

Spring 2-18-2019

Defining Authentic: The Relationship Between Native Art and Federal Indian Policy, 1879-1961

Aurora Kenworthy
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/honorsthesis>

 Part of the [American Art and Architecture Commons](#), [Art Education Commons](#), [Cultural History Commons](#), [Ethnic Studies Commons](#), [Indigenous Studies Commons](#), [Law and Politics Commons](#), [Legal Commons](#), [Legal History Commons](#), [Legislation Commons](#), [Other History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Kenworthy, Aurora, "Defining Authentic: The Relationship Between Native Art and Federal Indian Policy, 1879-1961" (2019). *Honors Theses, University of Nebraska-Lincoln*. 97.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/honorsthesis/97>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Program at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses, University of Nebraska-Lincoln by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Defining Authentic:
The Relationship Between Native Art and Federal Indian Policy,
1879-1961

An Undergraduate Honors Thesis
Submitted in partial fulfillment of University Honors Program Requirements
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

by
Aurora Skye Kenworthy, BA
History
College of Arts and Sciences

February 18, 2019

Faculty Mentors:
Katrina Jagodinsky, PhD, History
Wendy Katz, PhD, Art History

Abstract

Between 1879 and 1961, non-Native perceptions of what constituted authentic Native art shifted. These changing perceptions were influenced by, and then in turn influenced, federal policy and legislation. While non-Native individuals and groups worked to improve conditions for Native communities and to protect “authentic” Native art forms, Native reformers also attempted to enact change to help Native communities and Native artists exercised control over their own art and identity.

Key Words: Native art; federal Indian policy; art education; Southwest art; Santa Fe Railroad; Indian New Deal; Native artists; Indian Arts and Crafts Act; Indian Arts and Crafts Board; Institute of American Indian Arts

Appreciation

This thesis represents a culmination of my work as an undergraduate, but it would not have been possible without immense support. Both of my faculty mentors undoubtedly contributed to my success. Even before my thesis, Dr. Jagodinsky played a role in nurturing my desire to pursue history as a major. As my thesis advisor, Dr. Jagodinsky provided a foundation for my analysis and consistently provided feedback and suggestions throughout the process. Dr. Katz also provided great help and gave many suggestions for sources that proved critical in my analysis.

I would like to thank my parents for their support, not just on this project, but in every endeavor I have embarked on. They offered fresh eyes, grammar and spelling suggestions, and formatting ideas for my thesis, but have offered their encouragement, their advice, and their love throughout my life. I would also like to thank my sister, Celeste. She contributed to this project by checking out library books, providing feedback, and listening to me talk constantly about the details of this thesis, but she has made an unmeasurable contribution to my life as my best friend.

Defining Authentic:

The Relationship Between Native Art and Federal Indian Policy, 1879-1961

In the shadows of the First World War and before United States involvement in the Second, Americans searched for a national identity. From this search for identity came the search for a purely American art form, a distinctive form that rejected European avant-garde and traditional ideas of fine art. Some believed that Regionalism represented this truly American art form. Five years after completing *American Gothic*, Grant Wood wrote that “[American] painting has declared its independence from Europe, and is retreating from the cities to the more American village and country life. The American public, which used to be interested solely in foreign and imitative work, has readily acquired a strong interest in the distinctly indigenous art of its own land.”¹

While the demand for Regionalism was driven by a desire to define a national identity, it was also a response to the perception that regional “character” was disappearing and would be replaced by generic modern uniformity.² In this way, the motivations of Regionalism, to protect and document regional differences that were thought to be vanishing, are similar to the belief in the “vanishing Indian” and the subsequent desire to protect and document cultural differences, specifically Native art. Further, while Wood and other Regionalists found their idea of a purely American form of art in the rural Midwest, others believed that Native art represented an ideal national art form because of the perceived isolation of the Native artists from European influences and the demand for art that connected with an American past.³

¹ Grant Wood, *Revolt Against the City* (Iowa City: Frank Luther Mott, 1935), 4.

² Molly H. Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace: Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2001), 94.

³ *Ibid*, 91.

It is important to note that the willingness to accept Native art as a form of art for national identity stems from the view of successful conquest and thus, in turn, allows for the concept of the “vanishing Indian.” Sylvia Rodriguez argues that Native communities “went from subhuman to sublime more or less as their numbers and military threat diminished.”⁴ Rodriguez also argues that the U.S. followed a pattern in that “each large nation [in the Americas] has taken the arts of its crushed former people and erected them as symbols of ‘national ethnicity’ to distinguish each from the other, and all of them from their European homelands.”⁵ In other words, the acceptance of Native art as a form of national identity only occurred after Native communities were viewed as conquered and disappearing. Similarly, Native art gained attention and popularity only as it was viewed as the disappearing art forms of a disappearing people.

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, perceptions regarding what qualified as “authentic” Native art changed. This paper begins with boarding school policies that destroyed Native identities and cultures, including art and then addresses how these policies, when combined with Southwest tourism, created the conditions for salvage ethnography in the 1920s. This paper then examines Native participation in reform and perceptions of Native art prior to the New Deal. The codification of white definitions of Native art through the Indian Arts and Crafts Board is discussed in the context of the Indian New Deal and a discussion of Native critiques and responses to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board is included. Finally, this paper addresses shifting perceptions of Native art in the period leading up to the Institute of American Indian Arts.

⁴ Sylvia Rodriguez, “Art, Tourism, and Race Relations in Taos: Toward a Sociology of the Art Colony,” *Journal of Anthropological Research* 45, no. 1 (Spring 1989): 93.

⁵ Rodriguez, “Art, Tourism, and Race Relations in Taos,” 92.

Ultimately, non-Native perceptions of what constituted authentic Native art shifted from the 1870s to the 1960s. These changing perceptions were influenced by, and then influenced, federal policy and legislation. While non-Native individuals and groups worked to improve conditions for Native communities and to protect “authentic” Native art forms, Native reformers also attempted to enact change to help Native communities and Native artists exercised creative control over their own art and identity.

Art, Assimilation, and Boarding School Curriculum

At the turn of the twentieth century, the federal government focused on a policy of assimilation and an education system dedicated to destroying Native identities and culture. In response to nineteenth-century ideas of art as a means to promote personal and societal virtues, policy makers and educators accepted art as a means to reach assimilationist goals. Following changes in federal policy, “Native industries,” like weaving, pottery, and basketry, were introduced to the curriculum because these art forms aligned with changing federal policy.

Assimilation and Art

In 1879, Captain Richard Henry Pratt established The United States Indian Industrial School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, marking a new attempt at assimilation. Previous attempts at assimilation through education at day schools and boarding schools on reservations were considered failures because of the continued influence of parents and community on Native students. Off-reservation boarding schools like the Indian Industrial School in Carlisle strived to “remove children from the isolating, tribalizing influence of the reservation and immerse them in a totally civilized environment.”⁶ This desire to isolate Native students from community

⁶ David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1995), 53.

influence was consistent with assimilation policy and was intended to destroy Native culture and identity. Boarding school policy attempted to strip away Native students' identification with tribal life and create a new, more Euro-American identity by cutting students' hair, mandating school uniforms, renaming students, giving them surnames, and forbidding tribal languages.⁷

Eliminating ties to Native culture and destroying Native identity was not enough. Thomas J. Morgan, commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1889 to 1893, proposed the teaching of elementary art skills in boarding schools as part of his assimilationist plan. In order to assimilate, Native students also needed to adopt a Euro-American paradigm of thinking. Art played a role in this endeavor. Native boarding school students "had to learn how to draw and see things from a Western perspective that did not take into account their Indigenous knowledge or social and natural environments."⁸ By focusing on Euro-American ideas of the components of art, art education changed Native perspectives. For example, in the Navajo language, there is no word for a triangle and it is likely that Navajo pupils would have had a difficult time drawing the shape. At the same time, Navajo students would probably have been able to draw hexagons with ease because of its integration in Navajo life. Even ideas of color differed among Native students and their Anglo teachers. Shades of colors that in English have only one word may have multiple words in Native languages. Conversely, some distinct colors in English, like blue and green or yellow and brown, are not distinguished in Native languages.⁹ Thus, art curriculum that emphasized ideas of shape and color that are Euro-American and codified in the English language forced Native students to change the way they viewed the world.

⁷ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 101; Brenda J. Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 28.

⁸ Marinella Lentis, *Colonized Through Art: American Indian Schools and Art Education, 1889-1915* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2017), 45.

⁹ Ibid.

Clearly, art curriculum fit into the goal of assimilation, but art education also fit with the desire of education administrators to prepare Native students for vocational trades. Art curriculum in boarding schools was justified in terms of the importance of art skills in industrial jobs. Before students were instructed in manual trades like shoemaking, tailoring, sewing, and carpentry, Native students were given basic art instruction.

Changing Philosophies

At the turn of the 20th century, federal policy was shifting. No longer were federal officials certain that assimilation was feasible and some even questioned the desirability of assimilation. In this context of changing federal policy, policy regarding Native art began to shift as well. In 1900, the Normal and Agricultural Institute in Hampton, Virginia included training in Native beadwork, basketry, and pottery for the first time.¹⁰ This integration of Native art in boarding schools like the Normal and Agricultural Institute in Hampton was due largely to the efforts of Estelle Reel, the Superintendent of Indian Schools within the Office of Indian Affairs from 1898 to 1910. Before Reel's tenure, Superintendent William N. Hailmann had suggested that teaching Native arts and crafts in the boarding school context was appropriate and necessary for the preservation of these art forms, but it was Reel who implemented these ideas in school curriculum. In 1901, Reel led the production of the first standardized and widely distributed curriculum guide entitled *Course of Study for Indian Schools*. The new curriculum focused heavily on industrial education and learning practical skills through working, but also included Native arts and crafts.

¹⁰ Robert Fay Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of New Deal Indian Policy* (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1983), 5

This change in policy was justified in two ways. The first was economic. Educators believed that by selling art and crafts, students would learn money management skills and spend their earnings on supplies that then the schools would not need to buy.¹¹ The second justification was based on the belief that Native cultural traditions were not being passed down within tribal communities, and thus cultural knowledge was being lost. The fact that federal policy and boarding schools were responsible for severing these traditional and familial ties was largely ignored. Additionally, it was not acknowledged that the reason artistic traditions were not prominent was because of policies of forced assimilation. In light of these beliefs, Reel suggested that schools take on the role of passing down cultural knowledge, especially concerning cultural production like art.¹²

New Philosophies Implemented

One of the first forms of Native art that Reel focused on was basketry. Reel's 1901 *Course of Study* includes a chapter dedicated to basket curriculum. However, while Native art curriculum was largely justified by an interest in preserving Native art forms, Reel's basket curriculum illustrates the actual failure to encourage traditional Native art forms. Reel's curriculum uses lessons written by non-Native authors like Louise Walker, Annie Firth, and Mary White and advocates the usage of Madagascar raffia, not a material traditionally used in Native basketry.¹³ Additionally, Reel rejected traditional learning processes where Native children learned art and craft techniques by watching elders in favor of curriculum that left

¹¹ Anne Ruggles Gere, "An Art of Survivance: Angel DeCora at Carlisle," *American Indian Quarterly* 28, no. 3/4 (Summer-Autumn 2004): 654.

¹² Kevin Slivka, "Art, Craft, and Assimilation: Curriculum for Native Students during the Boarding School Era," *Studies in Art Education* 52, no. 3 (Spring 2011): 237.

¹³ Elizabeth Hutchison, *The Indian Craze: Primitivism, Modernism, and Transculturation in American Art, 1890-1915* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press), 69.

children isolated from their communities and families and broke art education down into strictly structured lessons. While Reel embraced Native art in schools, she did not successfully integrate traditional art. Instead, she used non-Native methods and materials to teach a Native art form.

Following the retirement of Estelle Reel, Native art curriculum was not widely continued. Rather, only individual art programs like those run by Angel DeCora continued. Not until the 1930s when W. Carson Ryan dismantled the Uniform Code of Study and emphasized curriculum consistent with Native cultural backgrounds did widespread acceptance of Native art in education return.¹⁴

Tourism in the American Southwest

At the end of the 19th century, the development of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway established the infrastructure necessary for a robust tourist industry in the Southwest. When combined with the continuing interest in travel, particularly to National Parks and other natural or historical sites, including Native land, the railroad and related travel industries became a highly lucrative business. In the mid-1890s, the Santa Fe Railroad began an advertising campaign and collaborated with corporate partners to promote Southwestern landscapes including the Grand Canyon.

Selling an Invention

One of these corporate partnerships was between the Santa Fe Railroad and the Fred Harvey Company. Their collaboration began in Topeka, Kansas in 1876 when Harvey opened a lunchroom in the train station. In 1902, the Fred Harvey Company established the Fred Harvey

¹⁴ Margaret Connell Szasz, *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-determination Since 1928* (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1971), 32.

Indian Department, which was tasked with collecting Native art to supply gift shops at the Harvey hotels with Native arts and crafts. In 1904, the company won an award for a display of Native blankets and baskets at the Louisiana Purchase International Exposition in St. Louis.¹⁵ By the 1920s, the partnership between the Santa Fe Railroad and the Fred Harvey Company was successfully operating over a dozen hotels including the Hopi House. The Hopi House was designed by Mary Colter, who modeled it after traditional Hopi dwellings and included wooden ladders, clay pots, rafters of logs, and adobe walls.¹⁶ Construction was done largely by Hopi builders and early on Hopis lived on the upper floors of the hotel. Inside this hotel, Native artisans sold their arts and crafts to tourists. Harvey established these “Indian curio” shops in many of his other hotels and restaurants and, in some cases, also arranged for Native artists to live near these attractions in model communities and demonstrate their artistic skills for tourists.¹⁷ These model communities were often used at expositions in which the Fred Harvey Company also participated. In addition to Native artists performing and selling goods, the Fred Harvey Company also relied on their artistic skills to decorate the interior of buildings. For example, in the Hopi Room at the rest station and gift shop at Desert View, the Fred Harvey Company had Hopi artist Fred Kabotie paint a large circular painting of the Snake Legend, the story of the first man to navigate the Colorado River.”¹⁸

¹⁵ Susan Labry Meyn, *More Than Curiosities: A Grassroots History of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and Its Precursors, 1920 to 1942* (Cincinnati, Ohio: University of Cincinnati Press, 1997), 14.

¹⁶ Marguerite S. Shaffer, *See America First: Tourism and National Identity, 1880-1940* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001), 55.

¹⁷ Meyn, *More Than Curiosities*, 15.

¹⁸ Marta Weigle, “Exposition and Mediation: Mary Colter, Erna Fergusson, and the Santa Fe/Harvey Popularization of the Native Southwest, 1902-1940,” *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 12 no. 3 (1992): 127.

Eventually, the Fred Harvey Company realized that in addition to the curated environments of rest stops, gifts shops, and hotels, it was possible, and lucrative, to take tourists to actual Southwest sites. Koshare Tours was an automobile tour company founded by Erna Fergusson and Ethel Hickey and eventually sold to the Harvey Company. Tours went to sites including Taos, Raton, the Carlsbad Caverns, Mesa Verde, the Grand Canyon, and the Hopi and Navajo reservations. While these auto tours did allow tourists to see popular Southwest sites, they were hardly free from the curated quality of other tourist ventures. For example, several of the touring companies had their all-female guides wear “Indian maid” uniforms that featured silver concho belts and several Native-style necklaces and bracelets.¹⁹

Ultimately, individuals like Fred Harvey took advantage of the influx of tourism in the Southwest to create personal wealth and used their positions to control perceptions of Native communities. By acting as an intermediary between tourists and Native artists, Harvey controlled non-Native ideas of Native identities and created a fictional west. The Fred Harvey Company also worked to create a market for Native art and these efforts inevitably altered the art made and the creation process. In collaboration with the Santa Fe Railroad, Harvey “emphasized the exotic and foreign character of the landscape, situating the Southwest and the spectacle of the Grand Canyon on the edge of civilization, where tourists could position themselves as adventurous explorers and amateur ethnographers.”²⁰

¹⁹ Weigle, “Exposition and Mediation,” 136.

²⁰ Marguerite S. Shaffer, *See America First: Tourism and National Identity, 1880-1940* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001), 59.

Tourism and Native art

While many white Americans embraced the narrative established by tourism companies like the Fred Harvey Company, other white Americans grew concerned about the disappearance of what they believed to be authentic Native culture and art because of the impact of the tourist market. John Collier, who would go on to serve in Franklin Roosevelt's administration, was one of those concerned. He believed that tourists were "not only responsible for the degradation of traditional native art and crafts, but if present in sufficient number, they threatened the future integrity of native lands and lives."²¹ Jennifer McLerran, however, argues that tourist art production allowed for Native artistic representation and production to continue while also allowing for modernization. McLerran suggests that tourism allowed for Native art forms to continue to develop, while Collier's attempts to "protect" Native art from the influence of the tourist trade were motivated by a romanticized primitivism. Collier's antimodernist belief that Native arts and crafts were crucial to the preservation of preindustrial cultures stemmed from his convictions that these cultures were superior to modern, mass-produced cultures.²²

White Reformers and Salvage Ethnography

In response to the decline in traditional Native arts and crafts and to the decline in Native communities' economic situation due largely to allotment policies implemented under the Dawes Act, many private groups attempted to promote the welfare of Native artists and communities. These groups included the General Federation of Women's Club, the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs, the Eastern Association on Indian Affairs, and the Indian Arts Fund. These

²¹ Jennifer McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art: Indian Arts and Federal Policy, 1933-1943* (Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 2009), 27.

²² McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 27.

private groups and non-Native, elite intellectuals like Edgar Lee Hewett, John Solan, Amelia White, Mabel Dodge Luhan, and Mary Austin represented a shift away from coercive assimilation to a paternalistic version of multiculturalism that was also embraced by John Collier.²³

The Bursum Bill

In 1922, New Mexico senator Holm O. Bursum introduced legislation that would have provided non-Native settlers with land title depending on proof of their continuous possession. The bill was intended to settle disputes regarding land ownership in the area ceded by the Mexican government through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, but it proved a threat to Native landownership.

Many organizations and individuals lobbied against the Bursum Bill, primarily through writing and publishing articles. John Collier joined with Stella Atwood, the chair of the Indian Welfare Committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in writing articles for multiple publications. Collier would continue to rely on publicity in women's and social justice magazines, and in 1929, helped journalist Vera L. Connolly write three articles for *Good Housekeeping* on the injustices facing Native communities.²⁴ Ultimately, the Bursum Bill was defeated due to "an intense political contest that utilized published critical commentaries, letter-writing campaigns, and the visit of a Pueblo delegation to Washington, D.C."²⁵

²³ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 97.

²⁴ Meyn, *More Than Curiosities*, 38.

²⁵ Norby, "Visual Violence," 36.

White Intellectuals and Native Art

During the 1920s, many of the same organizations and individuals that worked to defeat the Bursum Bill also worked to promote Native art. These “friends of the Indians” organizations attempted to revitalize Native art by focusing on traditional techniques. In order to, in their belief, preserve traditional Native art, patrons encouraged contemporary Pueblo artists to study and duplicate styles and patterns found at excavations in the region. These patrons influenced Native production and encouraged the creation of art similar to historic artifacts by organizing Native arts and crafts fairs at which they judged work and awarded prizes. Further, these patrons imposed their standards and materials, visual choices, and production methods “via hands-on demonstrations, competitions, and promotion of select artworks that met the specific requirements.”²⁶ Ultimately, “the patrons’ prescribed aesthetic qualifications for Pueblo art actually contradicted their own campaigns for authenticity and cultural preservation.”²⁷ While these individuals and organizations were concerned about the influence of tourists on Native art, they “consistently overlooked their own participation in larger colonization projects of this period, as well as the contemporary Pueblo artists’ perspectives about their own artwork.”²⁸

Art Education

Non-Native art educators also worked to increase Native art production based on their own definitions of authenticity. Perhaps the most well-known and influential of these art education programs was the one established by Dorothy Dunn. In 1932, Dunn, who trained at the Art Institute in Chicago, established a painting program for Native students at the Santa Fe

²⁶ Norby, “Visual Violence,” 5.

²⁷ Norby, “Visual Violence,” 34.

²⁸ Norby, “Visual Violence,” 34.

Indian School. Perhaps, in the context of assimilation policies, Dunn's education philosophies could be considered progressive. However, Dunn maintained control over art production and "made herself, not her students or their communities, the definer and authenticator of Native American art."²⁹

In this way, Dunn followed the role earlier patron-philanthropists in the Southwest had played. Dunn became a gatekeeper of authenticity. These individuals "did not see themselves as imposing alien influence on Indian artists; rather, they considered themselves to be counteracting the tastes that had already been imposed by others."³⁰ These white intellectuals believed that they were combatting the production of art that catered to popular stereotypes and that was designed for mass consumption by defining authenticity based on older Native artists and anthropologists' ideas of Native art. These white reformers "took older Indian artwork (or 'artifacts') as their standard of excellence."³¹

Ultimately, these non-Native patrons and educators influenced the production of Native art. They defined what authentic Native art was for themselves and others and then used their political and social influence to ensure that their definitions would eventually contribute to the legal understanding of authenticity in Native art during the New Deal-era.

Native Participants

While non-Native reformers worked throughout the Southwest to improve conditions for Native communities, Native activists also worked toward reform. Simultaneously, as non-Native patrons worked to influence Native artists and control art production and define authenticity,

²⁹ Laurie Eldridge, "Dorothy Dunn and the Art Education of Native Americans: Continuing the Dialogue," *Studies in Art Education* 42, no. 4 (Summer 2001): 324.

³⁰ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 108.

³¹ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 108.

Native artists continued to make individual artistic choices and challenge external definitions of authentic Native art.

Native Intellectuals

In 1911, the Society of American Indians (SAI) was founded. Throughout the early part of the 20th century, Native intellectuals like those who comprised the SAI worked on a variety of issues affecting Native communities. These Native elites leveraged their political and social influence to better conditions for Native communities around the United States. One example is Carlos Montezuma's work regarding Yavapais' water and land rights. The Secretary of the Interior, Walter L. Fisher, accepted Montezuma as a "voluntary charitable worker" and allowed him to access restricted information for the case.³² This illustrates the level of privilege Montezuma was afforded compared to other Native individuals at the time.

Just as non-Native reformers in the Southwest relied on mass media for political and social influence, Native intellectuals utilized writing as a tool for reform. Newsletters written by Native elites provided opportunities for them to spread their ideas and more effectively utilize their political and social standing to articulate ideas to a wider audience. Montezuma's newsletter *Wassaja* was perhaps "the ideal medium through which to carry out his crusade."³³ Montezuma used this publication to critique the Bureau of Indian Affairs and, at times, the Society of American Indians (SAI). At other times, when the SAI shared his views, Montezuma used *Wassaja* to increase support for their aims.

³² Peter Iverson, *Carlos Montezuma and the Changing World of American Indians* (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press), 124

³³ Iverson, *Carlos Montezuma*, 107.

Writing was also an important part of Zitkala-Sa's work. Zitkala-Sa used fiction to spread her political and social influence. Zitkala-Sa's literary works mirrored her political ideas regarding the status of Native communities and she used her writing to challenge white perceptions of Native communities. Her work "A Warrior's Daughter," "subverts the Pocahontas myth in having a Native woman rescue a Native man rather than a European one."³⁴ Zitkala-Sa also used her status as a Native intellectual to work with white reformers. Zitkala-Sa worked with Stella Atwood and the General Federation of Women's Clubs (GFWC) to improve conditions for Native communities and lobbied against legislation such as the previously mentioned Bursum Bill.

Native Artists

While non-Native art patrons attempted to control production in efforts to protect "authentic" Native art, Native artists used a variety of techniques to resist non-Native influences. Further, some Native artists protected Native artistic perspectives and passed them on through education within boarding schools.

One Native artist whose art illustrates the resistance of Native artists to non-Native control is Tonita Peña. *Quah Ah*, or Tonita Peña, was born in 1893 at the Tewa Pueblo, San Ildefonso. At age ten, Peña attended the government-sponsored day school at San Ildefonso. During this time, Esther B. Hoyt introduced art curriculum to the day school including basic drawing and painting techniques.³⁵ By the 1920s, Peña was painting professionally and Edgar Lee Hewett was financing her work. Peña used Hewett's financial support to care for her three

³⁴ Ruth Spack, "Translation Moves: Zitkala-Sa's Bilingual Indian Legends," *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 18, no. 4 (Winter 2006), 36.

³⁵ Patricia Marroquin Norby, "Visual Violence in the Land of Enchantment" (PhD dissertation, UMN, 2013), 43, <https://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/156008>

children Helia, Richard, and Joseph. Patricia Norby argues that “contrary to popularized art historical accounts of the time, which portray these painters as economically victimized and venerate the Euro-American art patrons, Peña, as well as other Pueblo watercolor painters, did not always readily defer to non-Indian aesthetic or marketing demands.”³⁶ Rather, artists questioned and challenged their non-Native benefactors by exercising their own creative control.

Another Native artist whose art illustrates resistance is Awa Tsireh. At the age of four, Tsireh attended the same day school that Peña attended at San Ildefonso and was also encouraged by Esther Hoyt. During his early twenties, both Alice Corbin Henderson and Edgar L. Hewett sponsored his art. Sascha T. Scott argues that Tsireh and other modern Pueblo painters “understood and sometimes accommodated Anglo demands and desires while resisting attempts to control, persecute, and/or exploit their culture.”³⁷ One method Native artists used to protect cultural knowledge was careful selection of subject matter that although seemingly traditional in depicting religious ceremonies, omits key ritual elements. These silences represent one form of resistance.

Viewing Native art through a Euro-American lens limits understanding of the ways in which artists like Peña and Tsireh controlled the production of their art. When considering their art with respect to Pueblo spiritual and historical associations with the land, the choices of Peña and Tsireh to remove Pueblo landscapes from their images, or to create silences, can be regarded as a conscious decision to impose a boundary between the viewer and the Pueblo.³⁸ Pueblo artists

³⁶ Norby, “Visual Violence,” 18.

³⁷ Sascha T. Scott, *A Strange Mixture: The Art and Politics of Painting Pueblo Indians* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015), 156.

³⁸ Norby, “Visual Violence,” 17.

also utilized misdirection, and alteration of details to protect cultural knowledge and resist non-Native patrons or audiences.

Angel DeCora also used her platform as a teacher and artist to challenge ideas of authenticity. From 1906 to 1915, Angel DeCora taught art at Carlisle Indian School. Prior to teaching, DeCora had a successful art career and used her art as a form of advocacy by countering stereotypical images of Native communities. She also used her position as a well-known Native artist to voice her political opinions. For example, in 1911, she spoke at the first conference of the Society of American Indians. In her teaching, DeCora used her class to encourage students to learn about their tribal and cultural traditions and then encouraged them to integrate tribal traditions into their own unique art, challenging views that authentic Native art is reproductions of pre-contact “artifacts.” DeCora challenged white views of Native art by emphasizing artistic differences among tribes and advancing the idea that Native artists could contribute to American art in general.³⁹

Native Participants and Art

While all of these Native intellectuals and artists contributed to ideas of reforming Native art or challenged definitions of authenticity, it is important to note that these Native individuals had different ideas regarding the future of Native communities and Native art. For example, Carlos Montezuma believed that the introduction of Native arts in schools would hinder assimilation efforts and set Native children back.⁴⁰ Even individual Native artists struggled to determine their own ideas of future Native art. While DeCora was committed to Native art as an

³⁹ Hutchison, *The Indian Craze*, 171-220

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 218.

expanding and evolving category, she was also conflicted about the degradation of traditional art forms.⁴¹

New Deal Legislation and Native Art

While Native participants challenged non-Native definitions of authentic Native art and worked to improve their communities, their voices were largely ignored by lawmakers. Instead, during the New Deal-era, the ideas of white patrons regarding authentic Native art were codified and non-Native individuals made decisions about Native communities.

Problems Identified

In response to concerns regarding Native communities voiced by white intellectuals in the 1920s, the government contracted the Institute for Governmental Research to provide research on the condition of Native communities across the nation. The resulting report entitled *The Problem of Indian Administration* (the Meriam Report) was critical of existing federal policies including allotment, education, and healthcare. Concerning Native arts and crafts, the report painted a bleak picture. The report claimed that Native arts and crafts had vanished in some areas and that in some instances, Native art was replaced by Euro-American art or by inauthentic art forms that were taught by boarding schools. The authors of the report found “that many of the young people considered the work of their elders to be old fashioned and that government employees blamed this attitude on the influence of schools.”⁴² While the Meriam Report identifies the negative impact boarding schools had on Native art, the Report glosses over the role that federal policy played in the destruction of Native culture and art. The Report

⁴¹ Ibid, 211.

⁴² Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 19

mentions that while a lack of support for Native art did in some cases come from “contempt for all that constitutes distinctive Indian life,” the Report suggested that the main reason whites have not supported Native art was not due to an attempt to destroy Native culture but rather “due to a lack of understanding of their economic possibilities.”⁴³

While the Meriam Report expressed many concerns regarding the disappearance of Native art, the Report also made suggestions on how the government could protect Native art. The Report suggested that the quality of Native products needed to be standardized and that the government needed to provide some guarantee of genuineness. The Report also suggested that any program to promote Native arts and crafts needed to not only focus on encouraging marketable goods but also needed to organize the market for these Native goods.⁴⁴ The Meriam Report also outlined, in vague and subjective language, the components that marked authentic Native art. The Report stated that “products that were characteristically Indian, of good materials, of good quality execution, of good color and design, usable unless intended merely for display, unique or original so far as compatible with other requisites, tagged with the government’s guarantee of genuineness and quality, and priced fairly” were critical components of authentic Native art.⁴⁵

Early Attempts at Legislating Native Art

Prior to the Meriam Report, government officials had expressed concern about Native arts and crafts. Charles L. Davis, the Indian Office supervisor of farming, was concerned that the quality of Navajo blankets was declining. Davis conducted an investigation of the Navajo

⁴³ Institute for Government Research, *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1928), 532.

⁴⁴ Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 18.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 20

blanket industry and discovered that the Fred Harvey company had increased profits by “attaching to each Navajo blanket a lead seal bearing the guarantee of the company that the blanket to which the seal was attached was genuine Navajo product.”⁴⁶ Davis then designed a plan in which linen tags with the name of the Indian agency, a date, and the words “this blanket is the product of Navajo Indians of this Reservation and made from native Navajo wool” would be distributed by superintendents in the Southwest and attached by traders or merchants to Navajo blankets. In 1914, the plan went into effect on two reservations. The system was extended to all Navajo jurisdictions in 1916, but the program was not considered a success because wholesalers continued to remove the government labels after traders sold the blankets to them because they claimed they were more marketable without the labels.

Following the release of the Meriam Report, concerns about Native arts and crafts were renewed and a new plan to protect Native art was drafted. The vice president of the J. Walter Thompson Advertising Agency, James W. Young, members of the board of directors of the American Indian Defense Association, John Collier, and attorneys from the Institute for Government Research drafted a plan with the purpose of successfully marketing Native goods. The resulting bill, the Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative Board bill, was introduced in the House on February 10, 1930, and the next day in the Senate. The bill included provisions for the Secretary of the Interior to create a trademark that could be used to mark authentic goods. The bill also provided for a three-member Indian Cooperative Marketing Board that would form a corporation to “buy, sell, deal in, own, and promote Indian arts and crafts with all standard

⁴⁶ Ibid., 8

corporate powers.”⁴⁷ In response to lobbying by traders, it was established that the corporation was not to serve as a retail agency and was instead to market through existing channels.⁴⁸

From the beginning, the Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative Marketing Board (Leavitt-Frazier bill) was controversial. Opponents argued that the bill created an increased dependence of Native communities on the federal government. Additionally, members of the Indian Arts Fund, specifically Mary Austin, considered the efforts of the Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative Marketing Board bill an affront to the efforts of private individuals in the Southwest who had worked to preserve authentic forms of Native art. Austin and the Indian Arts Fund believed that an expansion of the market would encourage quantity rather than quality and this would be detrimental to the aesthetic values of Native products. Further, the bill conflicted with President Hoover’s economic program, and Hoover did not give his approval for funding and voiced his belief that the Indian Cooperative Marketing Board should rely on private corporations for support. For these reasons, the bill made little progress. Attempts were made by Mary Cabot Wheelwright, Amelia and Martha White, Mary Austin, and Jesse Nusbaum to organize a privately funded plan, but their efforts were ultimately unsuccessful.⁴⁹

On February 4, 1932, Senator Lynn Frazier from North Dakota introduced a second Indian arts and crafts marketing bill in the Senate. The bill shared the same goals as the earlier Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative Marketing Board bill in that it emphasized the development of a larger market for Native arts and crafts and a plan to guarantee the genuineness of these Native products, but the bill also had some differences. The bill increased the number of commissioners on the board from three to five and allowed traders to sit on the board. The board

⁴⁷ Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 29

⁴⁸ Meyn, *More Than Curiosities*, 56

⁴⁹ McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 73-74.

was given more power to define standards, grades, and quality of Native goods. Perhaps the most drastic change was that the bill made concessions to traders hoping to maintain their monopoly on Native goods and makes no reference to cooperative enterprises to develop Native arts and crafts.

The Indian New Deal

Dramatic changes to federal Indian policy occurred with the election of President Franklin Roosevelt in 1932. In 1934, The Indian Reorganization Act and the Johnson-O'Malley Act were passed. Both bills impacted Native communities greatly. The Indian Reorganization Act ended allotment and established provisions for tribal self-government. The Johnson-O'Malley Act allowed contracts between the Interior Department and states to provide educational, agricultural, medical, and social welfare to tribes. While this bill undermined the relationship between tribes and the federal government, it did contribute to the reduction of boarding schools.

The Indian Reorganization Act

In February 1934, Collier, who served as Commissioner for the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, asked the Solicitor's Office of the Department of the Interior to draft a bill ending allotment. The draft was shaped largely by Felix Cohen, who worked in the Solicitor's office from 1933 to 1947. Ultimately, this bill was the first piece of a three-part process that Cohen envisioned for restoring Native communities that included his *Handbook for Federal Indian Law*, and the Indian Claims Commission Act.⁵⁰ Senator Burton K.

⁵⁰ Alice Beck Kohoe, *A Passion for the True and Just: Felix Cohen and Lucy Kramer Cohen and the Indian New Deal*, (Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 2014), 105.

Wheeler of Montana and Representative Edgar Howard of Nebraska introduced versions of the bill crafted by Cohen in the Senate and House respectively.

The Howard-Wheeler Act had four provisions. The first provision was intended to restore tribal social and political structures. The second provision was an attempt to encourage Native communities to study their own culture. In an attempt to codify changes introduced by Estelle Reel, boarding school staff were encouraged to offer courses in Native arts and crafts and history. The third provision was intended to restore Native land following the policy of allotment established by the Dawes Act of 1887. The fourth section proposed a federal court system that would have jurisdiction of all matters in incorporated Indian communities. After opposition from assimilationists, the bill was redrafted by the House Indian Affairs Committee and the first and fourth provisions were removed. On June 18, 1934, President Roosevelt signed the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) into law. Ultimately, the IRA would allow Collier to institute new programs that attempted to revitalize Native culture.

The Indian New Deal and Native Art

In 1934, John Collier worked with Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes to organize the Committee on Indian Arts and Crafts. The purpose of this committee was to determine how the government could facilitate the development of Native arts and crafts markets. The Committee's tasks included assessing the present production and marketing conditions, determining what the government's objectives should be, deciding the necessary organizational approach, analyzing the best marketing techniques, and ultimately determining the best way to improve the quality of Native arts and crafts, and instructing Native artisans in methods of production that would produce these better-quality goods.

The first meeting of the Committee on Indian Arts and Crafts was held on March 15, 1934 at the Museum of Anthropology in Santa Fe. The Committee focused primarily on economic factors because the need for income was most pressing.⁵¹ During the first meeting, it was suggested that the Committee focus “exclusively on Navajo weaving to begin with, so the Committee could establish a pattern that could be carried over to all arts and crafts mediums.”⁵²

The Committee found that the only markets for Native art, specifically Navajo weavings, were tourist souvenirs and fine art. The gap between these two markets was problematic because these markets required very different production methods making it difficult for Native artists to participate in both at the same time. Further, the Committee found that in the souvenirs market, Native products were unable to compete with machine-woven products that were standardized and cheap.

In response to these findings, the Committee determined that improvements to Native art production would be of the greatest benefit for Native artists. Both the Indian Arts Fund and the National Association on Indian Affairs had shown that the greatest commercial benefit for the producer came from elevating technical and artistic standards of production. The Committee believed that this improvement of production could be carried out by educating the artisans and considering productivity issues, such as selecting sheep with greater quantities or higher-quality wool. Additionally, the board suggested quality standards and distinguishing marks that would identify items that were handmade by Native artists to protect the market from imitators. This handcrafted nature was considered by the board as an essential element of Native art.⁵³

⁵¹ McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 79.

⁵² Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 95.

⁵³ McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 81.

The Committee did note concern that white involvement in and commercial exploitation of Native art would damage the authenticity of Native art through extensive commercial exploitation. The Committee noted that white involvement should not alter the handcrafted nature and quality of the goods being produced nor the production methods. Additionally, the Committee emphasized that white involvement should not affect the aesthetic quality of production. While the Committee did note the possible negative impacts of white involvement, the Committee allowed economic concerns overshadow its concern for the cultural function of arts and crafts for Native communities.

The report issued by the Committee on Indian Arts and Crafts rejected many of the suggestions and ultimately the entire premise of the Indian Cooperative Marketing Bill. The Committee stated that there was no evidence that the present tourist market needed to be better organized. Rather, the Committee emphasized the need to improve the quality of goods. This rejection of the goals of the Cooperative Marketing Bill and this new emphasis on the quality of Native goods led to a new direction of legislation. Rather than focusing on marketing, the Committee recommended the formation of a government agency focused on quality. The Committee suggested a board composed of five members that the President would appoint for terms of six years and given compensation of one dollar per year plus expenses. The Committee recommended that the board have two businessmen, one of whom was a dealer in Native goods, one Native member, one nominated by the Laboratory of Anthropology of Santa Fe, and one an authority in the field of art with an interest specifically in Native art.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Schrader, *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board*, 100

The Indian Arts and Crafts Act

On March 6, 1935, Congressman Will Rogers of Oklahoma introduced House Bill 6468 and two days later, Senator Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma, introduced Senate Bill 2203. The bills differed slightly from the recommendations of the Committee in that the term for board members was shortened from six years to four and career categories for the board were eliminated. One of the main obstacles facing the bill was the amount of money required for the board to operate. One of the primary purposes of the bill was to describe the duties of an arts and crafts board. The function of the board's duties included promoting economic welfare through the development of Indian arts and crafts and an expansion of the market for Native-made products. The bill also provided for a government guarantee of authenticity similar to earlier efforts to attach labels to Native-made products. This time, however, the bill provided that counterfeiting the board trademarks or falsely obtaining the trademarks would qualify as a misdemeanor offense and could carry a fine of up to two thousand dollars, imprisonment for six months, or both. On August 27, 1935, the bill was signed by President Roosevelt.

The Board met for the first time officially on October 5, 1936, in Albuquerque, New Mexico and focused on Native silver jewelry. After multi-day meetings in February 1937, The Indian Arts and Crafts Board approved standards for Pueblo, Navajo, and Hopi silver turquoise products. The regulations were approved by Ickes and dealers were instructed to attach labels to silver jewelry. Regulations regarding Navajo woven products followed. While regulations like these were established, ultimately, the early years of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board were primarily spent organizing surveys gathering information about Native communities and art production.

The Impact of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board

Perhaps the most positive economic contribution of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board was the development of arts and crafts cooperatives. The Board certainly contributed to the success of these cooperatives in a variety of ways including surveys that helped identify communities that would benefit from these cooperative and Board staff who advised interested communities and assisted educational efforts by providing resources. Further, these staff members helped develop marketing plans for these newly produced Native products.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board also worked to change perceptions of Native art through exhibits. In August 1938, the Indian Arts and Crafts Board worked with the United Pueblo Agency and Pueblo area traders to present an exhibit at the Gallup Intertribal Ceremonial. René d'Harnoncourt, the general manager of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board who had experience with Mexican folk-art revitalization efforts, emphasized the importance of displaying Indian goods and the usefulness of Pueblo arts and crafts in modern homes. In 1939, the San Francisco Golden Gate International Exposition presented six hundred and thirty-six works of Native art. D'Harnoncourt and the Indian Arts and Crafts Board again contributed to this presentation. The Board's efforts at the displaying and marketing Native art at the San Francisco Golden Gate International Exposition led to economic gains. In 1938, IACB-supervised sales of Native arts and crafts totaled \$863,267 and in 1939, sales increased to \$1,007,422.⁵⁵

Native Critiques of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board

In 1942, at Senate hearings for a bill appropriating Department of the Interior funding for the fiscal year, many Native critiques of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board were voiced.

⁵⁵ McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 140

Complaints ranged from letters sent to the Board not being answered to questions regarding the fees charged by the Museum of Modern Art in New York. One Native artisan named Diego Abeita, a silversmith who had served on the Indian Arts and Crafts Board Committee, stated that he owned his own shop, used modern production methods, and understood merchandising, but that it was easier for traders to get silverwork stamped by the Board than it was for independent Native silversmiths.⁵⁶

Native criticisms of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board were voiced at other times as well. Another Native critique was that board membership did not include any Native individuals. The Indian Arts and Crafts Committee had recommended a Native representative sit on the board, but when career categories were eliminated in the Indian Arts and Crafts Act, so too were requirements for Native representation. Eventually, this criticism was addressed in 1942, when Jones Narcho, Jr., Tohono O'odham, filled a vacancy on the Board.⁵⁷

Another of the Native criticisms of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board was the lack of enforcement. In fact, there was not a single conviction for misappropriating the Indian Arts and Crafts Board's mark in the first fifty years of its existence.⁵⁸ This lack of enforcement rendered the Board's mark practically meaningless. Besides failing to ensure that non-Native art was correctly labeled as such, the Board failed to ensure that retailers and traders properly labeled authentic Native art. For example, early in the Board's history, the certificates for Navajo woven products were almost never used because traders and dealers thought that the certificates were inconvenient and the information, like the weight of the fabric, was unnecessarily trivial. In fact,

⁵⁶ Meyn, *More Than Curiosities*, 198.

⁵⁷ Meyn, *More Than Curiosities*, 200.

⁵⁸ Jon Keith Parsly, "Regulation of Counterfeit Indian Arts and Crafts: An Analysis of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990," *American Indian Law Review*, 18, no. 2 (1993), 492.

after one year, only one dealer, a member of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, bothered to order more certificates and renew his license.⁵⁹

Ultimately, while the Indian Arts and Crafts Board did provide some positive services to Native communities, the Board also became, like white patrons and educators before, the gatekeepers of authenticity. With the power of the Board to determine the qualifications of Native art that would receive a government guarantee of genuineness, the Board was granted the power to determine what Native arts and crafts qualified as “authentic”. This critique led to the challenges of the Board’s ideas of authenticity and the development of schools like the Institute of American Indian Arts.

The Institute of American Indian Arts: Challenging Ideas of Authenticity

In 1962, the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) replaced the Santa Fe Indian School’s “Studio” that Dorothy Dunn had established. The IAIA is “widely credited with revolutionizing and revitalizing modern Indian painting.”⁶⁰ The IAIA was formed largely in response to Native artists’ critiques of previous institutions, including the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, which were more focused on the preservation of art forms rather than dynamic forms of modern art. During the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, multiple events marked a desire to shift away from the non-Native market for museum and culturally minded art production.

⁵⁹ McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 96.

⁶⁰ Joy L. Gritton, *The Institute of American Indian Arts: Modernism and U.S. Indian Policy* (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 1.

The Establishment of the IAIA

The 1959 Rockefeller Directions in Indian Art Conference was largely held in response to a fact-finding tour of the Southwest that Charles B. Fahs, the director of humanities for the Rockefeller Foundation, completed. Fahs believed that the Indian Arts and Crafts Act was effective, but was concerned that shifting policies that were giving states more and more power would limit the viability of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board in the future. The conference hoped to find ways to preserve and develop Native art through educating the public to better appreciate Native art and to provide education and training opportunities to Native artists through a partnership with the University of Arizona. The members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board argued that they should be in charge of any university program related to Native arts and crafts, but Fahs argued for state leadership. Ultimately, the conference focused largely on the economic aspects of Native art and limited ideas of new forms and styles of Native art to simply more currently marketable styles.

The Southwestern Indian Art Project also marked an attempted shift in definitions of Native art. Native artists worked with the University of Arizona and the Rockefeller Foundation to establish and fund workshop programs that ran during the summers of 1960 to 1963 for Native students that combined classes in Indian culture with studio work. The proposal for this program focused on answering multiple questions including the capabilities of young Native artists to adapt traditional cultural concepts to contemporary forms and if this student group would be able to learn in such an academic setting and still “produce personally created quality work.”⁶¹ These, at best, paternalistic questions ignored the overwhelming historical evidence that Native artists

⁶¹ Gritton, *The Institute of American Indian Arts*, 44.

can effectively blend Native culture with non-traditional mediums. For example, Tonita Pena's portrayal of Pueblo communities through the non-traditional medium of watercolor illustrates the adaptability of Native artists. Additionally, these questions ignored the fact that Native students had been taught art in academic settings before and had continued to create art that expressed individual and tribal identity. Ultimately, the goals of the Southwestern Indian Art Project were not well defined, but many of the instructors for this program would go on to teach at the Institute of American Indian Art (IAIA) and this workshop project laid the groundwork for the work of the IAIA.

While the Southwestern Indian Art Project was taking form, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Glenn Emmons and Director of Indian Education Hildegard Thompson were working to address criticism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs's failure to support art education. In 1960, sixty-two thousand dollars were set aside for an arts and crafts center at the Santa Fe Indian School. This program, however, was underfinanced and poorly publicized leading to low enrollment. In response, Hildegard Thompson lobbied for a full-fledged school. At the same time, the chair of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Willard Beatty, proposed a senior high school and post high school technical school with an art program. Following Congressional appropriations for new construction and remodeling at the Santa Fe Indian School in 1961, George Boyce was offered the position of superintendent to the newly named Institute of American Indian Arts.

Shifting Perceptions

The IAIA represents yet another transition in perceptions regarding "authentic" Native art. Gritton argues that "the physical placement of the institute on the ground of Dorothy Dunn's Studio, as well as adoption of the tenets of the Rockefeller Arizona conference, signaled a

directional shift in Native arts production.”⁶² While this shift challenged ideas that Native artists were unable to adapt to the modern art world and that Native art was inherently not modern, by emphasizing newness, the IAIA supported the implication that “traditional values and beliefs were- in their totality, at least- somehow dysfunctional and inimical to success in the modern world, certainly in the modern art world.”⁶³

Conclusion

As non-Native individuals worked to define “authentic” Native art from the 1870s to the 1960s, their definitions were codified in federal policies and legislation. These policies and legislation, in turn, influenced perceptions of authenticity. Often overlooked is the fact that at the same time, Native individuals and artists challenged these non-Native perceptions of Native communities and art. Native artists used art as a means of economic freedom, as a form of self-expression, and as a way to challenge stereotypes. They protected cultural knowledge through strategic omissions and used their platforms as educators to influence future generations.

Two modern institutions, the Santa Fe Indian Market and the IAIA, illustrate the progression from paternalistic conceptions of Native art to modern ideas of what qualifies as authentic Native art. In 1922, the New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs (NMAIA) was founded in opposition to the Bursum Bill. That same year, members of the NMAIA, along with Kenneth Chapman, helped organize the first judged display of Native arts and crafts as part of Santa Fe’s annual fiesta.⁶⁴ Indian Market continues to be held in Santa Fe annually in August. While today, program materials suggest continuity with phrases like “since 1922” or “the 78th annual,” the Santa Fe Indian Market no longer resembles the earlier paternalistic fairs aimed at

⁶² Gritton, *The Institute of American Indian Arts*, 150.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 153.

⁶⁴ McLerran, *A New Deal for Native Art*, 59.

encouraging art production that matched non-Native patrons' tastes. Today, Native artists display a wide variety of art and products. Two Native artists, Romona Sakiestewa (a Hopi textile artist) and Gail Bird (a jewelry designer that collaborates with Yazzie Johnson) argued Indian Market's strength is "its ability to embrace innovation, without displacing or devaluing art and artists more easily considered 'traditional'."⁶⁵

Currently, the IAIA is one of only three Congressionally chartered schools in the country and the only higher education institution in the world dedicated to contemporary Native art.⁶⁶ The IAIA also operates the nation's leading exhibition facility for contemporary Native art, the Museum of Contemporary Native Arts in Santa Fe. No longer located on the same site as Dorothy Dunn's Studio, the IAIA now sits on a 140-acre campus and offers a variety of degree programs.⁶⁷ Ultimately, the IAIA gathers impressive faculty and talented students and continues to challenge ideas of Native art and identity.

At the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, Missouri, there is a suite of three galleries featuring more than 200 works of Native art. The collection includes works from the nineteenth-century by unknown Native artists like *Jar* from Santa Ana, New Mexico ca. 1820 and *First Phase Chief Blanket* from Navajo, Arizona or New Mexico, ca. 1850. The collection also includes works from the New Deal-era like Leekya Deyuse's *Fetish Necklace* from 1935.⁶⁸ The museum also has one of Jamie Okuma's (Luiseño/Shoshone-Bannock/Okinawan/Hawaiian) pieces on display. Okuma, as an alumnus of the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) and a

⁶⁵ Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 148.

⁶⁶ "Key Facts and Public Documents," IAIA-Institute of American Indian Arts, accessed February 19, 2019, <https://iaia.edu/about/key-facts-and-public-documents/>

⁶⁷ "History," IAIA-Institute of American Indian Arts, accessed February 19, 2019, <https://iaia.edu/about/history/>

⁶⁸ "American Indian," The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, accessed February 1, 2019, <https://www.nelson-atkins.org/collection/american-indian/>

winner of three Best in Show awards from the Santa Fe Indian Market, illustrates the progression of these institutions. Okuma's piece at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art is entitled *Adaptation* and consists of high-heeled Christian Louboutin ankle boots covered in beadwork.⁶⁹ This piece is just one example of the many contemporary Native artists who continue to push boundaries regarding ideas of Native art and Native identity. In this way, Jamie Okuma joins a long tradition of Native artists challenging definitions of authenticity.

⁶⁹ "Adaptation," The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, accessed February 1, 2019, <https://art.nelson-atkins.org/objects/56934/adaptation>

Bibliography

Primary Sources

An Act: To conserve and develop Indian lands and resources; to extend to Indians the right to form business and other organizations; to establish a credit system for Indians; to grant certain rights of home rule to Indians; to provide vocational education for Indians; and for other purposes, Pub. L. No 73-383, 48 Stat. 984, 988 (1928-1934).

An Act: To promote the development of Indian arts and crafts and to create a board to assist therein, and for other purposes, Pub. L. No. 74-355, 49 Stat. 891,893 (1935).

Collier, John. "Office of Indian Affairs," Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior 1935: 113-155

Collier, John. "Office of Indian Affairs," Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior 1936: 159-206

Collier, John. "Office of Indian Affairs," Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior 1937: 198-261

Collier, John. "Office of Indian Affairs," Annual Report of the Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior 1938: 209-264.

D'Harnoncourt, Rene. "Activities of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board Since Its Organization in 1936." *Indians at Work* 8 (April 1940): 32-35.

Institute for Government Research. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1928.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs. "An Indian Handicraft and Machine Competition." *Indians at Work* 1 (April 15, 1934).

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs. "Indian Silver Work Standards Announced by Indian Arts and Crafts Board." *Indians at Work* 4 (March 1, 1937).

Wood, Grant. *Revolt Against the City*. (Iowa City: Frank Luther Mott, 1935).

Secondary Sources

Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas. 1995.

Bernstein, Bruce. "The Booth Sitters of Santa Fe's Indian Market: Making and Maintaining Authenticity." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 31, no 3. (2007): 49-79.

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

- Child, Brenda J. *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Indians in Unexpected Places*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- Deloria, Vine. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969.
- Eldridge, Laurie. "Dorothy Dunn and the Art Education of Native Americans: Continuing the Dialogue." *Studies in Art Education* 42, no 4. (Summer 2001): 318-332.
doi:10.2307/1321077.
- Garmhausen, Winona. *History of Indian Arts Education in Santa Fe: The Institute of American Indian Arts with Historical Background, 1890 to 1962*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Sunstone Press, 1988.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles. "An Art of Survivance: Angel DeCora at Carlisle." *American Indian Quarterly* 28, no. 3/4 (Summer-Autumn 2004): 649-684.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4138937>.
- Gritton, Joy L. *The Institute of American Indian Arts: Modernism and U.S. Indian Policy*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Howard, Kathleen L. and Diana F. Pardue. *Inventing the Southwest: The Fred Harvey Company and Native American Art*. Flagstaff, Arizona: Northland Publishing, 1996.
- Hutchison, Elizabeth. *The Indian Craze: Primitivism, Modernism, and Transculturation in American Art, 1890-1915*, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Institute of American Indian Arts. "Key Facts and Public Documents." Accessed February 19, 2019. <https://iaia.edu/about/key-facts-and-public-documents/>
- Institute of American Indian Arts. "History.," Accessed February 19, 2019.
<https://iaia.edu/about/history/>
- Iverson, Peter. *Carlos Montezuma and the Changing World of American Indians*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.
- Jacobs, Margaret D. "Shaping a New Way: White Women and the Movement to Promote Pueblo Indian Arts and Crafts, 1900-1935." *Journal of the Southwest* 40, no. 2 (Summer, 1998): 187-215.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40170017>
- Kehoe, Alice Beck. *A Passion for the True and Just: Felix Cohen and Lucy Kramer Cohen and the Indian New Deal*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 2014.
- Lentis, Marinella. *Colonized Through Art: American Indian Schools and Art Education, 1889-1915*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2017.

- Maddox, Lucy. *Citizen Indians: Native American Intellectuals, Race, and Reform*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- McLerran, Jennifer. *A New Deal for Native Art: Indian Arts and Federal Policy, 1933-1943*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 2009.
- Medicine, Beatrice. *Learning to Be an Anthropologist & Remaining "Native"*. Edited by Sue- Ellen Jacobs. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- Meyn, Susan Labry. *More Than Curiosities: A Grassroots History of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and Its Precursors, 1920 to 1942*, Cincinnati, Ohio: University of Cincinnati Press, 1997.
- Mullin, Molly H. *Culture in the Marketplace: Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. "American Indian." Accessed February 1, 2019. <https://www.nelson-atkins.org/collection/american-indian/>.
- Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. "Adaptation." Accessed February 1, 2019. <https://art.nelson-atkins.org/objects/56934/adaptation>.
- Norby, Patricia Marroquin. "Violence in the Land of Enchantment" Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, June, 2013.
- Parezo, Nancy J. and Don D. Fowler. *Anthropology Goes to the Fair*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.
- Parsley, Jon Keith. "Regulation of Counterfeit Indian Arts and Crafts: An Analysis of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990." *American Indian Law Review*, 18, no. 2 (1993): 487-514. doi:10.2307/20068750.
- Rodriquez, Sylvia. "Art, Tourism, and Race Relations in Taos: Toward a Sociology of the Art Colony." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 45, no. 1 (Spring 1989):77-99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3630172>.
- Rosenstein, Carole. "Indian Market: A Tournament of Values." *Signs and Society* 2, no. 2 (September 2014): 230-248. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/677560>
- Schaffer, Marguerite S. *See America First: Tourism and National Identity, 1880-1910*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001.
- Schrader, Robert Fay. *The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of New Deal Indian Policy*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1983.
- Scott, Sascha T. *A Strange Mixture: The Art and Politics of Painting Pueblo Indians*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015.

- Slivka, Kevin. "Art, Craft, and Assimilation: Curriculum for Native Students during the Boarding School Era." *Studies in Art Education* 52, no. 3 (Spring 2011): 225-242. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41407931>
- Spack, Ruth. "Dis/engagement: Zitkala-Sa's Letters to Carlos Montezuma, 1901-1902." *MELUS* 26, no. 1 (March 2001): 172-204. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185502>.
- Szasz, Margaret Connell. *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-determination Since 1928*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1999.
- Weigle, Marta. "Exposition and Mediation: Mary Colter, Erna Fergusson, and the Santa Fe/Harvey Popularization of the Native Southwest, 1902-1940." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 12, no 3. (1992), 116-150. doi:10.2307/3346645.
- Weigle, Marta, and Barbara A. Babcock, *The Great Southwest of the Fred Harvey Company and the Santa Fe Railway*. Phoenix, Arizona: The Heard Museum, 1996.