

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Great Plains Quarterly

Great Plains Studies, Center for

---

1989

## Joint Venture or Testy Alliance?: The Public Works of Art Project in Minnesota, 1933-34

Thomas O'Sullivan

*Minnesota Historical Society*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsquarterly>



Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

---

O'Sullivan, Thomas, "Joint Venture or Testy Alliance?: The Public Works of Art Project in Minnesota, 1933-34" (1989). *Great Plains Quarterly*. 405.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsquarterly/405>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Great Plains Studies, Center for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Quarterly by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# JOINT VENTURE OR TESTY ALLIANCE?

## THE PUBLIC WORKS OF ART PROJECT IN MINNESOTA, 1933-34

THOMAS O'SULLIVAN

Like many American painters of his generation, Syd Fossum left art school under the cloud of the Great Depression. The economic uncertainties of the 1930s only added to the dubious support a young painter in the Midwest might expect. But an unimagined opportunity launched Fossum and many others into unparalleled productivity as artists and self-respect as involved members of the art community and American society. Fossum's own reminiscences suggest the excitement of the moment. He recalled that in December 1933 he received a letter assigning him to the newly formed Public Works of Art Project (PWAP).

I phoned my artist friend Mac LeSueur, also recently a student at the Minneapolis School of Art (MSA) and learned that he too was on PWOAP [sic]. . . .

We were asked to do sketches of the "American Scene," which were then to be sent to Chicago. As we understood it, if they were

approved, we were to develop larger and more complete paintings from them.

• • •

The directions seemed vague, but Mac and I busily dashed off about half a dozen sketches apiece. To make sure that they were truly "American Scene," we included in our paintings, plenty of NRA symbols with their blue eagles. [The National Recovery Act was one of the first pieces of legislation in the New Deal program.]

Then we sat back to await further instructions . . . Mac and I both felt very important.<sup>1</sup>

As Fossum's experience indicates, the federally funded art projects of the 1930s affected artists' livelihoods and artistic production. This article will examine the workings, output, and character of the Public Works of Art Project in Minnesota as it sought to fulfill the cultural and social ideals of this national experiment through the leading art institution and the individual artists of the state.

In the growing literature on the federally funded art programs of the New Deal era, the PWAP holds a relatively small place. This is

*Thomas O'Sullivan is curator of art at the Minnesota Historical Society.*

(GPQ 9 (Spring 1989): 89-99)



FIG. 1. Syd Fossom; Self Portrait. Oil on canvas, 1936. Courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society Collection. *Fossom here portrays himself as the artist-worker. The studio setting, painting at upper right turned to the wall, and the pencil in hand all identify him as an artist, while the bulky fisherman's sweater and its red button, emblem of Fossom's Communist Party affiliation, bespeak his radical stance.*

understandable enough, for the project lasted only from the harsh winter of 1933 through the spring of 1934.<sup>2</sup> In contrast, the better-known Treasury Section of Fine Arts commissioned murals and sculptures for post offices and other federal buildings from 1934 to 1943. The Works Progress Administration's relief program, the Federal Art Project (FAP), can be credited with a comparatively large output of artworks and related activities between 1935 and 1943.<sup>3</sup> Yet the PWAP was the United States government's first large-scale, nationwide venture into art patronage. It effectively established the principle of federal art support by putting on its payroll 3749 artists who created 15,663 pieces of art. The PWAP's decentralized regional organiza-

tion utilized local museums to give a substantial degree of local control to parts of the nation that had long chafed under the cultural hegemony of the East—especially New York City. It also put an official stamp of approval on a broad spectrum of realist styles and contemporary subject matter with its theme of “the American Scene.”

In May 1933, painter George Biddle wrote to his old Harvard classmate, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to propose a national mural project.<sup>4</sup> The idea interested the president, who referred Biddle to the Treasury Department, custodian of government buildings. This initial foray into bureaucracy entangled Biddle's plan in the running aesthetic battles between conservative, classically-oriented architects and younger artists who saw the mural as an opportunity to interpret contemporary American life. But the idea of federal patronage took hold in the Treasury, where a newly appointed official named Edward Bruce was eager to advance it. A lawyer, specialist in international finance, and an accomplished painter, Bruce moved in the varied circles of art, business, and government that a federal art program would involve. Bruce and Biddle joined forces to press for an allocation of funds, and by November 1933 relief administrator Harry L. Hopkins granted \$1,039,000.00 from the Civil Works Administration for an artists' employment program, to be handled by the Treasury Department with Edward Bruce as its chief.

Bruce gathered a group of museum directors and an advisory committee of New Deal officials at his home on 8 December 1933. Dividing the country into sixteen regions, they planned an organization that enlisted local museum directors as chairpersons, with committees of interested citizens to oversee aesthetic standards and place art in public buildings. This structure took advantage of existing networks of individuals who knew the artists of their area as well.

The PWAP recognized artists as an integral segment of the American population, entitled to receive assistance and to contribute their special skills in the time of national crisis. Bruce's

announcement of the PWAP on 11 December 1933 spelled out this fundamental credo of the New Deal's approach to culture:

In approving PWAP, Mr. Hopkins, has recognized that the artist, like the laborer, capitalist, and the office worker, eats, drinks, has a family, and pays rent, thus contradicting the old superstition, that the painter and sculptor live in attics and exist on inspiration. . . . [T]he approximately 2,500 artists, now unemployed, are to be given employment in their own field under conditions calculated not to deflate their inspiration.<sup>5</sup>

PWAP organization moved quickly. Mrs. Increase Robinson, head of the advisory committee for PWAP Region 10 (comprising Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota), wired Minneapolis Institute of Arts director Russell A. Plimpton asking him to suggest unemployed Minnesota artists who could be put to "immediate work at good wages."<sup>6</sup> Plimpton's reply, mailed the next day, included the names of fourteen "practicing artists who depend on the sale of their work, or on odd jobs for their livelihood."<sup>7</sup>

The Minneapolis Institute of Arts was the likeliest headquarters for the PWAP's Minnesota subcommittee. Though the museum was not quite twenty years old, its parent body, the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, dated back to 1883.<sup>8</sup> The Minneapolis School of Art (today the Minneapolis College of Art and Design), its companion institution within the Society of Fine Arts, had opened in 1886. While its collections and exhibits were primarily intended to address an encyclopedic range of world art, the Minneapolis Institute had sponsored juried shows of local artists' work since 1915. Russell Plimpton had come to Minneapolis from New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1921 to become the Minneapolis Institute's second director. Educated in both business and art history, he has been characterized as warm yet aristocratic, "as popular in meetings of the Rotary Club as in gatherings at the exclusive

Woodhill Country Club."<sup>9</sup> His reign as director lasted thirty-five years.

Plimpton's advisory committee of ten showed a noticeable lack of professional artists, though all were knowledgeable in art. Minneapolis School of Art director Edward Kopietz was a painter; Cyrus Bissell and Wilbur Tusler, architects; Andreas Larsen, a worker in stained glass. Lindley Hosford was by avocation an etcher whose works were widely exhibited; Alfred Pillsbury was a discerning connoisseur and Minneapolis Institute trustee; and Hudson Walker, director of the University of Minnesota's Little Gallery, was champion of such American modernists as Marsden Hartley. This committee makeup was in line with PWAP policy as stated by PWAP official Forbes Watson:

To avoid embarrassing the artists by placing them on the Committees and thereby perhaps, rendering unemployed artists ineligible for employment, and to escape the risk of partisan action, the Committees have been made up of eminent museum directors and other distinguished members of the community actively interested in the advancement of art—men and women who have already proved their soundness of judgement and their lack of bias.<sup>10</sup>

In appointing his technical committee to evaluate the work of PWAP artists, Plimpton made the wise choice of the respected Minnesota painter Cameron Booth (fig. 2). Booth had also come to Minnesota in 1921, to teach at the Minneapolis School of Art, and soon won top honors in Minnesota exhibits. He knew the paintings and ideas of European modernists firsthand and subscribed to a work ethic that fit well with the PWAP philosophy:

The accepted idea that an artist is an impractical person waiting for an inspiration is ridiculous. A painter who takes his work seriously—and he is the only kind that turns out good pictures—knows an inspiration when it comes, well enough, but he also



FIG. 2. Cameron Booth painting, 1937. Photograph courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society. A Pennsylvania native who was an influential teacher in Minnesota from the 1920s until his death in 1980, Booth served as technical director of the Minnesota PWAP. In this capacity Booth advised the project's artists, many of whom worked in a realist style like that of Booth's own painting here.

knows that it is almost no use to him unless he has developed within himself an equipment that can use it.<sup>11</sup>

The forty-one-year-old Booth was director of the St. Paul Gallery and School of Art when the PWAP was established, and his position, accomplishments, and temperament all suited him well for the task of overseeing other artists' work for the PWAP.

An inevitable problem of the PWAP and other New Deal projects for artists was the reconciliation of federal employment with their individual work habits. By trading the stereotype of artist as solitary eccentric for a new

image as skilled worker contributing to society, PWAP painters and sculptors took on the obligations of time cards, committee critiques, and adherence to community tastes and standards. For example, consider the identity crisis posed by Bruce's dual aim of employing needy artists while at the same time securing each region's best talents. Was the PWAP primarily an employment program, or an effort to foster high artistic standards? The CWA, a relief agency, funded it, but Bruce downplayed the relief aspects of the PWAP in favor of good art: "We are going to be judged by class of work done, and quality of artists employed is a most important factor in selection for this work." Mrs.

Robinson interpreted the national directives to her Minnesota sub-chief succinctly: "The chief requirements an applicant must have are ability, sincerity and enthusiasm for the 'American Scene.'"<sup>12</sup>

That simple phrase, "the American Scene,"—that Bruce had declared from the beginning was to be the theme of the project—proved to be a most ambiguous guideline for PWAP art. The theme allowed wide variations in subject matter across the country and tolerated a certain range of stylistic interpretation as well. It put a federal imprimatur on the direction in which many artists had already been working for years, but PWAP officials in Washington felt obliged to drive home the point repeatedly:

Any artist who feels that he can only find the picturesque and paintable and the imaginative in foreign subject matter had better be dropped and an opportunity given to the man or woman with enough imagination and vision to see the beauty and the possibility for aesthetic expression in the subject matter of his own country.<sup>13</sup>

This artistic potential of American urban life had been recognized early in the century by such artists as Robert Henri and John Sloan, whose urban realism was derided as "Ashcan School" painting. Artists in other parts of the country, notably in midwestern and plains states, also looked to local scenery, industry, occupations, and history for inspiration. Thus a regional art, recognizable by its place-specific subject matter, was already being established by the time of the PWAP's founding.

Yet hindsight suggests that the PWAP's promotion of contemporary American life as subject matter may have been unduly limiting. Karal Ann Marling suggests that the American Scene proviso tended to link all the public art projects "to a nebulous species of realism."<sup>14</sup> The works of the majority of PWAP artists in Minnesota and elsewhere squarely occupied that representational middle ground between the classical

allegories of early twentieth-century public art and Americans' ventures into abstract and non-objective art after World War II.

A sampling of Minnesota exhibits in the years before the PWAP was organized shows that art that was both *local* in its inspiration and *current* in its modes of expression was already well established. "More noticeable than ever before are pictures that are not only local but definitely of this particular era," noted the Minneapolis Institute of Arts *Bulletin* of the 1933 Artists' Exhibition. Besides this general tendency, there are numerous instances of Minnesotans who were painting specific subjects on their own initiative before finding an official outlet for the same type of work in the PWAP. Dewey Albinson, for example, was already showing scenes of the state's dramatic Iron Range mines in local exhibits—his assignment on joining the PWAP was a continuation of the same body of work. Bob Brown and Arnold Klagstad, associated with urban realist views of St. Paul and Minneapolis, respectively, were assigned "easel paintings of railroad and industrial centers" and "Minneapolis mills."<sup>15</sup> Minnesota scenes thus merged neatly into the PWAP's American Scene.

The PWAP technical committee took an active role in assigning projects and critiquing submissions. The committee, chaired by Booth, met weekly to view work in progress. Minutes of these meetings preserve the dictates of an opinionated body that seemed to relish its task of criticism. The committee instructed artists to rework their compositions and modify color schemes, to abandon chosen projects and undertake new ones, and to change their preferred media as well as their subject matter. Painter David Granahan, for example, labored to comply with the technical committee's critique of his mural designs on the themes of seasonal sports in Minnesota's past. At one weekly meeting the committee gently corrected his color: "The committee would like to suggest whether it seemed to him that the yellow could be made to go with the rest better—such as a grey-green sky yet yellow enough so it would separate it from the house." He did as suggested, but was



FIG. 3. David Granahan painting a mural for the post office in Hopkins, Minnesota, ca. 1940. Photograph courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society. Granahan made watercolors and mural studies for the PWAP, and at the project's end, was at work on a mural for the Gateway Building in Minneapolis. He later painted murals for both the Federal Art Project and the Treasury Department's program to embellish federal buildings like post offices. This mural depicts a characteristic scene on the farms around Hopkins, a Minneapolis suburb.

later advised that "these panels are not in sympathy with the character of this project," and Granahan "said he would drop the mural project and do watercolors and paintings more in keeping with the ideal of PWAP." This reversal, just days after Granahan and the committee had both invested time on the work in progress, may have been influenced by Mrs. Robinson's visit to Minnesota that same week. As head of the region, she was obliged to enforce the American Scene requirement and to be wary of the historical themes that PWAP officials abhorred.

"Occasionally an artist's imagination will be fired by an historical subject," Watson had written to the Chicago office, "but laboriously to seek in the archives, and then laboriously to concoct an accurately costumed historical tableau seems, to judge by the achievements of our highly professional mural autocrats, to result in pretentiousness and painting anemia."<sup>16</sup> Granahan's easel pictures were acceptable to the Minnesota committee, which also found him capable enough to gain its recommendation for another mural project in Minneapolis.

Clement Haupers proposed a series of paintings on the theme “improvements on waste land in Minnesota.” The technical committee had other plans for the Paris-trained artist and *bon vivant*, whose prints had earlier toured the country in the prestigious “Fifty Prints of the Year” exhibit. The committee minutes reveal that the committee did not appreciate his first submission, an oil painting of Minnesota forests. They suggested that he etch scenes of daily life in St. Paul and other familiar subjects. The committee gave him a trial week in which to work on these etchings and improve his style or be dropped from PWAP enrollment.<sup>17</sup> A week’s work on etchings of street scenes filled with modish strollers and shoppers met with approval. Scenes like “Hot Dogs” (fig. 4) record the bustle of city life in clear, confident line. Hauper’s interest in the city’s universe of faces, ages, and classes resembles the work of his contemporaries Peggy Bacon and John Sloan, etchers who treated New Yorkers with a similar bemused regard.

Will Norman found ready acceptance from the PWAP for his drawings of another aspect of the American Scene: the city of industrial power as epitomized by his home town of Duluth. As a processing and shipping center at the western end of the Great Lakes, Duluth boasted an imposing lakefront system of mills, storage elevators, and iron ore loading facilities. “I do hope you will find these drawings of Duluth to your liking,” he wrote to the committee in sending his drawings to Minneapolis for critique, for “they are realistic, adhering closely to nature (believe it or not). I suggest a series of drawings completely covering the waterfront, as studies for lithos or oils.” The technical committee agreed heartily, but Booth commented in detail on Norman’s work: “Committee feels the work is interesting but suggest you imagine yourself farther away from the object you are drawing in order to overcome the violent perspective and it would bring all the forms into their respective perspective.”<sup>18</sup> Norman’s drawings of Duluth were printed in an edition of fifty (fig. 5). The lithographs comprise a powerful vision



FIG. 4. Clement Haupers, “Hot Dogs,” etching, 1934. Courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society Collection.

of industry, informed by the prints of masters of the industrial theme such as Joseph Pennell and the 1920s works of Precisionists like Charles Sheeler. Norman’s Duluth scenes are among the most “modern” of Minnesota’s PWAP products, combining geometric shapes of mill buildings and elevators, stacked in rhythmic patterns within swirling contours of smoke and steam that suggest the dynamism of Futurist compositions. The medium, too, was in tune with the times, for lithographs (images printed from a specially prepared stone) were the favored means of graphic expression for American artists in the 1930s. As a medium requiring a skilled printer, lithography was by nature a collaborative process. The Minnesota PWAP employed a printer



FIG. 5. William Norman, "Ore and Coal Docks, Duluth," lithograph, 1934. Courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society Collection.

to work with its artists in Minneapolis, thus advancing their knowledge of the medium as well as their productivity.<sup>19</sup>

A variant opinion on American industry is found in Mac LeSueur's work. Originally assigned to paint "American Holidays," LeSueur was dropped from the project, reinstated, and successfully submitted paintings and prints of industrial subjects.<sup>20</sup> His 1934 oil "Elevators" (fig. 6) is an ironic turn from the holiday theme with which he began his PWAP tenure. Its subject is a grain elevator along a railroad siding on the frayed edge of an industrial district. LeSueur's palette is as drab as his subject in its

range of browns, grays, and ochres. The glum color scheme contributes to the air of exhaustion and idleness that was an inescapable aspect of the American Scene.

The work of Haupers, Norman, and LeSueur suggests the tone and scope of Minnesota's PWAP output, just as Granahan's experience outlines some of the vicissitudes of PWAP employment. Other artists made sculptures and decorative wall maps as well as paintings and prints. Minnesotans had opportunities to view these works in a special exhibit at the Minneapolis Institute in March and April 1934; in a national touring exhibit of PWAP artwork that

first showed at Washington's Corcoran Gallery before traveling to such venues as the Minnesota State Fair in 1935; and in the schools, libraries, and hospitals in which PWAP artworks were deposited.<sup>21</sup>

Today, works sponsored by the Public Works of Art Project and other New Deal art efforts can often be found in the buildings and agencies to which they were originally allocated, such as libraries, community centers, federal offices, and hospitals. Many have found their way into art museums as the cycles of taste have returned New Deal art and artists to public view. The United States General Services Administration maintains an office in Washington, D.C., to document the existence and location of New Deal artworks across the country.

From half a century's distance, PWAP accomplishments in Minnesota are notable. Some fifty artists were employed; among them were many men and women who went on to prominent careers in the following decades. The hundreds of images they produced include many compelling glimpses of the Minnesota scene and American life during the Depression. Yet the PWAP in Minnesota had limitations worth considering. Few murals were executed under PWAP sponsorship, though designs were worked up by artists like Granahan and Elsa Jemne who were successful in other settings such as the Treasury Section's highly competitive post office mural program. Many Minnesota artists who were deserving of PWAP employment on the dual grounds of financial straits and professional merits did not make the project's rolls. Minneapolis painter Leslie LaVelle accused Plimpton and his committee of favoritism toward Minneapolis School of Art graduates in a letter to President Roosevelt—a plausible charge, given the Minneapolis bias of the committee and the preeminence of the school in local art education.<sup>22</sup> The PWAP's practice of critique-by-committee may well have hampered morale and inspiration far more than the strictures of the loosely defined American Scene theme did.

The PWAP's real success in Minnesota can

best be seen in its immediate legacy, since it broke ground for the federal art programs that followed. Even though the PWAP's employment of artists ended across the nation in the spring of 1934, seven of Minnesota's PWAP artists were fortunate enough to secure continued employment at the University of Minnesota under funds from the State Emergency Relief Act. Though Booth, Albinson, Klagstad, and the four others received approximately the same pay as the PWAP rate, the University shrank their *American Scene* to the confines of a neighborhood: "there should be no restrictions as to subject matter other than that they should center in the district in which the University is located—that is, south-east Minneapolis."<sup>23</sup>

After the PWAP's demise, the other federal programs gave artists in Minnesota opportunities for resumed employment. The Treasury Section's mural competitions offered a degree



FIG. 6. Mac LeSueur, "Elevators," oil on canvas, 1934? Courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society Collection.

of national recognition as well as commission fees, while the WPA's Federal Art Project employed several hundred Minnesotans in its broad programs of art activities. This latter project offers a marked contrast in organization to the PWAP. Among its many differences in philosophy and structure, the Minnesota FAP was established with its own offices under the leadership of Clement Haupers (fig. 7).<sup>24</sup> An aggressive advocate for his fellow artists, Haupers concentrated all his energies on the government program—something a harried museum director steering the institution through a depression could not do. After the termination of the Federal Art Project, Haupers returned to painting and teaching in St. Paul art schools. The other artists whose PWAP experiences have been recounted here also continued their careers as professional artists and teachers after PWAP and FAP employment: Norman in the Duluth area, Granahan in the eastern states, LeSueur in Minnesota and the southwest, and Fossum in Minnesota, Iowa, and California.

The PWAP's use of museums to operate an artists' support program imposed a rare marriage of interests on the Minneapolis Institute of Arts and Minnesota artists. The love-hate relationship artists traditionally have with local art museums, which they often characterize as inaccessible or at least patronizing to them, briefly gave way to a working relationship as the Institute's director and facilities made the PWAP a reality in Minnesota. Syd Fossum recalled his experience forty years later: "I had been unemployed since art school in June. I was chosen for this first project (PWOAP) [sic] because Russell Plimpton, the Director of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, was the local selector and he was looking after his own." This unity of interests between museums and artists engendered no sentimental affection at the time, however. In 1936 the Minnesota Artists Union, with Fossum and LeSueur among its officers, called for a boycott of the Institute's local artists' exhibit after Plimpton and the museum trustees refused to pay artists a rental fee for the time their works would be on display.<sup>25</sup>



FIG. 7. Clement Haupers in his office at the headquarters of the WPA Federal Art Project in Minnesota, 1938. Photograph courtesy of the Minnesota Historical Society. Haupers had exhibited his prints and paintings nationally before joining the PWAP in 1933. When the WPA's Federal Art Project was established in 1935, Haupers headed its Minnesota division, and later its Upper Midwestern region. By the last years of WPA-FAP in the early 1940s, Haupers was assistant to national director Holger Cahill in Washington, D.C.

New Deal arts official Olin Dows praised the PWAP for its success in establishing art patronage on a broad national scale. "By a magnificent and practical gesture the government had strengthened our art and culture," he wrote in the 1960s. "It was a healthy influence. Under the pressure of events local artists were encouraged to leave their ivory towers, and they responded enthusiastically by carrying American art to a practical degree of social consciousness never achieved before."<sup>26</sup> Minnesota's PWAP experience suggests that "leaving the ivory tower" was but half the metaphor needed to understand the PWAP. Thanks to the PWAP's use of museums to coordinate local operations, artists found the imposing marble halls of the museum open to them for a brief but productive season.

## NOTES

1. Syd Fossum, unpublished manuscript, Syd Fossum Papers, Minnesota Historical Society.
2. For a fine overview of the various New Deal art projects see Richard McKinzie, *New Deal for Artists* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972). McKinzie's first two chapters (pp. 3–32) treat the PWAP in some detail. The PWAP is the topic of Joel H. Bernstein, "The Artist and the Government: the Public Works of Art Project," *Canadian Review of American Studies* 1 (Fall 1970): 99–115. The New Deal art projects in Minnesota are treated in Nancy A. Johnson, ed., *Accomplishments: Minnesota Art Projects in the Depression Years* (Duluth, Minn.: Tweed Museum of Art, 1976).
3. Mathew Baigell, *Dictionary of American Art* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), pp. 119–21.
4. McKinzie, *New Deal for Artists*, pp. 5–10.
5. Press release no. 464, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, D.C., 11 December 1933, p. 2 (copy in Public Works of Art Project [Minnesota], Minnesota Historical Society, hereafter cited as PWAP-MN).
6. Telegram, Mrs. Increase Robinson to Russell A. Plimpton, 13 December 1933 (copy in PWAP-MN).
7. Plimpton to Robinson, 14 December 1933 (PWAP-MN).
8. Donald R. Torbert, "Art and Architecture in Minnesota," in William Van O'Connor, ed., *A History of the Arts in Minnesota* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), pp. 22–23.
9. Jeffrey A. Hess, *Their Splendid Legacy: The First 100 Years of the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts* (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, 1985), p. 38.
10. Forbes Watson, "The Public Works of Art Project: Federal, Republican or Democratic?" *American Magazine of Art* (January 1934, unpaginated reprint in PWAP-MN).
11. *Minneapolis Journal*, 23 October 1923, quoted in Nina Marchetti Archabal, "In Memoriam Cameron Booth 1892-1980, A Chronicle from His Scrapbooks," *Minnesota History* 47 (Fall 1980): 102.
12. Telegram, Edward Bruce to Walter S. Brewster, 18 December 1933 (copy in PWAP-MN); Robinson to Plimpton, 21 December 1933 (PWAP-MN).
13. Edward B. Rowan to Brewster, 5 March 1934 (PWAP-MN).
14. Karal Ann Marling, *Wall-to-Wall America: A Cultural History of Post Office Murals in the Great Depression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), p. 44.
15. *Bulletin of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts* 22 (21 October 1933): 127; Artist Project Files, Albinson, Brown, Klagstad (PWAP-MN).
16. Artist Project File, Granahan (PWAP-MN); Watson to Brewster, 4 January 1934 (PWAP-MN).
17. Jane H. Hancock, *Clement Haupers: Six Decades of Art in Minnesota* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1979), p. 17; Artist Project File, Haupers (PWAP-MN).
18. Will Norman to PWAP, undated, Artist Project File, Norman (PWAP-MN); Cameron Booth to Norman, 23 February 1934, Artist Project File, Norman (PWAP-MN).
19. See, for example, Holger Cahill, *New Horizons in American Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1936), p. 39; Booth to Robinson, 27 March 1934 and Robinson to Booth, 29 March 1934 (PWAP-MN).
20. Artist Project File, LeSueur (PWAP-MN).
21. *Bulletin of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts* 23 (24 March 1934) and 23 (28 April 1934); *25th Annual Fine Arts Exhibition*, Minnesota State Fair, 31 August–7 September 1935. A list of Minnesota institutions receiving PWAP artworks is in PWAP-MN.
22. Leslie LaVelle to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 31 March 1934 (PWAP-MN).
23. Johnson, *Accomplishments*, p. 5; Malcolm H. Willey, "University Art Project Employing PWA Artists," 14 November 1934, 2 (PWAP-MN).
24. Johnson, *Accomplishments*, p. 6.
25. Syd Fossum, "Militant Minnesota Artists," *North County Anvil* 10 (March–April 1974): 51; Undated clippings, Syd Fossum Papers, Minnesota Historical Society.
26. Olin Dows, "The New Deal's Treasury Art Program: A Memoir," in Francis V. O'Connor, ed., *New Deal Art Projects: An Anthology of Memoirs* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1972), p. 18.