THE SEARCH FOR AUTONOMY: REBELLION IN AMERICAN ART 1877-1913

By

JAMES HOWARD HARBISON

Bachelor of Arts

Trinity University

San Antonio, Texas

1987

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
May, 1993

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE SEARCH FOR AUTONOMY: REBELLION IN AMERICAN ART 1877-1913

Thesis Approved:

W Roger Bilss
Thesis Advisor

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Roger Biles for his encouragement and insightful comments throughout the writing of this thesis. Many thanks also go to Dr. Elizabeth Williams for the confidence she bestowed, and Dr. Ronald A. Petrin for first suggesting the topic to me. From Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, I wish to thank Dr. Char Miller who read through the early drafts and not only provided free lunches, but many critical suggestions. I am especially indebted to Dr. Richard C. Rohrs who provided me with a much-needed education in historical writing and took the time to review each chapter.

For financial assistance during my master's program, I wish to thank the Walter Letham Foundation, the Oklahoma State University graduate college, and the Oklahoma State University department of history.

David Scott provided an organized surrounding with a friendly computer throughout this project, and together with Julie Willcut patiently encouraged me to the end. Also, I appreciate the time and attention given this project by Charles Dupree, Julia Summers, and Christine Jelson.

Undoubtedly, I owe a tremendous debt to my father who supported and inspired me with his love, integrity, and compassion. Thanks also to Lisa for giving me perspective, and A. Baker Duncan for encouraging me to pursue my studies in history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"There has always been the new movement and there always will be the new movement," wrote Robert Henri about American art; "it is strange that a thing which comes as regularly as clockwork should always be a surprise." The period from 1877 to 1913 witnessed the development of artistic autonomy in the United States. The pressures of industrialization combined with the aesthetic assumptions of nineteenth-century institutions to produce a host of rebellious societies. Dissatisfied with existing artistic standards and seeking more creative autonomy, these groups experimented with new European art forms and exhibited without the sanction of older authorities. By asserting their individuality, the insurgents had completely disassembled previous assumptions about art by 1913 and introduced a novel aesthetic program called modernism.[1]

In the eighteenth century, American art established a tradition of static qualities based on European movements. Native artists looked abroad for examples of artistic excellence, most of which displayed neo-classical characteristics. Neo-classicism emphasized drawing skill

and anatomical precision, and usually depicted Greek or Roman themes. The style developed as a reaction against the decorative ornamentation of Rococo designs that gained popularity during the reign of Louis XV in France. Artists dedicated to its tenets often used copies of classical sculpture and reproductions of Renaissance or Antique art. The national art schools that formed in the early 1800s usually possessed a great number of these materials, because they accepted the neo-classical style as part of their curriculum.[2]

For most of the nineteenth century, native art maintained its interest in neo-classicism. American artists commonly studied in Europe and most likely absorbed the academic practices of the movement. A new artistic trait evolved, based on the observation of American life and scenery.

Genre painting quickly rose to become the favored type of American art. These were paintings that illustrated the leisurely or pleasant facets of everyday life, such as a master brushing his horse or a matronly figure quietly weaving cloth. The neo-classical tendency continued to dominate in all but theme. The muted colors, technical skill, and careful details gave this art a Jacksonian foundation, for it was easily recognizable. The river, boatmen, local merchants, and rising politicians of Mark Twain's work formed a close parallel to many genre

paintings. Although the subjects of these paintings extended beyond Western motifs, they consistently portrayed an idealized and often comical view of small-town life.[3]

The same was true for landscape painting, which enjoyed tremendous success throughout the period. Again, the principles of neo-classicism were visible, but the softer light and dramatic presentation suggested a more romantic perspective. Landscapes were often the product of an artist's journey west, where large tracts of undeveloped land testified to the dynamic nature of the young country. Like genre painting, landscapes were essentially an optimistic art form, and they rarely portrayed any oppressive or sinister elements.[4]

The rise of national art institutions in the early 1800s further consolidated an artistic code for native painters. These schools or academies copied the European tradition of aesthetic education by adopting a curriculum that stressed technical skill and examples of the past. Here, students could obtain the same training as their predecessors; academies typically rejected any attempts at stylistic experimentation. These schools lacked an abundance of stable patrons, until after the Civil War when the emergence of industrialism created unprecedented fortunes for some.

The oldest and most enduring such institution in the United States was the National Academy of Design.

Established in 1824, the National Academy of Design remained the authority of acceptable artistic precepts until the 1913 Armory Show. Supported by influential patrons, artists, and critics, the organization dictated aesthetic standards derived from the Renaissance or European tradition. These included a realistic representation of reality, a well-organized sense of composition, a somber color scheme, and the belief that art should illustrate God's majesty. The last quality generally meant a romantic portrayal of either God's creatures, especially neo-classical female nudes, or God's creation, as seen in the numerous idyllic landscapes of the nineteenth century. The Academy propagated its ideology through juries and prizes and by refusing to endorse any artistic experimentation that deviated from these tenets.

As a result of strict academic rules, several discontented cliques, referred to as "independents," formed in opposition. Rebellion in American art had never before existed because, until after the 1860s, no single organization had exercised such extensive aesthetic regulation as did the National Academy. By the 1870s, some artists began voicing their desire for a more innovative and self-expressive art. Thus began the succession of independent groups that included the Society of American Artists in 1877, "the Ten" in 1897, "the Eight" in 1908, and the Association of American Painters and Sculptors

(AAPS) in 1911. Each society struggled to assert its autonomy over a formidable tradition, but only the AAPS succeeded in establishing an aesthetic program to unseat the older code.[5]

The pressures of the "Machine Age" prompted artists to seek new forms of self-expression. As American culture became more homogenous because of its factory systems and standardization of production techniques, native artists increasingly sought an interior world. The threats that industrialization imposed on the artistic consciousness created the humanistic art of American realists, who painted the dispossessed poor and immigrant families. The fortunes industrialization supplied for some also bolstered the National Academy's position by providing a lengthy roster of benefactors. Finally, the estrangement many artists experienced regarding older aesthetic ideas led them to devise a new artistic language that would thoroughly reflect the contemporary urban environment.

The Armory Show's significance for American art included the defense of individual artistic expression and the promotion of native avant-garde groups, the establishment of national museums and collections devoted to modernism, and the destruction of national authorities powerful enough to dictate an exclusive set of aesthetic ideas. The exhibition's agenda created the foundation for

nearly all twentieth-century American art. Future artists fostered modernism until it became the acceptable code.

Other studies of the Armory Show, most notably Milton W. Brown's The Story of the Armory Show, do not attempt to define modernism as the artists themselves perceived it. This is essential to an understanding of what participating artists hoped to achieve by organizing the exhibition, as well as the importance of modernism as a cultural force. The following discussion reviews such material using Gabriele Buffet's illuminating essay published in a 1913 edition of Camera Work.

Nor do prior accounts sufficiently illustrate the spiritual dimensions of modern art. Although Martin Green's New York 1913: The Armory Show and the Paterson Strike Pageant refers to the need for maturing generations to reinvent the project of spirituality for themselves, an idea drawn from a Susan Sontag essay, he does not explore the changing role of spirituality from the early independent associations to the Armory Show. Unlike the current study, Green's emphasis rests largely on the events of 1913. Barbara Novak's American Painting of the Nineteenth Century is an exceptional explanation of that period's art and the spiritual implications of landscape painting, but it fails to relate the evolution of insurgent groups as an advancement toward modernism and the Armory Show. The following discussion, then, is unique in

offering a novel perspective regarding the spirituality of modernism and the artist's definition of that movement, and in fully illustrating the succession of insurgent organizations prior to the formation of the Armory Show's organizers.

CHAPTER I ENDNOTES

1. Robert Henri, The Art Spirit (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1923), 156.

2. Edward Lucie-Smith, Dictionary of Art Terms (New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1984), 128, 162.

3. Julius David Prown, American Painting From Its Beginnings to the Armory Show (New York: Rizzoli Press, 1980), 75.

4. Ibid, 82; and Barbara Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century: Realism, Idealism, and the American Experience (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969), 62.

5. Bernard S. Myers, Modern Art in the Making (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), viii.

CHAPTER II

YEARS OF TRANSITION: CHANGES IN THE AMERICAN ART SCENE 1870-1900

"We seem to be artistically in a somewhat chaotic state," observed a 1895 New York Times editorial.[1] True, the late nineteenth century witnessed an abundant display of turmoil and diversity in American art, primarily because artists had never before assumed that a national style existed. The complex pressures that the "Machine Age" applied also prompted artists to seek new ways to depict the world.[2] Since 1824 national art institutions had existed, but seldom did they achieve notoriety. After a century of painting that displayed the random impulses of various artistic temperaments, a new epoch of material expansion following the Civil War elevated the organizations. For the first time, an aesthetic doctrine dominated American painters. But as the power of these organizations grew, so did the numbers of artists who opposed academic conservatism.[3] The period from 1870 to 1900 epitomized the changing nature of American art and presented the dynamic arguments between traditionalist and modernist, conformity and individualism, and piety and

secularism that characterized the industrializing United States.

By the 1870s, American art demonstrated certain stable characteristics, not the least of which was subject matter. From the beginning, artists in the United States worked with three dominant themes in creating art: portraiture, historical drama, and landscape painting. Artists chose these subjects not only because their audience was familiar with typical European examples, but also because they were the most sympathetic subjects with which to convey American values.[4] Portraitists like Gilbert Stuart and Thomas Sully developed a heritage of immortalizing the national figures and privileged patrons who posed for them, historical accounts of the expanding country impressed viewers as displays of patriotism and reverence for the past, and the sustained popularity of landscapes indicated the nation's fascination with its immense wilderness and the opportunity it implied for men and women to prosper. There was no greater consideration for artists than subject matter. "Let it be remembered," sounded one critic's editorial, "that the subject of the picture, the material object or objects from which it is constructed, are the essential parts of it."[5]

Similarly, artists adhered to a strict style in depicting these subjects. By 1870, national art institutions dictated painting techniques and artists

accepted a singular, collective model for their work. Most simply, this "American style" involved an articulate imitation of reality tempered with various amounts of romanticism, usually executed in somber hues, and meant to reflect the subject as an expression of the average experience.[6] As an aesthetic, realism merged predictable artistic design with a democratic ideal; it was easily recognizable and did not betray the common standards of the layman's eye. The "American style" thus meant a generalized expression of the everyday. "For us," remarked one aging art critic, "the business of the painter was to convey with a certain grimness the look of things."[7] Painters sought an actual mimicry of the visual world that made even limited stylistic experimentation and innovation intimidating.

The only exception to this stylistic code was a small group of nineteenth-century artists called the Luminists. At mid-century, these men began promoting the effects of sunlight in their canvasses, clearly anticipating the Impressionists of thirty years later. In their large landscapes, light punctuated reality by illuminating the entire work from corner to corner; gone were the dark shadows and backgrounds that previously concealed much of a painting's surface from its viewers.[8] Using sunlight as a provocative presence, the Luminists Thomas Cole, John Kensett, Frederick Church, and Fitz Hugh Lane produced

landscapes characterized by a hyper realism that hinted at an unknown reality. Ralph Waldo Emerson remarked that they painted nature "with a supernatural eye."[9] It was precisely this exploration into the realm of the "other" that linked their paintings to the idealized depictions of past landscapes and also suggested a new role for artists. They began to define reality by an individual rather than collective consciousness--a position that distinguished the Impressionists as part of the modern movement.[10] Hence, the Luminists provided a transition between the purely academic techniques and the modernist theories that followed.[11]

Subject matter and style were the chief values that governed the stable code of American art by 1880, but certain assumptions regarding beauty, instruction, and religious piety accompanied them. "The function of art . . . [is] the creation of beauty," as one critic noted in his memoirs and "beauty" in the nineteenth century consisted of recreating the substance of reality.[12] For instance, one critic wrote disparagingly of a painting by noticing that "the lips . . . are too cherry-red," and that the "excessive redness of some of the flesh shadows" weakened its effect.[13] This is criticism that measured painterly skill by its approximation to actual lips and living hands. The instructive qualities of a painting were also fundamental to its success. "It was Victoria's age,

the great age of Duty. Art had its Duty: to entertain us in lighter moments, and in more solemn ones to instruct us by antiseptic precept," as one art historian wrote. "It was never to challenge, never to question why," and indeed nineteenth-century artists executed portraits and historical accounts as narratives of the past.[14] That art also could be a spiritual experience was evident to a writer in North American Review in 1855 who noted that "the highest art, therefore, is that which expresses . . . reverence and awe, the aspiration and love of religious enthusiasm."[15]

If art was to be an instructive, beautiful, and even spiritual project, absent of all individual interpretation outside of its prescribed traditions, it was never better represented than in the landscape paintings of the day. Landscapes were conducive to panoramic scenes of beauty that reflected both the majesty of God and the "sublimity of wild nature."[16] The emphasis on the moral value of contemplating landscape paintings was evident to many painters and their critics. Artist Thomas Cole believed that "religious fellowship with nature ever fills the bosom with incommunicable happiness."[17] Artist James Jackson Jarves characterized an awareness of landscape as "God's sensuous image of revelation."[18]

Yet, moral uplift was not the only consequence of examining nature or its oil-on-canvas representation. When

confronted with vast areas of undeveloped real estate, more enterprising Americans foresaw economic opportunity and national expansion. Unlike historical paintings that tended to rely on a viewer's background in classical literature or history, landscapes demanded no prior education or instruction; here was a democratic art that "required only the natural experience that was every man's rightful heritage."[19] Landscape painting was virtuous in every aspect its public demanded and proved highly successful until the century's end when non-representational modernism replaced its idyllic and sentimental compositions.

In no institution did the virtues of art find a more successful champion than in the National Academy of Painting, later renamed the National Academy of Design. Founded in 1824, the Academy was the type of organization many thought necessary to cultivate art appreciation in the United States.[20] At its address on Twenty-third street in New York City, renowned painters and sculptors instructed their students in the American style and its traditional values. The Academy also retained a European influence that emphasized classical studies, life drawing from nude models, and portraiture--all of which derived from the Renaissance tradition then prevalent in Europe and regularly imported by Americans who studied there.[21] Summarized, the Academy's aesthetic creed was "a belief in

composition . . . the primacy of drawing over color, and the models of the past."[22] At a time when few art galleries existed, the organization served as an important link between artists and patrons and brought national attention to younger, unknown artists.

The academic trend was toward aesthetic conservatism, however, and the institution generally neglected or ignored artists who exhibited innovative works. The Academy's members drew their subjects from the life of the middle and upper classes. The new movements that began emerging in the 1880s and 1890s threatened to offend its various patrons and weaken reputable positions; hence, the Academy did not foster experimentation but rather set standards for a national art that simply extended and formalized the existing precepts.[23]

After the Civil War, when the post-war economic boom created a stable roster of benefactors, the Academy became a powerful national institution that exercised greater control over artists than had any prior American organization. It propagated its aesthetic values in art through membership committees, juries, and official endorsement of American artists. Members enjoyed the privilege of placing the initials N. A., for National Academy, beside their names to indicate that they were certified practitioners of its ideology. While membership brought patronage and prestige, and opened markets for

artists, exclusion barred artists from the bigger exhibitions and prosperous galleries.[24] Through its careful administration, the Academy became the chief authority for American artists and their audience.

The dominance of the National Academy went unchallenged until 1877. In that year, an ambitious group of young artists returned from their studies abroad to form the Society of American Artists.[25] Having "passed through the rigorous discipline of the Paris ateliers," these men were familiar with the rebellious movements abroad and returned with a natural disregard for the older notions.[26] A new ruling "assuring every academician 'seven feet on the line' " (that is, seven running feet of wall space) discouraged the students who hoped the Academy would be less attentive to more customary art in favor of newer movements from Munich and Paris.[27] Having confronted the Academy's uncooperative president, the Society formed in opposition.

As they lacked an exhibition space of their own, the Society held its first shows in concert with the National Academy in the Twenty-third Street building. Both institutions displayed a considerable number of works, but it was the Society that attracted the most attention. "[The exhibition's] . . . most striking aspect," wrote a critic in The Nation, "is the bold front assumed by art-students working in Europe, who sign nearly all the best

pieces."[28] So significantly did the Academy's offerings pale beside the bold works of the Society that critics declared "the consequent collapse of what we used complacently to call the American school," which now assumed a "wall-flower place," its chief characteristic being an "absence of quality."[29] No longer could the Academy hold an exclusive claim on American aesthetics; the Society of American Artists had successfully challenged traditional dogmas and introduced a new decorum and authority.

The National Academy seemed ill-equipped to contend with the alterations in American society imposed by industrialization. The "prosaic portraits and stenciled landscapes" it endorsed recalled a simpler, sentimentalized American life that stressed a Jeffersonian heritage of agrarian labor, independent fishermen, or small merchants.[30] Frequently, however, their "poetry. . . of regret" alienated aspiring artists whose cosmopolitanism and curiosity with an increasingly complex world compelled them toward new modes of expression and interpretation.[31]

Perhaps the Academy's loyal patrons also contributed to its conservative tastes. Wealthy benefactors continually supplied the Academy with generous economic support like the $15,000 gift Julius Hallgarten provided in 1885.[32] Any newer tendencies in art the Academy embraced necessarily threatened a patron's holdings and, hence, an

artist's potential market. In dismissing the surfacing movements, the Academy maintained a certain respectability among its clientele by retaining its confirmed traditions; it did not risk embarrassment or ridicule by endorsing innovation that might soon be forgotten.[33] Both patrons and academic artists preferred a stale but stable heritage to the possibility of economic ruin.

From its beginning, the Society prospered. Esteemed painters like John La Farge and George Innes sympathized with the insurgents and gave the association a heightened reputation for skillful quality and serious achievement.[34] By incorporating contemporary European styles, these men produced experimental works that challenged the complacency of the academicians. After their first show in 1877, the New York Times reported that "the more one studies the pictures of the present exhibition, the more one is convinced of fresh life in the art world."[35]

What the Society promoted was, in short, a broad Impressionism. It emphasized individual vision, a love of the everyday, realism modified by modernism, and a weakened sense of piety.[36] For the first time, artists moved their studios into the natural sunlight of the countryside and attempted to render an instantaneous "impression" of their surroundings. They exerted their particular conception over concerns for form or detailed precision; they employed a quick, hurried method of execution instead of the

laborious pace set by the Academy; and they registered the effects of sunlight on their subjects instead of the Luministic tendency to record sunlight as an omnipotent presence in the work. Hilaire-Germain-Edgar Degas expressed his desire to " 'surprise a living moment,' " and it was "this immediate visual experience" that characterized the new movement.[37]

One of the elementary innovations of Impressionism was its use of color. The industrial revolution witnessed new technology in paint manufacturing that these artists quickly transformed into a bright palette to contradict the somber hues of the Academy. "Purple and blue now predominated over the traditional 'brown sauce' " and black disappeared from the Impressionists's paintings as did the lacquer commonly poured over a finished canvas.[38] They utilized color as they saw it reflected in nature, and this often meant an unconventional, if not shocking, juxtaposition of subject and tone. Speaking of Impressionism with the hindsight of several years, one witness reminisced, "the purple cow eating blue grass against a green sky was not wholly a myth."[39] One viewer reported his disgust at an 1886 exhibition in New York: "Some of the colors here do not cry, they yelp . . . as if but one idea had possessed the men who gave them being, and that was, to call attention to themselves at any cost."[40]

Color became an interpretive element instead of a prescribed axiom.

Impressionism gave the landscapist a forum in which to merge the two opposing viewpoints of his time--the artist could be "both modern in technique and traditional in subject matter."[41] This appealed to many artists who indicated their desire for personal expression amid a rush of technological change. They sought "complexity and mystery to complement the increasing complexity in the observable world."[42] Yet its traditional components kept Impressionism clearly within an accepted artistic heritage; in fact, it continued the tradition of democratic ideals begun by academic landscapists by creating an art that was "realistic enough for most people to understand."[43]

One of the primary characteristics of modernism was the assertion of an individual interpretation over the visual world. Impressionists blurred the "forms of literal reality" to avoid details and thus implied their subject more than defined them.[44] Note the contrast in emphasis between one teacher at the Academy and a modernist tutor of American painters: " 'Paint what you see and look with your own eyes,' " said portraitist Gilbert Stuart less than a century before Mallarme instructed, " 'Paint, not the thing, but the effect that it produces.' "[45] The difference is a description of the extreme disparity that separated academicians and modernists. Instead of

recreating the empirical world, modernists distilled its content to an emotional essence.

Still, critics were not overwhelmingly convinced of Impressionism's various merits. Many critics maintained that painting was "not free to neglect the most palpable feature of the object imitated or to substitute a fanciful congeries of detail . . . drawn from some purely a priori and extraneous principle," but that it should resemble the careful depictions popularized by the Academy.[46] The new art did not follow the "self-evident limitation and guiding law of resemblance," but created its own reality from the artist's vision.[47]

The most damaging of all criticism attacked Impressionism's destruction of God's nature. The colors of these artists, as well as their blurred lines and shadowy features, seemed garish and desecrating to American critics who considered form, definition, and academic realism divine attributes not suited to modernist meddling. Likewise, sunlight, the predominant tool of Impressionism, "could hardly be broken down into the light rays of the spectrum" without offending its Creator.[48] The unnaturalness of pink shades in the grass or rocks that mirrored the purple tones of the sky distanced Impressionism from previous assumptions about art. Just as the nation became more secular due to the materialism that industrialism encouraged, so too did American art break

free from previous pietistic impulses. Impressionism greatly reduced the expectation that artists be divine instruments who portrayed God's majesty within a small framework or that contemplation of their paintings approximated a religious experience.

By the late 1800s, the Society of American Artists was so staid that it ceased to represent a distinct separation from the National Academy. The Society demonstrated its growing conservatism in its selection of artists, acceptance of artworks, and disregard for any experimentation that extended beyond Impressionism--themes that echoed the National Academy's concern for classicism and rigorous academic training. It was not surprising, then, when the two bodies merged in 1906, and other groups began to revolt.[49]

A group of men, all members of the Society, formed the Ten on December 17, 1897, to oppose the Society's methods of exhibition. Led by William M. Chase, the Ten believed the "great disparity in quality, the vast number of works, and the tremendous variety of styles" hindered the progress of American art by allowing lesser artists equal exposure in the annual shows.[50] Although the original intentions of the Society shared these concerns, its popularity and increased membership slowly eroded the principles of its founders. By the century's end, the Society was itself assuring every participant "seven feet on the line."[51] The

Ten signaled yet another dissatisfied contingent in the ongoing evolution of American art.

But the Ten formed no new movement for artists to champion. Their primary concern was with the process and administration of exhibitions, and they organized small shows of their own as an alternative to the eclectic ones of the Society. Their first show was at the Durand-Ruel gallery in New York on March 31, 1898. The artists divided the gallery into ten sections and each member hung two to eight pictures of his choice. No constrictive juries presided, no hanging committees decided the merit of each artist, and no prizes tempted the artists into competition. The Ten simply wanted to show their art in a favorable environment.[52]

Despite their limited agenda, the Ten made a valuable contribution to American art. They epitomized the artistic rebellion that occurred with increasing frequency during the late nineteenth century and indicated the growing tendency to disregard academic precepts. This phenomenon only gained momentum. By the time the Armory Show appeared in 1913, the Academy, as an institution and an ideal, had lost the strength of ninety years of authority.[53] The Ten represented the artists's defense of their individuality.

Critics of the Ten and their sympathetic followers voiced their disapproval and regret for the late nineteenth-century art scene. Many conservative critics

lamented even the limited modernism of the Impressionists, because it endangered "the artist's hard-won social respectability."[54] Speaking of the "chaotic state" of American art, one critic noted, the "old no longer suffices, nor does the new fully satisfy us." But most of the criticism assailed the apparent loss of traditional methods: "To the past belongs the well turned phrases, the courtly elegance of the leisurely letter-writer." One observer noted, "Our old gods are broken."[55]

Yet some critics correctly assumed that the new movement of Impressionism heralded by both the Society and the Ten was an artistic response to industrialization. "In this day," reported Century Magazine in 1895, "when even steam is growing old-fashioned, and electricity is taking its place, it is not surprising that much of the work of our younger artists should resemble the telegram."[56] The artists's hurried studies mirrored the quickened nature of an industrialized society.

The dynamics of the Machine Age echoed the "new patterns, new mechanisms, new arrangements and applications of old patterns" of the painters; as the observable world changed, so too did the artist's record of that world. The individuality they expressed was a revolt against industrialization's homogenization of American society. The intellectual implications of their independent visions of reality indicated both a rejection of the factory

system's conformity and the assertion of the humanism that characterized the emerging Progressive movement.[57]

The results of these years of artistic change and dissention shaped the nature of American art for the twentieth century. Modernism, as first introduced by the Impressionists, became the aesthetic project for a whole generation of artists and their critics, but it failed to find wide-spread acceptance until the Armory Show of 1913. The revolt that various groups undertook throughout the 1880s and 1890s continually established new factions like the Eight, the Ten of 1911, precisionists, symbolists, and other independents. If some patrons understood Impressionism as a radical system that alienated its viewers with bizarre color schemes and imperfect depictions of details, the next two decades further separated artist and audience as modernism evolved into abstraction and non-representation. The late 1800s projected a broadened temperament for American art, even if few recognized the alterations as a progression toward the "artist's right to be completely of his own time."[58]

CHAPTER II ENDNOTES

1. New York Times, 14 January 1895.

2. Milton W. Brown, The Story of the Armory Show (New York: H. Wolff Publishers, 1963), 157.

3. Bernard S. Myers, Modern Art in the Making (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), viii.

4. Lewis Mumford, The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America 1865-1895 (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1931),

5. "Common Sense in Art," The Crayon 1 (7 February 1855): 81.

6. H. Wayne Morgan, New Muses: Art in American Culture 1865-1920 (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 38. Although Morgan presents a discussion of Impressionism and a brief description of the National Academy of Design, he does not sufficiently explore the theme of art as a spiritual project. The varying amounts of individualism that painting exhibited were expanded during this era as modern art seized upon industrialization's complexities to offer a new direction of depicting the world. Barabara Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century: Realism, Idealism, and the American Experience (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969) offers the best survey of that century's art despite her relunctance to designate the evolution as an advance toward modernism.

7. Frank Jewett Mather, Jr. Estimates in Art (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930), 319-320.

8. Eliot Clark, History of the National Academy of Design: 1825-1953 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), 132. See also William H. Gerdts, American Impressionism (New York: Artabras Publishers, 1984), 12-13.

9. Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century, 97.

10. Neil Harris, The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years 1790-1860, 2d ed (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 118.

11. Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century, 97.

12. Royal Cortissoz, American Artists (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), 3.

13. "Fifty-Eighth Annual Enhibition of the National Academy of Design," Nation 36 (19 April 1883): 349. The critic derides the painting Taming a Bird--Portraits of Justine and Bayard Cutting by Anna Lea Merritt, for its "prettiness," a term many associated with inefficient ability.

14. Rudi Blesh, Modern Art USA: Men, Rebellion, and Conquest 1900-1956 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 12.

15. Review of Scenery and Philosophy in Europe: Being Fragments from the Portfolio of Horace Binney Wallace, in North American Review 81 (July 1855): 257.

16. Howard Mumford Jones, O Strange New World: American Culture: The Formative Years (New York: The Viking Press, 1964), 361.

17. Ibid.

18. Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century, 62.

19. Ibid.

20. Morgan, New Muses, 7.

21. Clark, History of the National Academy, 13.

22. Martin Green, New York 1913: The Armory Show and the Paterson Strike Pageant (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1988), 132.

23. Morgan, New Muses, 6-7. Here, Morgan writes of the tendency toward conservatism that shaped many institutions; the National Academy of Design was not peculiar in its lack of innovation. The lofty goals of academic associations often necessitated narrowing its aesthetic agenda. See 8-9.

24. Milton W. Brown, American Painting from the Armory Show to the Depression (New York: Princeton University Press, 1955), 4.

25. Morgan, New Muses, 8. Walter Pach writes that the Society's aesthetic notions were just as narrowly defined as those of the Academy. See Walter Pach, Queer

Thing, Painting: Forty Years in the World of Art (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1938), 233-234.

26. Clark, History of the National Acdemy, 132. See also Marchal E. Landgren, Years of Art: The Story of the Art Students League of New York (New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1940), 22.

27. Milton W. Brown, American Art to 1900: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1977), 560. Such rulings were common enough, even in smaller associations, but the Academy's huge exhibitions eventually inhibited their artistic ideals. By the 1880s, Morgan suggests that the exhibitions at the National Academy "rapidly became more social than artistic events." In New Muses, 22.

28. "Notes," The Nation 24 (5 April 1877): 207.

29. Ibid.

30. "Notes," The Nation 24 (14 June 1877): 352.

31. Blesh, Modern Art USA, 13.

32. Landgren, Years of Art, 42-44. Landgren also reports that Harper's Magazine donated $5000 as a grant for European study, a phenomenon that became more common and expected by the nineteenth century.

33. Morgan, New Muses, 8.

34. Gerdts, American Impressionism, 172.

35. New York Times, 15 April 1877.

36. Morgan, New Muses, 38. These were also the fundamental components of French Impressionism, but the American adaption introduced some stylistic variations. Hence, the term "broad impressionism" is applied here to separate the American version from the more academic or strict impressionism of Europeans.

37. Clark, History of the National Academy, 130.

38. Ibid, 132.

39. Samuel G. Isham, "French Painting at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century," Scribner's Magazine 38 (September 1905): 384. Although Isham is speaking of French Impressionism, the American type derived and imitated its continental predecessor.

40. New York Times, 10 April 1886.

41. Morgan, New Muses, 181.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid., 113.

44. Ibid., 116.

45. Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century, 235, 255. Mallarme's protege was the painter Vuillard who recorded the quote as, "Peindre, non la chose, mais l'effet qu'elle produit."

46. "Turner's 'Slave Ship,' " Scribner's Monthly 4 (June 1872): 250. Turner was certainly not an Impressionist, but this comment appeared as a compliment to the painter's sense of traditional methods.

47. Ibid.

48. Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century, 91.

49. Pach, Queer Thing, Painting, 233-234.

50. Gerdts, American Impressionism, 172.

51. Brown, American Art to 1900, 560.

52. For a discussion of the formation of the Ten, see Gerdts, American Impressionism, 171-174. See also Ibid., 558-561.

53. Even Clark, in History of the National Academy, admits that members of the Academy felt "estranged from the new aesthetic conception," 170. It was widely believed that the Armory Show signalled the end of the Academy. See Pach, Queer Thing, Painting, 98-104.

54. Morgan, New Muses, 152.

55. New York Times, 14 January 1895.

56. W. Lewis Fraser, "Sergeant Kendall," Century Magazine 50 (July 1895): 478.

57. Oliver M. Saylor, Revolt in the Arts: A Survey of the Creation, Distribution, and Appreciation of Art in America (New York: Brentano's, 1930), 19. See also Morgan, New Muses, 30.

58. Blesh, Modern Art USA, 4.

CHAPTER III

PRELUDE TO THE REVOLUTION: INDEPENDENT GROUPS 1908-1910

The late nineteenth century witnessed the advancement toward artistic individuality in American art. The new aesthetic formula inherent in the color schemes and fragmentary brush strokes of the Impressionists directed native art away from the Academy standards toward independent groups. Although the Society of American Artists and the Ten of 1897 challenged traditional artistic notions, they failed to initiate any substantial changes. Their legacy of an enduring independent movement, however, proved a powerful stimulus for early twentieth-century art rebellions. The years 1908-1910 witnessed the strongest organized revolt in the Academy's history. Composed of a group of eight men, "the Eight," on one front, and by Alfred Steiglitz on the other, the progressive artists undermined the authority of the Academy, orchestrated independent exhibitions, and served as the harbinger of the Armory Show in 1913.

The Eight originated in Philadelphia in the 1890s. Here, William Glackens, John Sloan, Everett Shinn, and

George Luks worked as able artists-reporters for several local newspapers including the Press, the Bulletin, the Public Ledger, and the Record. Because photographers were both few and ill-suited to the frugal printing budgets of most newspapers, illustrators supplied the visual images of trials, accidents, strikes, and fires for their readers. The need for an immediate record of events required the four Philadelphians to make quick drawings. This contributed to their use of a "hurried" style and obscurity of details in their later paintings. Their duties also imposed a view of city life not familiar to these middle-class men. The poverty of tenement houses, the crowded hustle of immigrant slums, and the amusements of the lower classes all affected the artists and appeared as subjects in their paintings.[1]

If the four men held common posts on newspaper staffs that exposed them to similar human conditions, their admiration for one man united them even more. Robert Henri was already a prominent figure in Philadelphia by 1880. His instruction at the Philadelphia Women's School of Design as well as a trip to Paris in 1891 brought him a certain local fame. While in Europe he studied at the Beaux-Arts and the Academie Julian and befriended some of France's most celebrated painters. Glackens, Sloan, Shinn, and Luks attended the Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts, a precise, though smaller, imitation of the National Academy

of Design in New York. Upon his return from Paris, Henri boasted that the Academy's antiquated methods and devotion to useless techniques made it more like a morgue than a vibrant tool for art study. His domineering manner, explosive personality, and new revelations regarding art attracted the four newspapermen, who sought his instruction.[2]

John Sloan received his early training as a graphic artist at A. Edward Newton in Philadelphia designing Christmas cards, matchboxes, and bookmarks. He began working on the art staff of the Philadelphia Inquirer in February 1892, and soon enrolled in the city's Academy where he studied with Henri's former instructor, Thomas Anshutz. Sloan met Henri at a party just after the latter's return from Paris. Sloan's growing dissatisfaction with academic training and Henri's enthusiasm for forming an independent organization brought the men together.[3]

Of the Eight, George Luks was the most outrageous. He began his professional career as part of a vaudeville act in which his brother played the straight man. When his brother split up the team to pursue his interest in medicine, George traveled to Germany to learn art. It was doubtful that Luks was ever a serious student, for no record of any exhibitions or enrollment in an art academy survived. Luks himself evaded the issue of his

apprenticeship, saying only that he lived with a retired lion tamer in Europe. After returning to Philadelphia and securing a job as staff artist on the Press in 1893, Luks met Henri who encouraged the newspaperman to resume his painting. Luks was addicted to alcohol resulting in his early death in 1933. He died after a barroom row and was discovered dead beneath the El.[4]

Everett Shinn adopted numerous artistic styles in his career, but his paintings as a member of the Eight were the most notable. Shinn received his training from the Philadelphia Academy and earlier, at the city's Spring Valley Institute, where he learned mechanical drawing. He worked on assorted newspapers where he met Glackens and Sloan, who introduced him to Henri. Shinn's energy and ambition earned him many wealthy patrons and several wives, and Theodore Dreiser probably modeled The Genius after him, but Shinn's constant experimentation detracted many admirers and diminished his reputation. He died in 1958.[5]

William Glackens was born in Philadelphia in 1870. He began drawing in school and landed his first job as an artist for the Philadelphia Record. He soon moved to the Press, however, where he met Sloan, Luks, and Shinn, and briefly attended the Academy. Like the other members of the Eight, Glackens studied in Europe, but his real training came from the newspaper and his tutelage under Henri. Sloan introduced Glackens and Henri some time in

the early 1890s, and the two latter men shared an apartment where the Philadelphia group began meeting. Glackens's canvasses were slow in selling until the 1908 group exhibition at Macbeth's gallery, but besides Sloan, he executed the most typical examples of urban realism. With his wife Edith, Glackens moved to Paris in 1924, frequently returning to New York. After writing Sloan that he could no longer paint or sell and that he had lost his desire for living, Glackens died in 1938.[6]

At first these men met in informal evenings at Henri's studio on Walnut Street, but soon expanded their program. Dissatisfied with the conservative curriculum they found at the Philadelphia Academy, they enlisted approximately thirty others to form the Charcoal Club in the early 1890s. Their exact intent remained vague and if they ever enunciated a particular agenda, it was lost to historians. What was evident, however, was that these men gathered around Henri in an anti-academic environment. More than a social or fraternal organization, the Charcoal Club artists worked in a studio from nude models under Henri's criticism and learned the methods of his European training.[7]

Henri's influence on the Philadelphia artists was profound. As the most artistically educated member of the group, Henri assumed the role of teacher and critic for the men. Sloan said that without Henri, he would not have become an artist at all,[8] and it was Henri who persuaded

Luks to begin painting again after his unpromising early career.[9] But Henri's most significant contribution was orchestrating the men into a coherent group that endured as the most progressive force of artists in the United States until the Armory Show. "We younger men," wrote one artist, "have always looked at Robert Henri as a typification of the new movement in our art."[10]

Henri's paintings were less important than his philosophy, but they too adapted to his theories. After beginning as an academic painter, Henri darkened his canvasses after his Paris training and hence retreated from the increasingly popular Impressionist palette at a time when formal institutions were incorporating it into their instruction. Henri's modified colors were the somber tones long endorsed by academies, but he remained a practitioner of the broad brush-stroke and blurred details used by Impressionists and early modernists. In addition, he began to depict street scenes and common people, which mirrored the newspaper subjects of his Philadelphia students. Here was a new, eclectic direction in American art, though hardly revolutionary--a blend of traditional coloring, Impressionist styles, and urban subject matter.

It was not until 1907 that the Philadelphia men, then living in New York City, added three artists to their ranks to become the Eight. However, the breach in aims, styles, and intent between the Philadelphia five and the new men,

Maurice Prendergast, Ernest Lawson, and Arthur B. Davies, was significant. Far from urban realism, Davies painted mythological scenes in misty moonlight, and Prendergast rendered themes of children in globular patches of bright colors. Lawson was truly the anomaly. As one of the outstanding American Impressionists, his light palette and serene landscapes represented the very art Henri opposed.[11]

Maurice Prendergast was the oldest of the Eight. Largely self-educated until he visited Paris as a young man, Prendergast displayed some aspects of Impressionism but modified the popular style with large spheres of color and urban subjects. The gentility of his subjects separated him from the stark realism of the Philadelphia circle, but Henri greatly admired Prendergast's exhibitions at Macbeth's and the individuality of his art. The older artist never married, living most of his life with his brother Charles, and died in 1924.[12]

Ernest Lawson acquired his artistic training in various academies from New York to Mexico City, but unlike Shinn, his painting style was unwavering. Early in his career, Lawson embraced the principles of Impressionism and through his studies abroad, developed an approximate execution of the French style. Lawson's autumnal colors differed from other Impressionists, and although he enjoyed denying the influence of any schools or movements in his paintings, his art clearly resembled European works.

Lawson was reportedly a quiet man given too much to drinking, and although his art enjoyed a great reception for several years, he drowned himself in 1939 after a decade of oppressive debt and few buyers.[13]

Born in 1862 in Utica, New York, Arthur B. Davies was a sensitive yet practical man. He decided to become an artist at age twelve, when he visited an exhibition of landscapes. His early admiration of pastoral themes manifested itself in his own paintings of romantic woods or open fields populated by mythological creatures. Studying at the Chicago Art Institute and later at the National Academy of Design, Davies was not part of Henri's Philadelphia circle. His interest in independent shows and experimental art, however, as well as his respect for Henri, made him a desirable ally. Davies briefly studied abroad, then returned to New York in 1896 for his first one-man show at Macbeth's.[14]

Davies's self-discipline and devotion to his work rapidly made him one of the leading painters of his time, but privately his life proved more difficult. In 1892 Davies married an equally ambitious woman named Virginia Merriweather who had studied in Vienna and earned a degree in medicine. At the time of their marriage, Dr. Merriweather was the chief of staff at the New York Infant Asylum. The couple settled on a farm in Congers where she went into private practice while he spent his days at a New

York studio and continued to take frequent solo trips abroad. By 1900, the estranged Davieses were separated.[15]

Unable to attain a divorce, Davies remained in New York where he met Edna Potter and the two began living together as Mr. and Mrs. David Owen. So successful was Davies's discretion that few of his close friends knew of either Mrs. Owens or their daughter born in 1912. When Davies died in Italy, his legal wife, Dr. Davies, demanded her rights. The resulting confusion remained unsolved for years.[16] But in 1907 when Davies met Henri, the world was a more promising place.

Lawson, Prendergast, and Davies were recklessly chosen if Henri hoped to present a cohesive group of painters with similar progressive impulses. Their alliance developed due to their strong friendships and a common respect for, if not actual endorsement of, Henri's ideas and each other's work. At best, the Eight were a genteel group of vaguely anti-academic men who hoped to redirect American painting. At their worst, they were a diversified association of independent artists who held little resemblance to one another.

The National Academy of Design provided the catalyst for their alliance. In 1907 the Academy rejected the work of Shinn, Glackens, Sloan, and Luks for both its spring and fall group installations. As a full-member of the Academy whose paintings they accepted, Henri withdrew his name from

the rolls and announced his intention to stage a separate exhibition.[17] The New York Evening Sun announced: "Eight Independent Painters to Give an Exhibition of their Own Work . . . a group of eight painters who have been expressing their ideas of life as they see it in quite their own manner . . . have formed themselves into a body, it was announced last evening, without leader, president, or formal organization."[18]

Well-connected in the commercial art gallery arena, Davies secured a location. William Macbeth's Fifth Avenue gallery hosted one-man shows for various members of the Eight as early as 1896, and Davies solicited his help in producing a group exhibition. Even in 1907, Davies possessed remarkable resources and imagination in orchestrating and promoting such an event as he was to exercise again with the 1913 Armory Show. The opening was scheduled for the following February.

That these men opposed the Academy, in varying degrees, to be sure, was evidence not only of Henri's espoused progressivism, but of the increasing atrophy present in that institution. A writer in North American Review charged the Academy with an incestuous corruption: "There are cliques who control the whole situation. There is no use for anybody to try to win a prize until he is on an exceptionally good footing with several members of the jury."[19] He added that winning a prize at the Academy was

a dubious honor at best. "They prefer to hand these honors to each other alternately," he wrote. "One year one painter helps another get the prize, and next year the prize winner is under moral obligation to return the compliment."[20]

A popular magazine, The Craftsman, looked to the National Academy for leadership in American art, but found only lethargy. "Must we accept this famous institution merely as the art opinion of the academic few who invariably see originality coupled with anarchy, and who reticently offer the public year after year a programme of cold-served repetition?"[21] At a time when art influences from abroad and the independent's rebellion at home imposed a great amount of chaos on the domestic art scene, the National Academy failed to incorporate any new aesthetic formulas or restructure its method of instruction. Writing under the name of Giles Edgerton, Mary Fanton Roberts, a regular contributor to The Craftsman, considered the present turmoil an opportunity for exploration. "What we need just now in America," she wrote, "is this definite expression of the American quality, and every possible individual expression of it, regardless of blunders or difficulties or uncertainties."[22] She concluded that only by fostering the type of freedom of expression that the Academy was unwilling to support ("it hesitates year after

year at the unexpected, the unfamiliar"[23]) could native art "have a permanent significance to us and to others."[24]

The February exhibition of the Eight was a great success for the artists involved. Every man got twenty-five feet "on the line," in comparison to the one or two paintings the Academy occasionally placed "in the eaves."[25] Macbeth "couldn't find standing room for the crowds,"[26] and the artists themselves proclaimed it a surprising triumph. " 'We've made a success,' " said Sloan, " 'Davies says an epoch . . . Macbeth is pleased as punch.' "[27]

But what exactly had transpired at Macbeth's gallery? Was this a revolution or a minor skirmish such as the art community witnessed with the Ten in 1897 and the Society of American Artists? Had the Eight successfully introduced new art forms and techniques to rival the "autocracy" of the National Academy?

Clearly, there was no revolution in the sense of a startling new aesthetic creed. The Eight were not high modernists or insurgent philosophers. Their contribution lay in asserting the right of the individual to deviate from contemporary standards as well as stage an exhibition of free expression. As such they closely resembled the independent groups of the late nineteenth century.

The notoriety of the Eight owed much to the nature of their subject matter. Their paintings of impoverished masses and tenements teaming with "the swarmy life"[28] were

powerful images previously portrayed only by regional or local artists. Thirty years before, a few men depicted common life, most notably Thomas Eakins, whom Walt Whitman counted among the few who could "resist the temptation to see what they think they ought to rather than what is."[29] But here was a prominent association of men dedicated to the "sacredness of the everyday fact,"[30] and the press simultaneously dubbed them the "Ash Can School," the "revolutionary Black Gang," and the "apostles of ugliness."[31]

For their part, the Eight claimed to "just paint the way they see things every day,"[32] and in urban New York, 1908, they were accurate recorders of the "raw reality of things."[33] Between 1860 and 1900, nearly 14,000,000 immigrants poured into the United States, followed by another 14,500,000 between 1900 and 1915. Congregating in eastern cities, the immigrants comprised a formidable addition to American urbanity,[34] and as newspapermen, most of the Eight had considerable exposure to the activities of this new population.

But the Eight were not social crusaders or champions of Progressive reform. While the contemporary novels of Frank Norris or Theodore Dreiser attempted to expose the injustice of a capitalist system that ignored its responsibilities for the dispossessed, the Eight celebrated the gentle poetry of washerwomen or the humor of an old

cook. This was a humane portrait, separate from the passionate appeals for social injustice. The Masses, the Socialist magazine begun by Max Eastman, Floyd Dell, and John Reed, interpreted the despair in the slums as the catalyst for economic and political revolution. Sloan, who served as art-editor for The Masses until its end in 1917, may have reflected the militant cry for reform in his cartoons and illustrations but not in his paintings. Photographers like Lewis Hine and Jacob Riis produced photo-essays on the plight of immigrant families, but the collected work of the Eight was not meant to sway its audience to moral indignation.[35]

Many observers noted the theme of the Eight. "A number of young painters . . . believe in the poetical and pictorial significance of the 'Elevated' and the skyscraper, of city crowds and rows of flat houses," according to one writer.[36] Here were "the big, vital, simple conditions and experiences of life," wrote Edgerton.[37] In The Craftsman, Henri asserted that Sloan's neighborhood paintings produced "a human document of the lives of the people living in those houses."[38]

The optimism these artists felt toward their subjects was evident. In describing a Sloan painting of Twenty-Second Street, Henri wrote, "the quality of sunlight is that of a caress," and that the "atmosphere [is] . . . steeped in its warmth."[39] In the paintings of the Eight,

even Dreiser's tragically exploited Sister Carrie would appear with pink cheeks.

To Henri, the Eight ushered in a new era of art distinctly American in its nature and subject. " 'The skyscraper is beautiful,' " he said, " 'its twenty stories swinging towards you are typical of all that America means, its very line is indicative of our virile young lustiness.'"[40] He also equated the vision of the Eight with an enduring native art: " 'The basis of future American art lies in our artists' appreciation of the value of the human quality all about them.' "[41]

It seemed, at least until the Armory Show, that the Eight replaced the nineteenth-century landscape, held so long in academic esteem, with an urban counterpart. Other artists like Jerome Myers and Stuart Davis proved sympathetic partners in their imitative subjects. In the 1930s, the theme reached its broadest proportions in the "American Scene" paintings of Thomas Hart Benton and Ben Shahn.[42]

In 1908, however, a change in subject matter could neither topple the existing art hierarchy nor successfully initiate a revolution of aesthetic standards. "Any young painter recently returned from Paris or Munich," noted a review in the Sun, "would call the exhibition of the Eight painters very interesting but far from revolutionary." The Eight did not venture far enough in their revolt--they

remained within the Academy's painterly code by adhering to naturalistic, representational forms and only minimally broadened existing styles with their wider brush stroke. It was, in short, a modest fracas with limited impact.[43]

The immediate consequences of the Macbeth "experiment" extended beyond its public controversy to spurn a response from the National Academy.[44] In the following spring exhibition, the Academy reversed its decisions of the previous year and included Henri, Sloan, Lawson, and Glackens. While not a member of the Eight but certainly affiliated with their urban motifs, Jerome Myers also presented his work there. One observer noted their sudden appearance: "The Eight . . . were treated exceptionally well by the hanging committee, and on almost every wall there were one or two canvases that spoke of an interest in vital human conditions."[45] Their peculiar inclusion impressed The Craftsman as instructive: "Surely such an exhibition as this should open the eyes of the Academy to the younger school of American painters."[46] But the Academy failed to temper its disdain for the artists beyond this willingness to hang their art occasionally. Still, it was a moderate victory for the Eight.

In the same year, Alfred Steiglitz opened his small gallery to the turbulent force of European modernism. On April 6, 1908, Steiglitz's Little Galleries of the Photo-Secession hosted the work of Henri Matisse. As the leading

painter in Paris of a group dubbed "les fauves" ("wild beasts") because of their abstraction and seeming disregard for the fundamental tenets of art, Matisse represented the extreme discrepancy between academicians and the growing contingent of independents. Modernism as a powerful movement had little recognition in the United States, and Matisse's display created reverberations throughout the art community.[47]

Critics were among the first to comment on the installation. The most common observation referred to Matisse's "artistic degeneration." "There are some female figures that are of an ugliness that is most appalling and haunting," said the New York Evening Mail.[48] Another critic noted that while Matisse possessed "technical mastery," he also felt "the pull toward physical distortion, that sickening malevolent desire to present the nude . . . so vulgarized, so hideously at odds with nature, as to suggest . . . the loathsome and the abnormal . . . that somehow fills one with a distaste for art and life." Matisse was one of the "ultra modern Frenchmen," continued this reviewer, with "tragically decadent souls."[49]

Critical response to Matisse aside, the introduction of modernism in the United States was important. Prior to this exhibition, only the Eight and their few predecessors ventured outside the prescribed traditions of American art, and those rebellions centered around concerns for

exhibiting canvasses or an alteration in subject matter. What Matisse offered bewildered critics and artists alike, as no such radicalism existed on the domestic scene. Matisse represented an early example of the approaching tide of modernism, and its American audience now faced two conflicting departures from the academic traditions--the urban realism of the Eight and the anarchy suggested in Matisse's dismissal of representational forms. With the Armory Show five years later, this schism erupted.[50]

The Eight disbanded after their 1908 exhibition, but a new group emerged in 1910 composed of Henri, Davies, Glackens, Sloan, and several younger artists with anti-academic temperaments. Together, they organized a show of twenty-seven painters in a loft building at 29 West Thirty-Fifth Street. The primary difference between this Independents Exhibition, as it was called, and that of the Eight two years earlier was the decision to invite artists outside the organizing body to participate. Allowing the artists to choose their own canvasses, no jury sat in judgment. For the first time in American art, a nonjuried exhibit attempted to include all those willing to apply. Thus, Henri and his associates wished to display "an expression of the present tendency in America toward developing individuality."[51]

Typically, Henri proved the most articulate of the organizers. In an attempt to clarify their objectives, he

stated that this was not "an exhibition of the rejected, nor an exhibition of people who have had their pictures accepted or refused by the Academy," but that it was conceived to encourage the "freedom to study and experiment . . . not in any way retarded by the standards which are the fashion of the time."[52] He hoped that such an event would attract an audience to artistic individuality, despite the possibility of a certain "strangeness in the manner of expression." As in 1908, Henri was attempting to provide a forum for those who deviated from academicism--an alternative arena without boundaries in which unbridled experimentation might find enthusiastic viewers and thus advance native art. Fighting the isolationism of the Eight, he now envisioned a broad sampling of artists whose mere diversity and numbers would verify the vitality of American endeavors.[53]

Henri's personality proved too strong for such democracy, however, despite his pronouncement that "the Exhibition of Independent Artists is not a movement headed by any one man."[54] His own ideology regarding the direction art should take dominated the show. Because he served on the hanging committee, Henri exercised great control over the selection of paintings, as well as their subsequent placement, and his influence no doubt persuaded loyal followers like Sloan and Glackens. Due to his particular tailoring of it, the installation failed to

include some progressive artists who charged that the crimes of the Eight, especially their factionalism, had been repeated.[55] Despite Henri's optimism that the exhibition might provide an open arena for unknown artists, his "jury of one" in effect produced a student show. The limited nature of Henri's undertaking contributed to American art only in proposing that artists attempt such a show. Although later groups adopted this idea, including the organizers of the Armory Show, the Independents Exhibition was a considerable reflection of one man.

Nevertheless, the 1910 exhibition was a popular success. "Over two thousand people attended the reception and nearly as many were turned away after the galleries were crowded to the limit of their capacity," reported one observer. "A waiting line extended nearly to the end of the block . . . and finally police assistance was found necessary to avert a possible panic."[56] It is difficult to imagine a similar scene at any Academy showing, and the participating artists were confident that their independent program for American art would prevail.[57] Ironically, Henri was not a contributing member of the independent group that eventually succeeded in overcoming academic authority.

The first decade of the twentieth century witnessed the acceleration of anti-academic sentiment that buttressed the nineteenth-century independent spirit. The Eight, like

the Ten of 1897 and, to a lesser degree, the Society of American Artists in the 1870s, rejected traditional notions of art and introduced new subject matter that reflected the urban environment. Their efforts to initiate revolutionary new formulas for native art, however, fell decidedly short. Their significance lay in further projecting the ideology that artists should forfeit the "pedantic point of view about unreal things" and allow their work to reflect their individual observations.[58]

If Henri was the instigative force for the rebellions of 1908 and 1910, he was also the reason they proved unsuccessful. In inaugurating an era of prestige and increased autonomy for independent artists, the ideology of the Eight was not so extreme that it broke the prescribed artistic notions upheld by the Academy. Henri's limited program and failure to include a wide spectrum of independents splintered the collective anti-academic forces and left him unable to combat traditional dogma effectively. His agenda for reform self-destructed.

The real revolution in American art originated in Steiglitz's galleries in 1908. His controversial exhibition of Matisse signalled the radical nature of future art and served as a harbinger for the Armory Show. Only the insurgent modernist movement could reorganize popular assumptions about art. But without Henri's influence and the work of his devotees, the Armory Show

might never have occurred; it was his group that eventually overcame the inevitable conflicts between modernism and realism and toppled the dominance of academicism by orchestrating the 1913 exhibition.

CHAPTER III ENDNOTES

1. Milton W. Brown, American Painting from the Amory Show to the Depression (New York: Princeton University Press, 1955), 11.

2. Rudi Blesh, Modern Art USA: Men, Rebellion, Conquest 1900-1956 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 15.

3. Bennard B. Perlman, The Immortal Eight (New York: Exposition Press, 1962), 54.

4. Ibid, 75; and Mahonri Sharp Young, The Eight: The Realist Revolt in American Painting (New York: Watson-Guptill Publications, 1973), 111, 122, 125.

5. Young, The Eight, 144, 152, 154.

6. Young, The Eight, 95, 106; and Ira Glackens, William Glackens and the Ashcan Group: The Emergence of Realism in American Art (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1957), 5, 6, 259.

7. Glackens, William Glackens and the Ashcan Group, 8.

8. Young, The Eight, 20.

9. Ibid.

10. S. H., "Studio Talk," International Magazine 30 (December 1906): 183.

11. Young, The Eight, 79.

12. Young, The Eight, 127, 137, 141.

13. Young, The Eight, 80, 93; Glackens, William Glackens, 123; and Perlman, Immortal Eight, 164.

14. Perlman, Immortal Eight, 148; and Young, The Eight, 65.

15. Young, The Eight, 65, 72, 77.

16. Ibid.

17. Perlman, Immortal Eight, 161.

18. Quoted in Ira Glackens, William Glackens and the Ashcan Group, 78.

19. Sadakichi Hartmann, "The American Picture World: Its Shows and Shams," Forum 44 (September 1910): 300.

20. Ibid, 301.

21. Giles Edgerton (Mary Fanton Roberts), "What Does the National Academy of Design Stand For: Has it at Present a Value to the American Art Public?" The Craftsman 15 (February 1909): 520.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid, 522.

24. Ibid, 520.

25. Ibid, 522.

26. Ibid, 530.

27. Quoted in Young, The Eight, 35.

28. Charles Wisner Barrell, "The Real Drama of the Slums, As Told in John Sloan's Etchings," The Craftsman 15 (February 1909): 559.

29. Lewis Mumford, The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America 1865-1895 (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1931), 216.

30. Ibid, 215.

31. Various names for the Eight are listed in John I. H. Baur, Revolution and Tradition in Modern American Art (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 15. See also Barrell, "The Real Drama of the Slums," 562. Perlman, in Immortal Eight, 170-171, also reports on the popular names for this unpopular group.

32. Giles Edgerton (Mary Fanton Roberts), "The Younger American Painters: Are They Creating a National Art?" The Craftsman 13 (February 1908): 531.

33. Barrell, "The Real Drama of the Slums," 559.

34. Arthur S. Link, Robert V. Remini, Douglas Greenberg, and Robert C. McMath, Jr., A Concise History of the American People (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1984), 314.

35. Barrell compared John Sloan's paintings to the muckraker novels of Frank Norris and Jack London. See Barrell, "The Real Drama of the Slums," 559. For similar comparisons, see "The Greatest Exhibition of Modern Art," Current Opinion 54 (March 1913): 231.

36. S. H., "Studio Talk," 183.

37. Edgerton (Mary Fanton Roberts), "The Younger American Painters," 522.

38. Robert Henri, "The New York Exhibition of Independent Artists," The Craftsman 18 (April 1914): 168. Also see Robert Henri, The Art Spirit (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1923), 218-219.

39. Ibid.

40. Quoted in Young, The Eight, 35.

41. Quoted in Edgerton (Mary Fanton Roberts), "The Younger American Painters," 524, 531.

42. Baur, Revolution and Tradition, 22.

43. Young, The Eight, 35.

44. Edgerton (Mary Fanton Roberts), "What Does the National Academy of Design Stand For?," 530.

45. Als Ik Kan, "Notes and Reviews," The Craftsman 14 (June 1908): 340.

46. Ibid, 341.

47. Blesh, Modern Art USA, 32.

48. J. E. Chamberline in the New York Evening Mail, quoted in "Henri Matisse at the Little Galleries," Camera Work 23 (July 1908): 11.

49. Kan, "Notes and Reviews," 342.

50. Blesh, Modern Art USA, 32.

51. Henri, "The New York Exhibition of Independent Artists," 160.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. See William Innes Homer, Alfred Steiglitz and the American Avant-Garde (Boston: New York Graphic Society, 1977), 167.

56. Als Ik Kan, "Notes and Reviews," The Craftsman 18 (May 1910): 291-292.

57. Henri, "The New York Exhibition of Independent Artists," 161.

58. Henri, as quoted in Edgerton (Mary Fanton Roberts), "The Younger American Painters," 524.

CHAPTER IV

AMERICAN ART WILL NEVER BE THE SAME: THE ARMORY SHOW OF 1913

"Savages and children," remarked one artist in 1913 on the new modernist movement, "practice this art sincerely and get over it as fast as they can."[1] When the International Exhibition of Modern Art opened at the armory of the Sixty-Ninth Regiment on Lexington Avenue between 25th and 26th Streets in New York City on February 17, 1913, it generated a deluge of public attention ranging from sophomoric ridicule to intellectual debate. For one month, eighty-seven thousand spectators ranging from ex-President Theodore Roosevelt to the bohemia of Greenwich Village entered the eighteen-room make-shift gallery to view over thirteen hundred works of art. Despite the number and diversity of the artworks, critical and public attention alike focused on the European artists. It was, after all, the first time most Americans confronted modernism and, as such, they were unprepared to comprehend the new movement before them. Mabel Dodge compared the Armory Show's importance to the American Revolution and John Sloan considered its art a "bomb under conventions,"

while less enthusiastic observers proclaimed it "such a bore," or denounced it as a gathering of lunatics bent on destroying American art.[2] For this exhibition, the controversy only emphasized its appeal for artistic reform.

No matter what its place in the pre-war culture of the United States, the Armory Show certainly confronted the long-standing academicism of American painting and served as the culmination of several decades of struggle by independent groups to forge a new native art. The Society of American Artists, the Ten of 1897, the Eight, and the Independents Exhibition in 1910 expressed a sincere desire to introduce a broadened aesthetic beyond the Academy's Renaissance traditions. Although their efforts failed to initiate any substantial changes, they enabled the Armory Show's organizers to battle successfully the beleaguered National Academy of Design.

The 1913 exhibition offered the very thing previous independent associations had not--a radically new art form that involved more than minor alterations of the academic formula--and, hence, revolutionized American art. By introducing a novel aesthetic, the Armory Show redefined the spiritual expectations of art and asserted the individual's interpretation of the world as a legitimate means of expression. Moreover, both artists and critics claimed that the European efforts overshadowed American art momentarily, for native artistic experimentation paled

beside the considerable effrontery of modernism. Yet the Show, in existence for only one month, achieved a significant reeducation of artistic values.

While their work was on view at the Madison Gallery in New York, Walt Kuhn, Jerome Myers, and Elmer MacRae met to debate the condition of American art. The men were members of a group called the Pastelists and with the gallery's owner, Henry Fitch Taylor, they fostered the idea of producing an invitational exhibition much like the Independents in 1910. When the Pastelists show closed, the men continued to meet in Myers's nearby studio at 7 West Forty-Second Street. On 14 December 1911, Myers, MacRea, Kuhn, and Taylor recorded their desire to organize "a society for the purpose of exhibiting the works of progressive and live painters, both American and foreign--favoring such work usually neglected by current shows and especially interesting and instructive to the public."[3]

The Association of American Painters and Sculptors (AAPS), as the new society was called, included sixteen charter members. The group's membership reflected a representational number of artists from the various independent movements since the late nineteenth century. J. Alden Weir, the first president of the AAPS, was an illustrious member of the Ten of 1897; four members of the Eight, Arthur B. Davies, William Glackens, George B. Luks, and Ernest Lawson, participated; and the founders

themselves, Kuhn, Myers, and MacRea, shared an affiliation with the Henri circle and exhibited in the 1910 Independents show. The remaining men were mostly Academy members who expressed their desire to exhibit outside of that institution.[4]

By no means, however, was this a homogeneous assembly. Although a majority of the twenty-five artists who composed the AAPS held anti-academic views of varying degrees, many supported the National Academy of Design either through membership or stylistic imitation. Some were Impressionists, some realists, and some traditional landscapists. Clearly, they did not represent a stylistically radical group, except in a local sense, and with the exception of Davies and Kuhn, it is likely that none of them knew of radical European modernism at all.[5]

From the beginning, these artists emphasized showing their works rather than any aesthetic formulas or stylistic innovations. At the 2 January 1912 meeting, the AAPS adopted the following platform: "For the purpose of developing a broad interest in American art activities, by holding exhibitions of the best contemporary work that can be secured, representative of American and foreign art."[6] Only by employing such a general concern of artists could they successfully form a cohesive group.

Robert Henri, perhaps the most influential figure in American art at the time, joined the AAPS but never

contributed a significant role. The AAPS artists considered the new society an opportunity to exhibit very diverse works, a doctrine significantly at odds with Henri's tendency to promote the realism of the Eight. As we have seen, even though Henri attempted to achieve a broad sampling of American art in the 1910 Independent's Exhibition, he modified his intentions to focus on his own circle of students. This was precisely the type of limitation the AAPS hoped to rectify. So in 1911, when someone proposed Henri's name for the position of president, he was rejected on the grounds that he had "queered himself with the Independent Show."[7]

The AAPS chose J. Alden Weir as their first president. As one of the country's preeminent Impressionists, Weir could offer the association instant notoriety as well as unite the mixed band of artists under a common cause. He also shared their concerns that artists, rather than academic or bureaucratic institutions, organize and administer shows of their own work. As a member of the Ten in 1897, he labored for that very privilege. But never had he denounced the National Academy.[8]

Although the AAPS invited Weir to its meetings, he declined, and the organization elected him president in his absence. Unfortunately, this fact only aggravated Weir. " 'I was greatly surprised to find in your columns this morning,' " wrote Weir in the New York Times, " 'the

statement that I am the president of a new society "openly at war with the Academy of Design." ' " Weir then defended the Academy, of which he had been a " 'loyal member' " for twenty-five years, for " 'doing everything in its power for the promotion of art in this country.' " Because the AAPS evidently " 'had the intention of antagonizing the older institution,' " Weir formally rejected the presidency.[9]

Weir's protest was a curious demonstration for a man who once seemed discontented with the Academy's method of exhibiting American art. But considering the motives of the Ten, whose aim was to show their work in a more favorable environment, Weir possibly considered his independent exhibitions simply as opportunities for public exposure and not as acts of academic revolution. Clearly in 1912, he favored no such dissension.

Arthur B. Davies then assumed the presidency. Familiar with new American art, Davies proved a fortuitous appointment for the organization. He was broad-minded and connected with dozens of American patrons, and he brought a single-mindedness of purpose to the society--so much so, in fact, that the AAPS disbanded immediately after the Armory Show, as if its entire existence had been for that one brief moment and it expired from their massive exertion. Davies was a participant in the Eight and a critical managerial force in the 1910 Independents Exhibition.

Perhaps most importantly for the Armory Show, he was knowledgeable about the modernist movements abroad. Myers described Davies as the "one artist in America who had little to do with his contemporaries, who had vast influence with the wealthiest women, who painted unicorns and maidens under moonlight."[10]

In defining the purpose of the AAPS, Davies wrote:

> This is not an institution but an association. It is composed of persons of varying tastes and predilections who are agreed on one thing, that the time has arrived for giving the public here the opportunity to see for themselves the results of new influences at work in other countries in an art way.
>
> In getting together the works of the European Moderns, the Society has embarked on no propaganda. It proposes to enter on no controversy with an institution. Its sole object is to put the paintings, sculptures, and so on, on exhibition so that the intelligent may judge for themselves, by themselves.[11]

Throughout its existence, the society emphasized that "exhibition is the purpose of our uniting," despite the persistent rumors that the men hoped to defeat the Academy. They wanted to open up the marketplace for their "wares," they said, especially for the men who had not yet achieved a reputation in the art community.[12] "At this point," wrote Walt Kuhn in "The Story of the Armory Show," "it is important to remember that so far this group had thought no further than to stage somewhere, a large exhibition of

American art, with perhaps a few of the radical things from abroad to create additional interest."[13] The society had no money, and the prospects for securing a facility were limited. The AAPS discussed Madison Square Garden as a possible site, but prohibitive costs squelched the idea. Kuhn then investigated several armories and acquired the use of one on Lexington Avenue between Twenty-Fifth and Twenty-Sixth Streets. As he would do repeatedly for the next year, Davies raised the required funds--a fifteen hundred dollar deposit with the four thousand dollar balance due on 1 February 1913. The organization leased the cavernous exhibition space with a commitment for 15 February through 15 March, but still had no art to fill the hall.[14]

From what had initially begun as the desire to organize a show of predominantly American artists, came Davies's proposal of an exhibition international in scope that included the latest European movements. The impetus for this decision originated in a catalogue Davies procured of the Sonderbund Show ("Secessionist Group") in Cologne. Here was a show Davies admired--an impressive hanging of contemporary modernism including Pablo Picasso, Vincent Van Gogh, Paul Cezanne, and Edvard Munch.[15] He sent the catalogue to Kuhn, then in Nova Scotia on a painting trip, with a brief note: "I wish we could have a show like this."[16] Kuhn wired Davies to purchase steamship tickets

and immediately departed for Cologne. "Go ahead, you can do it," were Davies's parting words.[17]

In a fortuitous series of events, Kuhn arrived on the closing day of the Sonderbund Show. While workers dismantled the exhibit, Kuhn secured a large portion of the works through the show's management. The Cologne organizers also provided Kuhn with letters to collectors in Holland and recommendations to view other exhibitions in progress throughout Europe. After visiting the Hague with the promise that it would send several of Odilon Redon's works to the AAPS event, Kuhn left Holland and traveled to Munich and Berlin where he made arrangements with many of the artists living there.[18]

Finally Kuhn landed in Paris and met Walter Pach, an American artist who was familiar with the new French painting. Pach introduced Kuhn to Gertrude and Leo Stein, possibly the two most knowledgeable purveyors of modern art in 1912 Paris, and together they accompanied Kuhn to the studios of Picasso, Henri Matisse, Raoul Dufy, Marcel Duchamp, Constantin Brancusi, and the expatriate American painters Patrick Henry Bruce, Morgan Russell, and Elie Nadelman. Realizing that the task before him was becoming increasingly complicated, Kuhn wired for Davies to meet him in Paris. When Davies arrived one week later, Kuhn had amassed a sizable roster of artists for the February exhibition, and news of the event was already generating

enough attention that Arthur T. Aldin requested the show for Chicago after it closed in New York.

In less than one week, Kuhn and Davies accomplished an extraordinary amount of work. Their negotiations had succeeded in enlisting the bulk of the American exhibition by securing Europe's most prominent modern masters, including Odilon Redon, Fernand Leger, Paul Cezanne, Paul Gaugin, Henri Toulous-Lautrec, Pierre Bonnard, Edouard Manet, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Camille Pissarro, Alfred Sisley, Seuret, Signac, Vincent Van Gogh, Georges Rouault, Aristide Maillol, Marie Laurencin, Maurice de Vlaminck, Andre Derain, Francis Picabia, Robert Delaunay, Gleizes, Andre Dunoyer de Segonzac, Othon Friesz, Georges Leon Dufrenoy, Maurice Denis, Felix-Edouard Vallotton, Georges Braque, Emile Antoine Bourdelle, and Alexander Archipenko, in addition to those mentioned above. All counted, there were 399 paintings and 21 sculptures.[19] After stopping in London to see Roger Fry's second Grafton Gallery Show and arranging to transfer many of the works to New York, the two men sailed from Liverpool on 21 November. They were "worn out from work," but jubilant and confident that their week's efforts would create a sensation in New York and give the Armory Show a significance that even the Sonderbund could not surpass. Davies wrote Myers: "You will weep when you see what we've brought over."[20]

When Davies and Kuhn arrived in New York they immediately dispatched notices to the press through F. James Gregg, the press secretary for the AAPS. Gregg was an old friend and supporter of the Henri circle and wrote some of the Eight's most enthusiastic reviews in the New York Evening Sun. Davies was aware that the show's success rested largely on their ability to publicize their activities. Perpetually without funds, the AAPS paid Gregg twelve hundred dollars for his public relations services, and the newspaperman rattled off a series of press releases informing the public of nearly every development of the show's evolution. All of this generated great curiosity and excitement among the art community and public. Gregg also distributed flyers, posters, and buttons by the thousands, each depicting the association's motto, "The New Spirit." As the exhibition attracted increasing attention, Kuhn told a reporter that "all the advertising in the world and all the press-agenting will do no good if there is nothing for the public to see when it comes."[21]

Meanwhile, Davies was working to ensure that the armory would be full of art on opening night. With all the publicity regarding its foreign component, Davies began assembling the show's native art. For this purpose, he gathered a committee of eight--Glackens (chairman), Nankivell, Maurice Prendergast, Taylor, Tucker, and Fry; all were sympathetic to the progressive movements.

Glackens and Prendergast were familiar with Renoir, even if Picasso remained a mystery to them. The important element was their willingness to stray from the Henri/Realist tradition, in which they once participated, toward new expressions derived from European modernism.[22]

Unfortunately, the domestic committee's appropriation of native art paled beside the European contingent already secured. In part, this was due to the committee's selections, but the less-developed nature of American art also contributed to the disappointment. Aside from the Eight and those artists working around Steiglitz's 291, nothing very daring occurred on the domestic scene until the Armory Show. Marsden Hartley, John Marin, Max Weber, and Abraham Walkowitz attended Steiglitz's exhibitions and experimented with the new forms, creating the most original modernist work in the country. For reasons that remain vague, the AAPS largely excluded the Steiglitz group. Marin exhibited ten paintings, but these certainly did not appear as a triumphant expression of the modernist spirit when compared to the rich heritage of the Europeans.[23]

The problem stemmed from the fact that besides the small melange of Steiglitz artists, modernism, in particular Cubism, Fauvism, and Expressionism, was conceived and existed only in European art. The American tradition, beginning in the 1870s, consisted of a fostering of individualism, rather than an actual artistic movement.

Also, neither the Society of American Artists nor the Eight represented any new aesthetic programs, but simply a variation of acceptable painterly codes. Only the Ten in 1897 introduced a new aesthetic formula by importing Impressionism from France and adopting it to their native consciousness. By 1913, however, Impressionism no longer appeared as revolutionary art. In fact, the Academy had absorbed its method into the institutionalized curriculum. Hence, the United States had only the limited inventions of the Eight to promote as insurgent "American painting," and the European artists easily overshadowed such faint innovation.[24]

With all the publicity, American artists flooded the domestic committee for a chance to participate in the show. Davies and Glackens discussed the problem of viewing the numerous incoming nominations. The men decided to permit the artists to submit works "for inspection from 20-26 January inclusive." In effect, this measure conceived a jury system to review unknown artists, much like the juries and hanging committees of the National Academy against which the Eight and the 1910 Independents Exhibition protested. Glackens accepted a host of American artists, many of whom later commanded an honored place in the history of American painting. Included were Oscar Bluemner, Maurice Becker, Stuart Davis, Andrew Dansburg,

Edward Hopper, Joseph Stella, and Margaret and William Zorach.[25]

In December 1912, Kuhn wrote to Walt Pach, now serving as the European agent for the society, that "the ball is on now and there will be lots doing . . . we are all in the same boat for this chance to make America think," but Davies's efforts proved the most essential. He divided the association's members into six committees, each group being responsible for a different aspect of the event, but all directly accountable to the president. As debts mounted, Davies procured the necessary money. He rented an office at 122 East Twenty-Fifth Street, oversaw the printing, answered questions from the press, and took on the arduous task of planning the hanging of thirteen hundred works of art.[26]

Charges soon emerged that Davies conducted the AAPS with dictatorial licence. "When Davies was made president . . . he underwent an amazing metamorphosis," noted Guy Pene du Bois; "his presidency produced a dictator, severe, arrogant, implacable," who "strode out in the open, governed with something equivalent to the terrible Ivan's rod of iron." Myers agreed that with Davies's activities, "our society had ceased to be democratic according to my mind," and admitted that he was never privy to much of the show's organization. In this respect, Davies resembled Henri's determination three years earlier to model the

Independents Exhibition after his own predilections. Davies, however, possessed a knowledge of movements at home and abroad, and this insured the Armory Show against the isolationism of the earlier exhibition.[27]

If Davies's presidency was autocratic, it went unopposed until a few weeks prior to the show's opening. Gutzon Borglum, Vice President of the AAPS, resigned on the grounds that the affair had become a misrepresentation of American art, that it presented only a few American sculptors, and the most damaging accusation of all, that the society had lost its perspective and was merely trying to "put one over" on the Academy. The press reiterated this last statement and suspected the Association of charlatanry and deceit. Borglum's membership seemed problematic from the beginning, because his conservative attitudes and academic sculpture allowed him only a tentative sympathy with the younger artists who viewed the Academy as moribund. Borglum's sculpture was, however, like most American sculpture at the time, reflective of traditional values and academic qualities. Davies's decision to reject certain works Borglum nominated may have incited the latter's revolt, but Davies was clearly working toward an event like the Sonderbund and any art that did not contribute to that end detracted from it. For the Armory Show, artworks must possess that "personal note distinctly sounded," as Davies stated it. Borglum's

suggestions were progressive perhaps, but not modern, and that had become the resounding theme of the show.[28]

The AAPS turned to well-known sources in the United States to secure examples of modern art. Several collectors, galleries, and museums offered to lend their works, but others failed to grasp the importance of the exhibition. As Milton W. Brown reports in The Story of the Armory Show, a request to borrow two Monets from Hugo Reisinger elicited Reisinger's refusal with the explanation that " 'unfortunately, I cannot lend you the two pictures because Mrs. Reisinger will not allow me to take any pictures out of the parlors, where they are hanging now, and I really cannot blame her because this is the season when we entertain and must have our house in order.' "[29]

With the exhibition less than one month away, the pressing concern was how to arrange the artworks. Hanging thirteen hundred pieces of art proved difficult, even for the ingenious Davies. He proposed a labyrinth of eighteen small galleries within the armory that would demonstrate the natural and logical progression from nineteenth-century realism to the most radical elements of Cubism and Fauvism. Placement of the canvasses and sculpture was crucial if Davies and the AAPS were to be successful in providing an historical context for the new movements, all of which harkened back to earlier artistic ideas. Myers remembered the remarkable fact that Davies "made a water-color sketch

showing the location of each picture--an instance of the care and devotion he gave to the exhibition."[30]

Kuhn and Davies decided the armory's interior needed altering to better enhance the exhibits. They covered the partitions with burlap, set several evergreens about, and attempted to minimalize the cathedral-like heights of the ceiling by hanging streamers in a downward sweep. Finally, they hung the artworks across twenty-five hundred feet of wall space, and within two days, the show was ready for its first patron.

On 17 February, the International Exhibition of Modern Art opened to much fanfare and exhaustive press coverage. Publicist Gregg announced: "This exhibition is an indication that the Association of American Painters and Sculptors is against cowardice even when it takes the form of amiable self-satisfaction." The critics were numerous, but few displayed the acumen the Association desired. After all, the modernist movement was introduced suddenly in the United States and with an aggressiveness few critics embraced. Only an artistic elite witnessed the innocuous unveiling of modernism at 291, and the American independent shows consisted of relatively weak modernist examples. For most, the Armory Show seemed a complete reversal of established artistic principles.[31]

Yet the Armory Show was not without sympathetic reviews, however sparse. William D. MacColl, in the July

issue of The Forum wrote that the participating artists "give us something that was not in our life, that was not in the painting before . . . there has been a quickening . . . into something rich and strange."[32] The New York Evening Mail commended the AAPS for triumphing "over all formal restrictions . . . it was a privilege to get out of the artistic straight-jacket." Even Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., one of the most conservative critics of his day and an outspoken opponent of modern art, offered dubious praise to the organization for "bringing over a full representation of this latest eccentric work."[33]

The most common epithet cast on the exhibition was an analogy to an insane asylum. The New York Times reported that "the Armory Show is pathological . . . hideous!"[34] Kenyon Cox, a painter and conservative critic, felt he had "passed through a pathological museum where the layman has no right to go." Again in The Nation, Mather said:

> On all hands I hear in the show the statement, "At any rate, this new art is very living and interesting." So much may said for much of the Post-Impressionist and Cubist work; and something like that may be one's feeling on first visiting a lunatic asylum. The inmates might well seem more vivid and fascinating than the everyday companions of home and office.

In yet another diatribe, a critic labeled the Armory Show "a temporary lunatic asylum" and described the paintings as "blear-eyed daubs and phantasmagories of the insane." Even

ex-President Theodore Roosevelt visited the exhibition and, although he thought its scope admirable, its "lunatic fringe" repulsed him. A few leading members of the National Academy announced a mock event called the "Post Mortem Impressionist Exhibition," with the "most distinguished artists of the Cubist, Post-Impressionist, Futuristic, Neurotic, Psychotic, and Paretic Schools . . . and other nutty groups," presiding.[35]

Specific pronouncements of modern art as anathema kept the publicity on the front page. "This is not a movement and a principle," said art critic Royal Cortissoz, "it is unadulterated cheek." Nearly everywhere the artists were decried. If lunacy was not the explanation for such "eccentricities," lack of skill was. This reaction seemed logical enough considering the critics lack of education in modernism and their acceptance of Academy standards. A description of Cezanne included the assessment that he was a "sincere amateur" who "simply does not know his trade"; a "second-rate Impressionist who had now and then the fair luck in painting a moderately good picture." Accordingly, Van Gogh had "little sense of beauty and spoiled a lot of canvasses with crude, quite unimportant pictures." Gaugin, the last in the great triumvirate of modernists, was a "mediocre technician, trying to do something he cannot accomplish." Royal Cortissoz stated simply, "the common sense view is that these men paint poorly."[36]

In The Nation, Mather wrote three separate articles that testify to the reactionary stance many critics assumed. In the first review, he addressed the entire Armory Show, denouncing its European contingent. Secondly, he concentrated only on the American art at the exhibition and praised its impassive nature. Finally, he turned completely from the Association's show to the National Academy's, where he found the art he had long championed. This was typical fare for many critics who were apt to declare the corruption modernism imposed on native art.[37]

But what was it exactly that provoked the critics and public alike to such violent condemnations of the Armory Show? What did the exhibition offer that induced charges of "Barnumism" and charlatanry? The answer was modernism.[38]

Explanatory theories and suppositions soon surfaced to help the layman grasp the meaning of the new art. The AAPS printed studies of Cezanne, Redon, and Raymond Duchamp-Villon to educate the spectators; Kuhn translated extracts from Gaugin's Noa-Noa; and Mabel Dodge and Gertrude Stein published complimentary essays on each other to explain the "modernist spirit." The society distributed all of these to its audience. In addition, the magazine Arts and Decoration devoted an entire "special exhibition number" to the Armory Show with statements and articles by Davies, du Bois, collector John Quinn, Gregg, Glackens, and sculptor

Jo Davidson. Steiglitz issued an edition of his magazine Camera Work to enlighten his readers, and participating artists gave newspaper interviews in abundance.[39]

The basic premise of modern art theory proposed that because of the psychological impact of changes in society brought about by industrialization, artists should retreat to an interior world in which they interpreted visual observations through an emotional means of expression. This stance significantly altered the expectation that artists imitate reality. An editorial writer in the New York Tribune reasoned that modernist painting was "not what things are but the expression of introspection." "Something is wrong with the world," claimed financier and art collector James Stillman, "these men know." Art critic Christian Brinton wrote that "painting was no longer content to minister modestly unto life; it had learned to echo in theme and treatment the social, political, and intellectual complexion of the age." Artists responded to the pressures of the Machine Age by asserting their individual vision, allowing them to participate in the new era without sacrificing their particular perspective.[40]

In a lengthy and illuminating article for Camera Work, Gabriele Buffet, the wife of painter Francis Picabia, enunciated the modernist outlook. "The old language of the artist is no longer appropriate for the last new needs of our being," she wrote. Artists must "find a new formula

which will relate the trends of events of modern consciousness." To explain the modernists further, Buffet said that "they did not want to represent merely external nature but that they availed themselves of natural forms to embody their religious and sentimental ideas; and the beauty of their achievement lies rather in the expression of feeling than in the representation of objects."[41]

Buffet's discussion said further that the denunciations of the Armory Show were due to a misunderstanding between an uneducated and reluctant public and modernism. "The public looks upon art merely as a pastime," she observed, "and balks at the slightest effort to understand the significance of the work of art . . . [the public] seeks in the work of art merely its own convictions." Here was an argument against the nineteenth-century experience that art was meant to entertain. Similarly, Buffet dismissed any tendency on the spectator's part to locate a reference point between the title of a work and the work itself. "This point of reference doesn't exist, and the title only represents the state of mind, the emotion, which influenced the artist," she explained. Furthermore, the public must not assume that artists create from a common understanding of artistic principles, as had academicians. "One should try to reconstitute," she asserted, "[the artist's] . . . thought, his need and the

need of the epoch in which he lived and the form of the language in which he tried to explain himself."

Buffet's argument was perhaps the most lucid account of the modernist orientation to appear during the Armory Show. Certainly, the public entered the exhibition with an antiquated set of criteria. Still, not everyone embraced the aesthetic departure. Rejecting the tenets of modernism, Kenyon Cox disagreed that "we must give the necessary time and thought to learn the language of these men before we condemn them. Why should we? Why should they not learn the universal language of art?" Mather wrote that as a critic, his prior experience had not prepared him for modernism. In older art, he noted, "there was no feeling of things which the artist need regard." Gregg denied that modernism could be precisely explained. "What is called the New Art cannot be defined . . . when we are able to analyze such a manifestation it is safe to say that it will have come to an end," he wrote. Gregg concluded by saying: " 'All is disturbance. Change is everywhere. Something has happened . . . is happening. What that something is we cannot tell--as yet.' "[42]

Critics leveled their most virulent criticisms at cubism. "No imagination outside the psychopathic ward of Bellevue . . . can conceive without actually seeing it what a cubist picture is," noted the New York Evening World. It added: "Cubism must have originated in the brain of a

professor of mathematics stricken with paresis." Mather surmised that cubism was merely "an occult and curious pendantry." Because of the "queer agglomeration of line and color, in which one may divine in a fragmentary way elements of the human form," critics dubbed the cubist section of the Armory Show "the Chamber of Horrors." The Saturday Evening Post wondered why the cubist had "not been locked up yet," and debated the merits of a philosophy where "all things in nature . . . properly resolve themselves into cubes." Cortissoz charged that the cubists "produced some of the most stupidly ugly pictures in the world," and Mather threw in the observation that here was an art "essentially epileptic." Kenyon Cox believed that "the real meaning of this cubist movement is nothing else than the total destruction of the art of painting." Writing of an earlier group of Matisse paintings, one reviewer offered the following analogy: "If you can imagine what a particularly sangunary little girl of eight, half-crazed with gin, would do to a white-washed wall, if left alone with a box of crayons, then you will come near to fancying what most of the work was like."[43]

But by far, Marcel Duchamp's Nude Descending A Staircase (1912) attracted the most attention. This cubist painting seemed so mistitled that local newspapers offered a ten dollar prize to anyone who could discern the nude. Arthur Jerome Eddy, a collector and proselytizer of modern

art, published his solution in the Chicago Tribune "complete with diagram." Gutzom Borglum described the painting as "a staircase descending a nude," and a sporting competition developed among newspapers for the most outrageous epithet. This list included "a lot of disused golf clubs and bags," "an elevated railroad stairway in ruins after an earthquake," "a pack of brown cards," and the most enduring one of all, "an explosion in a shingle factory." When someone asked Walt Pach to locate the nude, he rhetorically asked, "where was the moon in the Moonlight Sonata?"[44]

Also levied against the modernists was the charge of immorality. The Academy had long believed the purpose of art was to beautify and provide its viewer with an appreciation of all that was good or godly. Edward Dangerfield expressed the ideas behind this puritanical art: "For that which is good in art is that which is obedient--that which is beautiful is that which is reverent . . . reverence toward that which is behind, above, and transcends law--God!" Hence modernism seemed not only revolutionary, but anti-God. Cortissoz discarded modern art because it appeared to flout "fundamental laws" and "repudiate what I take to be the function of art, the creation of beauty."[45]

The distortion of the female figure in particular disconcerted many critics, especially the figures of

Matisse. The nineteen-century art tradition maintained that the "female form divine" was not subject to the "studied brusqueness and violence" of the modernist brush. All it took was the discovery of six toes on one of Matisse's nudes to prompt an investigation by the vice squad. His garish color schemes and juxtaposition of forms defied the academic impulse to depict sensuous beings at their most spectacular. The New York Review announced that Matisse's portraits were "a nauseating monstrosity."[46]

The difficulty critics experienced in accepting an art that relied on the interior world of the artist stemmed from an unwillingness to analyze the artist's perspective. Conservative critics like Cortissoz, Mather, and Cox upheld nineteenth-century aesthetic assumptions. Briefly, these included a belief in the morality and beauty of art, the notion that artists rely on models of the past, especially the Renaissance tradition, and the idea that art had a responsibility to communicate with its audience. Modernism contradicted all such ideology. "The fidelity to sound principles," reminded Cortissoz, "is our insurance against the subversiveness of modernism." Mather agreed: "The artist can be no law unto himself."[47]

After one month of chaotic activity, the Armory Show closed its doors. At the final day's celebration, it was clear to the AAPS and its supporters that the society had irrevocably jolted the conventional theories regarding art.

The National Academy of Design crumbled, appearing to many as an antiquated foe that had long proven inadequate. When one artist derisively toasted the older institution at the closing ceremonies, John Quinn said, "Don't cheer, boys, the poor devils are dying." A professor at Columbia University reported that the show signaled a triumph for the artists: "I felt for the first time that art was recapturing its own essential madness at last, and that the modern painter-sculptor had won for himself a title of courage that was lacking in all the other fields of art."[48]

The exhibition made a profound impression on American artists as well. Myers wrote that "Davies had unlocked the door to foreign art and thrown the key away . . . more than ever before our great country had become a colony; more than ever before, we had become provincials." No matter what their previous training and expectations dictated, native artists could not ignore the dynamic components of modernism; American artists did not paint the same after 1913. Stuart Davis, Charles Sheeler, Tom Benrimo, and Davies turned from their representational art toward flattened, overlapping shapes and began experimenting with the new styles. Myers described his transformation to the modernist school:

> With a pencil, at first timid and faltering, I adopted my line to what I saw. Then, gradually becoming more assured, my line began automatically to react to my feeling . . . in this instinctive way, I set

> myself in opposition to the authority that had governed my art instruction. It was a choice between becoming merely a cultural artist or learning to make a personal statement of my own feelings.[49]

Perhaps American artists felt compelled to react to modernism not simply because it was the current scandal, but because they realized it established a vigorous era for them. If the Armory Show alienated its audience, it did so only momentarily. It significantly diminished the gap between artists and their public in one important way: United States galleries, exhibitions, and collections grew in earnest. Total sales from the Armory Show amounted to $44,148.15, and many of the principal buyers later donated their collections to form the nucleus of several prominent museums, including the Museum of Modern Art, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and portions of the Chicago Art Institute. Galleries opened their doors to experimental art, and modernism, as presented by the Europeans, became the established code of twentieth-century art. Artists readjusted then, not only because of the exhilaration many experienced in new innovation, but because the art market changed dramatically. There was a new class of consumers, only recently aware of the new currents, and the market seemed limitless.[50]

In this respect, the Armory Show may have provided its greatest service, for it clearly established modernism as

an unequivocable force in this century. Although the introspection artists employed led them to abandon traditional ideas of technical skill, refinements of color and tone, and naturalistic representation, their viewers did not remain estranged. With the growth of modernism and its eventual acceptance, the new language became comprehensible to critics and other artists alike. It no longer appeared individualistic to the point of anarchy. Not only did the Armory Show serve as the vehicle for introducing the new aesthetic to the United States, it reeducated the public's assumptions about art, and it initiated a new climate of opinion that favored experimentation. "More thinking has been devoted to painting . . . since the Armory Show than in the preceding century and a quarter of our existence as a nation," Mather noted. The exhibition, thus, accelerated the avant-garde movements in the United States.[51]

But the Armory Show also cut short the realist movement in the United States, as typified by Henri's circle. With the emergence of modernism, variations as slight as modified subject matter seemed naive. The exhibition destroyed Henri's authority as the leading figure in American art. Ernest Lawson joined the National Academy when many abandoned it; Davies involved himself in the new tendencies but later retreated to his favorite themes of nymphs and moonlight; Maurice Prendergast thought

there was too much " 'Oh-my-God' art" at the Armory Show to embrace fully its directives; and Luks never strayed from his training from Henri. John Sloan cautiously dabbled in modernism, for he found it hard to ignore, and disregarded Henri's teachings, but he did not completely neglect his earlier skills. After 1913, the Eight did not command much attention; "something fatal had happened to them."[52]

On a broader scale, Kuhn asserted that the exhibition affected the entire American culture. "The decorative elements of Matisse and the cubists were immediately taken on as models of a brighter, more lively America . . . Brancusi went into everything from milliner's dummies to streamline trains," he wrote. With the advent of a consumer culture in the 1920s and the simultaneous rise of American advertising, elements of modernist designs appeared regularly in the publicity of department stores and big business. On the day the Armory Show closed, Wannamaker's Department Store in New York announced that "at last the modern spirit is developing in the realm of women's dress." Designers created "cubist fabrics" and "futuristic cretonnes." Kuhn credited the Armory Show for this display:

> The exhibition affected . . . the apparel of men and women, the stage, automobiles, airplanes, interior decorations, beauty parlors, advertising . . . plumbing, hardware--everything from the modernist designs of gas pumps and added color of beach

> umbrellas and bathing suits, down to the merchandise of the dime store.

This attests to the acceptance and absorption of modernism not only in native art, but in other fields as well. Even after it closed, Kuhn said that the Armory Show "kept right on going, and is going better than ever today."[53]

Critics lambasted the Armory Show for its decadent figures, its "foreign language," and its individualistic expression, but it ushered in a new epoch for American art. Once and for all, the conventions of the nineteenth century and the National Academy of Design were dead. Eventually, native artists and their audience absorbed and sustained the doctrine of modernism and redefined the parameters of native aesthetic standards. What appeared to many critics in 1913 as an exhibition of charlatans and iconoclasts became the theater of a national revolution in art and ideology. In 1913, The Globe reported, "American art will never be the same again."[54]

CHAPTER IV ENDNOTES

1. "Bedlam in Art," Current Opinion 54 (April 1913): 316.

2. See Milton W. Brown, The Story of the Armory Show (New York: Abbeville Press, 1988) 177; Mabel Dodge Luhan, Movers and Shakers (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1936) 26, 36; Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., "Old and New Art," The Nation 96 (6 March 1913): 241-242; and Bruce St. John, John Sloan's New York Scene: From the Diaries, Notes, and Correspondence 1906-1913 (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), 633.

3. Brown, The Story, 48.

4. Ibid.

5. Davies was the only member of the Eight to visit Steiglitz's modernist shows at 291. See Barbara Rose, American Art Since 1900 (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1967), 69.

6. Brown, The Story, 49.

7. Rose, American Art Since 1900, 68.

8. Ibid.

9. Brown, The Story, 54. Also, Bennard B. Perlman, The Immortal Eight (New York: Exposition Press, 1962), 208.

10. Jerome Myers, Artist in Manhattan (New York: American Artists Group, Inc., 1940), 35.

11. Jerome Mellquist, The Emergence of an American Art (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942), 219.

12. Walt Kuhn, "The Story of the Armory Show," Arts Magazine 58 (Summer 1984), 138.

13. Ibid, 139.

14. Ibid, 139-140; Brown, The Story, 61-62; and Perlman, Immortal Eight, 211. The armory was nearly brand new; it was erected in 1904. Contributors to the AAPS

included Mrs. Harry Paine Whitney, Dorothy Whitney Straight, Clara Davidge, and Gertrude Vanderbilt. See Brown, The Story, 90-91.

15. Werner Haftmann, Painting in the Twentieth Century Vol. 1: An Analysis of the Artists and Their Work (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961), 162. See also Rose, American Art Since 1900, 69.

16. Kuhn, "The Story of the Armory Show," 139.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. For an actual count of the artworks Kuhn and Davies secured, see Brown, The Story, 79.

20. Myers, Artist in Manhattan, 36.

21. Brown, The Story, 92.

22. Ibid.

23. See Abraham A. Davidson, Early American Modernist Painting 1910-1935 (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1981), 163-166.

24. Ibid.

25. Kuhn, "The Story of the Armory Show," 140. See also Brown, The Story, 66.

26. Brown, The Story, 78, 82.

27. Ibid, 58. For Myers's account, see Myers, Artist in Manhattan, 37.

28. Milton W. Brown, The Story, 103; and Perlman, Immortal Eight, 212.

29. Brown, The Story, 73.

30. Myers, Artist in Manhattan, 35.

31. John I. H. Baur, Revolution and Tradition in Modern American Art (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 6.

32. William D. MacColl, "The International Exhibition of Modern Art: An Impression," The Forum 50 (July 1913): 24.

33. Brown, The Story, 109. See also Mather, Jr., "Old and New Art," 241.

34. Quoted in Rudi Blesh, Modern Art USA: Men, Rebellion, Conquest 1900-1956 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 51.

35. See Brown, The Story, 163; Mather, Jr., "Old and New Art," 241; and Theodore Roosevelt, "A Layman's View of an Art Exhibition," The Outlook 103 (29 March 1913): 719.

36. Jerome Mellquist, The Emergence of an American Art, 224. See also Brown, The Story, 158-159; and Peninah R. Y. Petruck, "American Art Criticism: 1910-1939" (Ph.D. diss, New York University, 1979), 80-81.

37. Mather, Jr., "Old and New Art," 240-243; Mather, Jr., "The Armory Exhibition," 267-268; Mather, Jr., "The Academy Exhibition," 317-318.

38. Mellquist, The Emergence of an American Art, 224.

39. Brown, The Story, 93.

40. Ibid, 180. See also H. Wayne Morgan, New Muses: Art in American Culture 1865-1920 (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 163; and Petruck, "American Art Criticism: 1910-1939," 44.

41. Gabriele Buffet, "Modern Art and the Public," Camera Work n.v.(June 1913): 10-11. Others also attempted to determine the meaning of the new art. John Quinn, lawyer to the AAPS, wrote to a friend: " 'When one leaves the exhibition . . . one goes outside and sees the lights streaking up and down the tall buildings and watches their shadows, and feels that the pictures that one has seen inside after all have some relation to the life and color and rhythem and movement that one sees outside.' " See Morgan, The New Muses, 177-178.

42. Kenyon Cox, "Artist and Public," Scribner's 55 (April 1914): 518. Petruck, "American Art Critism," 63. Also, Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., Estimates in Art (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931), 319-320.

43. Brown, The Story, 136, 163; Mather, Jr., "Old and New Art," 241; Mellquist, The Emergence of an American Art, 222; Blesh, Modern Art USA, 51; Morgan, The New Muses, 172; and Petruck, "American Art Criticism: 1910-1939," 84-85.

44. Brown, The Story, 136-137. See also Van Wyck Brooks, "John Sloan and the Armory Show," Arts Digest 29 (1 February 1955): 35; and Perlman, Immortal Eight, 216.

45. Milton W. Brown, American Painting from the Armory Show to the Depression (New York: Princeton University Press, 1955), 53. See also Royal Cortissoz, American Artists (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), 3.

46. Mather, Jr., "Old and New Art," 164; Brown, American Painting, 56; and Brown The Story, 164.

47. Cortissoz, American Artists, 323; Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., "Newest Tendencies in Art," The Independent 74 (6 March 1913): 509. See also Cox, "Artist and Public," 512; and Barbara Novak, American Painting of the Nineteenth Century: Realism, Idealism, and the American Experience (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969), 264-265.

48. Blesh, Modern Art USA, 57; "The Mob as Art Critic," Literary Digest 46 (29 March 1913): 708; and "Bedlam in Art," Current Opinion 54 (April 1913), 316.

49. Myers, Artist in Manhattan, 18, 36; Walter Pach, Queer Thing, Painting: Forty Years in the World of Art (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1938), 201.

50. For an account of the Armory Show's total sales, see Brown, The Story, 97.

51. Mather, Jr., Estimates in Art, 325. Also see Bernard S. Myers, Modern Art in the Making (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), 394-395.

52. Van Wyck Brooks, "John Sloan and the Armory Show," Arts Digest 29 (1 February 1955): 7, 35; and Mahonri Young, The Eight (New York: Williams Proctor Institute, 1971), 8, 37, 89. If Henri never directly reacted to the new European movements, his legacy made a significant contribution to twentieth-century American art. By 1917, Who's Who in Art listed over one hundred of Henri's students, many of whom became notable modernists themselves, like Stuart Davis. See Perlman, Immortal Eight, 217.

53. Kuhn, "The Story of the Armory Show," 141; and Blesh, Modern Art USA, 67.

54. Brown, The Story, 109.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In his study of American artists, Royal Cortissoz relates a story of the artist James McNeil Whistler telling one of his students, " 'there never was an artistic period . . . there never was an art-loving nation.' "[1] But certainly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries American art surpassed Whistler's analysis and established a brief period of dynamic interchange and fervent activity. The rise of various groups hoping to surmount the authority of the National Academy of Design created an era of artistic experimentation. The Society of American Artists, the Ten, the Eight, and the Association of American Painters and Sculptors struggled for artistic autonomy, but it was only in 1913 at the Armory Show that the insurgent bodies prevailed. The Armory Show was the catalyst for establishing a new artistic period that significantly altered an academic heritage and redefined the artist's role.

The succession of insurgent groups who hoped to overcome academic conventions began in the late nineteenth century. The Society of American Artists formed in 1877 to

ensure that artists familiar with the movements abroad, especially those activities in Paris and Munich, gained public exposure and exhibition space. When the Academy refused to accept these artists, they exhibited as an independent body. Their rebellion was significant in that subsequent groups, discontent with academic rules, followed this example. However, members of the Society quickly became intolerant of any artistic expression that strayed from Impressionism and when the National Academy institutionalized the tenets of that movement, the two bodies merged.

"The Ten" formed in 1897 to protest the exclusive exhibition practices of the Academy. Hoping to show their artwork in a favorable environment unhindered by formal policy, the Ten sought an open atmosphere of "no juries, no prizes"--a clear departure from the academic experience of selecting works of merit from among the applicants and then awarding them various prizes. Like the Society, the Ten were Impressionists, but a much smaller group. The number of their members never exceeded the original roster, thereby excluding many sympathetic talents.

In 1908, Robert Henri and seven of his followers showed their work at a New York gallery. Known simply as "the Eight," these men painted lower Manhattan street scenes in a hurried manner. As such, they neither produced a revolution nor contributed any prolonged significance,

except in continuing the independent revolt begun by the Society of American Artists. The Eight were anti-academic in general, and a few of their members later organized the Armory Show, but their relevance rests in pursuing the struggle for artistic autonomy.

Finally, the Armory Show of 1913 overcame past conventions and established a new era for American artists. Its modernist element received a barrage of critical condemnation, but it succeeded in introducing an entirely novel aesthetic formula. Modernism asserted that artists create works from an interior vision, a position that stressed artistic individuality. The Armory Show redefined American art in modernist terms, and invoked a new meaning of the spiritual assumptions about art. The Academy's domination perished and the aesthetic reeducation of patrons, critics, and public began.

One of the primary distinctions modernism introduced was an alternative meaning for art's spiritual nature. Throughout the nineteenth century, artists believed in the spiritual properties art maintained. For most, art served as a component of worship; that is, majestic landscapes reflected God's glory and the relative insignificance of man. Emerson believed in art's transcendence, as did critic Edward Dangerfield, who denounced modernism for its sacrilegious presentation of the world. This position helped explain the necessary importance that nineteenth-

century artists create works of "beauty." The Impressionists and the Ten of 1897 recorded a more visible landscape, by painting only the things they actually saw. Although sunlight appeared in their work, it was not a tangible representation of a holy omnipotence, as the Luminists interpreted it.

With the Eight, the spiritual role of art assumed a more human arena. The Eight stopped looking heavenward and painted the dispossessed figures of the slums. These men turned humanistic in their painting, finding dignity and honor in the celebration of the impoverished. In their art, all previous references to spirituality disappear--the Eight did not paint the usual divine attributes of sunlight or landscapes; instead, they replaced the rural landscape with an urban one. By portraying the working classes as the only example of God's handiwork amid a decadent man-made environment, the Henri group elevated the poor to a heavenly position.

Finally, modernism brought the spiritual nature of art to the internal source of the artist. The movement asserted that the other-worldly references of the nineteenth century as well as the earthly vision of the Eight no longer sufficed in the early twentieth century. Artists must redefine the parameters of their art on a personal level and diagnose their particular consciousness with paint and canvas. Self-expression now relied on the

interior world of the artist and drastically reformed the older values. Gabriele Buffet's argument, with its insistence that modern artists communicate their individual reality not to an audience, but to a canvas, testified to the new role of artistic consciousness. Marcel Duchamp, whose Nude Descending a Staircase scandalized the Armory Show, believed in the "transcendence" modern art could achieve, which indicated that artists still expected their art to conduct a spiritual function. The nature of that project, however, was now self-expression.[2]

The struggle for artistic autonomy characterized the years from 1877 to 1913. Beginning with the Society of American Artists, native artists organized their independent exhibitions to counter the academic limitations imposed by national institutions. Whether their rebellion emphasized stylistic variations, as did the Society and the Eight, or exhibition opportunities, as the AAPS and the Ten championed, these groups sought more individuality and freedom of expression. By 1913, they succeeded in destroying conventional authority.

It was interesting to note that from the establishment of the Society of American Artists to the organization of the Armory Show, American independent associations largely imported new movements from abroad. Impressionism existed in Munich and Paris long before the Society and the Ten adopted its tenets. Modernism, especially as the Armory

Show presented it, had few attentive followers in the United States until the 1913 exhibition introduced it on a grand scale. The Steiglitz circle was no exception, for it fostered a modernist agenda protracted from the European shows at 291. Only the Eight were distinctly American. They painted local subjects in a style derived from the hurried practices of newspaper illustrators, and while they were not modernists, they presented an urban realism closely aligned to American literature at the time. After the Armory Show, some native artists devised a hybrid style that incorporated European modernist elements with certain native features. But from the beginning, rebellious groups gathered their anti-academic movements from the ateliers abroad.

The independents continued to gain momentum even after the Armory Show closed. In 1914, Walt Pach again traveled to Europe to collect samples of the new movement for another New York exhibition, but the war intervened. However, successive attempts produced a litany of accomplishments like the 1915 Friends of the Young Artists. In 1916, the Forum Exhibition of Modern American Painters appeared and the Society of Independent Artists formed. In 1917, the New York Independent Show opened, further exposing the American avant-garde. In 1918, the Whitney Studio Club began showing younger artists and eventually consolidated in 1931 into the Whitney Museum of American

Art. In 1920, Marcel Duchamp, Katherine S. Drier, and Man Ray created the Societe Anonyme for the advancement of free expression.[3]

World War I also contributed to the advancement of the avant-garde. The conflict interrupted artistic education as many academies, especially those in Europe often attended by American artists, closed for the war's duration. This phenomenon forced artists into isolation requiring that they rely on their own ingenuity and creative resources. In effect, the war continued the artist's search for autonomy introduced by the Armory Show. It is important to note that the transformation of American art from an academic exercise to an expression of individuality had already occurred by 1914. Modernism preceded the war, and was not a result of its dynamics.[4]

Through the rebellions of independent groups, American art evolved from its prescribed traditions to an open forum for artists to assert their autonomy. The Armory Show was responsible for the final eradication of the academic ideology, but several insurgents contributed. It is difficult today to predict what direction twentieth-century American art might have taken without the foundation of the Armory Show and the introduction of modernism. Certainly contemporary artists still respond to the modernist values. The legacy of the exhibition also continues in American museums, shows, galleries, studios, and art reviews. Walt

Kuhn's statement that the Armory Show never ended remains a fact of American culture.

CHAPTER V ENDNOTES

1. Royal Cortissoz, American Artists (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), 315.

2. Martin Green, New York 1913: The Armory Show and the Paterson Strike Pageant (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1988), 73.

3. Walter Pach, Queer Thing, Painting: Forty Years in the World of Art (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1938), 394-395.

4. Eliot Clark, History of the National Academy of Design 1825-1953 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), 169. Similarly, Henry F. May argues that the end of American innocence occurred prior to the war, and was not caused by it. See Henry F. May, The End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Time 1912-1917 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1959).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

"About an American School of Art." Scribner's Magazine 10 (July 1875): 50-66.

Alexander, John W. "Is Our Art Distinctly American?" Century Magazine 87 (April 1914): 826-828.

American Association of Painters and Sculptors. The Armory Show: International Exhibition of Modern Art 1913. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

"An Opportunity to Study New Art Tendancies." The Outlook 1 (March 1913): 466-7.

"Art as a Steady Diet." Scribner's Magazine 17 (January 1879): 438-439.

"Art in New York This Season." The Craftsman 24 (April 1913): 134-136.

"Art Study Abroad." The Nation 3 (6 September 1866): 195-196.

Barrell, Charles Wisner. "The Real Drama of the Slums: As Told in John Sloan's Etching." The Craftsman 15 (February 1909): 559-564.

"Bedlam in Art." Current Opinion 54 (April 1913): 316-317.

Bishop, William H. "Young Artists' Life in New York." Scribner's Magazine 19 (January 1880): 355-368.

Blashfield, Edwin Howland. "The Actual State of Art Among Us." North American Review 191 (1910): 322-329.

Bluemner, Oscar. "Audiator et Altera Pars: Some Plain Sense on the Modern Art Movement." Camera Work n.v. (June 1913): 25-38.

Blumenschein, Ernest L. "The Painting of Tomorrow." Century Magazine 87 (April 1914): 845-850.

Brinton, Christian. "The New Spirit in American Painting." The Bookman 27 (June 1908): 351-361.

Brownell, William C. "The Art Schools of New York." Scribner's Magazine 18 (September 1879): 737-750.

Buffet, Gabriele. "Modern Art and the Public." Camera Work n.v. (June 1913): 10-14.

Child, Theodore. "American Artists at the Paris Exhibition." Harper's Monthly 79 (September 1889): 489-521.

"Common Sense in Art." The Crayon 1 (7 February 1855): 77-83.

Cortissoz, Royal. "Egotism in Contemporary Art." Atlantic Monthly 73 (May 1894): 644-652.

Cox, Kenyan. "Artist and Public." Scribner's Magazine (April 1914): 512-20.

_____. "The Modern Spirit in Art." Harper's Weekly 15 (15 March 1913): 10.

de Casseres, Benjamin. "The Renaissance of the Irrational." Camera Work n.v. (June 1913): 22-24.

de Zayas, Marius. "The New Art in Paris." Camera Work n.v. (April-July 1911): 29-34.

Edgerton, Giles [Mary Fanton Roberts]. "Is America Selling her Birthright in Art for a Mess of Pottage: Significance of this Year's Exhibit at the Pennsylvania Academy." The Craftsman 11 (March 1907): 657-670.

_____. "Pioneers in Modern American Art: A Group of Men Whose Influence had Greatly Aided its Development." The Craftsman 14 (September 1908): 596-606.

_____. "What Does the National Academy of Design Stand For: Has it at Present a Value to the American Art Public?" The Craftsman 15 (February 1909): 520-532.

_____. "The Younger American Painters: Are They Creating a National Art?" The Craftsman 13 (February 1908): 512-532.

"Fifty-Eighth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design." The Nation 36 (19 April 1883): 349.

"Forty-Second Exhibition of the National Academy of Design." The Nation 4 (2 May 1867): 358-359.

Fraser, W. Lewis. "Sergeant Kendall." Century Magazine 50 (July 1895): 476-478.

Gallup, Donald, ed. The Flowers of Friendship: Letters Written to Gertrude Stein. New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1953.

Garczynski, Edward Rudolf. "Jugglery in Art." The Forum 1 (August 1886): 592-602.

"The Greatest Exhibition of Insurgent Art Ever Held." Current Opinion 54 (March 1913): 230-232.

Gregg, Frederick James. "A Remarkable Art Show." Harper's Weekly 126 (15 February 1913): 13-16.

_____. "The Attitude of the Americans." Arts and Decoration 5 (March 1913): 165-167.

H., S. "Studio Talk." International Studio 30 (December 1906): 182-183.

Hambidge, John and Gove Hambidge. "The Ancestry of Cubism." Century Magazine 87 (April 1914): 869-875.

Hapgood, Hutchins. A Victorian in the Modern World. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939.

Harrison, Birge. "The Future of American Art." North American Review 189 (January 1909): 24-34.

Harrison, Frederic. "Decadence in Modern Art." Forum 15 (June 1893): 428-438.

Hartman, Sadakichi. "The American Picture World: Its Shows and Shams." The Forum 44 (September 1910): 295-304.

"Henri Matisse at the Little Galleries." Camera Work n.v. (July 1908): 10-12.

Henri, Robert. The Art Spirit. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1923.

_____. "Progress in Our National Art Must Spring From the Development of Individuality of Ideas and Freedom of Expression: A Suggestion for a New Art School." The Craftsman 15 (January 1909): 387-401.

_____. "The New York Exhibition of Independent Artists." The Craftsman 18 (May 1910): 160-172.

"The International Art Exhibition." The Nation 96 (20 February 1913): 174.

Isham, Samuel G. "French Painting at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century." Scribner's Magazine 38 (September 1905): 383-385.

James, Henry. "Our Artists in Europe." Harper's Monthly 79 (June 1889): 50-66.

Kans, Als Ik. "Notes and Reviews." The Craftsman 14 (June 1908): 340-345.

_____. "Notes and Reviews." The Craftsman 18 (May 1910): 290-292.

Kuhn, Walter. "The Story of the Armory Show." Arts Magazine 58 (Summer 1984): 138-141.

Luhan, Mabel Dodge. Movers and Shakers. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1936.

MacColl, William D. "The International Exhibition of Modern Art: An Impression." The Forum 50 (July 1913): 24-36.

Mather, F. J., Jr. "The Academy Exhibition." The Nation 96 (27 March 1913): 317-8.

_____. "The Armory Exhibition." The Nation 96 (13 March 1913): 267-268.

_____. "Newest Tendencies in Art." The Independent 74 (6 March 1913): 504-512.

_____. "Old and New Art." The Nation 96 (6 March 1913): 240-243.

Millet, Francis D. "What Are Americans Doing in Art?" Century Magazine 42 (November 1891): 46-49.

"The Mob as Art Critic." Literary Digest 46 (29 March 1913): 708-709.

Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute. Armory Show: Fiftieth Anniversary Exhibition 1913-1963. New York: Clarke and Way, Inc., 1963.

Myers, Jerome. Artist in Manhattan. New York: American Artist Group, Inc., 1940.

"Notes." The Nation 24 (5 April 1877): 207.

"Notes." The Nation 24 (14 June 1877): 352.

"The Old and the New." The Outlook 103 (1 March 1913): 467.

Pach, Walter. "The Point of View of the Moderns." The Century (April 1914): 851-64.

_____. Queer Thing, Painting: Forty Years in the World of Art. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1938.

"The Progress of Painting in America." North American Review 124 (May 1877): 452-464.

Robinson, Theodore. "Claude Monet." Century Magazine 44 (September 1892): 696-701.

Roosevelt, Theodore. "A Layman's View of an Art Exhibition." The Outlook 103 (29 March 1913): 718-720.

Sloan, John. Gist of Art. New York: American Artist Group, 1939.

St. John, Bruce, ed. John Sloan's New York Scene: From the Diaries, Notes, and Correspondence 1906-1913. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

[Stein, Leo.] "Panic in Art." New Republic 1 (7 November 1914): 20-21.

Sturgis, Russell Jr. "American Painters: The National Academy Exhibition." The Galaxy 4 (June 1867): 226-236.

Triggs, Oscar Lovell. "Democratic Art." The Forum 26 (September 1898): 66-79.

"Turner's Slave Ship." Scribner's Monthly 4 (June 1872): 250.

Waern, Cecilia. "Some Notes on French Impressionism." Atlantic Monthly 69 (April 1892): 535-541.

Wallace, Horace Binney. Unsigned review of Scenery and Philosophy in Europe: Being Fragments from the Portfolio of Horace Binney Wallace. In North American Review 81 (July 1855): 212-244.

Weir, John F. "Popular Art-Education." North American Review 132 (January 1881): 64-78.

Secondary Sources

Books

Aaron, Daniel, ed. America in Crisis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

Atkins, Robert. Artspeak: A Guide to Contemporary Ideas, Movements, and Buzzwords. New York: Abbeville Press, 1990.

Baur, John I. H. Revolution and Tradition in Modern American Art. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Blesh, Rudi. Modern Art USA: Men, Rebellion, Conquest 1900-1956. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Boswell, Peyton, Jr. George Bellows. New York: Crown Publishers, 1942.

Braider, Donald. George Bellows and the Ashcan School of Painting. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971.

Brinnin, John Malcolm. The Third Rose: Gertrude Stein and Her World. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1959.

Brooks, Van Wyck. John Sloan: A Painter's Life. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1955.

Brown, Milton W. American Art to 1900: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1977.

_____. American Painting from the Armory Show to the Depression. New York: Princeton University Press, 1955.

_____. The Modern Spirit: American Painting 1908-35. London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1977.

_____. The Story of the Armory Show. New York: Abbeville Press, 1988.

Cahill, Holger. American Painting and Sculpture, 1862-1932. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, (c. 1932).

Cheney, Sheldon. The Story of Modern Art. New York: The Viking Press, 1947.

Clark, Eliot. History of the National Academy of Design, 1825-1953. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Cortissoz, Royal. American Artists. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

_____. Arthur B. Davies. New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1931.

Daval, Jean-Luc. Modern Art: The Decisive Years 1884-1914. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1979.

Davidson, Abraham A. Early American Modernist Painting 1910-35. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1981.

Doezema, Marianne. American Realism and the Industrial Age. Cleveland: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1980.

Duffus, R. L. The American Renaissance. New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 1928.

Encyclopedia of World Art, 1959 ed. S. v. "Americas: Art Since Columbus."

Encyclopedia of World Art, 1959 ed. S. v. "Modernism."

Farnham, Emily. Charles Demuth: Behind a Laughing Mask. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.

Fry, Edward F. Cubism. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1966.

Gablik, Suzi. Has Modernism Failed? New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1984.

Gerdts, William H. American Impressionism. New York: Artabras Publishers, 1984.

Glackens, Ira. William Glackens and the Ashcan Group: The Emergence of Realism in American Art. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1957.

Goodrich, Lloyd. Pioneers in Modern American Art: The Decade of the Armory Show 1910-1920. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1963.

_____. Three Centuries of American Art. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1966.

Green, Martin. New York 1913: The Armory Show and the Patterson Strike Pageant. New York: Charles Scribner's, 1988.

Haftmann, Werner. Painting in the Twentieth Century Vol 1: An Analysis of the Artists and Their Work. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961.

Harris, Neil. The Artist in American Society: The Formative Years 1790-1860. 2d. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Homer, William Innes. Alfred Steiglitz and the American Avant-Garde. Boston: New York Graphic Society, 1977.

Jones, Howard Mumford. O Strange New World: American Culture, the Formative Years. New York: The Viking Press, 1964.

Landgren, M. E. Years of Art: The Story of the Art Students League of New York. New York: Robert M. McBride and Company, 1940.

Link, Arthur S., Robert V. Remini, Douglas Greenberg, and Robert C. MacMath, Jr. A Concise History of the American People. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1984.

Lucie-Smith, Edward. Dictionary of Art Terms. New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1984.

Mather, F. J., Jr. Estimates in Art. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931.

Matthiessen, F. O. American Renaissance, Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman. New York: n. p., 1941.

May, Henry F. The End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Time 1912-1917. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1959.

McShine, Kynaston, ed. The Natural Paradise: Painting in America 1800-1950. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1976.

Mellquist, James. The Emergence of an American Art. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942.

Morgan, Charles H. George Bellows: Painter of America. New York: Reynal and Company, 1965.

Morgan, H. Wayne. New Muses: Art in American Culture 1865-1920. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978.

Mumford, Lewis. The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America 1865-1895. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931.

Myers, Bernard S. Modern Art in the Making. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Myers, Jerome. An Artist in Manhattan. New York: American Artists Group, 1940.

Nash, Roderick, ed. The Call of the Wild: 1900-1916. New York: George Braziller, 1970.

Norman, Dorothy. Alfred Steiglitz: An American Seer. New York: Aperture Foundation, Inc., 1990.

Novak, Barbara. American Painting of the Nineteenth Century: Realism, Idealism, and the American Experience. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.

Perlman, Bennard B. The Immortal Eight. New York: Exposition Press, 1962.

Prown, Jules David. American Painting: From its Beginnings to the Armory Show. New York: Rizzoli, 1978.

Reed, Herbert. A Concise History of Modern Painting. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1959.

Rose, Barbara. American Art Since 1900. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

_____. Readings in American Art 1900-1975. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Rosenfeld, Paul. Port of New York: Essays on Fourteen American Moderns. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1942.

Rosenstone, Robert A. Romantic Revolutionary: A Biography of John Reed. New York: Vintage Press, 1972.

Rudnick, Lois Palkan. Mabel Dodge Luhan: New Woman, New Worlds. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.

Saylor, Oliver M., ed. Revolt in the Arts: A Survey of the Creation, Distribution and Appreciation of Art in America. New York: Brentano's, 1930.

Scott, David. John Sloan. New York: Watson-Guptill Publications, 1975.

Sontag, Susan. A Susan Sontag Reader. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, Inc., 1982.

Stearns, H. E., ed. Civilization in the United States: An Inquiry by Thirty Americans. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922.

Young, Mahonri Sharp. The Eight: The Realist Revolt in American Painting. New York: Watson-Guptill Publications, 1973.

Articles

Brooks, Van Wyck. "John Sloan and the Armory Show." Arts Digest 29 (1 February 1955): 6-8, 35.

Kruty, Paul. "Arthur Jerome Eddy and His Collection: Prelude and Postscript to the Armory Show." Arts Magazine 61 (February 1987): 40-47.

Marvin, George. "Gutzon Borglum." World's Work 28 (June 1914): 200-217.

Mellquist, James. "The Armory Show Thirty Years Later." Magazine of Art 36 (December 1943): 298-301.

Watson, F. "The All-American Nineteen." Arts (January 1930): 301-311.

Unpublished Material

Petruck, Peninah R. Y. "American Art Criticism: 1910-1939." Ph. D. diss., New York University, 1979.

VITA

James H. Harbison

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE SEARCH FOR AUTONOMY: REBELLION IN AMERICAN ART 1877-1913

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Muskogee, Oklahoma, April 5, 1965, the son of Howard A. and Betty Harbison.

Education: Graduated from Muskogee High School, Muskogee, Oklahoma, in May, 1983; received Bachelor of Arts in History from Trinity University at San Antonio, Texas, in May, 1987; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1993.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of History, Oklahoma State University, January, 1989, to May, 1991.