

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

The Early Years of Native American Art History: The Politics of Scholarship and Collecting. Edited by Janet Catherine Berlo.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/83w0q253>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Feye, Cornelia S.

**Publication Date**

1993-03-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Because his grandparents were such successful parental surrogates, Dudley's life seemed to be filled with a curiosity and insight unblemished by bitterness and violence. He faced the inadequacy of his parents without rancor and with an insight that possibly led him to his present occupation.

There are few biographical accounts of this era of Sioux life. The author should be lauded for sharing his unique experiences as a Dakota man. Fortunately, his book is superior to those feminine "as-told-to" life documents. I cannot suggest that this book be used in tandem with such books as Mark St. Pierre's *Madonna Swan* or *Lakota Woman* (Mary Crow Dog with Richard Erdoes). Increasing numbers of Lakota/Dakota persons reading these latter books are questioning their authenticity. Perhaps the most effective dyadic pairing with Dudley's book would be Liz Cook-Lynn's novel *The River's Edge* and her poetry. Mindful that her works are literary gems and outside the genre of life histories, creative teachers of Indian studies and anthropology might use these Dakota creations to enrich their teaching.

Dudley's book should warm the hearts of all of us Dakota and Lakota and teach us further about respect and relatedness.

*Beatrice Medicine*

California State University, Northridge (emerita)

**The Early Years of Native American Art History: The Politics of Scholarship and Collecting.** Edited by Janet Catherine Berlo. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992. 256 pages. \$30.00 cloth.

Cultural tastes and scientific approaches change frequently—especially in the field of art history. This collection of essays evaluates the methods of collectors, scientists, and curators in regard to Native American art. Several major institutions like the Smithsonian (founded 1846), the Brooklyn Museum (founded 1903), and the American Museum of Natural History in New York (founded 1869) shaped Native American art history through their collecting policies, their research, and their exhibitions.

*The Early Years of Native American Art History* is a collection of essays about essays about art. It deals with ways to look at early research regarding American Indian art between 1875 and 1941, and how to evaluate it. It can teach us how to look and how not to

look at American Indian art today—not as expressions of an exotic but primitive and colonized species, but as creations of talented individuals who are part of a long and changing cultural tradition.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a frenzy of Indian art collecting and anthropological research swept North America. Unfortunately, the accumulation of data about the supposedly vanishing cultures and the attempt to save some of their disappearing artifacts contributed to the destruction of the cultures they were trying to preserve. At the end of the century, more Northwest Coast art was found in Washington, D. C. than in the state of Washington. In the Southwest, missing prototypes of old pottery and baskets made ongoing traditional production difficult.

Anthropologists searched for typical styles and techniques, but often their hunt for original, authentic, old Indian art became misdirected, and they ended up with the crafts of talented individual artists. In their efforts to prove their theories about the evolution of ornamental forms and the history of tribal arts, they often mistook art influenced by merchants and collectors for the real thing, or they commissioned replicas according to their own specifications. One of the contributors to *The Early Years*, Aldona Jonaitis, describes how Haida artifacts and replicas produced by the gifted Haida artist Charles Edenshaw were mistaken as typical for his culture. Franz Boas and his colleague John Swanton commissioned miniature totem poles and other carvings from Edenshaw. They used him as their main informant, not realizing that they were receiving information about one individual instead of a whole culture.

Another essay examines the Zuni collection of the Brooklyn Museum, assembled by curator Stewart Culin, who never had any academic or anthropological training. Frank Hamilton Cushing, a white adventurer, was his main informant. Cushing lived with the Zuni in New Mexico for five years and was instructed to buy “old things” for the Brooklyn Museum’s collection. However, because he could never get his hands on any authentic ceremonial artifacts, he commissioned the carving of new religious masks, which were never used in rituals. Together Culin and Cushing reinvented Zuni tradition as they thought it should be and tried to create a romantic picture of the Zuni past, without regard for the real living conditions of the people in the present.

It was in the interest of white collectors and patrons to produce a romantic, “typical,” and touching Indian background for the

artists who produced their materials. This image of an Indian artisan, preferably with ceremonial knowledge and possibly from a chieftain's family, appealed to the audience and the customers. Louisa Keyser, a Washoe basketmaker and former laundry maid, received a whole new, invented biography from her white patrons. Traders Amy and Abe Cohn transformed her from a household helper to the "Queen of Basketry," in order to obtain higher prices for her products. In return, she had to produce exclusively for the Cohns and according to their specifications. They invented new names for the symbols on her baskets and sold the baskets as old style Washoe, even though they were individual creations and were influenced by California basket designs.

Treatment of Native American artists as individuals, with the rights of innovation and equality with white American artists, is essential. This approach was accomplished in two reports described in this volume: the report on Salish basketry by Haeberlin, Teit, and Roberts under the supervision of Boas (1928), and Lila Morris O'Neale's report on Yurok/Karok baskets (1932). These accounts serve as positive examples, because they focus on individual Indian artists and their thoughts, actions, and attitudes toward their products. The reports also take into consideration the pleasure taken in the masterful production of an art object, which may outweigh the value appointed to the finished product (some patterns are not visible in certain completed baskets). They acknowledge individual innovation and clearly distinguish between baskets made for use and baskets made for sale.

Most contributors to the book stress the importance of studies that focus on the achievement of individual artists instead of generic, primitive art. Haeberlin (1918) states the consensus of opinion "that we study the formal principles in primitive art by methods comparable to those applied in the esthetics of our own" (p. 9). This means that the individual artist and his or her creation should be the center of any research just as much as in Western art history. Gladys Reichard, Ruth Bunzel, and lately Nancy Parezo have demonstrated this method successfully but are not included in this volume.

*The Early Years of Native American Art History* is a misleading title, insofar as no overview of these early years is given. The selection of contributions and examples seems arbitrary. Basketry and the Northwest Coast are overrepresented, while no consideration is given to other areas of artistic production like weaving,

jewelry-making, bead- and quillwork, and pottery, which also underwent dramatic changes. Early collectors, anthropologists, and scientists examined are Cushing, Boas, O'Neale, and René d'Harnoncourt, who curated the influential exhibition *Indian Art of the United States* at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1941. One would wish for at least a listing of the other important anthropologists of the time (such as Kroeber, Levi-Strauss, Lowie, Benedict, Tylor, and Radcliffe-Browne) and reasons why they were not chosen.

Defining, evaluating, and experiencing Native American art is an ongoing process. Indian art has a universal aspect and can be appreciated both for its function in Indian society and for purely aesthetic reasons outside of its context. "These two conceptions were not mutually exclusive" (Rushing, p. 222). Indian art is part of the American heritage and tradition; it provides Americans with a cultural context thousands of years old. It has been a strong influence on twentieth-century artists, especially neo-expressionists like Jackson Pollock. Contributor Rushing points out that the exhibition *Indian Art of the United States* also managed to create a market for contemporary Indian art as a collector's item and as interior decoration, thus helping to preserve and assure its appreciation and ongoing production.

These concepts and the idea of taking the individual maker's point of view instead of assuming anonymous craftsmanship may change again. James Clifford (1988), quoted by Catherine Berlo, wrote, "Ethnographic study is an ethnography of conjectures, in which culture is not a tradition to be saved, but an assembled code of artifacts always susceptible to critical and creative recombination" (p. 15). This indicates that information and artifacts can be interpreted, decontextualized, recontextualized, and aestheticized in continuously changing ways.

The reader comes to the conclusion that there is good and bad, subjective and objective research at any given time. The authors thoroughly researched a few highly limited and specific historic examples. For these they supplied extensive bibliographies and notes. One would wish for additional volumes to complement the missing geographical and artistic areas. As it is, the book is a specialized tool for sophisticated experts in the field of classic anthropological art history.

*Cornelia S. Feye*