated to the understanding of art by American youth, in a college whose attitude toward international co-operation is a matter of historical record, we feel that it is our duty to defend with every means at our command the dignity and freedom of the American artist. It is our firm belief not only that nothing should be done to hinder the State Department travelling exhibitions of American art or limit their scope, but that every financial and moral encouragement should be given so that these exhibitions may continue to represent always more fully the creative life of America.

Most sincerely yours,

Clarence Kennedy, Ph. D., Professor of Art
Oliver Waterman Larkin, A. M., Professor of Art
Kate Ries Koch, A. M., M. L. D., Associate Professor of art
Karl Scott Putnam, B. S. in Arch., Professor of Art
Priscilla Pain Van der Poel, A. M., Associate Professor of Art
Mervin Jules, Associate Professor of Art
Randolph Wardell Johnston, Assistant Professor of Art
H. George Cohen, Assistant Professor of Art
Phyllis Williams Lehmann, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Art
Ruth Wedgwood Kennedy, A. B., Lecturer in art
Teresa Grace Frisch, Ph. D., Instructor of art
Martha Leeb, A. B., Instructor of art
David Shapiro, Instructor of Art
Frederick Hartt, A. M., Acting Director, Museum of Art
Stanford University
Graphic Art
Rooms 310-318
Stanford University, California

June 20, 1947

The Honorable George C. Marshall,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

I was greatly surprised to hear recently of the cancellation of the State Department’s exhibition of contemporary painting. This collection represents the best work being done in the United States at this time and is in no sense radical; rather, it is evidence of this country’s creative vigor in the arts and I believe that everything possible should be done to acquaint other nations of the world with our cultural progress.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

Ray Faulkner
Executive Head
May 2, 1947

Secretary George Marshall
Department of State
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

The opposition which UNESCO’s program of visual arts has encountered from some quarters of press and government has aroused the concern of those of us at the University of Wisconsin who believe in the power of a free and unfettered creative art to promote understanding and good will among nations. It appears to us that the principles adopted by the National Commission concerning the work of UNESCO shall be denied if any group is allowed to dictate to the artist the content and form of his art. These principles, with which we are in full accord, stated that it would be part of UNESCO’s program to foster the conditions which lead to a healthy artistic expression, and to assist in the circulation of the artist’s work. It is of the greatest importance that the approved principles also admitted that the organization could not create art. This is a truth well understood by those who present the art of others.

We of the Student Union Gallery Committee recently presented an exhibition of student art, and in doing so faced much of the same problem as the national Commission, for we too were confronted with the unavoidable lack of unanimity which accompanies the evaluation of art. Probably not one art student or gallery visitor or committee member agreed completely with the choices of our selected judges, but it was realized that even among those who devote their lives to art, one cannot expect uniformity of opinion, and thus the judges’ opinions were accepted. For while we were not sure that the best had been selected, we were sure that in an atmosphere of artistic tolerance, where the artist is given full opportunity for expression, the best and truest cannot long remain hidden. It is rather only by the erection of artificial and unbending artistic principles that a nation’s art can be killed.

With other nations furnishing ample illustration of the effect which governmental dictation has on the integrity of art, let us not create in our country a dictatorship of aesthetics which will advance, in the guise of art, a propagandistic program for any political, social, or economic action. It is rather our duty and our opportunity to encourage, through UNESCO, the unintimidated artistic expression which can help us achieve understanding among men.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Schneiders
Chairman
Union Gallery Committee
The University of Tulsa  
Tulsa, Oklahoma  

April 30, 1947  

The Honorable George C. Marshall  
Secretary of State  
Washington, D. C.  

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As a practicing American artist, I represent a class of people who seldom take “pen-in-hand” in protest to official happening of the day. This class of people represents a large group of which even the newspapers are not conscious, because they do not write letters every time they disagree with the public policy.

However, the news of the recent action of the State Department in drawing back the UNESCO exhibition of American art which had started on its European tour disturbs me very much, not because I am an artist but rather because this action involves freedom of speech. Freedom of speech is a freedom which is generally associated with the spoken word. It is possible that our representatives in Washington do not realize that visual expression as exemplified in the arts is a form of speech which appeals to the eye rather than to the ear.

It seems rather strange to me that the exhibition would have been called back with a rather flimsy excuse for the action, when at the same time the former Vice-President is allowed, without restraint, to express himself freely in the same European countries. According to the American system, Mr. Wallace has this right, and I am not advocating that he or anyone else be restrained from speaking his mind. However, I am advocating that the artist, as an American citizen, be allowed this same freedom, particularly when it is a fact that the exhibition contained nothing critical or derogatory regarding foreign policy.

If we, the American artists, should turn out an exhibition which would please the officials who were responsible for withdrawing the UNESCO exhibition, they would find that it would be a perfect parallel to the art produced with the sanction of Hitler and Stalin, and that modern art in all its phases was banned by these same dictators. That is why we feel that the State Department’s action is a most dangerous precedent which should never be set in a democratic country because it smacks of Fascism.

In this city alone I know of at least sixty artists who feel exactly as I do; yet, out of this group, you probably will receive no more than three or four letters. Obviously, the principles of the Gallup poll do not apply to the professional class of people – the non-letter-writers. We urge reconsideration of the withdrawal of the UNESCO exhibition.

Sincerely yours,

Alexandre Hogue
Head, Department of Art
The University of Tulsa  
Tulsa, Oklahoma  

April 30, 1947  

The Honorable George C. Marshall  
Secretary of State  
Washington, D. C.  

My dear Mr. Secretary:  

Your recent action in calling home the UNESCO exhibition, together with the excuse for such action, which, according to TIME Magazine, you are quoted as submitting, is of deep concern to me as an Associate Professor of Art History at the University of Tulsa. Any action which would tend to channel creative expression in one direction could have but one inevitable end, and that is the complete stifling of creativity. Those who are familiar with what happened to art under Fascistic regimes in the recent war, and preceding it, know art rapidly disintegrated into mere propaganda for political dogma, and the level of taste reflected descended to a new low.

The statement attributed to a congressman that the exhibition was recalled for fear that Europe might think that all American artists were crazy shows a rather shallow understanding of the whole development in art since Cezanne. The continuing abstraction which takes place in modern art is a direct reflection of the electronic and atomic age; and, of course, since painting, sculpture, and architecture have always mirrored a society, it is quite logical to find the most direct reflection of contemporary society in the new expressions. Those expressions based upon the Illusionism of the Renaissance reflect a strong hold of tradition upon the minds of the artists and indicate an out-of-attunement with contemporary problems.

In any age the contemporary art has been a vital means of unifying the society. That is why dictators seize first upon it as a means of propaganda. The unerudite openly accuse the followers of the modern movement of being Communistic. The answer to this accusation, of course, lies in a study of what happened to art in Russia under Communism. The splendid experimental and creative aspects of Russian art were rapidly stifled so that today we find the approved art of Communistic Russia degenerated into literal illustration, with the subject matter and interpretation having some bearing upon Communistic propaganda.

I am sure that as Secretary of State for a nation that has always rested on firm foundations of democracy, you would be the last man to ever concede to the destruction of that liberty and equality which is our American ideal. Yet, your action in calling back the UNESCO exhibition might be so construed. This letter is in no sense intended to be vindictive or insulting to you as an individual. My only desire is to acquaint you with an attitude which I am sure is shared by every thinking artist in our country.

Very truly yours,
Edgar A. Albin
Associate Professor of Art
Dear Sir:

It has come to our attention that certain contributions of our Department of State to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have been the subject of violent attack from some sections of the national press and radio. A few selected paintings from among those sent abroad by the Department of State have been reproduced by certain newspapers with accompanying sarcastic commentaries about expenditure of taxpayers’ money for the purchase of “degenerate” art.

Our institution feels that the United States National Commission to UNESCO has done an able job. In a field as controversial as art there is bound to be a wide variety of opinion. The current issue, however, we feel is not whether the art selected is good or bad, but whether freedom of expression in the cultural fields is to be encouraged and the resulting work given a world-wide audience from press and radio are heeded by short-sighted government officials, the integrity of the art program of UNESCO itself would be jeopardized through the destruction of our own State Department’s program in the creative arts.

May we, therefore, ask your cooperation in taking a sympathetic attitude toward the free expression of free artists under a free and democratic government should you be asked in anyway to make a decision on the future program of the State Department’s art contribution to UNESCO?

Sincerely,

William A. Bostick
Business Manager

WAB: or
Honorable George Marshall
Secretary of State
Washington 4, D. C.
April 22, 1947

President Harry S. Truman
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear President Truman:

Last December 3, (through my efforts) you sent the following telegram to the Audubon Artists, an organization of which I am now Vice-President…

WA 984 Govt NL Pd WUX Washington DC 2- 1946 Dec 2 PM 7:45
Frederic Whitaker
President Audubon Artists 107 Chambers St NY

I have much pleasure in sending hearty greetings to Audubon Artists and to all who participate in Honor Day. I trust that the Award Certificates of Meritorious Achievement to be presented today will bring deserved encouragement to the recipients and that as a result of this recognition new contributions will be made year by year to the art treasures of the nation.

Harry S. Truman

Determined to spread culture and acquaint the people with art, I had expended all my energy for six full months of last year, working without any remuneration, from early morning until late at night with as little as two to three hours sleep a night… It was successful to an extent, with many of the leading art organizations complimenting me on the accomplishments and asking for my assistance……….. One of these was the American Artists Professional League. The Vice President asked me to publicize the League throughout the U.S. and offered to pay me… I refused because I was physically exhausted and was advised by my physician to rest. I also wanted to paint…. However, I had promised to help with suggestions and advice…. Now this very organization is doing its utmost to destroy the unity of art and put American culture at a standstill….

For years, this group, who has wielded personal power by having all the city commissions for murals and exhibits abroad (in which only its own intimate friends participated) is bitter and resentful of the fact that it was not included in the State Department’s purchase of “art representing the most advanced currents in America today”… This exhibit, when on view at the Metropolitan Museum, was received most favorably by the critics. (Their comments can easily bear me out). The collection was a step forward in helping to seal a closer relationship between the countries of Europe and America.

The “neglected” group has incited and enlisted the aid of other art groups to protest that the government’s money was used to purchase “communistic” works… This is wholly untrue!
Please believe that I am not a communist, nor do I share in their beliefs but neither am I proud to be on a side with these groups who are so destructive to the culture of our nation by mangling art and artists…. The AAPL has urged all its members “to protest to their Senators and Congressmen against further appropriations to the State Department for the purchase of art, for exhibitions, either here or abroad”… This is just the beginning!!! The group also says, “More Fumigation Needed… While we are on the subject, our National Departments are not the only places which need a good spraying. Our museums and arts schools are rapidly being filled with the forward looking boys who absorbed the alien ideologies and getting a strangle-hold”…

Mr. President, in the past centuries, art was sponsored by patrons, royalty and the church. That is why culture is so prevalent in Italy, France, England and the other European countries… It is and always was a part of their life… BUT in America, it was neglected because we were too busy progressing in other directions… Our nation is sorely in need of culture. We can present to the world through our art, that we not only excel industrially and financially but that we encourage and support art and the cultural aspects of American life.

Art can bring so much beauty and thought to a disillusioned world. Won’t you help to spread the good will and do something to stop these dangerous groups before greater damage is done?… So far, through their efforts, Secretary Marshall has called the collection back from its tour.

Incidentally, I resigned from this League when I received the letter urging me to protest to Congress. Can’t these people see the harm being done to American culture with such tactics? I wrote the Vice President, “Where there is prejudice, there is hatred. Where there is hatred, there is destruction and I don’t have to tell you where destruction leads…” Why should any artist have his political beliefs used against him when the particular paintings have no political message?… Shouldn’t one’s politics be as sacred as his religion, or as personal as the way he breathes, eats, functions or sleeps?… Does it matter whether he still has his own teeth or wears plates? Then why must politics be brought into a discussion when one is viewing a landscape or a still life?… Yet, these groups have done just this and only because they have no other means or manner of attack…

In their battle against the artists, the “neglected” groups acknowledged the intelligent and helpful support of Senator Bridges, Chairman of the Finance Committee, Congressman Taber, the Chairman of the House Committee and Congressman Stefan of the Sub Committee…. How ridiculous of these men to fight an issue based on petty jealousies and sour grapes! Is that why our Congress is being paid? Why, before they took up or fought this issue, didn’t they interview a representative group from both factions (modern and traditional) and thrash it out openly and honestly? Instead, they took the word of these groups who didn’t have the official vote or sanction from these members of the organizations they represented… What is wrong with these Congressmen who leap so dangerously before they know what it is all about? Where is the justice in their acts or decisions?

Must art be at a standstill because of petty artists who have “friends” in Congress? Must American culture suffer because of this? Many of the paintings in that exhibition were executed by men who were in service overseas while these “protestors” remained home to continue their
painting and profit by the protection of the very men they are now condemning by branding them communists.

Mr. President, as head of the government, you should have the welfare of your country at heart. These men must not be permitted to win their battle of destruction…. Tolerance is necessary for peace and those men are out to destroy it…. Truly, this is not an issue for Congress but for a man like Solomon, whose wisdom could penetrate through the motives of this abusive and vicious group.

When your good wishes and encouragement were solicited by the Audubon Artists, I had sent some literature (written by me), the radio programs, I had procured and the Events I had planned. You evidently thought it worthwhile or you would not have sent us the telegram. Therefore, you know I only have the welfare of my country and its culture at heart, when I beg you to speak to Sec. Marshall to rescind the order recalling the collection and have Congress continue its policy of further appropriations to the State Department for the purchase of art… By doing so, we can prove to Europe that the American Government stands proudly behind her artist…

Please Mr. President, think it over and remember that the cultural outlook of America is in your hands to flourish or to stagnate…Don’t set us back because of a bitter and resentful group who have but selfishness and jealousies as their stronghold. Let America lead in culture as well as every other way….

Thank you for your patience in reading this lengthy letter.

Just a humble citizen,

Enclosed is the radio sheet and Calendar of Events to prove that I had worked earnestly to spread culture and acquaint the people with art…. Admission was free…
May 2, 1947

Mr. William Benton
Ass’t Secretary of State
State Department
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

It is extremely regrettable, to say the least, that the State Department has found it necessary to curtail traveling exhibitions of paintings in Europe and South America.

We feel that development of cultural relationship with other countries will go a long way toward establishing a lasting peace and good will among the nations.

We urge you to reconsider the decision, and to establish these exhibitions on a larger, more representative scale, including sculpture and graphic art as well.

Respectfully yours,

Norman Barr
Exec. Sec’y
April 28, 1947

Mr. William Benton,  
Assistant Secretary of State  
Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Benton:

The Sculptors Guild wishes to register its deepest protest against the action of the State Department in stopping the traveling exhibit of American Paintings abroad.

As an organization of progressive artists we feel that the State Department deserved commendation for its original plan to show the best and most forward types of American Painting. If reason has been found to include a percentage of other types of Art, this should not serve as an excuse to nullify the entire program. The Sculptors Guild regards this stoppage as a definite backward step in the cultural progress of the country which should be rectified immediately.

The Sculptors Guild again wishes to suggest to the State Department that Sculpture be included in any future program of American Art as no exhibit could be complete or representative without it.

I am certain that you welcome the position of our organization on these matters.

Sincerely,

Robert Russin, Secretary

RR: FA
Progressive Citizens of America  
205 East 42nd Street  
New York 17, N. Y.

May 13, 1947

The Honorable Secretary of State George C. Marshall  
State Department  
Washington, D.C.

Honored Sir:

We enclose a resolution whose signatories include artists, museum directors, writers, educators, and others prominent in the cultured field.

An artists action meeting was called on May 5th by the Art Division of the Progressive Citizens of America. The sponsors of this meeting included an American Group, Artists Equity, Artists League of America, Audubon Society, New York Society of Women Painters, Serigraph Society, and Sculptors Guild. The speakers were Edward Alden Jewell, Art Critic New York Times; James Johnson Sweeney; John D. Morse, Magazine of Art; Juliana Force, Whitney Museum of Art; Henry Schnakenberg, Artists Equity; and Edith Halpert, Downtown Gallery.

The resolution, (copy of which with signatures on file) was in addition endorsed by over six hundred people who attended the meeting.

We earnestly beseech that you give your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mildred Constantine  
Executive Secretary, Art Division

MC: t
Progressive Citizens of America
205 East 42nd Street
New York 17, N. Y.

To: President Truman and Secretary Marshall:

We, the undersigned, vigorously protest the cancellation and recall of the State Department exhibitions of American painting on tour in South America and Europe.

We feel that the action of the State Department has the effect of condemning American Art and therefore not only discredits American culture, but undermines its great possibilities for creating good will between our own country and the rest of the world.

We cannot agree with Secretary of State Marshall’s statement that there are better ways of spending the tax-payer’s money. On the contrary, we feel that all culture is important to all mankind and as such should receive the greatest amount of encouragement and dissemination. We can think of no better way to achieve understanding and friendship among the United Nations, than by such exchanges of their arts and sciences.

The attacks against this form of American cultural expressions appears to us, a violation of the democratic tenets recently set forth by Secretary Marshall.

We urge therefore, that this order be rescinded and the exhibitions be allowed to continue as scheduled. Further, we urge that many other such cultural activities, of ever broader and wider scope, be included in the State Department program.

Agnes A. Abbot    Department of Art, Wellesley College
Albert Abramowitz 862 East 14 Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Beys Afroyim 1 West 95 Street, New York, N. Y.
Herman R. Agin 630 Fort Washington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Harold Ambellan 232 Wooster Street, New York, N. Y.
Renee Arb 224 East 55 Street, New York, N. Y.
Dominico Arena 127 East 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Emil J. Arnold 340 West 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
Charles E. Atkin 363 Grand Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Sylvia Atkins 850 East 175 Street, New York, N. Y.
Gertrude Atramy 96 Christopher Street, New York
A. Everett Austin, Director Ringling Museum of art, Sarasota, Florida
Milton Avery 294 West 11 Street, New York, N. Y.
Leila Cook Barber Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Will Barnet 50 West 106 Street, New York, N. Y.
Mrs. Ella Baron 200 West 20 Street, New York, N. Y.
Charles Barrows 634 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
William Basof 357 West 53 Street, New York, N. Y.
John W. Baur (Brooklyn Museum) 65 Laurel Place, New Rochelle, N. Y.
Donald Bear 2021 Garden Street, Santa Barbara,
Miriam Behnstock 21 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Sam Berman Campfire Road, Chappaqua, N. Y.
Theresa F. Berstein 54 West 74 Street, New York, N.Y.
Ernestine Betsberg 12-35 31 Drive, Long Island City, N.Y.
Gross-Bettelheim 86-10 34th Avenue, Jackson Heights, N.Y.
Marjorie Bishop 37 West 8 Street, New York, N.Y.
Eleanor Bitterman Architectural Forum, 350 5th Ave., N.Y.C.
Lucille Blanche Woodstock, N.Y.
Steve Bodnarchuk 2310 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.
Willborg Bjorck 80 West 94 Street, New York, N.Y.
Cameron Booth 165 West 23 Street, New York, N.Y.
Louis Bosa 400 West 57 Street, New York, N.Y.
Angela c. Bowhn 240 East 79 Street, New York, N.Y.
Adelyn D. Breeskin, Acting Director The Baltimore Museum of Art, Maryland
Minna H. Breuer 420 East 48 Street, New York, N.Y.
Alexander Brook 14 East Bay Street, Savannah, Ga.
Byron Browne 216 East 15th Street, New York, N.Y.
Gertrude Breuear 215 West 88 Street, New York, N.Y.
Stella Buchwald 215 East 12 Street, New York, N.Y.
E. Buck 329 West 4 Street, New York, N.Y.
Richard Burlingame Woodstock, N.Y.
David Burliuk 2575 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, New York
Marussioc Burliuk Hampton Bays, New York
Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 49 East 96 Street, New York, N.Y.
Carlyle Burraros 230 West 41 Street, New York, N.Y.
Gene Byron Woodstock, N.Y.
Paul Cadmus 5 St. Lukes Place, New York, N.Y.
Alexander Calder Roxbury, Conn.
Clara Candell 23 East 92 Street, New York, N.Y.
Victor Candell 23 East 92 Street, New York, N.Y.
Rhys Caparn 333 West 57 Street, New York, N.Y.
M. Carreno 237 West 14 Street, New York, N.Y.
Rosalind A. Cash 295 Cumberland Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.
James Chapin 126 Washington Place, New York, N.Y.
Edward Chavez Woodstock, N.Y.
Herman Cherry Woodstock, N.Y.
Frederick M. Clapp, Director Frick Collection, 1 East 70 Street, N.Y.C.
Bernard Chester 356 East 12 Street, New York, N.Y.
Max Arthur Cohn 258 West 17 Street, New York, N.Y.
G. Constant 118 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.
Lucille Corcos South Mountain Road, New York, N.Y.
L. de Creeft 218 Greene Street, New York, N.Y.
Robert M. Cronbach 2231 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
S. Cummings 160 East 15 Street, New York, N.Y.
Bruce Currie Bearville, N.Y.
A. A. Damm 4 East 82 Street, New York, N.Y.
Jo Davidson 80 West 40 Street, New York, N.Y.
L. Theodore Davis 175 East 151 Street, New York, N.Y.
Perry A. Davis, Jr.  
Robert Tyler Davis  
D. F. Defenbacher, Director  

1288 Denniston Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
Portland Art Museum, Portland, Oregon  
Walker Art Center, 1710 Lyndale Ave. S., Minneapolis, Minn.

Adolph Dehn  
Joseph Delaney  
Sidney Delevante  
Julio de Diego  
William Howard Donahue  
Louis Donato  
Evelyn Dorfman  
Volia Dorian  
Eugene H. Dortche  
William C. Dove  
Lillian Dubin  
Carlos E. Dyer  
Dr. J. G. Efremoff  
Ada Ellison  
Jimmy Ernst  
Phillip Evergood  
Robert Fawcett  
Lyonel Feininger  
Tully Filmus  
Mrs. J. M. Fitch  
Lucille R. Flaum  
Mrs. Julian Force  
Ruth Forbes  
Rosalyn Foner  
Karl E. Fortress  
Bena Frank  
David Fredenthal  
Louise A. Freedman  
Don Freeman  
David Friend  
Marion Frost  
Rosamond Frost  
Ella Fuerle  
O. Gasparo  
F. Gersham  
Ruth Gikow  
Vincent Glinksy  
Jay C. Goldin  
Robert Goldwater  
A. M. Good  
Bertram Goodmen  
Lloyd Goodrich

230 East 15 Street, New York, N. Y.  
68 Grand Street, New York, N. Y.  
510 West 124 Street, New York, N. Y.  
65 West 56 Street, New York, N. Y.  
461 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
89-44 161 Street, Jamaica, N. Y.  
246 Stockton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
194 West 10 Street, New York, N. Y.  
520 West 140 Street, New York, N. Y.  
42-37 Union Street, Flushing, N. Y.  
58 Morton Street, New York, N. Y.  
361 Clinton Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
147 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
680 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
327 East 58 Street, New York, N. Y.  
132 Bank Street, New York, N. Y.  
Ridgefield, Conn.  
235 East 22 Street, New York, N. Y.  
734 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
25 Vandam Street, New York, N. Y.  
14 Washington Place, New York, N. Y.  
10 East 8 Street, New York, N. Y.  
35 East 75 Street, New York, N. Y.  
3922 49 Street, Long Island City, N. Y.  
Woodstock, N. Y.  
240 East 20 Street, New York, N. Y.  
637 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
41 West 83 Street, New York, N. Y.  
18 Jones Street, New York, N. Y.  
327 East 75 Street, New York, N. Y.  
170 East 2 Street, New York, N. Y.  
330 East 58 Street, New York, N. Y.  
50 Greenwich Avenue, New York, N. Y.  
167 ½ East 115 street, New York, N. Y.  
408 East 10 Street, New York, N. Y.  
97 St. Marks Place, New York, N. Y.  
9 East 17 Street, New York, N. Y.  
2280 Loving Place, New York, N. Y.  
142 East 18 Street, New York, N. Y.  
22 East 60 Street, New York, N. Y.  
74 Grove Street, New York, N. Y.  
1349 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Philip L. Goodwin    32 East 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
Franck Greco    2 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Jane Griffith    55 West 47 Street, New York, N. Y.
Peter Grippe    113 West 13 Street, New York, N. Y.
William Gropper    Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Chaim Gross    63 East 9 Street, New York, N. Y.
Renee Gross    30 West 105 Street, New York, N. Y.
Louis Guburak    2310 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Louis Guglielmi    132 West 23 Street, New York, N. Y.
Lena Gurr    71 Remsen Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rosalie Gwathmey    1 West 50 Street, New York, N. Y.
Esther Haas    362 West 22 Street, New York, N. Y.
Lee Hager    230 East 36 Street, New York, N. Y.
Edith Halpert, Downtown Gallery    32 East 51 Street, New York, N. Y.
Murray Hantman    5 West 21 Street, New York, N. Y.
Minna Harkavy    Hotel Ansonia, New York, N. Y.
Lily Harmon    12 east 82 Street, New York, N. Y.
Aurelia Harris    47 Grove Street, New York, N. Y.
Cleo Hartwig    9 Patchin Place, New York, N. Y.
J. D. Hatch, Albany Museum    125 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y.
Kotteyce Hatcher    100 Greenwich Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Milton Hebald    400 East 74 Street, New York, N. Y.
David Hecht    138 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
J. Hecht    503 East 11 Street, New York, N. Y.
Nova Hecht    138 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Zoltan Hecht    138 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Joan Held    10 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Helen West Heller    732 East 6 Street, New York, N. Y.
Charles R. Henschel, President    M. Knoedler & Co. 14 E. 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
Selma Herbst    6155 19 Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
E. Herzfeld    40 Central Park South, New York, N. Y.
Fritz Heyle    538 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Theo Hios    260 West 29 Street, New York, N. Y.
Joseph Hirsch    12 West 69 Street, New York, N. Y.
Prof. Stefan Hirsch    Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson
Gerrit Hondins    417 West 26 street, New York, N. Y.
Henry R. Hope    800 Sheirdan Road, Bloomington, Ind.
Frank Horowitz    221 East 28 Street, New York, N. Y.
Bernece B. Hunter    357 West 11 Street, New York, N. Y.
Grace H. Jackins    202 West 19 Street, New York, N. Y.
Edward A. Jewell    The New York Times, New York, N. Y.
Morris Kantor    42 Union Square, New York, N. Y.
Joseph Kaplan    161 West 22 Street, New York, N. Y.
Betty Kathe    1 Jane Street, New York, N. Y.
E. Mcknight Kauffer  21 East 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
Arthur Kaufmann  414 West 121 Street, New York, N. Y.
Antoinette M. Keauschaar  130 Caterson Terrace, Hartsdale, N. Y.
Charles Keller  30 East 14 Street, New York, N. Y.
Rockwell Kent  Au Sable Forks, N. Y.
Susan L. Kent  922 9 Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Paula Kessler  210 West 72 Street, New York, N. Y.
M. G. King  282 Utica Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
William D. King  314 East 9 Street, New York, N. Y.
Doris Kirsh  4 East 28 Street, New York, N. Y.
Florence Kirshenblut  42 Myrtle Avenue, Passaic, N. J.
Dee Knapp  610 West 116 Street, New York, N. Y.
Santor Knox  4 East 10 Street, New York, N. Y.
I. Koblenz  644 East 170 Street, New York, N. Y.
Sidney Koblenz  644 East 170 Street, New York, N. Y.
Babette Kornblith  1725 East 53 Street, Chicago, Illinois
Ida Krangel  1325 Walton Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Anne Kroll  117 West 58 Street, New York, N. Y.
P. Kron  55 west 8 Street, New York, N. Y.
Rose Kuper  60 Park Terrace West, New York, N. Y.
Edward Landau  326 Bleecher Street, New York, N. Y.
L. Lev Landau  222 West 23 Street, New York, N. Y.
Oliver Larkin, Smith College  65 Bridge Street, Northampton, Mass.
Joseph Lasker  401 East 107 Street, New York, N. Y.
R. Lavaggi  27-08 39 Avenue, Long Island City, N. Y.
Jacob A. Lawrence  385 Decatur Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Doris Lee  Woodstock, N. Y.
Abraham Levin  3451 Gile Place, Bronx, N. Y.
Jack Levine  97 St. Marks Place, New York, N. Y.
Josephine Levy  25 West 21 Street, New York, N. Y.
Reeves Lewenthal  Associated American Artists, 711 5 th Ave.
Norman Lewis  New York, N. Y.
Jean Liberte  139 West 125 Street, New York, N. Y.
Jacob Lipkin  104 West 16 Street, New York, N. Y.
Seymour Lipton  218 West 20 Street, New York, N. Y.
Frans Lerch  1909 Grand Concourse, Bronx, N. Y.
Sidney Livingston  350 West 55 Street, New York, N. Y.
Michael Loew  250 West 24 Street, New York, N. Y.
Clara Loobie  15 West 29 Street, New York, N. Y.
William Lorach  359 West 18 Street, New York, N. Y.
Margaret Lowengreund  276 Hicks Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Nicholas Luisi  Woodstock, N. Y.
Elizabeth McCausland  155 East 26 Street, New York, N. Y.
Loren Maclver  50 Commerce Street, New York, N. Y.
Marie R. Macpherson  61 Ferry Street, New York, N. Y.
Loren Maclver  129 West 60 Street, New York, N. Y.
Arthur Osver
Walter Pach
Ralph M. Pearson
I. Rice Pereira
Keans G. Perls
Mary Perry
George Picken
Gen Pine
Vernon C. Porter, Director
Gregorio Prestopino
Maria Price
Rosa Pringle, Director
Fernando Puma
Luis Quintanilla
Sydelle Radin
Lila Radkai
Steve Raffo
Edna Rall
Leila Ramer
Esther Raskob
Joseph Raskob
L. T. Rathbone
Abe Rattner
Mlle. Rebay, Trustee,
Guggenheim Foundation
Arnold Reece
Ruth Reeves
Anton Refebier
Ad Reinhardt
Alma Robinson
Fanny Rocker
Jane Rogers
Bernard Rosenbaum
Jules Rosenberg
Peyton Boswell, Jr., Art Digest
Dorothy Rossen
Thorbjorg Rostand
Drena Rothstein
Francois H. Rubitschung
Robert Russin
William Sanger
Louis Schanker
Katherine Schmidt
Henry Schnakenberg

12-35 31 Street, Long Island City, N. Y.
3 Washington Square, New York, N. Y.
Design Workshop, Nyack, N. Y.
121 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
32 East 58 Street, New York, N. Y.
404 East 5 Street, New York, N. Y.
61 East End Avenue, New York, N. Y.
315 East 17 Street, New York, N. Y.
Riverside Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.
304 Waverley Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
31 Avenue B, New York, N. Y.
New Age Gallery, 138 West 15 Street New York, N. Y.
108 West 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
26 West 8 Street, New York, N. Y.
250 West 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
18 West 57 Street, New York, N. Y.
401 East 107 Street, New York, N. Y.
134 Montague Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
435 Albee Square, Brooklyn, N. Y.
56 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.
56 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.
City Art Museum, St. Louis, Mo.
8 West 13 Street, New York, N. Y.
Green Farms, Conn.
1406 MacDonough Place, New York, N. Y.
434 Lafayette Street, New York, N. Y.
1807 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
30 Gansevoort Street, New York, N. Y.
45 Herkimer Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
1085 Simpson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
56 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.
303 West 89 Street, New York, N. Y.
40 West 97 Street, New York, N. Y.
88 Coolidge Street, Malverne, N. Y.
35 Charles Street, New York, N. Y.
110 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.
27 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
7 McKenny Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
782 Pelham Parkway, Bronx, N. Y.
70 West 11 Street, New York, N. Y.
130 State Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
19 West 12 Street, New York, N. Y.
322 West 55 Street, New York, N. Y.
Margaret Schoen    15 Abingdon Square, New York, N. Y.
Alvena V. Seckar    200 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Frances Serber    12 West 69 Street, New York, N. Y.
Theodora Sangree Settele    R.F.D. F, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.
Ben Shahn    Hightstown, N. J.
Charles Sheeler    Dows Lane, Irvington, N. J.
Ella A. Sherley    48 Commerce Street, New York, N. Y.
Harmon N. Shesman    370 Central Park West, New York, N. Y.
Seymour Shimin    125 West 11 Street, New York, N. Y.
Morris M. Shulman    121 Pitt Street, New York, N. Y.
Audrey Silbey    43-17 48 Street, Sunnyside, N. Y.
Helena Simkhovitch    96 Barrow Street, New York, N. Y.
Bernard Simons    54 West 89 Street, New York, N. Y.
Clara Sitney    132 West 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Victor Sklaire    1439 55 Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
John Sloan    222 West 23 Street, New York, N. Y.
Alwood Smith    503 West 111 Street, New York, N. Y.
Betty Smith    302 Mott Street, New York, N. Y.
Lenore Smith    5851 Forward Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Jerome Snyder    92 Jane Street, New York, N. Y.
Mitzi Solomon    208 Central Park South, New York, N. Y.
Raphael Soyer    526 West 111 Street, New York, N. Y.
Eugene Speicher    Woodstock, N. Y.
Niles Spencer    Hotel Lafayette, New York, N. Y.
Lilyan B. Spitz    140-30 Ash Avenue, Flushing, N. Y.
Florence Spivak    175 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Lila Stanley    133 East 40 Street, New York, N. Y.
Margaret Stack    82 Christopher Street, New York, N. Y.
Cesare Stea    4107 10 Street, Long Island City, N. Y.
Florence Stea    4107 10 Street Long Island City, N. Y.
Robert Steed    230 East 15 Street, New York, N. Y.
Bernard Steffen    308 Mercer Street, New York, N. Y.
P. N. Steinberg    16 East 52 Street, New York, N. Y.
Virginia Stevens    134 West 4 Street, New York, N. Y.
Etta Stock    149 West Tremont Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.
Paul Strand    134 West 4 Street, New York, N. Y.
Ed Strauten    322 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Wally Strauten    322 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Sylvia Sussman    220 West 72 Street, New York, N. Y.
Edward F. Stut    R. F. D. #1, Alexandria, Va.
Sandy Sutherland    13 East 8 Street, New York, N. Y.
M. Sweed    307 East 17 Street, New York, N. Y.
Lucille Sylvester    200 West 20 Street, New York, N. Y.
Philip Tavalin    314 Georgia Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Irving Schman    62 Midwood Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Ruth J. Terrell    129 East 82 Street, New York, N. Y.
Frederic J. Thalinger
9 Garrison Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.

A. Tromka
123 Bainbridge Street, Brooklyn, N. J.

Joseph Thonson
Institute of Fine Arts, 17 East 80 Street, New York, N. Y.

Dimitri Tselos
41-44 48 Street, Long Island City, N. Y.

(first name missing) Turner
542 East 79 Street, New York, N. Y.

(first name missing) Turpin
424 S. Aiken Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

(first name missing) Twiggs

(first name missing) H. Twiggs

Harold Ulman
46 West 21 Street, New York, N. J.

Bumpei Usui
33 East 12 Street, New York, N. Y.

Alfredo Valente
75 Bank Street, New York, N. Y.

Susan d'Vsseau
5 East 54 Street, New York, N. Y.

Abraham Walkowitz
1469 53 Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

S. Walter
1901 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Verna Ann Wear
16 West 57 Street, New York, N. Y.

Max Weber
10 Hartley Road, Great Neck, N. Y.

Sylvia Weingarter
1496 Flatbush Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Nat Werner
315 East 17 Street, New York, N. Y.

Sol Wexler
775 East 175 Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Warren Wheelock
1947 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Gene Foster Whitaker
359 West 18 Street, New York, N. Y.

Miriam Whiter
454 15 Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

John Van Wicht
106 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Harry Wickey
Cornwall Landing, New York

Marian Willard, Willard Gallery
32 East 57 Street, New York, N. Y.

Carolyn Wilson
Woodstock, N. Y.

Gilbert Wilson
245 East 36 Street, New York, N. Y.

Reginald Wilson
Woodstock, N. Y.

Sol Wilson
567 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Mrs. Sol Wilson
307 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Beatrice Winser, Director
Newark Museum, Newark, N. J.

Denny Winters
Woodstock, N. Y.

Sarah Woldman
2160 Beekman Place, Bronx, N. Y.

Lee Worman
70-11 108 Street, Forest Hills, N. Y.

Ben-Zion
58 Morton Street, New York, N. Y.

Teresa Zarnover
15 West 67 Street, New York, N. Y.

Dorothy C. Miller
12 E. 8th St., New York 3, N. Y.

Arthur Szyk
Weed Street, New Canaan, Conn.

Paul Burlin
939 Eighth Av., New York 19, N. Y.

Rene d’Harnoncourt
333 Central Pk. West, New York 25
Florida Federation of Art
Hollis Howard Holbrook
President
University Station
Gainesville

28 May 1947

The Honorable George C. Marshall
Secretary of State
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Mr. Secretary:

The Board Members of the Florida Federation of Art, an organization of fifteen-hundred members, met on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} of May at Orlando, Florida, and recommended writing a letter to you expressing their views on the disposition of the paintings recently recalled from foreign exhibition.

It was unanimously agreed that our American Painting should be sent on a “good will tour” throughout the world, in order that all nations should be fully aware the current art products presently being created in this country. It was felt, however, that the exhibit could be modified slightly with less emphasis on the so-called controversial pictures at this time.

There is little need to argue that it is good business policy to conduct our foreign relationships on a cultural plane. Precedents set by enterprising American businesses have made this quite clear. An indication to foreign nations that we also create art products should off-set, in a small way, alleged rumors regarding our affection for the “almighty dollar.”

We felt that our State Department was too easily swayed by the Hearst publications and other groups who wished to boost their circulation, and radio audiences, by playing up an old “appeal psychology” used by some of our writers and commentators. Considering the fine work being done by our State Department, it seemed inconsistent that they should not have the strength to resist this attack on such a brilliant undertaking.

Cordially yours,

Hollis H. Holbrook, President

HHH/m

Cc: Senator Claude Pepper
Senator Spessard L. Holland
“34 Paintings Added to API Collection”

A.P.I has bought a collection of 34 paintings and water colors from the 117 selected by the US government for exhibit overseas. The paintings were withdrawn from Cuba and Czechoslovakia following Congressional criticism of the project.

The collection includes works of the outstanding American artist today and shows the achievements of modern American art. Artists included are Stuart Davis, Georgia O’Keeffe, Arthur Dove, William Gropper, John Marin, and Max Weber.

University of Oklahoma was the only other college bidding on the paintings, Frank W. Applebee, head of the applied art department, Dean Turpin C. Bannister, and Acting President Ralph B. Draughon were responsible for the purchase.

Mr. Applebee said the paintings, valued at $18,000, now give Auburn a collection unequaled by any other college. The paintings cost the state department about $500 each but the “fair value” price granted API was from $22 to $25 each.

The paintings will arrive next month. A special showing will be arranged in the fall. There is a possibility that Auburn will get four more paintings from the collection.

Mr. Applebee said, “Despite the great controversy over these paintings in the newspapers and in the Halls of Congress, our State Department did an excellent piece of work in assembling the original collection of one hundred and seventeen paintings. I am amazed that we have been so successful. On third of all these oils and watercolors will come to Auburn. Of all the schools in the country apparently only Auburn and Oklahoma were aware of the proper procedure to be followed for obtaining of the works. Auburn’s bid, we have been told, go in hade of all others.

A little notice in a WAA release led to the purchase “through the obtaining of these paintings, API will have a contemporary painting collection that probably will not be surpassed by that of any other school in the anion.” Mr. Applebee continued. “Our present students and all others of the future will benefit through contact with these works.

“All pictures except those obtained by Auburn and Oklahoma, were won by dealers who had to be veterans in order to have priority over us. Many museums tried to get these works but we had an advantage over them in that we are a school with a large veteran enrollment.”
“Auburn College Purchases 34 Oil Paintings From War Assets Group”

Auburn, Ala, June 25—Thirty-four oil and watercolor paintings valued at approximately $18,000 were purchased by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute through the War Assists Administration in New York this week.

The purchase brings to a close much controversy over the paintings which are a part of the State Department Collection boasting 117 works.

The Collection was purchased in 1945 in order to spread the achievements of modern American art abroad. However, the entire project was abandoned in Czechoslovakia and Cuba when criticism developed from Congress and the Hearst Press.

Look Magazine reproduced seven of the paintings in color under the title “Your Money Bought These Paintings.” William Benton then Assistant Secretary of State, was called on the carpet by the House appropriations Committee that finally killed the Office of International and Cultural Affairs under whose aegis the Collection was bought and circulated.

API and the University of Oklahoma were the only successful bidders for the paintings in the educational group. The University of Oklahoma will receive 36 of the paintings, the rest will go to private bidders.

According to Frank W. Applebee, API’s head professor of Art the new paintings will give Auburn a collection probably unsurpassed by any other school in the nation. He said that all the greatest contemporary painters in America are represented in the exhibit. Among these he cited especially the works of Stuart Davis, Georgia O’Keeffe, Arthur Dove, William Gropper, John Marin, and Max Weber.

While these prints cost the State Department approximately $500 each, Auburn, under a “fair value” bid, will receive them for $22 or $25 each.

The paintings will arrive here sometime in July and go on exhibit in the gallery in November.

Dr. Ralph Brown Draughon API’s acting president, and Turpin C. Bannister, Dean of the School of Architecture and the Arts, have [sic] worked with Professor Applebee to effect the purchase.

“Despite the controversy over the paintings,” said Professor Applebee, “our State Department did an excellent piece of work in assembling the original collection I am amazed that we have been so successful in securing one-third of them.”
“Auburn Will Get Two More Paintings From Famed State Department Collection Brings Total To 36 and Are Valued At Over $18,000; Special Showing Scheduled for Fall”

Professor Frank W. Applebee, head of the applied art department, has been notified that Auburn will receive two more paintings from the much-discussed collection of 117 works of the art recently sold by the War Assets Administration. The collection was originally bought by the U.S. government for exhibit overseas. The paintings were withdrawn from Czechoslovakia and Cuba following Congressional criticism of the project.

The works are valued at over $18,000. They give Auburn a collection unequalled by any other college. The State Department original buyers of the paintings, paid enormous prices for the works. The “fair value” rice, granted Auburn because of the high veteran enrollment here, averaged around $29.70 per picture.

“A little item in the WAA release noticed by Dorsey Baron, WAA official here led to the purchase,” Prof. Applebee said. Dean Bannister, Dr. Draughon, Mr. Barron, and I gathered to consider bidding for the paintings. Through our cooperation and especially Mr. Barrons’s expert advice, Auburn was the first school to bid for the paintings. Oklahoma University was also awarded a number of them. All pictures except those obtained by Auburn and Oklahoma were won by dealers who had to be veterans in order to have priority over us. Man museums tried to get these works, but we had an advantage over them in that we are a school with a large veteran enrollment. St. Louis Museum, for example, had to pay $10,000 for one of two paintings in the collection by John Marin. For the other Marin picture, Auburn paid a “fair value” price of approximately $29.30.

The paintings have not yet arrived in Auburn. There will be a special showing arranged in the fall.

New York-(AP)-Alabama Polytechnic Institute picked up $21,853 worth of oil and watercolor paintings for $1,092.65 at a recent War Assets Administration sale here.

The institute one of six universities and colleges which submitted successful bids for 117 modern paintings by leading American artist, bought 36 works. This was the same number purchased by the University of Oklahoma.

Other universities which bid successfully were the University of Georgia, the University of Washington, Rutgers University and Texas A & M. The University of Georgia took 10 works valued at more than $5,000.

The remainder of the 117 paintings were [sic] bought by high schools, museums, public libraries, and individuals throughout the country.

All schools and institutions obtained a 95 per cent discount on the fair value of the paintings as determined by appraisal experts. Total “fair value” of the offering was given at $79,658.

Bought By API

Among the highest valued oil paintings were Yasuo Kuniyoshi’s “Circus Girl” and John Marin’s “Seascape”. These two works were priced at $2,000 each and were awarded to the Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

The University of Georgia received Reginald Marsh’s “Lifeguard,” valued at $900, and Louis Guglielmi’s “Tenements,” as well as other oils by Raymond Breinin, Julian Levi and Everett Spruce. They were also awarded watercolors by Ben Shahn, Hans Moller, De Hirsch Margules and Adolph Dehn.

The paintings and watercolors were purchased by the State Department in 1945 for exhibition abroad but were recalled from Czechoslovakia and Cuba when they received Congressional criticism.

Rep. Marion T. Bennett (R.) Missouri, said they were “mis-representative of American Life.”

Successful bidders at the sale were determined by their priority rights under the surplus property act and by the amounts of their bids. All awards were reviewed by the War Assets Administration review board in Washington.
“Salons Send Congratulations To Applied Art Department”

Auburn’s Art Department has received congratulations from Alabama’s two Senators and from the Third District’s Congressman.

“I am delighted that Auburn was the successful bidder on 36 of the State Department paintings. I know that these paintings will mean much to Auburn and people in that region.” - John Sparkman

“I share your gratification that Auburn has been able to acquire a number of the paintings.” - Lister Hill

“I am delighted that Auburn was the successful bidder on 36 State Department paintings.” - George Andrews, M.C.

Senators Sparkman and Hill and Congressman Andres did much to help Auburn in the acquiring of the famed State Dept. paintings. They kept Auburn officials informed in regard to the general situation and the necessary procedures to be followed.” Said Prof. Frank W. Applebee, head of the applied art department.
Montgomery Examiner
July 7, 1948

“API Buys Paintings Worth Nearly $18,000”

Thirty-four oil and watercolor paintings valued at approximately $18,000 were purchased by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute through the War Assets Administration in New York this week.

The purchase brings to a close much controversy over the paintings, which were a part of the State Department Collection boasting 117 works.

The Collection was purchased in 1945 in order to spread the achievements of modern American art abroad. However, the entire project was abandoned Czechoslovakia and Cuba when criticism developed from Congress and the Hearst Press.

API and the University of Oklahoma were the only successful bidders for the paintings in the educational groups. The University of Oklahoma will receive 36 paintings, the rest will go to private bidders.
“Interpretations”
Washington Merry-Go-Round
By Drew Pearson

   Washington--It was just about a year ago that the Republican Congress was berating and bulldozing Assistant Secretary of State Bill Benton for the State Departments art exhibit—especially the portrait of the fat circus girl.

   Benton was called up to Capitol Hill, literally made to stick his nose in each portrait, as Congress scoffed at modern art. After it was all over, the Republicans proceeded to cut all Stated Department’s cultural and propaganda funds to ribbons. Wasting money on crackpot art, they decreed, would not happen again.

   Even President Truman joined privately in the fray by writing Benton a letter about art. In the end, Secretary of State Marshall decided that Benton was “too hot” politically and his resignation was accepted.

   That was all about a year ago. Now comes the sequel.

   The art exhibit which the congressmen thought was such a waste of money has been sold at a profit. The State Department bought the collection for $56,000 and has now sold it for $79,658— a profit of more than $23,000 to Uncle Sam.

   The “Circus Girl,” by Yasuo Kuniyoshi which the congressmen so scored, sold for $2,000. The State Department had paid $700 for it.

   Bill Benton, now a private citizen tried to buy some of the pictures when they were up for auction, but was outbid each time. He didn’t get one.

   Note—The congressional cut in the State Department’s general propaganda funds was about as tragic as the congressional refusal to fortify Guam before Pearl Harbor. The art collection was not important, but the curtailment of other propaganda was. Fortunately, Congress has now seen the error of its ways and has restored part of the money.
Birmingham Herald  
November 15, 1948  

“Art Treasures Worth $20,000 Shown at A.P.I”  

Auburn, Ala, Nov. 14--One of the most distinguished exhibitions of paintings to the presented in Auburn is the Alabama Polytechnic Institute Collection of Contemporary Paintings, which will be shown for the first time in the School of Architecture and the Arts Library Gallery Nov. 15-30.

Valued at nearly $20,000 the collection was purchased from the government last Summer [sic] for only $1,000 and is the only one of its kind in Alabama. It contains works by some of America’s distinguished living artists whose names are the most significant in contemporary art.

In celebration of the exhibit, a preview and reception were held Sunday afternoon from 3 to 5 in the Arts Library Gallery. Members of the Auburn branch of the American Association of University Women were hostesses.

Mrs. L. E. Ensminger, arts chairman, and Miss Catherine Cater, dean of women and president of the A.A.U.W., were assisted by Mesdames S. L. Toomer, Frank Marion Or, R.G. Brownfield, Roger Allen, H.E. Klontz, E.V. Smith, R. S. Poor, Dale A. Porter, E. G. Salter and Misses Dana Gatchell, Jeanette Hall, Winifred Hill and Rebecca Pate.

Artists whose works are represented in the collection are John Marin, Georgia O’Keeffe, Joseph de Martini, Boardman Robinson, Lyonel Feininger, John Heliker, William Gropper, Philip Evergood and Arthur Dove.
“Fine arts for Auburn: Elegant Smith Museum will house collection”

By Michael Sznajderman
News Staff Writer

“It’s a building unlike any other on Auburn campus. It’s going to be great to have a place to show pride in arts.”

Taylor Littleton
Auburn English professor

The temporary offices of Jule Collins Smith Museum of Art won’t win a prize for architecture. But at least the view should improve in the coming months.

The mobile home that serves as museum headquarters overlooks an assortment of orange and yellow earth-moving equipment and mounds of East Alabama red clay. But in his mind’s eye, Director Michael De Marsche can already picture the completed vista.

“I believe this project has enough merit that, in five years, we can become a national museum,” De Marsche said.

A bold prediction for an institution that hasn’t even opened. But De Marsche, a Stanford University-educated art historian, doesn’t stop there.

“This is going to be historically important for the entire state,” he predicted.

De Marsche was tapped in January as the first director of Auburn University’s fledging fine arts museum. He is now shepherding the $12 million, 29,000-square-foot structure from blueprints to brick and mortar.

Already visible are the contoured banks of the new, 4-acre pond that will hug the backside of the travertine stone and glass museum. An outdoor terrace, walking rails, landscaped sculpture garden and an ornamental pool also will grace the museum grounds.

As for inside the museum- construction is expected to be completed in early 2002- visitors will enter an expansive lobby and rotunda before moving to the grand gallery, one of eight exhibition spaces.

The structure, just off South College Street at the gateway to the university, will also feature a multi-purpose auditorium, meeting rooms, a café and a museum shop, as well as storage and repair facilities and staff offices.
De Marsche, former director of the University of Southern Mississippi Art Museum, arrived at Auburn after the new museum was designed. But he still had time to tweak the layout to bring it more in line with other, modern museums.

Now, the previously exposed entranceway will be enclosed, and the gift shop and café expanded. The changes forced the elimination of a children’s education center, but that idea remains alive for future expansion.

“The architects were wonderful,” De Marsche said. They advised him to set up an office on site, so he can be close when questions arise during construction.

The museum is named for the wife of Albert James Smith Jr., a retired businessman from Houston and 1947 Auburn graduate. Smith pledged $3 million for the museum project to honor his wife on their 50th wedding anniversary.

Not to be outdone, Mrs. Smith returned to Auburn after the announcement to complete the undergraduate degree she started more than 50 years ago. She obtained her diploma last year.

Smith’s donation, combined with others, helped spur the university to move forward on the project. To date, the university has received nearly $12 million in commitments for the museum.

Among the museum’s holdings are more than 100 prints by 19th-century naturalist, John James Audubon. The collection, valued at nearly $1 million, was donated to the university and has never been exhibited. It will be displayed in two galleries decorated in 19th-century style.

Even more valuable is the “Advancing American Art” collection, purchased by the university from the State Department in 1947.

Growing value

Auburn English professor Taylor Littleton, who co-wrote a book about the collection, said a savvy employee in the university’s business office saw a notice about the State Department art sale. Auburn was one of the first universities to bid on the then avant garde collection, which had become a political hot potato following criticism from conservatives in Congress. The school ended up with 36 of the 113 paintings.

The pieces include works by a host of important American artists, among them Georgia O’Keeffe, Ben Shahn, Jacob Lawrence, Arthur Dove and John Marin. The university bought the collection for about $1,000. Today, its estimated value tops $5 million.

Over the years a few of the pieces have been shown at the Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, where the collection have been stored. But it has been decades since most of the pieces have been publicly displayed.
The Auburn museum also has two other sizable collections of American paintings, prints and drawings that have been donated to the university. What the university has lacked, De Marsche said, is a fitting place to show it all.

“Auburn has already spent 50 years building a collection,” he said. And as word about the new facility spreads, he expects more people to come forward with donations.

“It really is a case of, ‘If you build it, they will come,’” he said.

De Marsche hopes to fill out the museum’s collections with some selective purchases. He is creating several endowments that will be used to buy artwork, maintain the building and pay for educational programs, among other needs. The museum’s financial plan calls for the institution to be self-sustaining.

In addition to out-of-town visitors, De Marsche plans to draw a repeat crowd of student faculty and area residents with a vibrant schedule of visiting exhibitions, prominent guest speakers, art films and other happenings. Already, the museum is sponsoring special events, such as a bus tour to the Matisse exhibition in Birmingham.

“It’s just going to be a grand thing for Auburn,” said Littleton, a former Auburn administrator who has long pushed for a fine arts museum on campus.

He predicted the museum will become a “venue for the culture of the institution” and a magnet for the community.

It’s a building unlike any other on the Auburn campus.” Littleton said. “It’s going to be great to have a place to show pride in the arts.”

For more information about the Jule Collins Smith Museum of Art, call 1-334-844-1484.
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The University’s growing Holbrook Memorial Collection of paintings has been increased by 10 new additions, it was announced this week by Alfred H. Holbrook, curator. The collection now numbers 200 works of art.

The paintings were formerly a part of the U. S. Department collection of contemporary American art which some months ago caused a Congressional uproar. The canvases were among 117 originals by leading American artists. The collection was gathered after insistent demands from both Europe and America for a representative exhibition of American art, particularly modern art.


The original collection has received critical praise in both Europe and America since exhibition in the fall of 1946.
“Museum of Art Opens Monday: Exhibition Will Display Holbrook Gift Collection”

Over 600 notables, including Acting Gov. M. E. Thompson and Gov.-Elect Herman Talmadge, are expected to attend the reception which officially opens the new Museum of Fine Arts Monday at Main Library at 8 p.m.

Created to house the Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection, the museum was given to the University in 1945 by Alfred H. Holbrook, who will serve as curator. His collection memorializes his late wife.

The galleries are located on the ground floor at present, but upon completion of a new library building the entire structure will house the art collection.

Heads of Southern art schools and museums will view the collection Monday night, and others expected to attend include members of the board of regents, local city council members, and state legislators.

The museum’s south gallery, to be called Lamar Dodd Room in honor of the art department head, will house paintings borrowed from collections throughout the South. Paintings by Southern artists from all states except Mississippi will be represented.

In the north gallery will hang the Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection. The room will bear her name.

Museums and art institutions cooperating in picture loans are Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; Mint Museum, Charlotte, N.C.; Telfair Academy of Arts and Sciences, Savannah; Montclair Museum; Milwaukee Art Institute; International Business Machines; and Pepsi-Cola Company.

The two galleries were designed by Harold Wescott, associate professor of art, and are of modern decoration. Building the museum was made possible by the general education board of Rockefeller Foundation and Edward Shorter, head of Barnesville Art School, N.C.
Alfred H. Holbrook finds a great many benefits in his position as director of the Georgia Museum of Art.

“In the First place I am having a longer life than I anticipated,” the gentleman, who will soon be 93 years old, admits, with a twinkle in his eye. “The nights can’t go fast enough for me—I am that eager to back to the Museum in the morning. So instead of life being a boring thing, it is a delight.”

But no matter what, with Holbrook’s dynamic personality and vivid interest in a variety of activities, life would never be boring. He has successfully pursued two diverse careers—the first as a lawyer in New York, and after his “retirement,” as founder and chief benefactor of the Georgia Museum.

Holbrook’s story is romantic and adventuresome.

NEW YORK LAWYER

“I practiced law in New York for 46 years before coming to Athens,” Holbrook remembers. “And man times, during my leisure hours, I would leave the office and walk up to the dozens of galleries with their paintings.”

Holbrook’s interest in art was shared by his first wife, Eva Underhill Holbrook, and after her death in 1940, Holbrook was determined to start a museum in her memory.

So, he searched for paintings. “It seemed to me that the European artists were too high-priced, and so I went into American art,” Holbrook says. “I brought (sic) paintings by such artists as Andrew Wyeth and George Ennis (sic), and by 1944, I had 100 paintings by leading American artists.” This group of paintings, known as the Eva Underhill Holbrook Memorial Collection, was to become the foundation of the Georgia Museum.

However, it was still a long way from New York City to Athens, Georgia.

WANTED SOUTH

Holbrook had decided that he wanted to go South to avoid the bitter Northern winters, and one night at dinner, an old friend mentioned the University of Georgia.

Holbrook made a trip to Athens to investigate the possibilities here and after meeting Lamar Dodd, head of the Art Department, and others, Holbrook knew that he had found a home.
“They all seemed happy to have me start here,” Holbrook remembers, “and during the first day that I was here we tried to find a suitable location for the Museum.”

“The Old Library seemed adequate, and I returned to New York feeling that I had found just the place I wanted—I had landed in the place that I would like the best. So I returned to Athens on January 1, 1945, and have been here ever since.”

Since that time, Holbrook has seen the Museum grow, although sometimes progress has been slow. The Museum was, not officially installed in the lower level of the Old Library Building until 1948, and it was not until 1958 that the Museum occupied the entire building, when the new University library was completed.

PLAIN SAILING

“From that time on,” Holbrook reveals, “it has been plain sailing. It is just a matter of getting the right paintings. You can’t just go off half-cocked. You have to consider what leading artist you do not have, and what you want to have. At this time we have a good, well-rounded collection with all different schools represented.”

When Holbrook became Director of the Georgia Museum, he returned to the classroom. He studied at the University of Georgia School of Art and took up painting as a hobby. He returned North to acquaint himself with museum management, and his study, combined with his natural enthusiasm and experience as a collector have paid off in an outstanding Museum for Georgia.

Holbrook finds the development of the Museum and the regional growth in art interesting and exciting. “It’s slow, and you can’t put your finger on it, but I have seen a love for Art constantly developing and spreading out,” he observes.

The Georgia Museum of Art plays an important part in encouraging art appreciation.

TWO AUDIENCES

The Museum is geared to two audiences. “One consists of students from the Art Department, and many exhibits are procured with them in mind, and are especially adapted to give them new ideas. The other audience is the general public, and we constantly have collections on display which are of interest.”

On exhibit now is a coveted collection of works from the National Gallery.

In addition to providing a place for exhibits, either permanent or traveling, the Georgia Museum has its own exhibits which are displayed here and in other institutions. It also loans paintings to University faculty members for use in their offices.
The Georgia Museum is an active part of the community. It is the headquarters for the Athens Art Association, and it provides two galleries to the Art Association for its annual spring exhibit.

“The Museum also works in with any art proceedings in the city,” Holbrook explains. “We are available to advise or to contribute pictures on loan. Now we have pictures on loan to museums all over the country. A museum will borrow a painting from us for a month or two, and this is all part of trying to have utmost use made of our collection.”

HOLBROOK SPEAKS

The Museum frequently works with the University Art Department, and according to Holbrook, caters to the public with emphasis on visitors to this area. Holbrook himself is a frequent speaker, and the Museum is often the scene of lectures on art.

“All of this spreads the feeling for art very strongly,” Holbrook says. “It is inspiring to see different communities develop permanent collections of their own.”

Any sign of artistic development in Georgia delights Holbrook. And now he is looking into the future with confidence.

He is currently very pleased to have purchased some new prints, created by a contemporary of Rembrant’s (sic), for the Museum. As he surveys the galleries he muses, “It will not be long before we shall have to have additional wings or a new building…

“As the collection has increased, we have had to keep too many of our paintings in bins…”
“New OU Art Still in News”
By Nan Sheets

We were pleased to learn, from an Associated Press news item, that the University of Oklahoma had acquired through the medium of a sealed-bid, 36 oils and watercolors from the controversial state department collection of modern art. During June, the entire collection has been on exhibition at the Whitney Museum of Art, New York, and offered in public sealed-bid sale by the war assets administration as war surplus property.

Ever since the collection was first exhibited in New York’s Metropolitan museum in October, 1946, it has been in the news. The paintings and prints were selected and purchased for the government by J. Leroy Davidson, representative in charge of the state department art program. He had at his disposal an appropriation of $49,000. His first purchase consisted of four groups of original prints. These were sent to South America, as was the next purchase of watercolors. The idea behind the purchases was to acquaint our Latin American neighbors with the modern trend in art in this country. Later a group of oils were selected; these were to be sent to Europe as well as South America.

The first criticism of the collection that we recall, was concerning the fact that not always the best examples of an artist’s work had been purchased. However, the New York critics lauded the pictures and considered them a cultural asset.

After the Metropolitan Museum showing, the oils were sent abroad. They were shown in Paris in November and December, 1946, where they were a part of the huge international contemporary exhibition presented for UNESCO month there. It was in November, 1946, that the American Artist’s Professional league published a letter from that organization to the Honorable James P. Byrnes, secretary of the department of state, protesting the one-sided representation of American art in its globetrotting exhibition. This was the start of a controversy, probably egged on by conservative artist that gained momentum until the Hearst newspapers saw the news angle and began an active campaign to have the pictures recalled from the foreign circuit. Even President Harry S. Truman took a blast at Kuniyoshi’s painting of a fat semi-nude circus girl. He said: “The artist must have stood off from the canvas and thrown paint at it. If that is art, I’m a Hottentot.” It is interesting to note that artists say this is a very good early Quniyoshi [sic].

Art critics, through the medium of their art columns in newspapers and art periodicals, tried to combat the harmful publicity given the collection by the Hearst papers, but to no avail. The state department and congress became intimidated and the exhibitions, then in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and Haiti, were recalled. This was done regardless of the fact that President Edward Benes had the Czech government put up $6,000 to ship the American paintings to other cities in his country. The cause of art and artist, as well as government sponsorship of art, has been irreparably hurt by the small group of conservative artist, who eventually succeeded in
having the pictures recalled, because the office of international and cultural affairs has been discontinued.

We have no idea what the University of Oklahoma paid for its collection, but we feel positive it was a bargain price. The pictures will be invaluable to the art students who will have the privilege of studying originals by artists, whose names are found in all national exhibitions. Congratulations to whoever had the foresight to send in a bid.

We are of the opinion that Oklahoma University probably received the pictures through the federal works agency, “where educational institutions accepting GI students (museum schools) which can demonstrate their eligibility and need may receive up to 100 percent discount, or what amounts to an outright gift.”
“O.U. Art Exhibit Scheduled Today”

Thirty-six American paintings, part of a collection of 117 pieces purchased by the government for exhibits in Europe, will be previewed from 2 to 5 p.m. today in the Art building on the University campus.

Dr. Oscar B. Jacobson, research professor and director of the museum, said there will be no lecture in connection with the paintings.

The University museum purchased the 36 paintings from the state department after Secretary of State George Marshall requested the entire collection be sold.

The local exhibit includes the work of some of America’s foremost artists, including Georgia O’Keeffe, Julio de Diego and Ben Shahn.
“OU to Give Public First Peek Today at ‘Ham and Eggs’ Art”

Norman, Sept. 25- (Special)- The first exhibit of the University of Oklahoma’s newly acquired modern art collection will be held from 2 to 5 p.m. Sunday, Dr. O.B. Jacobson, director of the art museum, announced Thursday.

The 36 paintings, once part of a collection made by the government to be shown in Europe, were bought from the war assets administration. The exhibit was recalled from its European tour because the senate and top government officials considered it “ham and eggs” art.

The works will be on display in the Art building on the OU campus. They will remain on exhibit for two weeks. The university paid more than $1,000 for the collection, which was five percent of its stated value. However, the stated value was set at its lowest mark by the artist. Actually, the collection would bring nearer $50,000 if sold on the market, Leonard Good, curator of the university museum said.

When the WAA offered the collection for sale, OU bid for all 117 of the paintings upon suggestion of Dr. Jacobson. While the university did not receive the complete lot, it received the largest single group. Alabama Polytechnic received 31 and the University of Washington also got a large number.

Jacobson said the paintings were, on the whole, excellent works and representative of American artist of today.

Some of the most outstanding and popular paintings in the collection to be exhibited are Jack Levine’s “Horse,” Georgia O’Keeffe’s “Cos Cob,” Julio de Diego’s “Nocturnal Family” and Ben Shahn’s “Renascence.”
Modern American art is so gloomy it might have been painted by some of the displaced persons of Europe, Dr. Oscar B. Jacobson, University research professor of art, believes.

Just back from Colorado where he spent the summer working on his own paintings, the University art museum director said in an interview that in his opinion modern art “is shrouded in a prevailing gloom and is not ‘happy’ as art should be.”

“I always thought art should be something to enjoy,” Jacobson continued, “but there is not much joy to be found in modern art. It seems to me that the modern work might have been done by some displaced persons from Europe, but we have nothing like that over here. It is difficult to account for.”

Jacobson said the art exhibit, which will be ready Sunday, September 26, would illustrate his point.

It is a show of a part of a group of original American paintings, which the government planned to send on a “good will tour” through Europe, but was recalled by Congress shortly after arriving there. The University bought 36 of the 172 pieces at a [ ] explained, [ ] colleges and universities prize.

The exhibit is typical American art and will include [ ] of many famous American artists including Julio de Diego, Jack Levine, Georgia O’Keeffe, Abraham Rattner, Ben Shahn, Marsden Hartley, Stuart Davis, Joseph de Martini, Adolph Gottlieb, Edward Hopper, Dong Kingman, and Bouche [ ].

Jacobson expressed a [ ] hope that the depression [ ] American art is “just a [ ] would pass.

“I sincerely hope that [is the] case,” he said.

During the summer, [ ] at his log cabin 9,000 [ ] the Colorado Rockies and [ ] with his art “from early until nightfall.”

“The place is small but [ ] he said, “and it is comfortable.”

Some of Jacobson’s wor[ ] displayed at a one-man show [ ]ber 31 through November [ ] Fort Smith, Ark., by the [ ] KPFW, there. Jacobson [ ] about 20 of his latest pieces will be shown there.
“This is the first time ever heard of anything like [ ] he said. “Fort Smith is no[ ][ ] but the radio station there [ ] exhibits of many of [ ] from this territory, not just Arkansas. I think it is [ ].”
“O.U. Purchases ‘Condemned’ Art”

President Truman and the State Department may not appreciate good art, but the University of Oklahoma art museum, its director Oscar B. Jacobson and curator Leonard Good certainly know a bargain when they see it.

The University recently became the proud “second-parents” of 35 of the 117 paintings bought by the government to exhibit in Europe but now being sold because top brass did not think they a typical portrayal of American life.

After being shown in their entirety in New York City, the paintings, which represent the work of the best American artist, were divided to be sent both to Europe and South American. They were displayed in Haiti and Czechoslovakia. Secretary Marshall saw them in Prague and finding them distasteful personally, appealed to both Truman and Byrnes. The President took a look at photographs of paintings and came out with his now famous approval of “ham and eggs” art. For a year after this decision the paintings remained in storage while all magazines dealing with national affairs published articles and reproductions about the collections.

Finally they were offered for sale at the Whitney Museum of Art in New York City. Good stated, “The O.U. Museum of Art bid for the whole lot.” The regional office of the War Assets Administration in New York recommended, however, that O.U. receive the largest single group, Alabama Polytechnic receive 31 and the University of Washington another large allotment.

The paintings were bought at 5% of their stated value which was purposely set at a low mark by the artist concerned. There was a certain amount of prestige involved in getting a painting in the State Department exhibit.

Notable among the paintings was one by Georgia O’Keeffe who has been regarded as the foremost woman painter in the United States. Her paintings rarely sell for under $1,000, and more often up to $5,000. The University obtained her original Cos Cob for $50!

It is a reflection on the judgment of the Washington “critics” that the artist who participated in the State Department exhibit are now being shown “almost without exception” at the American Pavilion in Venice. This exhibition is sponsored by four of the leading museums in the United States, Metropolitan, Whitney, Museum of Modern Art, and the Brooklyn Museum of Art, all of New York City.

In discussing the paintings, Professor Good stated some of the paintings are “almost photographic in effect” and others are of abstract surrealistical nature. The University collection is
“the finest that could be brought together” and will certainly give art students an opportunity to study the brush strokes of original paintings by some of the world’s foremost artists.

The University was recommended to receive the most sought-after painting of the entire collection, Jack Levine’s *Horse*. Good said this one picture alone would bring nearly $10,000 if offered for sale.

Two other well-known works the University purchased are Julio de Diego’s *Nocturnal Family* and Ben Shahn’s *Renascence*.
“Art Museum Name is Official; Public Exhibit Space Obtained”

The University Art building on the main campus will assume officially this summer the title it has maintained for identification purposes during the past year.

The name University Art museum will become effective with the completion of remodeling of the former Naval Air Technical Training center’s administration building into headquarters for the art school.

Dr. Harrison Kerr, dean of the college of fine arts, said the Art museum will be used exclusively for housing the University’s art collections and for exhibits of interest to the public. Art displays for students will be in the south campus art building.

Kerr, William Harold Smith, art school director; Joe Taylor, chairman of the department of painting and sculpture, and Eugene A. Bavinger, chairman of the department of design will be in charge of the operation of the museum.

Plans call for the school’s oriental art collection to be classified, probably early in September, by a Chinese scholar.

The moving of the Art school complete with offices, classrooms and laboratories to the south campus, will make it possible to bring the study of art from dark basement quarters and pave the way for more adequate display of art collections, Kerr explained.

The present school of art building formerly was the O.U. library. While it will become the Art museum this summer, the building will be sued temporarily for music classes while Holmberg hall undergoes remodeling. Date for start of the remodeling is awaiting completion of architect’s plans, Kerr said.
“Art Wacky? OU Hits Pay Dirt in Purchase of Recalled Exhibition: Sooners Witness Cultural Phenomenon”
By Aline Jean Treanor

Contemporary American art gets no rest from its ups and downs. Just when it begins to show a fancy profit for the University of Oklahoma, Sen. Kerr joins its detractors. The coincidence invites a look at the record.

“Wacky,” said the senator a few days ago, backing up President Eisenhower’s dissatisfaction with the art sent to Moscow for the current American exhibition there.

“We are not too certain exactly what art is, but we know what we like…” was the president’s comment, in part. So he ordered a supplementary exhibition sent over, largely of 19th century works.

Thus have two more officials, entered the lists of art critics by official prerogative. Historic precedent is voluminous. One pope slapped Michelangelo in the face for his artistic ineptitudes. Another threatened to have him thrown from the scaffold.

Peir Soderini, the gonfaloniere of Florence, demanded that the nose of “David” be shortened. So before it was accepted the artist had to count the scaffold and pretend to give it a shave, dropping marble dust he held in his hand as he went up.

“I like it better now,” said Soderini. “you have given it life.” Michelangelo climbed down, “not without compassion for those who wish to appear judges in matters about which they know nothing,” according to Vasari, Florentine historian of the Renaissance.

The special victim of the bishops of Salzburg was Mozart. It was Bishop Hieronymus, as I remember, who said, “His music is too full of notes,” they drove Mozart out of Salzburg and he hated it as long as he lived. It is ironic that the town now cashes in so richly, with its Mozart festivals, on the native son it repudiated.

“Oh off with their heads” has been the cry of official criticism as far back as the art chronicles go. Undoubtedly some prehistoric bison painter was clubbed by the chief for defacing cave walls.

Closer home, there is congressional precedent. Representative Dondero scuttled more than one important international art exchange in his time. This writer encountered him in his own north Detroit precincts in 1946, and was stunned at the daze of his mind, in which his twin phobias, communism and modern art, were inextricably meshed, each a monster more hideous than the other.
Closer in time, and more pertinent, was President Truman’s “me too” to the congress.

“If that is art, I am a Hottentot,” he snapped at an exhibition the state department had organized for circulation abroad in 1947. For a trial run, it has been shown in the Metropolitan museum in New York, then in Paris, The Netherlands, and Prague, and was admired in all, attacked in none. President Benes of Czechoslovakia had just raised $6,000 to send it on tour of Czech cities, when it was recalled.

Time is of course the only supreme court of art criticism. And usually it dallies over it decisions. The longer they hang fire, the more clear cut they are to interpret. That’s why we are surer about Michelangelo and Mozart then we can be about the state department collection of 1947.

In this latter case, however, time appears to have taken a spurt. We in Oklahoma are witnesses to the phenomenon.

Thirty-six of the 117 paintings that comprised the recalled exhibition are property of the University of Oklahoma, thanks to the critical foresight of international art scholar Dr. Oscar Brousse Jacobson, who guided the course of art at OU for 33 years. The haul was made at a U.S. salvage agency auction for $1,061, which was five percent of the original value, as set by the artist and paid for by the state department.

Now the OU museum of art had had some of them sent to New York for up-to-date appraisal. And of the first three precisely priced, one has exactly doubled its value, one has almost doubled. This amounts to about 40 times what OU paid for them. The figures have been supplied by Professor artist Eugene Bavinger, OU art museum director.

No re-appraisal of the collection in total has yet been made, but these three, with one other bought at $100, and now valued at $5,000, are enough to indicate that oil has been truck.

Market prices of art fluctuate. No one price ever measures the ultimate stature and standing of masterwork. But prices are an index of general esteem, which oftener than not follows the judgment of informed criticism.

The paintings re-appraised are Ben Shahn’s, Abraham Rattner’s, Max Weber’s and Jack Levine’s. In this order, here are theOU purchase price and their recent re-appraisal value: $45 to $1600; $45 to $1800; $90 to $2000; and $100 to $5000. All four artists are represented in the Moscow show.

It is a telling co-incidence that the Levine “White Horse” in the OU collection has turned out the best investment yet, and the Levine “Welcome Home”, in the Moscow collection is the one the president was called to comment on. He said “it looks more like a lampoon than art, as far as I am concerned.”

The Whitney museum in New York, conservative cousin of the Museum of Modern Art, has announced it will show the Moscow exhibition on its return. Missouri’s Thomas Benton,
Iowa’s Grant Wood, are represented in it: Ohio’s Charles Burchfield, John Stewart Curry of Kansas; John Marin, John Sloan, Reginald Marsh, Marsden Hartley, Andrew Wyeth; about 10 abstractionists. In the main it’s a show of the country’s 20th century “old masters.” It was assembled under as sober counsel as dwells among us, the Detroit Archives of Art.

It would be a favor for the rest of the country to see the exhibition. I doubt if any of us would find it “wacky.”
Monday is the opening day of the public exhibition [to] Henry Art gallery of the six controversial paintings bought by the University from the State Department. According to “Newsweek” magazine, these are part of a collection that caused “one of the most controversial art stories of recent times.”

The paintings were bought for $300 by the University from the War Assets administration, which disposed of them for the State Department. They were originally a part of a collection of 117 oils and watercolors called “Advancing American Are,” which was sent oversees to acquaint other countries with American trends in modern art.

The paintings were divided into two sections and one section got as far as Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the other as far as Haiti when they were suddenly recalled to the United States as a result of congressional investigation, newspaper and magazine agitation and State Department action.

Back in the United States, the picture were placed on the auction block and sold. The University bought their six at a 95 per cent discount from fair price which is the policy of the W.A.A. regarding purchases by tax-supported institutions.


The Hearst publications and “Look” magazine were the vanguard in attacking the overseas exhibition of the pictures. These two guardians of American culture not only smelled communism in the paintings, but according to “Art Digest,” “started a campaign that involved more space and vigor than taste, intelligence or even truth.”

Some of the facts that were overlooked by the critics of the pictures are: In spite of cries of wasted tax payer money, the pictures were bought below open market prices. After their recall to the United States, one dealer offered for them one-half again as much as was originally paid. The University in getting the pictures at a 95 per cent discount made a very good investment, financially at least.

Regardless of whether certain journalists do or don’t like the paintings, they are representative of what is being done today by American “name” artist. The painters of the six University picture are widely known in art circles. Seven of the painters represented in the state department collection were among the eleven best American painters, as determined by a recent public poll.
In spite of cries of communism, the pictures were banned by the communists in Europe whereas both conservative European and American critics praised the collection.

According to Josephine Gibbes, managing editor of “Art Digest,” “no available group now in existence would be more valuable to students of modern technique and points of view who have little opportunity to see original examples of progressive American painting.”

In addition to the state department pictures, the Henry galleries will also open Monday with an exhibit of 100 drawings and watercolors from the Mexican Academy of Art.
Museums over the past 50 years have changed a great deal, just like about everything else.

The Henry Gallery of 1927, when its present building on the University of Washington campus was constructed, was a far different institution than it is now in the midst of its 50th anniversary.

In retrospect, the creation of the museum, the oldest publicly supported museum in the state, was a relatively simple affair.

Horace Chapin Henry (1844-1928) made his money in railroads and real estate, and in time-honored tradition began to interest himself in philanthropy and art. For a while, he opened his house on Harvard Avenue to the public in order to exhibit the art, which he had collected. But that seemed impermanent, and Seattle had no museum to which one could give an art collection.

In the mid-twenties, Henry Suzzallo, then president of the University of Washington, convinced Henry that he should not only donate his collection of about 150 paintings of 19th century and early 20th century European and American art to the university but money for a museum.

Henry agreed. In a letter to the board of regents, Henry offered his collection, not more than $100,000 for a building and a request that the board get going quickly. Its members did and not a year later the Henry Gallery, its Tudor-Gothic Building designed by Carl Gould, was opened.

It should be noted that Henry was an ideal patron. He did not play coy games with the university as collectors often do today with museums as if the institution was created for their personal amusement.

Henry’s collection has been dubbed a collection of mostly cows. It is primarily landscapes, pastoral scenes. Of the current exhibition, one gallery is devoted to Henry memorabilia, including the formal offer of the collection and the money to build the museum to the regents, and three other galleries devoted exclusively to the Henry collection. There are samples of the collection in other galleries.

Henry collected bits and pieces; some good and some, well, examples of their kind. There is a good representation of the early 19th century French art- Barbizon, Delacroix, Corot,
Bouguereau (the sheer perversity of the painting is rather startling)- and American art- Ralph Blakelock, William Merritt Chase, Childe Hassam (one of American’s foremost Impressionists), George Inness and one of the prizes of the whole collection: Winslow Homer’s “An Adirondack Lake” purchased incidentally by Henry in [1930?] for $5,000.

The museum’s first director, Halley Savery, who served from 1927-1946, witnessed not only the growth of the museum but also the creation of two other museums in Seattle-The Seattle Art Museum and the Frye Art Museum.

From the outset, the Henry Gallery sought to serve the academic community and the community-at-large. The first year of operation included a traveling exhibit of Klee, Kandinsky, Feininger and Alexei von Jawlensky (the four formed “Die Blaue Vier” in 1924).

Throughout the five decades, exhibits of paintings, prints, sculpture, crafts were shown. International artists as well as students and faculty saw their work hung at the gallery. Art of Africa, Pre-Columbian, Northwest Coast Indians were shown long before it was fashionable. Art of Europe, America, China Japan was shown.

During the two-year directorship of Elizabeth Bayley Willis was an exhibit of furniture of Charles Eames. The exhibit in Seattle was held in 1947, one year after the Museum of Modern Art gave Eames a show of his plywood furniture.

Melvin O. Kohler was the third director, from 1948-52. During that items, shows were given of Cartier-Bresson, Moholy-Nagy, American houses, Mies van der Rohe, Henry Moore, “New Direction in Contemporary Furniture,” Archipenko, Mark Tobey, Marsden Hartley.

Gervais Reed (1952-68) was interested in experimental films another example of the museum being in the forefront of the advance of modern art in all of its manifestations. He also gave shows in the 1950s to Alexander Calder, Marsden Hartley to name a couple and in the 1960s the Yamasaki. The Henry gallery Association, which numbers about 400, was formed in 1967.

The next six years of the museum proved to be the most turbulent of its entire 50. LaMar Harrington, a long-time staff member of the museum, succeeded Reed in responsibility but not title.

There was no agreement among the parties concerned- the university administration, which is the overseer of the museum, the school of art, which has continuously sought to extend its influence over the policies of the museum, the Henry Gallery Association, which has only a supportive role officially but would like more power- about what direction the museum should take.

In 1972, Jan van der Marck, a respected scholar of contemporary art and former director of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago, was appointed part-time curator and was also on the art faculty.
He was brought here by members of the Henry Gallery Association who hoped to construct a new museum dedicated to modern art. Marck is reported as saying that he would have sold a good deal of the collection if he were named director, to facilitate the purchase and exhibition of contemporary art. It was additionally reported that the Wright collection, which had been turned down by the late Richard Fuller, director and president of the Seattle Art Museum, would form the core of the new museum.

Problems arose on all fronts, and van der March soon grew tired of waiting and left the city for Dartmouth College where he is now head of its art queues. Richard Grove was named director in the spring of 1975. Subsequently Harrington filed a suit with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, a suit she has reportedly won.

During Harrington’s penultimate year as acting director, the museum was accredited by the American Association of Museums. The report had high praise for the museum and its staff. “The exhibition program is remarkable interesting and varied and is the strength of the gallery. It is well-known and respected on local, regional and national levels for its high quality and educational and esthetic exposure.”

However, the role of the Henry Gallery Association was questioned- it was acting too much like a board of trustees with actual governing powers. The university administration, through the board of regents, which is the final arbiter of things relating to the museum, was criticized for its failure to make its intentions clear.

Since Harrington’s ousting- she is currently curator of Northwest Art Archives at Suzzallo museum and its director has been quiet. The ambiguity of the roles of the various people and departments and organizations connected with the museum does not yet seem truly settled by the university. The school of art, which is looking for a new chairman, has included in the job description, “museum experience.” That decision should be reached this spring, and it is expected the person will not come from within the present UW art faculty.

In fact, Grove has been criticized for opting for an ambiguous status quo and allowing principal parties to have little bits of Henry Gallery pie in order to keep everyone reasonably happy instead of insisting on a firm statement of university policy.

The budget for the museum is small as its professional staff: Fred Dunagan, who did a splendid job of organizing and hanging the anniversary show, and Julie Anderson, a first-rate museum professional and member of the Seattle Arts Commission.

Grove, who had been out of the museum business for more than 15 years when he was appointed head of the Henry Gallery, said there are not quite $12,000 yearly exhibitions and publications at the museum. He said private support is nominal- the current exhibition was funded in part by the association and its catalogue, to be published this spring, by PONCHO. He is working on some grants to various agencies.

The museum is cramped for space. A new and larger museum has been on two long-range UW building plans, but no allocation of funds has been made. There has been reportedly
no active push to get the university to proceed with planning a new museum, which would require not only capital funds but increased yearly budgets, something the accreditation committee recommended more than two years ago.

Since Grove has been at the museum, he has initiated not major exhibits. However, those, of course, require time and money. He said, however there were discussion of two exhibits sometime in the future: hand-built houses of the Northwest and native artist of the Northwest.

On the exhibition schedule this coming year are three major ones: Eskimo art of the North Alaska, fall, 1977, guest curated by Dorothy Jean Ray; history of Northwest ceramics, Fall, 1977, guest curated by Harrington, both of which will have publications, part of the “Northwest Index”; a joint retrospective with the Seattle Art Museum in July of Guy Anderson. Funds for a catalogue are still being sought.

Grove said he wanted to continue the tradition of the Henry Gallery- its interest in crafts, its interest on being on the “cutting edge of modern art.” “We’re under no obligation to do trendy things.” It also appears that he aims to keep the museum [at] eclectic as possible.

The rest of the exhibit, which continues through March 13, details what the museum has collected and been given as well as its latest conservation efforts which includes the Corot, Frederick Waugh, Kenyon Coz, Hassam, William Merritt Chase, Jules Depres, Constant Troyon.

There is a sizable collection of Northwest art-Tobey, Graves, Callahan, Anderson, Horiuchi, Bunce, Walter Isaacs, Celetano, Ray Hill, Viola Patterson, Richard Gilkey, Kenney, William Ivey, Carl Morris, Emily Carr- which has been interspersed with the rest of the collection- Sonia Delaunay, Rembrandt, Leonard Baskin, Archipenko, Matisse, Marsden Hartley, Theodoros Stamos, Peter Vouikos, Robert Arneson, Imogen Cunningham, Hogarth, Stuart Davis, Motherwell.

There are some rather marvelous juxtapositions: Stamos next to Callahan, Ambrose Patterson, Buncei, Feiniger, Fred Anderson, Gabor Perterdi, Rauschenberg.

Bill Talley’s marvelous plant arrangements should also be mentioned.

The museum has a great history. One hopes the next 50 years will be as dynamic as the last.
Since the February show of the Tacoma Art League is displaying the six pictures (often referred to as “War Assets” paintings) arranged through the office of Circulating Exhibition, Adult Education Division, University of Washington, it seems timely to tell something of the history of this group of paintings, purchased originally with taxpayer’s money and now the property of the state university.

In the autumn of 1946 these paintings, and about 75 others, hung in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, on view, before being divided into two collections, one to tour Europe and the other to circulate throughout the other American Republics.

The European exhibit opened in Paris in November, 1946, during UNESCO month. Therefore it was to tour Europe and the Near East over a period of years. It reached Czechoslovakia where Jan Mosaryk, the foreign minister, personally opened the exhibition, and the late President Benes spent hours viewing the pictures. Despite the interest abroad, its career was destined to be short-lived for reactionary forces in the United States, i. e., Look magazine and the Hearst papers, more vociferous than-art-wise, caused such confusion of opinion that the state department hastily recalled the collections in spite of the fact that the selection of pictures was made on the basis of pleas from abroad “to show the newest development of American art.” It might have been very salutary for American art to have had the benefit of foreign criticism but the hasty withdrawal of the collections prevented that. At home again, the pictures were classed as “war surplus,” and sold, preference being given to schools and institutions who paid about five per cent of the original purchase price.

The names of the artists on the pictures acquired by the University of Washington—on display here—are among the well-known of the art world. All are represented in the top museums of the United States. All are American citizens, but Stuart Davis, Robert Motherwell, and the late Marsden Hartley are native Americans while Max Weber and Ben-Zion are Russian-born and Werner Drewes is German.

“Trees and El” by Stuart Davis has all the clean cut precision of a piece of American machinery. He has simplified and formalized familiar objects into an abstract design, a synthetic pattern in art, analogous to synthetics in other fields. Viewed closely one notices how interestingly the artist has textured the white areas.

All facets of American style were included in the collection and Max Weber represented the Expressionist group. He is skillful in building three-dimensional form with color, “sensuous and seductive.” His “Conversation” has evident sincerity. The muted color and distorted figures have an earthy quality quite characteristic of his work. He outlined his figures with black lines but lines of an entirely different character than Ben-Zion used in “Perpetual Desbuictor [sic].”
Werner Drewes “Balcony” introduces the only gay note in the group. Its pleasing color, intriguing space division, opposing horizontal and vertical forms relieved by diagonals, dispels gloom and is sufficiently exciting to have a stimulating effect.

The late Marsden Hartley’s “Whale’s Jaw, Dogtown” is not one of his best nor does it hold much of interest. As a painting it has the feeling of stodgy middle age. There is none of the exhilaration found in “Balcony.”

Robert Motherwell was born in Aberdeen, Wash., but he shows little kinship with Northwest artists who are his peers in recognition. “Figuration,” executed in tempera on paper, has pleasing colors arranged somewhat like a fragment of weaving. Trying to approach pure abstraction, his subject matter is “paint” itself, and “his paintings are quite simply about paint”; a creed of his craft that may produce simple results or be abstruse beyond comprehension.
They opened a packing case from the War Assets Administration yesterday at the Henry Art Museum at the University of Washington and out tumbled six of the darnedest painting you ever did see, mother.

Abstractions, they call them, in which the artist was more concerned with composition and the arrangements of objects in juxtaposition (wait a minute, Welch, watch your language! This is a family newspaper) than he was in mirroring life or telling a story. Shapes and colors in interesting combinations but nothing a low brow could get his teach into.

We now part the hair that hangs down over our eyes and try to tell you something about these truly valuable acquisitions to the campus museum. They are (1) all the work of established paintings, (2) they are part of a collection which not long ago became a congressional cause celebre, and (3) the University bought them for peanuts.

From left to right they are “Perpetual Destruction [sic]” by Ben Zion, “Trees and El” by Stuart Davis, “Balcony” by Werner Drewes, “Whale’s Jaw, Dogtown” by Marsden Hartley, “Conversation” by Max Weber, and “Figuration” by Robert Motherwell. They cost the University only three C-notes, or less than the third part of a grand, and originally they were valued at five with three ciphers following.

You surely must remember, mother, the crisis that occurred in Washington, D.C., back in April, 1947, when the state department bounced something like fifty grand for a collection of modern American art to send on exhibit throughout the world. The idea was that people in the distressed countries would look at these astonishing painting and be convinced that things were tough in the United States, too.

Then congress got wind of the plan, and one or two members of congress saw some of the paintings, and such an anguished cry arose in the legislative halls that the state department called the whole works back and handed them over to War Assets for quick sale.

There were about 150 canvases in the collection, and the University bid modestly on six.

There is a strong temptation to say that all six look like the Santa Fe’s Super Chief leaving the Pasadena station in a low fog over a brimming plate of coddled eggs, but we shall resist the temptation.

The artists are all established artists, their work is rated good by people who know, they knew what they were doing, and they did well what they set out to do, it says here.
(Editor’s Note: Mr. Welch absent-mindedly neglected to point out that we taxpayers are playing twice for these masterpieces—once when they were bought to edify our overseas cousins and now again as supporters of the University of Washington. Maybe Mr. Welch doesn’t pay any taxes.)

These paintings, unfortunately, probably will not be exhibited for a month or two. The museum has another show under way including some paintings equally obscure to obtuse visitors, fabrics, abstractions and a lot of other stuff like that there. Melvin Kohler, the new curator as of July 1, and a cautious man, says of the six new acquisitions: “They mean something from the campus standpoint. They present interesting relationships of spaces and forms.”

Shame on us, we tried to trap him into saying they grew on one, but he wouldn’t.

One of the charges hurled in congress (to trot out a stout old cliché) was that more or more of the painters of the 150 paintings were Communists. Judging from the six the University bought, they could well be. If Communists are working for confusion, Old Joe at the Kremlin must have been pretty pleased when he got his report from the N. K. V. D. art spy system in America.

But what, after all, distinguishes the work of a Communist abstract painter from the work of a left-wing Democrat abstract painter—a line her, a line there, a little more use of the scarlet pigments, perhaps, a brooding sense of futility?

Before you can decide whether or not it is subversive, mother, you’ve got to know first what it is…
The Stroller
October 2, 1948

The University of Washington finished displaying, this week, the six canvases it had acquired from the U.S. State Department through the War Assets Administration at an average cost of $50 apiece. Visiting the display this week, we found ourselves more astonished than ever at the controversy which made the State Department’s acquisition of 117 paintings by American artists for exhibit overseas a veritable “celebrated cause” in artistic, not to say political circles.

Assuming that the pictures in the Henry Gallery on the campus are a fair sample of the whole exhibit, the government got a better bargain for its $49,000 than those who stirred up this controversy (including certain Midwestern senators, the Hearst newspapers, and, less explicitly Look magazine) were interested in indicating. A private California dealer, in fact, trying to evade the maze of procedure involved in selling off surplus government property, offered about half as much again as the original cost for the lot. Notwithstanding the necessity of selling many of these pictures for practically nothing or even giving them away to a category of schools and colleges for whom the Federal Works Agency was the agent, the government finally came out with a profit on its collection anyway, we understand.

The local Hearst newspaper sent its gifted humorous-feature writer, Douglass Welch, to the Henry Gallery exhibit some weeks ago. This turned out to be one of Mr. Welch’s tougher assignments, and what he did with it was to (1) address his readers as “mother”; (2) repeat the implication that the pictures were the work of communists because they did not coincide with the man-in-the-street’s idea of what a picture should be; (3) indicate in a disingenuous “editor’s note” that the taxpayers paid twice for the University pictures, forgetting that the University’s $300 and other sums paid to the WAA for the pictures went back into the federal coffers.

If the communist label is to mean anything, it ought to be applied more judiciously; to equate Marxism with obscurity is no more than frivolity; for, as we showed in a previous column, Marxist art doctrines make the same demand for comprehensibility to the average, common man as the detractors of this exhibit made. The exhibit was received very favorably in several foreign countries before it was abruptly withdrawn from Czechoslovakia, where it had been warmly praised by conservatives, led by Masaryk and Benes, and as warmly panned by the communists.

Not that the University’s half-dozen canvases are utterly incomprehensible to the layman. The balcony in Werner Drewes’s “Balcony” is plainly discernible. Marsden Hartley’s “Whale’s Jaw, Dogtown” has in it an object which may be described with the aid of this title and is an emotional painting that does not tell the masses to strike off their chains, or anything else, for that matter. “Trees and El,” by the abstractionist Stuart Davis, has in it abstractions of a tree and the trestle of an elevated railway, and in the full color of the original is much more decorative than a newspaper half tone can indicate. Ben-Zion, a Russian born artist known for unconventional treatments of biblical subjects, symbolizes the effects of war in “Perpetual Destructor” by showing what is obviously the tracking mechanism of a tank mowing down objects which seem to represent a blend of human figures and human constructions, Max
Weber’s “Conservation,” a boudoir or backstage scene, could give no one any trouble—it’s as plain as representation can be.

One picture, Robert Motherwell’s “Figuration,” a burgundy-colored piece painted in tempera, might give most customers trouble because it is not a picture of anything at all, not even an abstraction from real objects. Presumably it is supposed to convey feeling, thought, and pattern in the self-contained way music does. Is Mr. Motherwell a communist? This artist, a native of Aberdeen (Wash.), happens to be known personally to the present columnist, who can vouch for it that he is a young man of fantastically good education, independent income, much industry, little of what is called “social consciousness,” and an intelligence that would find little to interest it in the Marxian theories, shoddy as they really are.

Far from aiming at the annihilation of Western individualistic (or “bourgeois”) values in favor of the communal values or the East, this modern art which seems to irritate so many of us actually is an assertion of a perhaps rather advanced individuality. It wouldn’t hurt anything if statesmen and newspapermen in this country were to inform themselves as to what their fellow Americans are up to in artistic fields, or at least give them the benefit of the doubt. If Winston Churchill can be a painter (a conservative one, as befits his age and amateur standing) and Anthony Eden a connoisseur, how are we to take our administration’s behavior? The State Department’s Mr. Benton was unable to defend his underling’s art purchases, and President Truman opponents of the purchases, which had been selected with the view of winning for this country the increased respect of influential circles abroad.

We naturally want to be represented abroad by an image that we consider a true, even flattering, likeness, and that means excluding what many of us consider the “arty” or other phony elements from the image. But it also means taking the prejudices of the people we want to impress—which may be different from ours—into consideration, too.
The Holbrook Collection as a Service to the Schools

In a community far removed from the vital collections of original paintings such as are found in many metropolitan centers, there is a great need for the collection of 200 paintings which Alfred H. Holbrook has presented to the University of Georgia. Students who can have first-hand contact with the original works in this collection will have a much truer conception of the art of painting than that obtained when they can experience only reproductions of paintings. In fact, many educators claim that unless one can have access to original works it is impossible to study paintings with any degree of success.

The Holbrook Collection could make possible this first-hand study. The art program which the University of Georgia should offer would follow the trend of the leading art museums of the country which, building upon the realization that the child of today is the adult citizen of tomorrow, have re-designed their offerings to make the public school student feel at home in their museums. Many communities such as ours and in fact many communities of much larger size than ours are starving for a collection of good original paintings. Here we are faced with an entirely different problem. We have the collection. It is housed in racks in one small storage room. Neither children nor adults in large groups can see it. Unlike larger cities where the problem of transporting large groups of children becomes serious, Athens, being a comparatively small city, makes it possible for school groups to assemble with comparative ease in the centrally located University campus. Our most pressing need is for a gallery large enough to show the collection and thus make possible a program in art education for the pupils of the public schools, the
community at large as well as the immediate community of the University of Georgia.

It is thought that, for the present, the ground floor of the University Library should be remodeled to provide an emergency gallery for the Holbrook Collection. Since future plans call for remodeling the entire structure into an art museum as soon as the new library can be constructed, the work done on the ground floor now would be permanent. Plans already drawn were made with the ultimate purpose in mind of showing to the best advantage a constantly changing educational exhibition which will make use of new exhibition techniques and materials. The overall objective will be a gallery where the young student will feel intimately associated with the work displayed rather than an apathetic awe such as many museums present. Modern, flexible galleries that will function as fluid backgrounds for the installations are needed to feature a program such as we have in mind as a distinct service to the schools of the community. The cost of this remodeling will be relatively small in comparison to the investment in the Holbrook Collection of paintings to be housed.

*see the writings of Albert C. Barnes of the Barnes Foundation; the various reports of the Educational Director, Thomas Munro, of the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, Ohio; the reports of the childrens classes at the Toledo Museum, the Milwaukee Art Institute, and the Walker Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota.
VALUE AND USE OF THE EVA UNDERHILL HOLBROOK
MEMORIAL ART COLLECTION IN TEACHING

The writings of Albert C. Barnes of the Barnes Foundation, the various reports of Thomas N. Reed, educational director of the Cleveland Museum of Art, the reports from the Children's Classes at various art museums throughout the country, and the reports of the Toledo Museum, Milwaukee Art Institute, and the Walker Center in Minneapolis all call attention to the fact that unless one can have access to original works it is impossible to study painting with any degree of success. It is impossible for a student to evaluate a painting properly by looking at a reproduction.

In any field, before one can take a step forward he has to go back into reverse and see what has been done before. A foundation must be laid by an examination of what others have done, and then one can proceed from that point.

Mr. Alfred Holbrook, donor of the Eva Underhill Holbrook Collection of Art, has been asked on several occasions why he purchased a particular type of painting. His reply has been that he was not buying paintings that he just liked but that he was attempting to form a collection of fine paintings that would prove to be excellent source material for the young artist. To illustrate the point, a student in painting at the University of Georgia recently spent three hours with the Holbrook Collection after a classroom discussion of Peter Hurd. He wanted to investigate the approach of Hurd and how he used the tempera technique. Fortunately the Holbrook Collection is not only
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of the obvious cultural and instructional value of having the Holbrook Collection available for the use of the entire community and State.

Few communities such as Athens have a collection of good original paintings. However, we are faced with the problem of making adequate use of the collection. It is housed in racks in one small storage room.

Neither children nor adults in large groups can see it. Unlike larger cities where the problem of transporting groups of children becomes difficult, Athens is a comparatively small city, a fact which makes it possible for school groups to assemble with ease in the centrally located University campus. Our most pressing need is for a gallery large enough to show the Holbrook Collection, thus making possible a program in art education for the children of the public schools and for the community at large. The primary objective, however, is to provide a gallery where the art student will feel intimately associated with the work displayed—where the feeling of apathetic awe which exists in many museums will be dissipated. Modern flexible galleries that will function as a fluid background for the installations are needed to feature a program such as we have in mind as a distinct service to the University and to the schools of the community.
WAA Form 48,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION
BID FORM AND ACCEPTANCE
RELATING TO PROPERTY ADVERTISED BY
Sales Announcement No. WAX-5025

TO:
WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION
P. O. Box 316, Wall Street Station
New York, N. Y.
Attn: Associate Regional Director

In accordance with the offering as numbered above, and subject to all of the terms and conditions stated herein, the undersigned offers to purchase the items or lots listed below, at the price written opposite each.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

This form must be filled out in ink, indelible pencil, or by typewriter, and be properly signed by bidder.

This bid form must be submitted in duplicate in a sealed envelope. The sale number shown in the title box and the date of the bid opening must be shown on the face of the envelope.

See "Notice" as to payment and shipping instructions on reverse hereof.

**WRITE IN BELOW THE ITEMS ON WHICH YOU WISH TO BID AND THE AMOUNT OF YOUR BID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSERT LOT NO.</th>
<th>UNIT NO., ETC., AS APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT OF SALE</th>
<th>AMOUNT BID</th>
<th>AMOUNT PEU</th>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT BID</th>
<th>REMARKS (FOR WAA USE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If space above is insufficient for entering all items desired, list additional items on a plain sheet of paper, sign and attach here.

☐ Bid Deposit in the Amount of ______ and in the Form of ______ Payable to the Treasurer of the United States Is Enclosed.

☐ Bid Deposit Is Not Enclosed Inasmuch As Credit Has Been Established at (Indicate WAA Regional Office).

☐ I am a Veteran of World War II.

Special Conditions of Sale:

This bid subject to all terms and conditions stated in Sales Announcement No. WAX-5025, of which this bid form is a part. The catalog by reference is made a part of this contract.

Bidders are required to state on this form who in New York City will take delivery; all sales will be made on an "as is, where is", basis, except that War Assets Administration will deliver paintings, wrapped only in corrugated paper and tied with cardboard, to delivery point at point of display.

A 3-day limit will be given to successful bidders for removal of paintings. All bidders from distant points are therefore urged to select a New York agent and disclose his name, address and telephone number on the bid form for immediate notification after an award is made.

**SHIP TO:** (Insert specific shipping instructions)

**VIA:**

**BIDDER'S NAME AND ADDRESS**

**BIDDER'S SIGNATURE**

**TITLE**

**DATE**

**ACCEPTANCE BY WAA IS TO BE INDICATED ON THE REVERSE HEREOF**
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WAA STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SALE

SEAL, BID TERMS

SPECIAL NOTICE TO BE ENCLOSED ON ENVELOPE. Unless otherwise directed in the solicitation, bids shall be submitted in duplicate. Each bid shall be enclosed in a sealed envelope, properly marked in the lower left-hand corner of the envelope as indicated on the invitation.

FORM OF SUBMISSION. All designations and prices should be fully and clearly set forth. Each bid must give the full business address of the bidder and be signed by him with his name and complete signature. Bids by partnerships must furnish the full names of all partners and must be signed with the partnership name and by one of the members of the partnership or by an authorized representative, followed by the official designation of the person signing. In the case of the person signing being typed, printed, or otherwise reproduced adjacent to signature.

WITHDRAWAL OF BIDS. Bids may be withdrawn or modified by written or telegraphic notice received from bidders prior to the date fixed for opening of the bids. Once the bid has been accepted, no bid may be withdrawn for a period of 15 days.

INSPECTION. Prospective purchasers are urged to inspect property and arrangements for inspection may be made through the nearest Office of War Assets Administration.

BIDS OF ALL OR PART. Where bids are not qualified by specific limitations, the Government reserves the right of awarding any or all of the items included in the bids.

DESIGNATIONS. The Government reserves the right to reject any and all bids, or to accept any or all bids, or to divide any contract among two or more bidders.

REJECTION OF BIDS. The Government reserves the right to reject any and all bids, or to accept any or all bids, or to divide any contract among two or more bidders, regardless of whether the same constitute the highest and best bid as the competitive bid as bid or any time prior to the giving of a formal notice of award.

CONDITIONS OF SALE:

The Standard Terms and Conditions of Sale and any Special Conditions contained in this solicitation shall form a part of the contract of sale and shall be binding on the parties with respect to the sale of surplus property.

REJECTION OF BIDS. Upon notification of rejection of any bid, the bidder may appeal to the appropriate Government agency for a determination of the propriety of the rejection and may require that the bid be considered further.

Acceptance by WAA

AUTHORIZED OFFICER'S SIGNATURE:

ITEM OF LOT OR BID ACCEPTED

TOTAL AMOUNT OF CONTRACT

DATE

NOTICE—Full payment (and shipping instructions, if not specified herein) must be submitted within 15 days of the date of acceptance of this bid by WAA. See Standard Terms and Conditions of Sale.
INSTRUCTIONS

This certification is required of each veteran when exercising his veteran's priority in purchasing non-essential personal property for business use. The veteran shall complete this form, hereinafter referred to, and submit it to the War Assets Administration office together with his purchase order.

Questions to which specific answers are required shall be answered by entering "Yes" or "No" whichever is applicable. In addition to the business data in question 2, either (a) or (b) must be answered. Answer only one part of questions 3 and 4.

Failure to execute and sign the form properly or failure to answer specific questions shall be sufficient cause to prevent the veteran from purchasing surplus property.

In connection with my desire to purchase surplus property to be used in my business, I certify that:

1. I served in the active military or naval service of the United States during World War II, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and was discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions. YES NO

2. My business is (Describe fully such as: Retail Hardware, Wholesale Grocer, etc.)
   known as located at
   (a) I own more than 50% of the proprietary interest of the enterprise described above. YES NO
   (b) I, together with other eligible veterans, own more than 50% of the proprietary interest of the enterprise described above. YES NO

3. (a) The property requested in the accompanying order is to be used in the enterprise described above and is not for resale.
     (b) The property requested in the accompanying order is initial stock necessary to establish or maintain the enterprise described above to be resold in the normal course of business.
     (c) The property requested in the accompanying order consists of tools or equipment required to be owned by me as a condition of my employment.

4. (a) The money to be used in making this purchase is mine. YES NO
     (b) I have obtained or will obtain it from (Name)
     (Address) (Business)

5. I have not heretofore been refused the right to purchase surplus property by War Assets Administration at any time.

6. I am not purchasing the property requested in the accompanying order for the use or benefit of any undisclosed partner or principal, nor acting as agent or broker for any such person or persons.

7. All of the statements contained herein have been read by me or to me, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I understand that false statements may subject me to THE CRIMINAL PENALTIES OF SECTION 35-A OF THE U.S. CRIMINAL CODE.

(Veteran's Signature) (Military Service Serial Number) (Date)

(Address) (City) (State)

I have witnessed the signature of the veteran whose name and address appear above.

Witness: (Name) (Address) (City) (State)
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LIST OF NEW YORK ART GALLERIES FROM WHICH THE PAINTINGS FOR
AMERICAN ART WERE PURCHASED

A.C.A. Galleries
Work Song by Robert Gwathmey
Abstraction by Irene Rice Pereira
The Newspaper by Gregorio Prestopino
Trolley Car by Gregorio Prestopino
Fascist Leader by Philip Evergood
End of the Conference by Anton Regregier
Girl with Cock by Philip Evergood
Dirt Farmers by Robert Gwathmey

Associated American Artists
Home by William Gropper
They Fought to the Last Man by William Gropper
Floral by Frank Kleinholtz

Babcock Galleries
Fishermen on Wharf by Sol Wilson

Bertha Schaefer Gallery
Strangled Tree by Ben-Zion
End of Don Quixote by Ben-Zion
Perpetual Destruction by Ben-Zion

C. W. Kraushaar Art Galleries
Gallery K by Louis Bouché
Maspeth, Queens by Louis Bouché

D. G. Kelekian, Inc.
Basket of Fish by Milton Avery
Wild Sea Rose by Marsden Hartley
Roses by Marsden Hartley

Downtown Gallery
Still Life with Flowers by Stuart Davis
Deserted Brickyard by Yasuo Kuniyoshi
News from Home by Paul Burlin
Plane Production by Charles Sheeler
Circus Girl Resting by Yasuo Kuniyoshi
Her Lover’s Return, Raymond Breinin
Around the Lighthouse by Karl Zerbe
Cos Cob by Georgia O’Keeffe
Small Hill near Alcade by Georgia O’Keeffe
Boneyard by Charles Sheeler
Seascape by John Marin
Another Arrangement by Arthur Dove
Tree and El by Stuart Davis
Shipbuilding Composition by George L. K. Morris
Sea and Boat #1 by John Marin
Two Owls by Karl Zerbe
Gray Greens by Arthur Dove
Wing Fabrication by Ralston Crawford
Hunger by Ben Shahn
New England Church by George L. K. Morris
White Horse by Jack Levine
Subway Exit by O. Louis Guglielmi
Still Life by Julian Levi
Clown and Ass by Karl Zerbe
Tenements by O. Louis Guglielmi
Wasteland Images, Martha’s Vineyard by Julian Levi
Renascence by Ben Shahn

Ferargil, Inc.
Rock Crabs by George Constant

Kleeman Gallery
Balcony by Werner Drewes
Under Stiff Rearguard Action by Julio de Diego
Gaiety in times of Distress by Werner Drewes
The Medusa by Charles Howard
And a dark thought came to visit my peaceful backyard by Werner Drewes

Kootz Gallery
Still Life in Red, Yellow, Green by Byron Browne
The Couple by Adolph Gottlieb
Five in the Afternoon by Romare Bearden
Flower Head by William Baziotes

Midtown Galleries
Portrait of Shanah by Philip Guston

Mortimer Levitt Gallery
Owl on Rock by Everett Spruce
Turkey by Everett Spruce
Canyon at Night by Everett Spruce
The Clown by Cam Booth

Nierendorf Gallery
Nocturnal Family by Julio de Diego
Paul Rosenberg and Co.
Whale’s Jaw, Dogtown, Cape Ann by Marsden Hartley
Discussion by Max Weber
Fruit and Wine by Max Weber
Two Vases of Flowers by Max Weber
Yellow Table by Abraham Rattner

Perls Galleries
Mother and Child by Nahum Tschacbasov
Fishes by Nahum Tschacbasov
Choir Boys by Nahum Tschacbasov

Rehn Gallery
Lifeguard by Reginald Marsh
Afternoon by Morris Kantor
Woman’s Head by Franklin C. Watkins

William Macbeth, Inc.
The Ravine by Joseph de Martini
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