THE POLITICS OF SCHOLARSHIP: COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION AND THE UNEASY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ART AND ART HISTORY 1911-1945

by

CRAIG HOUSER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the City University of New York

2011

© 2011

CRAIG HOUSER

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Patricia Mainardi

Date	Chair of the Examining Committee

Dr. Kevin Murphy

Date	Executive Officer

Dr. Kevin Murphy

Dr. Diane Kelder

Dr. Elizabeth C. Mansfield

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

THE POLITICS OF SCHOLARSHIP: COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION AND THE UNEASY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ART AND ART HISTORY 1911-1945

by

CRAIG HOUSER

Advisor: Professor Patricia Mainardi

This dissertation examines the critical role that the College Art Association (CAA) played in the early development of art history and studio art education as academic disciplines in U.S. colleges and universities. Although CAA initiated a variety of projects after its inception in 1911, this study focuses on the association's journals, specifically the *Bulletin of the College Art Association, The Art Bulletin, Parnassus,* and *College Art Journal.* Serving as journals of record for art and/or art history, these publications functioned not only to provide an ongoing exchange of ideas related to the visual arts in higher education, but also to validate authorities and scholars, particularly art historians, and their academic institutions. As a result, certain individuals and schools became prominent in the visual arts. My study therefore addresses not only the histories of art history and studio art, but also the relationship between CAA and its supporting institutions.

Another issue in my dissertation is the rapport between CAA's two main constituents: the art historians and the artist-teachers. While they united to form CAA in 1911 to promote the visual arts in colleges and universities, the relationship between the two disciplines was often uneasy. Although CAA was established primarily by artist-teachers, the organization was taken over in the mid-1920s by art historians who controlled the journals. By the early 1940s the conflict erupted with the art historians trying to sever ties, albeit unsuccessfully, with the artists.

CAA was also affected by economics and politics of the 1930s. During the Great Depression the association struggled financially and adopted questionable policies to maintain publication of its primary journal, *The Art Bulletin.* With the influx of European émigrés, many CAA members also wanted the association to assume a more nationalist identity. In many respects my dissertation demonstrates that CAA was a changing social organization whose identity was at times unstable from the 1910s through World War II, as it was affected by internal conflicts and larger sociopolitical issues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people were helpful to me throughout all the stages of this dissertation. I would like to thank my dissertation committee first. My advisor, Professor Patricia Mainardi, was tremendously supportive, and I can honestly say that I would not have finished the dissertation if it was not for her. Her familiarity with the topic and her editorial comments were incredibly useful to me. Professor Kevin Murphy was also extremely encouraging, especially with the proposal. I am grateful that he persuaded me to pursue this project and helped me along at various stages. Professor Diane Kelder, who is also quite familiar with my topic, was kind enough to serve on my committee. Her insights in the early stages of the project were most valuable. Lastly, I am grateful to Elizabeth C. Mansfield for serving as my outside reader; her publications on the history of art history have been quite valuable to my research. In addition to my dissertation committee, I have appreciated the help of the Art History Department's staff including Andrea Appel and Sandylene Wakefield.

I would also like to thank Susan Ball, the former executive director of CAA. I met her in the mid-1990s when I worked for CAA as the in-house editor in the Publications Department. She was a constant support to me throughout the entire dissertation process and offered help at key points. Many people were kind enough to let me interview them for my dissertation, including Ball, Linda Downs, Colin Eisler, Thomas DaCosta Kaufman, Irving Sandler, Lucy Freeman Sandler, and Rose Weil. Previously I had the opportunity to interview Nicholas Adams, Richard Brilliant, Walter Cahn, Creighton Gilbert, Janet A. Kaplan, Diane Kelder, Lenore Malen, John Paoletti, Patricia C. Phillips, Debra Pincus, Judith F. Rodenbeck, Richard Spear, and Nancy Troy, all of whom spoke with me about their roles as editors within CAA's publications program.

J. Fiona Ragheb, Stephen Frankel, Gary Koslowski, Ethan Kinory, and Laura Morris provided useful advice at many crucial stages in the dissertation process. Christian Huemer helped me translate certain German texts. My colleagues at City College New York also supported me throughout the process including Harriet Senie, Lise Kjaer, Molly Emma Aitken, Anna Indych-Lopez, and Ellen Handy. In addition, my fellow students at the CUNY Graduate Center were very encouraging including Jennifer Farrell and Kathleen Wentreck.

Numerous institutions were helpful to me in terms of my research and writing. First, College Art Association allowed me to examine its minutes of meetings and files in its Publications Department. Jay Barksdale of the New York Public Library provided me with a space in the Wertheim Study room. In addition, numerous staff members of libraries and museums were helpful to me including Erin Schreiner of the Avery Library and Farris Wahbeh of the Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Columbia University; Susan Chore of the Frick Art Reference Library; Athena Smith of the Gelman Library of the George Washington University; Erin Mackin of the Harvard Art Museums Archives; Amy Lucker of the Institute of Fine Arts; Christie Lutz of the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library; Julia Gardner of the University of Chicago Library; Patrice Mattia of the Department of European Paintings of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; Gary Cox of the University of Missouri-Columbia; Margaret Zoller of the Smithsonian Archives of American Art, and Dean M. Rogers of the Vassar College Library. In addition, two German librarians—Sigrun Rieger of the Bibliothek Bayerisches Nationalmuseum and Carola Wenzel of the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte—were very helpful to me. Without the openness and accessibility of these individuals and their institutions, I would not have been able to discover so much research material.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends and family. My roommate, Dick Leitsch, and my friends Christina Rufin, Alberto Ferreras, Kenn Nadel, Christine Hastings, and Shelley Klein were kind enough to put up with me over the past year. My sister, Ann, and my brother, Jim, were also very encouraging. Most of all my parents, Wayne and Betty Houser, were truly supportive. I spent most of the last year feverishly working alone on my dissertation, and whenever I needed a break to talk with someone, they always gave me their ears. I dedicate this dissertation to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT………………………………………………………………………………………iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…………………………………………………………………………vi

INTRODUCTION: STUDIO ART AND ART HISTORY AS A SOCIAL ORGANIZATION………………………………………………………………………………..1
Some Historical Background
The Project
The Outline

PART 1: THE SCIENCE OF ART, OR ART HISTORY'S ENTANGLEMENTS WITH STUDIO ART EDUCATION AND ARCHAEOLOGY……………………………………..…21

CHAPTER 1: CAA's *BULLETIN:* THE INITIAL AGENDA, THE CONSTITUENTS, THE INTERNAL POLITICS, AND THE MOUTHPIECE…………………………………………22
The Origins
The Bulletin of the College Art Association
CAA's Membership
CAA in a Larger Context: Other Art Organizations and Academic Societies
CAA's Pedagogy: A Humanistic and Technical Focus
Countering Stereotypes

CHAPTER 2: *THE ART BULLETIN* AND THE DOMINANCE OF ART HISTORY IN CAA…………………………………………………………………………………………59
The Growth of Higher Education and the Establishment of the *Art Bulletin*
Erwin Panofsky, CAA, and Art History in the United States in the 1920s
Some Analysis and Conclusions about *Art Bulletin* in Its First Decade
Art Bulletin and the Old Boys' Network
Addendum: John Shapley as an Alternative Case Study

PART 2: *ART BULLETIN* IN THE 1930s: CHALLENGING THE DISCOURSE IN ART HISTORY……………………………………………………………………………………..96

CHAPTER 3: *ART BULLETIN* FROM A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: CAA IN THE EARLY 1930s, THE GREAT DEPRESSION, AND AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP………97
CAA's Expansion and Diversification
Financing the *Art Bulletin* during the Great Depression
The Scholarship of U.S. Art Historians in the 1930s: Schapiro and Meiss

CHAPTER 4: *ART BULLETIN* FROM AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: PANOFSKY, ICONOLOGY, AND HIS SCHOLARSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES…..127
An International Exchange: The Early Stages
Panofsky and the Development of Iconology: Establishing a Methodology
Art History and Some General Observations on Theory

CHAPTER 5: *ART BULLETIN* AND CAA IN THE LATE 1930s: INSTITUTIONAL POLITICS AND THE RECEPTION OF THE EUROPEAN ÉMIGRÉS………………… 156

Historiography and the Reception of the European Émigrés
CAA and the Lecture Bureau
CAA and *Art Bulletin* in the Latter Half of the 1930s: The Ongoing Great Depression, the Threat of Xenophobia, and the Possibility of Reorganization
The Letter of Protest: A Need to Restructure
The Old Boys' Network Again

PART 3: CAA'S SECOND JOURNAL AND THE DEMISE OF STUDIO ART EDUCATION……………………………………………………………………………..188

CHAPTER 6: *PARNASSUS* AND *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL:* THE QUIETING AND DISQUIETING OF STUDIO ART EDUCATION…………………………………………...189

Parnassus and the Return of the Artist Members
Parnassus: A Makeover
College Art Journal
A Bias against Studio Art
CAA and the Societies for Literature and Music
CAA and Affiliated Societies

CONCLUSION: THE ONGOING POLITICS OF SCHOLARSHIP AND A TURNING OF THE TIDE WITHIN CAA……………………………………………………………………...226

The Aftermath: CAA after World War II
Some Statistics in Higher Education
College Art Journal and CAA's Position on Studio Art Education from the Late 1940s through the 1960s
Art Bulletin and CAA's Position on Art History in the 1950s and 1960s
The 1970s and Changes for CAA
Art Journal and Its Embrace of Change
Art Bulletin and Its Resistance to Change
The Rossen Report and Changes in the Governance of the Publications Program
Art Bulletin and the Quality of Scholarship: The Need to Revive the Journal
The Association for Art History: An Attempt to Separate from CAA
Art Journal as a Forum for the Artist and Exhibition
Contemporary Art and Contemporary Art History
Recent Concerns for CAA's Publications Program: Cronyism and Peer Review
CAA in Transition: The Internet and the Ongoing Problem of Building Consensus

Table 1: *Art Bulletin* articles 1919-1944…………………………………………………….273

WORKS CITED.…………………………………………………………………………275

INTRODUCTION

STUDIO ART AND ART HISTORY AS A SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

In colleges and universities throughout the United States, the disciplines of art history and studio art are often placed together in the same department. Such a combination seems logical: their names alone share the word *art,* and the two disciplines are often designed to work together, such that the study of one is presumed to enhance the other. Artists and art historians have also often joined forces to support one another and fight for their greater mutual interests. However, like siblings living under the same roof, the two fields have not always seen eye to eye. In fact, the history and practice of art have sometimes been at odds with one another in the U.S. higher education system, especially in the early stages of their development as distinct academic disciplines. As one might expect, such conflicts affected the growth of each discipline. Despite the apparent interrelationship between the two fields, the histories of art history and studio art education in the United States are often told as separate stories, yet their tales might be explained better if they were intertwined. How did the two disciplines work in tandem with one another? As the two fields became recognized as professional academic disciplines in colleges and universities, what caused them to partner? What was the nature of this partnership? What conflicts erupted? In addition, how was each discipline affected by the larger politics of higher education in the United States?

Some Historical Background

In order to understand these questions, a brief overview of the establishment of the two separate fields of studio art and art history is necessary. The study of art developed largely as vocational training before it became formally institutionalized in trade schools. When universities were first established in the Middle Ages, art was not

considered an acceptable academic subject. Such a study was first relegated to monastic workshops and later apprenticeships under masters working in the guild system.[1] In 1562 Giorgio Vasari founded the first academy of art and tried to develop rules for art as a means to maintain the glory of the Renaissance tradition.[2] Later in 1648 French court artists established the French Academy of Painting and Sculpture as a strategy to disempower the political influence of the guilds, whose policies were too restrictive in terms of apprenticeships and foreign imports.[3] The educational program of the academy included instruction in art and history, as well as architecture and anatomy. Students attended life drawing classes and lectures on the principles of art. Following this European tradition, Charles Wilson Peale tried to establish the first art academy in the United States as early as 1791, which eventually led to the foundation of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia in 1805, followed by the National Academy of Design in New York in 1825.[4] Although these two art academies remain the longest-running U.S. institutions for art in operation today, they were initially interested more in promoting and exhibiting art than developing rigorous educational programming.[5]

As the forces of industrialization became more prominent in the latter half of the 1800s, and the United States chose to compete in this realm on an international level, basic drafting skills and the aesthetic appeal of manufactured products became a

---

[1] Arthur D. Efland, *A History of Art Education: Intellectual and Social Currents in Teaching the Visual Arts* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1990), 63.
[2] Ibid., 29-33; and Nikolaus Pevsner, *Academies of Art: Past and Present* (New York: DaCapo, 1973), 42-55.
[3] Efland, *History of Art Education,* 36-38; and Pevsner, *Academies of Art,* 82-99.
[4] See "History of the School," Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art, accessed September 1, 2010, http://www.pafa.org/School/Overview/History-of-the-School/350; and "History of the Academy," National Academy Museum and School, accessed September 1, 2010, http://www.nationalacademy.org/pageview.asp?mid=5&pid=100.
[5] Arthur D. Efland, "USA, §XV: Art education: XVI. Art education," in *Oxford Art Online,* accessed September 1, 2010, http://www.oxfordartonline.com.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/subscriber/article/grove/art/T087095pg15?q=efland&article_section=contributors&search=article&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit.

greater concern. As a result, more art schools and art education programs were established.[6] Some art schools were initially dedicated to design, such as the Rhode Island School of Design in 1877, while others became affiliated with museums, including the School of Painting and Drawing with the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1877, the Chicago Academy of Design with the Art Institute of Chicago in 1882, and the Corcoran School of Art with the Corcoran Gallery of Art in 1890.[7] In addition, the importance of teaching drawing skills in primary and secondary schools grew in importance. For example, in 1872 the Englishman Walter Smith was hired by the state of Massachusetts to develop requisite educational drawing programs for grammar schools and establish the Massachusetts Normal Art School to train teachers.[8]

While the development of art schools grew steadily throughout the nineteenth century, the story was somewhat different in U.S. colleges and universities. The inclusion of studio art and/or art history developed much more erratically as subjects of study, especially in the late 1700s and early 1800s. While Thomas Jefferson was governor of Virginia in 1779-81, he sat on the board of visitors of the College of William and Mary and might have been one of the first Americans to encourage the teaching of the visual arts within a college curriculum. Later in the early 1800s he proposed an elaborate educational program that embraced the study of visual arts as a scientific discipline for his yet-to-be-realized University of Virginia, but by the time the school's academic plan passed through the state legislature in 1824, the subject of art was no

---

[6] Susan Ball, "The Beginnings: 'Art for higher education, and higher education for Artists,'" in *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind: A Cultural History of College Art Association,* ed. Susan Ball (Piscataway, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming).
[7] The Chicago Academy of Design, which eventually became the Art Institute of Chicago, was founded as early as 1866; see "1879-1913: The Formative Years," Art Institute of Chicago, accessed September 1, 2010, http://www.artic.edu/aic/aboutus/wip/formative/index.html. The School of Painting and Drawing became the School of Museum Fine Arts in 1901; see Efland, "USA, §XV: Art education." See also "History: Dedicated to Art," Corcoran College of Art and Design, accessed September 2, 2010, http://www.corcoran.edu/about_the_college/history.php.
[8] Ball, "The Beginnings."

longer mentioned.[9] Later attempts to incorporate the visual arts within the curriculum of higher education included a Roman art course offered at Princeton University in 1831, followed by archaeology taught as a supplement to courses in the classics from 1843 to 1868. In addition, the inventor and painter Samuel F. B. Morse, who had been one of the founders of the National Academy of Design, was appointed to be a teacher of art and design principles at New York University in 1832 and the artist John Trumbull as a lecturer at Yale University in 1839.[10] However, unlike the art academies, no stable, ongoing tradition in the teaching of fine art in colleges and universities emerged from any of these initiatives.

It was not until after the Civil War that the visual arts in colleges and universities were offered with any kind of regularity and permanence. In *A History of Art Education,* Arthur D. Efland explains that colleges and universities tended to follow one of the three different educational models established at Yale University, Harvard University, or Princeton University: (1) Yale, which founded its school of fine art in 1867, was perhaps the most radical. The school's first director, John Ferguson Weir, was a painter and sculptor, and the primary intent of the school was to provide technical training for artists and architects, although art history was available as part of the liberal arts program. Such an emphasis on the practice of art was highly uncommon for universities in the 1860s, and the fact that women were allowed to take classes at the school was quite

---

[9] Priscilla Hiss and Roberta Fansler, *Research in Fine Arts in the Colleges and Universities of the United States* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1934), 3-6. Jefferson's design for "academic village" made the buildings themsevles tools for studying architectural history; see "Thomas Jefferson's Academic Village," University of Virginia, accessed January 12, 2010, http://www.virginia.edu/academicalvillage/.

[10] Ibid., 6-7; Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "American Voices: Remarks on the Earlier History of Art History in the United States and the Reception of Germanic Art Historians," *ARS* 42 (2009): 131; and Craig Hugh Smyth, "Introduction to Part 1," in *The Early Years of Art History in the United States: Notes and Essays on Departments, Teaching, and Scholars,* ed. Craig Hugh Smyth and Peter M. Lukehart (Princeton, N.J.: Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, 1993), 5-6.

unusual, even for Yale.[11] (2) In 1874 Harvard University appointed Charles Eliot Norton as Lecturer in the History of Fine Arts as Connected with Literature, and the next year he was named professor. A scholar of literature and an expert on Dante, Norton was heavily influenced by his British teacher John Ruskin. Norton preached about the moral attributes of classical art and also encouraged some basic technical training as part of his fine arts program, which was offered separately in Harvard's Lawrence Scientific School.[12] (3) In 1883 Princeton University named Allan Marquand as the first person to be appointed as an independent chair specifically for art and archaeology. Marquand held a Ph.D. in philosophy and was therefore, like Norton, self-taught in art history. However, Marquand's focus drew upon the long, established tradition of the German art historical model. Following this program, Princeton offered no studio art training, but developed a program that catered to graduate students in art history, which eventually helped shape the subject into a scientific discipline distinct from the classics.[13] In addition to these schools, several all-female colleges, particularly Vassar, Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr, played a leading role in the teaching of both art history and/or studio art in higher education in the late 1800s, with Wellesley offering the first undergraduate major concentration and Vassar offering the first M.A. in art history.[14] By the turn of the century, the number of colleges and universities offering art and/or art history on their

---

[11] Efland, *History of Art Education,* 63-67.

[12] Sybil Gordon Kantor, "The Beginnings of Art History at Harvard and the "Fogg Method," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 164-65.

[13] See Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, *The Eye of the Tiger: The Founding and Development of the Department of Art and Archaeology, 1883-1923, Princeton University* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1983); and idem, "Princeton: The Beginnings under Marquand," and David van Zanten, "Formulating Art History at Princeton and the 'Humanistic Laboratory,'" in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 7-10, 175-76.

[14] Given that art was viewed as an aspect of cultural refinement, women in particular received instruction in the arts as but one aspect of female proficiencies along with elocution and languages. It is no coincidence, then, that all-female colleges played a significant role; see Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984).

campuses was roughly forty-seven, and the visual arts was just beginning to establish standards and professionalize itself as an academic subject.[15]

The Project

While this brief chronology of the development of the teaching of fine art and art history in colleges and universities is useful because it helps to establish the historical foundation of the subjects, historiographers have repeatedly tended to privilege the same individuals—typically men—and named the same schools. In fact, historiography tends to suffer from an emphasis on both biography and institutional history that often treat their subjects in a celebratory fashion. While biography and institutional history cannot be avoided, a major problem with this approach is that, as it celebrates the achievements of certain individuals and schools, it often tends to decontextualize their activities within a larger historical perspective. In response to such commemorative texts, Elizabeth C. Mansfield's *Art History and Its Institutions* examines the practices of the discipline in a broader, more critical manner. Mansfield explains:

> [a]rt history possesses its own mythology. Like all social organizations, an intellectual discipline coheres around a community with a shared history, a common language, and seemingly similar beliefs and goals. Fundamental to any social organization is a myth of its origins. Art history, as practiced and theorized in the West, enjoys a particularly active etiological impulse.[16]

While Mansfield's words concentrate on art history, they can easily be applied to the discipline of studio art education, which possesses its own mythology and also shares a mythology with art history.

My general purpose in this study is to examine some of the myths associated with studio art education and art history by focusing on the early professionalization of

---

[15] Howard Singerman, *Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 6.

[16] Elizabeth C. Mansfield, ed., *Art History and Its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 1. See also idem, ed., *Making Art History: A Changing Discipline and Its Institutions* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

the two fields in U.S. colleges and universities. According to the historian of education Roger L. Geiger, "If there is a single crucial point in the process of academic professionalization, it would be the formation of a national association with its attendant central journal."[17] For both the teaching of studio art and art history, such a pivotal moment occurred when the College Art Association (CAA) was officially established in 1911 and its first journal, *The Bulletin of the College Art Association,* began publication in 1913. Operating as both a learned society and educational organization, CAA has from its beginning largely represented the interests of studio art teachers and art historians working in U.S. colleges and universities. CAA therefore has often served as the official "social organization" for the two disciplines, to borrow Mansfield's words above. By its very function, CAA works to create a sense of "community with a shared history" and perpetuates "a common language" among its members with "seemingly similar beliefs and goals."[18]

My specific purpose in this study is to provide both a history and a criticism of CAA by examining the critical yet often conservative role the association played in the formation and early development of art history and studio art education as academic disciplines in U.S. colleges and universities. Although institutional politics have played a major part in cultural studies and art history for several decades, the number of analyses addressing CAA—and more generally, academic disciplines and the societies that support them—has been surprisingly limited. Yet the purpose of these associations, especially in their early stages, was crucial to the development and professionalization of the academic disciplines they endorsed. According to Geiger, "[b]y giving form and function to an inchoate or potential scientific community, associations enhanced the knowledge-generating capacity of the disciplines. Competent and advanced figures in

[17] Roger L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 22.
[18] Mansfield, *Art History and Its Institutions,* 1.

the field assumed positions of leadership, so that their influence became widespread in the evaluation of scholars and scholarship."[19] As a result, some sociologists and feminists have argued that the "heart" of an academic discipline lies not only within the confines of the classroom or larger university, but more so in the academic society because it legitimates or rejects standards in scholarship and provides endorsement that both scholars and academic institutions seek.[20]

While CAA serves many purposes, the association's most prominent ongoing functions include its annual conference and publications. My study focuses largely on CAA's journals, especially in the early years, because they played such a significant role in the institutional politics of CAA and in the development of these nascent disciplines. The publications program represented the organization on a much broader and more public level than did the annual conference, and the journals have become an ongoing record of the fields they represent. In addition, the history of the journals reflects the power struggle between CAA's two main constituents: the artist-teacher and art historian. By focusing on significant episodes in the history of CAA and its journals, this study examines the various trends in the scholarship that the association promoted at different times and some of the questionable institutional practices that the association engaged in to substantiate certain types of scholarship. Serving as both a historical analysis and an institutional critique, my project will show that CAA and its journals, as a result of their very function within the academic system, have often encouraged traditional viewpoints in the fields of art history and studio art education and sometimes reinforced the discipline's hierarchies, rather than challenge them.

In the early part of the twentieth century, a number of art organizations were established just prior to the founding of CAA, each of them serving a different purpose:

---

[19] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge,* 22.
[20] Patrice McDermott, *Politics and Scholarship: Feminist Academic Journals and the Production of Knowledge* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 8.

the American Association of Museums, created in 1906, concentrates on museums, while the American Federation of Arts, originated in 1909, focuses on exhibitions.[21] Among these various organizations, CAA was able to carve a specific niche for itself in the visual arts. Although CAA remains the one general U.S. professional organization for art historians, studio art professors, and others involved in the visual arts, very few histories of art history or studio art have considered the role that CAA played in shaping the disciplines in colleges and universities, and among those histories, either studio art or art history is favored. While CAA represents the interests of both studio art education and art history, and many colleges and universities combine the two disciplines in one department, the two are not typically understood as growing and developing in tandem because the former is a matter of contemporary practice while the latter is necessarily retrospective. Because CAA's journals serve as journals of record, they not only reflect the practices of the association but also the disciplines of art and art history themselves. In addition to publishing the *Bulletin of the College Art Association* (1913), CAA also began to produce a diverse array of periodicals including the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* (1917-1918), which was replaced by *The Art Bulletin* (1919-present). In 1929 CAA produced another journal titled *Parnassus*, which was abolished in 1941, and the *College Art Journal* (1941-1960) was created and subsequently renamed *Art Journal* (1960-present). Among its other major publications projects, CAA also published a book series called Monographs on the Fine Arts (1944-2000) and more recently *caa.reviews* (1998-present), an online journal for reviews of books and exhibitions.

Despite the importance of CAA's publications, few analyses have been published explicitly regarding CAA and its journals, and those that do exist have represented what

[21] "About AAM," American Association of Museums, accessed August 11, 2010, http://www.aam-us.org/aboutaam/; and "About the AFA," American Federation of Arts, accessed July 12, 2010, http://www.afaweb.org/about/.

should be labeled official histories. These texts have appeared in the very organs they address and have tended to celebrate the achievements of CAA's individual journals as opposed to offering any critical account of their practices and their influence. In 1964 Millard Meiss, who had been the editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin* in 1940-42, wrote "The Art Bulletin at Fifty." CAA had received substantial funding from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation to support *Art Bulletin* and CAA's Monographs on the Fine Arts, and Meiss's brief history acted largely as an expression of gratitude to the foundation. Its most important contribution was that he briefly addressed the relationship between archaeology and art history.[22]

It was not until 1994, thirty years later, that Richard Brilliant, who was completing his three-year term as the editor-in-chief of the journal, published a series of personal accounts from past editors of *Art Bulletin*.[23] While he himself contributed a poem, the other editors including Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt, Creighton Gilbert, Richard Spear, and Walter Cahn, recalled their past experiences. Although most of them addressed the general duties and sometimes the hardships of the job, Brandt focused on her reception as the first female editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin,* and Gilbert alluded to some of the internal politics when H. W. Janson was head of CAA's Publications Committee. While these texts were much more candid than Meiss's article, they were also largely official accounts of *Art Bulletin.*

Regarding CAA's other journals, nothing has been published yet on *Parnassus*. In terms of *College Art Journal,* which was retitled *Art Journal* in 1960, Henry R. Hope provided an "Editor's Report" in 1966. He had been the editor of the journal for almost two decades, and his history addressed in large part the production and finances of the

---

[22] Millard Meiss, "The Art Bulletin at Fifty," *Art Bulletin* 46, no. 1 (March 1964): 1-4.
[23] Richard Brilliant et al., "Editorial Ruminations," *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 202-9.

journal.[24] In 1991, on the fiftieth anniversary of the journal, CAA's president Ruth Weisberg talked about the importance of *Art Journal*'s thematic issues in terms of their usefulness for teaching.[25]

Most recently, *The Eye, the Hand, and the Mind: A Cultural History of the College Art Association,* which was edited by CAA's former executive director Susan Ball, celebrates the one-hundredth anniversary of CAA. The book examines CAA's various purposes, and my chapter on CAA's publications serves, quite honestly, as another official history of the association's publications program, despite the fact that the book was published by Rutgers University Press.[26] During the process of writing the text, I examined significant primary resources including the minutes of CAA's board of directors and the editorial boards of *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal,* which had not been analyzed previously. I also interviewed several past editors of CAA's publications. Although I had access to much, but not all, of CAA's archive, I was not able to include everything that I learned. I also wanted to address the scholarship found in the journals and the internal politics of CAA in a more in-depth manner and felt the topic was much bigger than a single chapter, amounting to a complete book-length study.

My purpose in writing this dissertation is therefore to expand upon this previous chapter and provide a more critical account of CAA and its journals. I also address more explicitly the histories of the disciplines of studio art and art history in relationship to CAA's journals. I chose to concentrate on the early years of CAA and its journals, specifically 1913-1945, because during this period CAA and its journals seemed to wield their greatest influence. The journals experienced numerous changes that reflected the growth and development of the two disciplines at the time. Also, I found that information

---

[24] Henry R. Hope, "Editor's Report," *Art Journal* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1966): 268-69.
[25] Ruth Weisberg, "Art Journal at Fifty," *Art Journal* 50, no. 4 (Winter 1991): 7.
[26] Craig Houser, "The Changing Face of Schoalrly Publishing: CAA's Publicatons Program," in Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, and the Mind.*

in CAA's archive, particularly during this period, was much more candid and sometimes challenged the existing notions in the literature regarding the histories of studio art education and art history.

While the historiography of studio art education and art history has been extensive, the most relevant texts for my project are Howard Singerman's *Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University* and Erwin Panofsky's "Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European."[27] What is significant about these texts is that they are among the few that recognize the influence of CAA in the development of the fields of studio art and art history and acknowledge the battles between the artists and the art historians. However, each text mentions CAA only briefly and shows a sense of bias in its own way: Singerman focuses predominantly on the role of the artist-teacher while Panofsky favors the art historian. Time and again, historiography has tended to examine one or the other field. In contrast, my history addresses the interrelationship between the two and examines both sides of the debates. I concentrate on CAA's journals because so many of the battles between the artists and the art historians in CAA were about the publications, namely *Art Bulletin,*

---

[27] Singerman, *Art Subjects;* and Erwin Panofsky, ""Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European," *College Art Journal* 14, no. 1 (Autumn 1954): 7-27. This article was first published as "The History of Art," in *The Cultural Migration: The European Scholar in America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953), 82–111. Some minor changes were made from the first to the second version, namely the title, otherwise nothing else that would affect my analysis. Other helpful historiographies include James S. Ackerman, "Western Art History," in *Art and Archeology* by Ackerman and Rhys Carpenter (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), 123-229; Jonathan Harris, *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2001); W. Eugene Kleinbauer, *Modern Perspectives in Western Art History: An Anthology of 20th Century Writings on the Visual Arts* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971); idem, *Research Guide to the History of Western Art* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1982); George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1962); Udo Kultermann, *The History of Art History* ([New York?]: Abaris Books, 1993); Vernon Hyde Minor, *Art History's History,* 2nd ed. (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2001); Michael Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982); Donald Preziosi, ed., *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); idem, *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989); and David Watkin, *The Rise of Architectural History* (London: Architectural Press; Westfield, N.J.: Eastview Editions, 1980); as well as Lee Sorenson, ed., Dictionary of Art Historians, http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org.

Parnassus, and *College Art Journal.* Although I have tried to be impartial regarding the different agendas of CAA's artists and art historians, my dissertation, admittedly, focuses more on art history than studio art. The main reason is that the art historians, more often than not, controlled CAA's journals, and these publications were one of the only vehicles for the art historians to publish their scholarship prior to World War II. The development of art history is therefore more readily revealed in the journals, especially *Art Bulletin.* The history of studio art education contained therein is, to be frank, somewhat spotty.

While Singerman's text is useful to my history, Panofsky's writings and Panofsky himself play a much more crucial role. In fact, my dissertation could easily include his name in the title. He served on CAA's board of directors in the early 1940s and instigated many policies that affected the journals. Although Panofsky's historiographic texts are insightful, I go to great lengths to qualify many of his remarks and, on more than one occasion, refute some of the myths that have been perpetuated in his publications. Panofsky's "Three Decades of Art History," for example, tends to gloss over the troubled reception of the European émigrés who were forced to flee Nazi Germany and come to the United States. Although Colin Eisler provided a more candid account of the situation in 1969 by addressing personal testimonies from the émigrés, several art historians in the past two decades have begun to rethink some of Panofsky's basic ideas.[28] In response to Panofsky's seminal text, Kathryn Brush, Thomas Crow, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Karen Michels, and Christopher Wood have each provided new insights in the history of art history during the 1910s, 1920s, and/or 1930s.[29] Their texts

---

[28] Colin Eisler, "*Kunstgeschichte* American Style: A Study in Migration," in Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, eds., *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969), 544-629.

[29] Kathryn Brush, "German Kunstwissenschaft and the Practice of Art History in America after World War I: Interrelationships, Exchanges, Contexts," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 26 (1999): 7-36; idem, "The Unshaken Tree: Walter W. S. Cook on German Kunstwissenschaft in 1924," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 52-53 (1998-99): 24-51; Thomas Crow, "The Practice of Art History in America," *Daedalus* 135, no. 2

grapple more explicitly with the dialogues between U.S. and European art historians and sometimes make stronger criticisms of U.S. art history during this period. However, none of them addresses the politics of CAA explicitly.

The Outline

I have divided my study into three parts, each of which covers a distinct period in the early history of CAA or concentrates on a specific journal. Part 1, which addresses the 1910s and 1920s, is titled "The Science of Art, or Art History's Entanglements with Art Education and Archaeology." In the 1910s, the disciplines of studio art and art history were relative newcomers to the college and university. While history, philosophy, and literature had firmly established themselves as primary subjects in the humanities within higher education in the late 1800s, the fields of art and art history were still struggling to find their niche. Much of their battle related to the fact that art simply had not been included regularly within the curricula of colleges and universities. The field also suffered from negative stereotypes that stemmed from the previous poor academic performances of art schools that had been associated with colleges and universities, as well as the larger cultural perception that undervalued art and privileged the sciences in U.S. education. CAA was therefore founded to promote the study of art within colleges and universities, and the journals were intended to reflect the association's initiatives, which in the early years ranged much more radically and diversely than one might expect.

Part 1 covers the history of the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America,*

(Spring 2006): 70-90; Kaufmann, "American Voices"; and Karen Michels, "Transfer and Transformation: The German Period in American Art History," in *Exiles + Émigrés: The Flight of European Artists from Hitler,* ed. Stephanie Barron with Sabine Eckmann (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1997), 304-16; Karen Michels, "Art History, German Jewish Identity, and the Emigration of Iconology," in *Jewish Identity in Modern Art History,* ed. Catherine M. Sousloff (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 167-79; Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft: Deutschsprachige Kunstgeschichte im amerikanischen Exil*, Studien aus dem Warburg Haus 2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999); and Christopher S. Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," in *The Italian Renaissance in the Twentieth Century* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2002), 65-92.

which was published from 1913 to 1918, and the first decade of *Art Bulletin,* which began publication in 1919. The latter would eventually become one of the oldest art publications still produced in the United States and defines itself as a peer-review "journal of record" for art history, publishing the "leading scholarship in the English language."[30] However, the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* was by no means a journal of record for art history.[31] In fact, it initially served merely as a promotional organ for CAA. Not much information is available about the internal workings of CAA in the early years; indeed, the first several issues of the *Bulletin* are among the few known documents that recorded the activities of the fledgling organization. In those pages, the hardships and crusades of the many "college art workers," as they were called, are revealed in addition to the rhetoric of art academia at the time.[32] Much of chapter 1 therefore discusses the basic early development of CAA by using the publication and a few other sources as a means of deciphering its goals and interests. While chapter 1 concentrates on studio art education, chapter 2 focuses on art history, specifically the radical change that occurred in *Art Bulletin* in the mid-1920s, when the art historians, especially those living in the Northeast, took over the journal for their own purposes, and the concerns of studio art teachers seemed to vanish from CAA almost entirely. Certain individuals in the field of art history would be endorsed, and a specific type of art history, one that celebrated the positivist tradition, would be touted, leaving other more radical and more interdisciplinary models to the wayside.

---

[30] "*Art Bulletin* Mission Statement," College Art Association, accessed March 20, 2008, http://www.collegeart.org/artbulletin/.

[31] Volume 1, number 1, was titled the *Bulletin of the College Art Association.* Numbers 2–4 were called the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America.*

[32] Western Drawing and Manual Training Association, "Report of Annual Meeting," 1910, p. 143, quoted in W. L. M. Burke, "Early Years of the College Art Association," *College Art Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1942): 101.

Part 2 is titled *"Art Bulletin* and the 1930s: Challenging the Discourse in Art History." The 1930s is perhaps one of the most complex decades in the development of art history, especially in the United States. Part 2 addresses a variety of changes related to the contents, finances, and editorial policies of *Art Bulletin* from the late 1920s through the early 1940s. This period is significant because it includes such pivotal sociohistorical events as the Great Depression, the arrival of numerous European émigrés after 1933, and World War II. While historiographers have addressed the influences of immigration and the war on U.S. art and art history, few have considered the impact of these events on CAA and *Art Bulletin,* and subsequently their indirect influence on the development of studio art and art history as academic disciplines in the United States.

In the early 1930s, art history in the United States was still largely in its infancy, yet "by the end of the 1930s," according to the *Grove Art Online,* "the *Art Bulletin* had established itself as the world's leading art-history periodical."[33] While such a statement is clearly subjective, the claim has some validity simply because art-historical publishing in Germany was dramatically slowed in the 1930s as a result of the poor economy and the rise of the National Socialist party. The eruption of World War II in 1939 also largely curtailed publishing activity in other European countries. The *Gazette des beaux-arts* stopped publishing in 1939 and had to move its offices to the United States, where it resumed operations in 1942. While the *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* was issued during the war, its page count was reduced to about half its usual size. In the United States, *Art Quarterly,* which was published by the Detroit Institute of Arts beginning in 1938, was *Art Bulletin*'s biggest competition. However, *Art Bulletin*'s circulation was substantially greater at the time and, because the journal was published

---

[33] John Kirby et al., "Periodical," sec. II Historical survey; 2. After c 1850; (i) Art history; (a) c. 1850–1930s, in *Oxford Art Online,* accessed March 20, 2008, http://www.oxfordartonline.com.

by an academic society, *Art Bulletin* had a greater influence on the discipline.[34] As a result of these circumstances, *Art Bulletin,* which continued its operations throughout the war years, albeit sometimes erratically and on a shoestring budget, became one of the few journals available to art historians internationally, allowing the journal's reputation to flourish.

Part 2, like part 1, explores the same set of problems that plagued CAA internally, namely the conflicts between the art historians and artists, as well as the regional debates between members in the Northeast and those located elsewhere in the United States. Another concern in the 1930s was the role that CAA played as either a national or an international association. Opinions differed on this matter and at times even wavered back and forth. Because the transitions within CAA, *Art Bulletin,* and the art-historical scholarship of the 1930s were complicated, part 2 comprises three chapters, all of which focus on the same time frame. Chapter 3 looks at CAA's and *Art Bulletin*'s practices and challenges during the early stages of the Great Depression, as well as the new developments in U.S. art-historical scholarship, with a particular focus on the articles by Meyer Schapiro and Millard Meiss published in *Art Bulletin.* These scholars are given special attention for they were the major emerging figures of this time who made significant contributions to both *Art Bulletin* and the discipline of art history. Chapter 4 addresses changes in the scholarship of European refugees in the United States, namely the writings of Panofsky, who wrote for *Art Bulletin* in the same period. Chapter 5 considers the reception of the European émigrés and issues of prejudice and internal politics within CAA and *Art Bulletin.* While all three of these chapters are interrelated, each of these histories is somewhat distinct because a combination of the three phenomena would not allow for a nuanced investigation of the many issues at

---

[34] Trevor Fawcett, "Scholarly Journals," in Fawcett and Clive Phillpot, eds., *The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines* (London: Art Book Company, 1976), 16, 18.

stake. In the 1930s CAA was an evolving, complex social organization made up primarily of artists and art historians, and *Art Bulletin* represented a multifaceted knowledge network that was integrating the divergent practices of U.S. and European art history. The bottom line is that by the end of the 1930s a standardized approach to the discipline of art history irrespective of geographic boundaries would be set, and *Art Bulletin* would play a substantial role in the development and maintenance of such a standard.

In part 2, the internal politics and editorial policies of the organization are addressed in much greater detail. A major difference between parts 1 and 2 is that the history of CAA during the 1930s is supported by the availability of substantial primary source material. Beginning in 1930, CAA kept an archive of minutes from the meetings of its board of directors and the annual meetings of its members. While much of this documentation is routine and mundane, some of it reveals significant initiatives and policies that affected the development of art history in the United States, such as CAA's establishment of a Research Institute. Also, some interactions among board members were recorded in great detail like a transcript, allowing the personal nature of the communications to become apparent. In addition, letters exchanged between CAA's board members and other individuals reveal the nuances of the then-current debates regarding nationalist policies and cronyism and help to explain the complexities of certain decisions made by CAA, as well as their impact.[35]

Part 3 is titled "CAA's Second Journal and the Demise of Studio Art Education." Comprised of only one chapter, part 3 focuses on CAA's other journals: *Parnassus,* which was published from 1929 to 1941 and then replaced by *College Art Journal.* If *Art Bulletin* represented the "official organ" or primary journal of CAA, *Parnassus* and

---

[35] CAA does not house a significant archive. While it holds records of meetings of the board of directors, most of the correspondence exchanged among board members and other CAA members, if retained at all, was kept by the individuals who wrote or received the letters. These letters are therefore scattered among various archives in the United States.

College Art Journal might be labeled CAA's secondary periodical simply because they were smaller and operated on much smaller budgets. While *Art Bulletin* was committed to art history and remained steadfast in that purpose, CAA's secondary journal was much broader in scope. Its mission, unlike that of *Art Bulletin,* was to cater to the diverse needs of CAA's membership at large, not only the art historian, but the artist, critic, museum professional, and numerous others working or interested in the visual arts. In this capacity, CAA's secondary journal was much more vulnerable to the changing whims of the board of directors and the membership, and it was revamped and repackaged numerous times.

In part 3, I address the history of *Parnassus* and the early years of *College Art Journal* up until 1945.[36] My purpose in this chapter is to examine the rationale for replacing *Parnassus* with *College Art Journal* and the resulting dispute that developed between the art historians and the artists. The content and even the look of the two journals, which represented the initiatives of CAA, played a critical role in the process, and the impact of the battle was significant because the entire mission of the association changed, favoring the art historian once again. One of my major purposes in this study is to address the internal politics of CAA and examine the ways in which art history was allowed to rise while studio art education met its demise within the association in the early 1940s at the onset of World War II. While CAA was initially innovative in its purposes and at times was willing to challenge the status quo of higher education by advocating the practice of art within the college curriculum, the association time and again favored a more traditional agenda that supported the history of art within academia.

---

[36] College Art Association, *What the College Art Association Does* (New York: College Art Association, 1930), 2.

My extensive conclusion offers a brief history of CAA and its publications from 1945 to the present. After World War II, higher education changed radically, namely in terms of the number of people who enrolled in colleges and universities. However, it was not until the 1970s, as part of the larger growth of liberal politics within academia, that CAA experienced fundamental shifts in its governance, and a more egalitarian relationship between the artists and the art historians ensued. While *Art Journal* would change several times from the early 1970s onward, it was not until the late 1980s that CAA began to address the entrenched cronyism that had infected its journals since their beginnings. On more than one occasion CAA had to change the editorial management of its publications, including its system of peer review. In addition, *Art Bulletin* had to be revamped in terms of its scholarship, so that its content might become more current within the field of art history.

Put simply, this dissertation addresses the politics of scholarship, by exposing many of the hidden discourses and disputes associated with studio art and art history in higher education, especially those related to scholarly publishing. On a larger scale, this dissertation also examines the very process of legitimization within academia and the means by which individuals and schools, as well as certain types of scholarly practices, fall either inside or outside the established boundaries of academia. While the process is often considered fair and neutral, my analysis demonstrates that such a system can be sometimes biased in its very makeup.

PART 1

THE SCIENCE OF ART, OR ART HISTORY’S ENTANGLEMENTS WITH STUDIO ART EDUCATION AND ARCHAEOLOGY

CHAPTER 1

CAA's *BULLETIN:*

THE INITIAL AGENDA, THE CONSTITUENTS, THE INTERNAL POLITICS, AND THE MOUTHPIECE

> "Often regarded today as an elitist East Coast entity, the organization [College Art Association] grew out of a group of Midwestern primary and secondary school teachers, the Western Drawing and Manual Training Association."
> —Stephen Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores*[1]

Today the mission statement of the College Art Association (CAA) states that the organization "promotes the visual arts and their understanding through committed practice and intellectual engagement."[2] Although this somewhat broad purpose allows CAA to act in a variety of capacities within the visual arts on a national level, the association, as its name states, has been concerned primarily with the teaching and promotion of the history and practice of art in colleges and universities. In this regard, CAA was tremendously influential in the growth and development of art departments in higher education. Nevertheless, as Dyson's words of 1998 suggest, CAA has suffered from a certain reputation—or rather reputations—throughout much of its history that seem to counter the breadth of its current general mission. In fact, CAA has not only sometimes been considered an "elitist East Coast entity," as opposed to a national organization, but it has also often been regarded as an organization that caters primarily to the needs of art historians, and less so those of artists and others working in the visual arts.[3] The results of a 2009 survey confirmed that 78 per cent of CAA's members

---

[1] Stephen Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores: Classical Archaeology in the United States* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 101.
[2] "Mission Statement," College Art Association, accessed October 1, 2010, http://www.collegeart.org/about/mission.
[3] Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores,* 101.

think that the association "is most relevant to art historians."[4] Despite these perceptions, CAA's origins are, as Dyson indicates, ironically quite different from what one might imagine, and they are worthy of investigation to see how the association was transformed, especially in its early years. This chapter therefore explains the formation and early development of CAA, addressing the association's initial agenda, the constituents, the internal politics, and the first journal.

The Origins

Although CAA was founded in 1911, its inception dates back as far as 1907, when the Western Drawing and Manual Training Association (WDMTA) held its 14th annual meeting in Cleveland in conjunction with the Eastern Manual Training Association and the Eastern Art Teachers' Association. Although the agenda of each organization varied, they were generally comprised of elementary and secondary school teachers, as well as post-secondary instructors, who were dedicated to creating standards in art and/or design education.[5] The WDMTA, originally called the Western Drawing Teachers' Association, and the Eastern Manual Training Association, first named the Manual Training Teachers' Association of America, were established in 1893 in conjunction with the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago.[6] The latter significantly transformed the United States in terms of art, industry, and architecture, as well as

---

[4] Michael Fahlund, "2009 Member Survey Results," *CAA News*, last modified July 16, 2010, accessed July 20, 2010, http://www.collegeart.org/news/2009/07/16/2009-member-survey-results/.

[5] Ball, "The Beginnings." See also John A. Michael, "The Emergence of the Regionals and the NEA Art Departments: The National Art Education Association Is Born," in *The National Art Education Association: Our History—Celebrating 50 Years, 1947-1997* (Reston, Va.: NAEA, 1997), 1-22; and Ralph Jacobs and Bill D. Francis, "Ninety Years of the Western Arts Association," *Art Education* 38, no. 4 (July 1985): 32-37.

[6] The Manual Training Teachers' Association of America changed its name in 1896 to the American Manual Training Association to attract members who were not necessarily teachers. Although the organization was supposed to be national in scope, it catered to the interests of people in the East Coast and therefore changed its name to the Eastern Manual Training Association in 1900; see Charles Alpheus Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education 1870 to 1917* (Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1937), 495-502.

educational initiatives.[7] The Eastern Art Teachers' Association, as its name states, was comprised of art teachers, and was founded in 1900.[8]

In the early 1900s studio art education had come to include both the fine arts and the industrial arts. One reason was that the industrial arts had garnered more government support and attention since the passing of the Morrill Act in 1862. The statute had provided federal lands to states to establish land-grant colleges and universities to "promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."[9] The United States had already proven itself to be a budding international force in industrial design since the *Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations* was held in 1851 in London, and with the support of the Morrill Act, the importance of industrial design grew throughout the latter half of nineteenth century.[10] However, at the Paris Exposition of 1900, the United States had been severely criticized for its excessive number of mediocre designs. Their "lack of aesthetic appeal," according to Susan Ball, had caused some critics to doubt the quality and usefulness of the inventions, which "convinced American industries that aesthetically appealing and *well-designed* manufactured objects were a matter of sound business in order to compete successfully in a world market" [Ball's emphasis].[11] Following this trend, the Western Drawing Teachers' Association chose to embrace manual training

---

[7] See ibid.; Stanley Appelbaum, *The Chicago World's Fair of 1893: A Photographic Record* (New York: Dover, 1980); and Joan E. Draper, "Introduction: The White City and Its Interpretation: Historians, Critics, and the Chicago World's Columbian Exposition of 1893," in Daniel H. Burnham, *The Final Official Report of the Director of Works of the World's Columbian Exposition* (New York: Garland, 1989). For a critical account related to the racist and sexist politics of the world's fair, see Neil Harris et al., *Grand Illusions: Chicago's World's Fair of 1893* (Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1993).

[8] Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education*, 498.

[9] Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 14; see also Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., *American Higher Education: A Documentary History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 2:568.

[10] James Parton Haney, "The Development of Public Schools," in *Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States,* ed. Haney (New York: American Art Annual, 1908), 42.

[11] Ball, "The Beginnings"; see also Arthur J. Pulos, *American Design Ethic: A History of Industrial Design: A History of Industrial Design to 1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983), 228-43; Jacobs and Francis, "Ninety Years of the Western Arts Association," 32-37; and Fred D. Crawshaw, *Manual Arts for Vocational Ends* (Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1915).

among its main initiatives and changed its name in 1904 to the Western Drawing and Manual Training Association. In addition, the Eastern Art Teachers' Association and the Eastern Manual Training Association would merge in 1909 to become the Eastern Art and Manual Training Teachers' Association (EAMTTA).[12]

Although the WDMTA and the EAMTTA were regionally based, the associations had chosen to team together and expand their efforts on a national scale in order to examine art education at the college level by forming a Committee on the Condition of Art Work in Colleges and Universities.[13] The committee members included John S. Ankeney of the University of Missouri in Columbia, Edward J. Lake of the University of Illinois in Urbana, and William Woodward of Tulane University in New Orleans. Representing the Midwest and South, they were members of the WDMTA, which remained the lead organization in the project.[14] They wrote to 175 "art educators," as they were called, asking for information about the teaching of art at various colleges and universities in the United States:

> This committee is addressing you to request your hearty co-operation in its effort to place before the art workers in the American colleges, whether in the field of the history, practice or theory of art, as comprehensive a statement as possible of the status of their work, today. It also hopes to determine what the majority of the instructors believe to be the best lines along which to develop their subject."[15]

This request was significant not only because it called for information and standards in the teaching of art, but also because it united the history, practice, and theory in the teaching of the visual arts. Such a diverse combination would serve as the broad common ground for the committee's initiatives and later for CAA. The committee's 1910 final report stated: "the most important factor toward the final solution of the problem of

---

[12] Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education*, 496-98. See also Michael, "The Emergence of the Regionals and the NEA Art Department," 3, 4, 8, 9.
[13] Ball, "The Beginnings."
[14] John S. Ankeny, Edward J. Lake, and William Woodward, "Final Report of the Committee on the Condition of Art Work in Colleges and Universities," in *Proceedings of Meetings: Western Drawing and Manual Training Association* (Peoria, Ill.: J. W. Franks and Sons, 1915), 161.
[15] Ibid.

art education in universities is the unity of effort which may be developed in the teaching corps itself." The name *College Art Association* was already in use and an effort to form a separate association was clearly underway: "At the present meeting a College Art Association has been formed, and it is earnestly hoped that this may expand into a national movement."[16] In 1911 the new group met separately from the WDMTA for the first time at the University of Illinois to establish an independent association, and in 1912 the constitution of CAA was signed, and the first conference took place. A journal was produced the following year to help explain the mission of the new association and support its effort to promote art in colleges and universities.[17]

The Bulletin of the College Art Association

Throughout the 1910s CAA's first publication, *The Bulletin of the College Art Association*, changed radically in size, format, and content, and many of these alterations were related to the growth of the disciplines of art and art history at the time in the United States. The inaugural issue, published in January 1913, looked remarkably different from what the scholarly journal would eventually become. A 16-page document measuring 7 by 4¼ inches, the first issue seemed to live up to its basic name—a *bulletin*. Acting predominantly as a newsletter, CAA's publication provided lists and general information including the organization's officers and directors, committees and their members, colleges and other institutions represented in the organization, information regarding the annual conference, and the association's constitution. Although this first issue may now be perceived as insubstantial, much of the discussion at CAA's 1912 conference had been devoted to how the publication would keep its nationally diverse membership in communication with one another, help establish the

---

[16] Ibid., 162. See also Holmes Smith, "The Future of the University Round Table," in *Proceedings of Meetings,* 143-46.
[17] Ball, "The Beginnings."

new academic society's goals, and promote its accomplishments.[18]

By the early 1900s, according to Roger L. Geiger, the importance of publishing a journal for any new academic society was well understood. A publication served as the means by which an association was able to unite its members and advocate for its causes.[19] A journal also allowed scholars in a particular field to reach beyond the boundaries of their individual universities and establish a nationwide network with colleagues. In addition, it provided the opportunity for individuals to publish and gain recognition in their specific fields. Acting as the official voice for a discipline, a journal served as a learning tool to keep practitioners up to date in their fields and provided support and credible evidence for those who might need to pressure their college administrators to effect changes in their schools and programs. Because the first issues of CAA's *Bulletin* served initially as a newsletter and promotional tool for the association, they not only provide a general history of CAA, but also reflect some of the national trends in studio art education and art history in the 1910s.

The inaugural issue of the *Bulletin* featured an official statement by CAA's first president, Holmes Smith, who was a painter by profession and a teacher at Washington University in St. Louis. Like many art teachers of his generation, he taught courses in both studio art and art history, although the latter was likely some sort of art appreciation course.[20] Smith had played a large role in the establishment of CAA. He was therefore a logical choice to lead the initial crusade of CAA to promote the teaching of art and art history in the curriculum of higher education. Smith's statement, "The Problems of the College Art Association," articulated the challenge of teaching of art and art history at the

---

[18] Homer Eaton Keyes, "The College Art Association," *Art and Progress* 4, no. 4 (February 1913): 868.
[19] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 22-25.
[20] Allen Stuart Weller, "John Pickard, Walter Miller, the College Art Association, and the University of Missouri," in *100 Years of Teaching Art History and Archaeology: University of Missouri, 1892-1992* (Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, 1992), 15.

university level in the United States. Smith was well aware that a college education had only recently come to be accepted as an essential component for success in professional careers in commerce, science, and literature. However, he bemoaned that "art production and appreciation" had been neglected within this national trend in support of higher education. Smith reported that only approximately one hundred twenty "institutions of college grade" offered courses in art instruction, and fewer than one hundred provided courses in art history. Although these statistics showed a marked increase from the numbers twenty years earlier, less than one-fourth of the liberal arts colleges and universities in the United States were offering courses in art, which was meager in comparison to more established academic disciplines, such as philology, history, and English.[21]

The reason why art and art history had not already been accepted as academic disciplines boiled down to one essential problem in Smith's view: "There is no commonly-accepted view even among art teachers as to *what*, *how*, and *when* art shall be taught in undergraduate and graduate courses."[22] As a result, he claimed, colleges and universities were reluctant to offer courses in these fields. Although CAA's constitution stated that its general purpose was "to promote art interests in all divisions of American colleges and universities," the organization's specific goals were to establish standards in studio art education and art history and to serve as the expert in these fields.[23] Smith laid out the solution to CAA's problem as follows:

> We are in need of an authoritative voice that shall quell the confusion of tongues, a quickening breath that shall clarify the atmosphere of threatening clouds of indolence, ignorance and ineptitude, and a deft hand that shall single out the truth

---

[21] Holmes Smith, "The Problems of the College Art Association," *Bulletin of the College Art Association* 1, no. 1 (January 1913): 6-7. Note that issues 1-4 were published without volume numbers; in 1919 the journal's new editor decided that they would comprise volume 1 of the journal.
[22] Ibid., 7.
[23] "Constitution, Article II.: Purpose," *Bulletin of the College Art Association* 1, no. 1 (January 1913): 13.

> from the tangled mass of insincerities, for "where there is no vision the people perish."[24]

From the beginning CAA was determined to serve as the "authoritative voice," and its journal was to be the organization's mouthpiece for the fields of studio art education and art history. Smith explained that "one of the important functions of the Association will be the publication of a bulletin," which will reveal the work of "various committees that have been appointed by the executive board."[25] The reports of these committees and the board of directors were therefore a means to "quell the confusion" by establishing basic standards in studio art and art history.

Although CAA's initial purpose was broad, the organization seemed to focus primarily on studio art and the importance of its potential role within the college or university.[26] Seven of the eleven papers presented at CAA's 1912 conference, which were listed in CAA's *Bulletin*, addressed concerns related to art education, including Walter Sargent's "The Pedagogical Study of Problems of Art Education," Irene Sargent's "A Plea for the Granting of a College Degree in Fine Arts," and Herbert M. Cross's "The Place of the Study of Art in American Universities." The remaining papers varied considerably in scope. While Allan Marquand's "The Tomb of Ilaria del Caretto" provided an art-historical analysis of an early Italian Renaissance monument, the rest of the presentations, from today's perspective, seem quite broad in nature, such as Homer Eaton Keyes's "Art and the Commonplace" and John Beverly Robinson's "Art and Architecture." That so many papers focused on such fundamental pedagogical concerns for studio art education, and so few concentrated on specific art objects or periods of historical study, suggested that CAA's agenda was dedicated primarily to studio art education, and that the fields of art and art history were still quite broad and largely

---

[24] H. Smith, "Problems of the College Art Association," 6.
[25] Ibid., 9.
[26] "Constitution, Article II.: Purpose," 13.

undefined.

By comparison with academic organizations for art and art history in Europe, CAA was quite different. In European countries, studio art and art history were taught in different types of institutions: studio art was learned in academies, and art history in universities. The conferences that promoted their interests were separate as well. For example, artist-teachers had been gathering together every four years at the International Art Congress for the Development of Drawing and Art Teaching, and Their Applications to Industry, beginning in 1900. At the 1908 meeting in London, the United States was represented by some two hundred people, several of whom were members of the WDMTA. The conference typically featured an enormous exhibition. Woodward, who had been in attendance with Ankeney, reported that the United States "had the largest space allotted to any foreign nation" and "in some lines we seemed to outstrip our competitors."[27] The need for the United States to serve as a formidable international force in the industrial arts had clearly played a substantial role in the country's desire to improve art education.[28]

Art historians, in contrast, convened at the International Congress for Art Historians, which had been held on a triennial basis since 1873 and embraced scholars from countries around the world. Among the European countries, Germany had a much more established tradition for art history within its higher education system. Johann Joachim Winckelmann had written *History of Art of Antiquity* as early as 1764, and the first full professorship in art history had been granted to Johann Dominic Fiorillo in Göttingen in 1813, much earlier than any chair for art history in the United States.[29] In 1908 German art historians had established an association called the Deutscher Verein

---

[27] William Woodward, quoted in John S. Ankeney, "Report: International Congress of Art," in *Proceedings of Meetings,* 158.
[28] Ball, "The Beginnings."
[29] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 8-9.

für Kunstwissenschaft to promote the history of art. The organization initially published books specifically on German art, but no journal until 1934. European academic art-historical journals were typically published by individuals, universities, or museums, which differed in practice from the United States, where scholarly journals were often published by learned societies.[30]

Although CAA presented itself in its *Bulletin* as a unified body representing the needs and desires of both artists and art historians, working at colleges and universities, as well as museums, conflicts were apparent from the beginning between the practitioners and the historians. It is thus important to consider both what was and what was not published in the *Bulletin*. Keyes, who had presented a paper at CAA's 1912 conference and taught art history at Dartmouth College, served on the editorial committee that produced the first issue of the *Bulletin.*[31] However, in 1913 he chose to publish an article in another journal, offering a candid, insider's perspective on what had happened at CAA's meeting. While Smith explained that CAA's main problem was the need to establish standards, Keyes identified a different kind of crisis: divisiveness. Keyes felt the association's membership was divided into three camps, each of which reflected the varying, even conflicting, agendas of the organization. At the 1912 annual meeting, one group believed that college-level courses in art should solely concentrate on the history and theory of art.[32] In fact, the *American Art Annual* reported that Oliver S. Tonks, the head of the Department of Art at Vassar College since 1911, caused controversy when he proclaimed in 1912 that technical training in art should not be part

---

[30] Heinrich Dilly, "Germany, §XVII: Historiography," *Oxford Art Online,* accessed September 1, 2010, http://www.oxfordartonline.com.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/subscriber/article/grove/art/T031531pg17?q=international+congress+of+art+historians&search=quick&pos=12&_start=1#firsthit.
[31] Wendell Garrett and Allison Eckardt Ledes, "Seventy-five Years of 'The Magazine Antiques,' 1922–1997," *The Magazine Antiques* 151 (January 1997): 178-83.
[32] Keyes, "College Art Association," 868.

of the college curriculum.[33] A second group felt that history and theory could be taught more effectively when the student had had some technical training.[34] Along these lines, Arthur Pope, an assistant professor at Harvard University, proposed a studio art course "as being cultural rather than professional and as comparable to methods of teaching English Composition."[35] The third group, which represented mostly teachers from art schools affiliated with universities, wanted college credit awarded for studio art classes. After much "animated discussion," according to Keyes, the first group eventually accepted the proposal of the second; however, the third group remained somewhat marginalized.[36] Schools of art affiliated with colleges and universities were thought to have weak standards for admissions, curricula, and degree requirements, and some CAA members felt the organization needed to distance itself from practical training, so that art history might be more readily accepted within the university.[37] In the end, any formal decision on the subject was tabled, and a committee was encouraged to expand on the discussion in greater detail by investigating which types of art courses might be appropriate for the bachelor's degree and which types of studio courses would be best in an art school within a university.[38]

Keyes concluded that while it made perfect sense for art historians and artists to work together, "[t]hey will, in time, meet as distinct sections."[39] Despite their differences, which are still apparent within the organization today, they needed each other desperately in the early 1900s to promote their common interests in colleges and universities and fight indifference from both the general public and college administrators.

---

[33] "The College Art Association," *American Art Annual* 11 (1914): 38.
[34] Keyes, "College Art Association," 868.
[35] "College Art Association," *American Art Annual,* 38.
[36] Keyes, "College Art Association," 868.
[37] Singerman, *Art Subjects*, 15.
[38] Keyes, "College Art Association," 868.
[39] Ibid.

It should be noted, however, that the distinctions among the factions of CAA were not as simply divided as art historian versus artist-teacher. Rather, the divisions among Keyes's three groups stemmed in part from a sense of regionalism. While generalizations are difficult to make, liberal arts colleges and universities in the Northeast, whose art programs or departments were often governed by art historians, tended to believe that studio art education had no place in the curriculum or that its purpose was only to enhance the student's traditional educational program. Previously, studio art training in colleges and universities in the Northeast had often been offered in schools of art that were separate from the main colleges, and these schools of art often allowed non-degree students to take classes. Many of these art schools had therefore been closed in the 1890s because of low standards.[40] By contrast, colleges and universities in the West, South, and parts of the Midwest, which sometimes lacked art history, promoted the idea that art was to be learned by doing and continued their studio offerings. In these regional debates, Chicago was considered the dividing line between the West and Northeast because its schools split half and half in terms of attitudes regarding the teaching of art.[41] These regional differences stemmed from the fact that, before CAA was established, art organizations had been regionally based and different criteria for art education had thus been promoted.[42]

While these general divisions regarding professions and regions would continue in the following decades, exceptions to the rule were apparent. The lines were sometimes blurred between the artist-teacher and the art historian because many college instructors, such as Smith, taught in both disciplines. In addition, various types of

---

[40] Singerman, *Art Subjects*, 52-53.
[41] Ibid., 18. Singerman draws his conclusion from Lura Beam, "The Place of Art in the Liberal College," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (May 1927): 272; and Robert Goldwater, "The Teaching of Art in Colleges of the United States," *College Art Journal* 2, no. 4, supplement (May 1943): 23.
[42] Ankeney et al., "Final Report of the Committee on the Condition of Art Work in Colleges and Universities," 162.

schools, including the research university, the liberal arts college, and the state university or college, sometimes promoted different agendas. Individual colleges and universities, with their various departments and affiliated schools, occasionally established different standards within the same institution, and faculty members, even those working within one department, expressed conflicting opinions at times.[43] Lastly, schools changed their curricula throughout their history. For example, after having denounced studio art education in 1912, Tonks reinstated art training in Vassar's curriculum in 1915. However, credit was not awarded for such courses until 1918, albeit to a limited degree, such that it was not possible to major in the discipline until several decades later.[44] Although these professional and regional differences were key political concerns for CAA, none of these conflicts was articulated in the 1913 *Bulletin* itself.

As president of CAA, Smith clearly understood the battles he was facing in establishing proper standards for art and art history. Research on current practices was needed to address the issues appropriately, and a committee was therefore established called On Investigation of Art Instruction in Colleges and Universities. Smith appointed three key people to handle the necessary research: Ankeney, T. Lindsey Blayney of the Rice Institute in Houston, and Marquand of Princeton University in New Jersey. Smith's selections helped to combat the factional nature of CAA by uniting different types of schools from different locations in the United States. Although each man had impressive

---

[43] Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 17–18.

[44] Pamela Askew, "The Department of Art at Vassar: 1865-1931," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 62. See also Karilyn B. Strickland, "Art Department," in *An Administrative History of Vassar College 1861-2003,* ed. Ronald D. Patkus and Elizabeth A. Daniels (Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Vassar College, 2004), 12, which provides an overview of the volatile acceptance of studio art training within Vassar's curriculum. In 1865, drawing and painting were offered in the School of Design (sometimes called School of Art). By 1867 students were able to receive academic credit for studio classes, and art history classes were added. In 1892 the School of Design was closed, although students could earn a diploma in art in the Art Department. By 1900 no studio courses were offered, and in 1915 studio art was reinstated but no credit was offered for courses. By 1918 students could receive four credit hours altogether for studio art, and by 1927 it was ten hours because Vassar started to offer a major in art history that year. In 1935 studio art courses were no longer mandatory. Finally, in 1984, students were able to major in studio art.

credentials in terms of such research, Marquand had advised one of his students, E. Baldwin Smith, in the research and production of a 1912 pamphlet titled "Study of the History of Art in the Colleges and Universities of the United States," which listed the individual courses taught at various schools offering art history.[45] President Holmes Smith appointed Marquand as chair of the committee, even though Princeton did not offer education in studio art. Smith was, therefore, quite explicit in his instructions to Marquand that the "investigation should not be confined to instruction in art history, but should include all phases of Art work in universities. This suggests a work of greater scope than that included in Mr. [E. Baldwin] Smith's pamphlet."[46] The formation of the committee demonstrated that CAA wanted all voices to be incorporated in its research discussions, and the association was committed to both studio art and art history. Although the threat of one group or another taking over was apparent, Smith's strict instructions conveyed that in the early years the artist-teachers, who had founded the association, were in charge of CAA.

CAA's Membership

In his 1913 president's statement, Smith had invited all college art teachers involved in the practice, theory, or history of art to join CAA. He also hoped that instructors working in related professional departments, especially architecture, would become members.[47] While Smith's invitation seemed open, the criteria for "active membership," according to

---

[45] Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, "Princeton: The Beginnings under Marquand," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 7-10. Smith's pamphlet had been produced for the 1912 meeting of the International Congress for Art Historians. Adolfo Venturi of Italy had asked Marquand of Princeton to produce statistics regarding the teaching of art history in colleges and universities in the United States. Regarding the other committee members, Ankeney was obviously important because he had helped found CAA, and Blayney was significant because he had been working for the American Federation of Arts while investigating the teaching of art history in the United States.
[46] Holmes Smith to Allan Marquand, T. Lindsey Blayney, and J. S. Ankeney, March 5, 1913, Allan Marquand Papers, 1858–1951, box 12, folder 24, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[47] H. Smith, "Problems of the College Art Association," 9.

CAA's constitution, was restricted to "all instructors in the history, practice, teaching or theory of the fine arts in a college or university of recognized standing and all who are engaged in educational work on the staff of any museum or art gallery of recognized standing."[48] An individual who did not meet these criteria could join as an associate member by invitation. Such a restrictive practice was not unusual for academic societies at the time. They wanted their members to represent their specific interests, and "recognized standing" was likely considered essential to ensure that the mission of the academic society would be respected and advanced by its membership.[49] While "recognized standing" for a college or university typically meant a four-year school that awarded a bachelors' degree, CAA was different from other learned societies because museums were included, and its criteria did not always appear strict. Nevertheless, a general analysis of the membership reveals some inherent biases within CAA from the beginning.[50]

In the January 1917 issue, CAA's *Bulletin* listed 105 individual members.[51] Only four were listed as not having any affiliation with an institution. Among the other 101 members, the vast majority worked for a university or college, while only 2 were associated with a museum and 3 with another type of organization.[52] The reason for so few museum members might have stemmed from the fact that museums, like art departments, were relatively new at the time. Also the American Association of

[48] "Article III.: Membership," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 4-6, 31.
[49] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 25.
[50] In the three issues of the *Bulletin* published in 1917 and 1918, the organization provided a list of the individual members and their affiliations.
[51] The number of members totaled 108 because three institutions were included in the list—the Newark Free Public Library in New Jersey, St. Catherine College in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Wellesley College of Massachusetts—despite the fact that two individuals were also affiliated with Wellesley. In 1917 CAA did not list institutional members separately.
[52] Edith R. Abbot and Edward Robinson worked for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Walter Mitchell was affiliated with the Archaeological Institute of America, and H. H. Powers and J. H. Powers were listed "c/o University Prints, Boston"; see "Members," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 4-6.

Museums (AAM) had been established in 1906 and likely catered to their needs more directly.[53] Unfortunately, no information was included indicating which members identified as artists and/or art historians. However, it is possible to examine regional and gender differences among the membership.

Although CAA's constituents lived in several regions of the United States, about 45 percent were located in the Northeast.[54] The schools with the most members were Harvard University (with 5) and Princeton University (with 4), which was logical given that these two schools offered more courses and had more faculty members in art history than any other university or college in the United States.[55] Surprisingly, no one was listed from Yale's School of Fine Arts, which had served as a leader in practical art instruction at the college level since the mid-1860s, or the University of Pennsylvania, which offered numerous archaeology and art history courses.[56] Approximately 35 percent of the members came from Midwestern institutions; the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois ranked almost as high as Harvard and Princeton in their numbers of members. The remaining 20 percent were divided evenly between the West and the South. These statistics reflect CAA's beginnings as a joint venture between Midwestern- and East Coast-based art associations. The membership numbers also demonstrate that the young organization still needed to develop a national constituency; however, it should be noted that the Northeast and the Midwest simply had more

[53] "About AAM," American Association of Museums*,* accessed August 30, 2010, http://www.aam-us.org.
[54] Among the states representing the Northeastern region of the United States, I am including Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont.
[55] George H. Chase, Arthur Pope, and Chandler Post, "Faculty of Arts and Sciences," *Harvard Gazette* (1930): 30; Efland, *History of Art Education*, 64-66; Hiss and Fansler, *Research in Fine Arts*, 20-25; and Agnes Mongan, "Harvard and the Fogg," and Sybil Gordon Kantor, "Harvard and the 'Fogg Method,'" in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 48-49, 164.
[56] The information about course offerings in art history comes from E. B. Smith, "Study of the History of Art," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 12-36.

schools than other areas of the United States, which was why those regions had more members.

In terms of gender, approximately 35 percent of CAA's members were women, and several of them participated in CAA's activities by serving as committee members, speaking at conferences, and publishing in the *Bulletin*. Although women were affiliated with a variety of institutions, most of them worked for all-female liberal arts colleges, such as Mt. Holyoke, Vassar, and Wellesley Colleges, where the teaching of both art and art history had been embraced quite early as academic subjects. According to Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, music and art were traditionally studied as a means "to 'finish' a woman for polite society."[57] In 1865, when Vassar opened, the college had established a School of Design, and in 1876 the college had awarded the very first M.A. in art history in the United States.[58] Wellesley also had decided to incorporate art as part of its core liberal arts curriculum from its beginnings in 1875 and established its School of Art as early as 1878. In 1900 Wellesley was also the only U.S. college where a student could receive a B.A. in art history.[59] Women's institutions had clearly played a pioneering role in the early development of art and art history as academic subjects, and more women than men sought education in the visual arts. According to a 1916 survey conducted by

---

[57] Horowitz, *Alma Mater*, 83.
[58] Strickland, "Art Department," 12; and Askew, "Department of Art at Vassar," 60. The M.A. was awarded in conjunction with a thesis titled "The Progress of Art in Ancient Times"; see Hiss and Fansler, *Research in Fine Arts*, 195.
[59] Ibid., 84; and Claire Richter Sherman, "The Department of Art, Wellesley College, and the History of Art and Classical Archaeology, Bryn Mawr College, 1875-1914," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 153-55. In 1901 Wellesley awarded two M.A. degrees in art history; see Hiss and Fansler, *Research in Fine Arts*, 195. Wellesley closed its art school in 1896, and Smith did the same in 1902, because the school offered studio art "in conjunction with period art history classes as art-historical skills"; see Singerman, *Art Subjects*, 53. For information on Vassar's art school, see note 42.

CAA, approximately twice as many women took classes in the visual arts than men.[60] Art was thus time and again coded as effete and feminine.[61]

In this discussion of all-female colleges, it should be noted that although Georgiana Goddard King of Bryn Mawr College was highly active in CAA, she was not listed as a member. Bryn Mawr was somewhat distinct among the Seven Sister colleges because the school had not offered studio art in the late 1800s or early 1900s. While one reason might have been the Quaker background of the school, the other reason was that the school's president, Carey Thomas, did not want her students associated with any kind of special practical education for women. Bryn Mawr favored history, philosophy, classical languages, and science, and Thomas categorized studio art training among what she disparagingly called "practical geisha education."[62] Although practical training in art was reputed, Bryn Mawr had developed courses in art history in the mid-1890s and began offering Ph.D.s in archaeology and art history in 1907.[63]

Despite the seminal role women played in CAA, no woman served as president of CAA until 1972, and no woman as editor of CAA's *Bulletin* until 1977. This sexist practice was not wholly in keeping with all art organizations active in the early twentieth century: the WDMTA had several female presidents, including Emma M. Church in 1913 and Florence H. Fitch in 1915, whereas the EAMTTA was consistently run by men.[64] These statistics suggest that sexism was more prevalent in the East than the Midwest or West, although the exclusion of women in leadership roles in general was typical for the time, affecting numerous types of academic institutions in the United States.

---

[60] Holmes Smith, "The College Art Association of America," *School and Society* 4, no. 87 (August 26, 1916): 335.
[61] Singerman, *Art Subjects*, 36-39, 41-66, devotes an entire chapter to the means by which art has been interpreted as feminine.
[62] Carey Thomas, quoted in Joyce Antler, *The Educated Woman and Professionalization: The Struggle for a New Feminine Identity, 1890-1920* (New York: Garland, 1987), 100.
[63] Hiss and Fansler, *Research in the Fine Arts,* 182.
[64] Michael, "The Emergence of the Regionals and the NEA Art Department," 3, 4, 8, 9. See also Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education,* 496-98.

CAA was somewhat conservative not only for its treatment of women, but also for its near exclusion in membership of teachers working at well-established, independent, professional art schools. Only one, Joseph Lauber from the Maryland Institute of Art, was listed as a teacher from an art school unaffiliated with a college or university. John F. Lewis, the president of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, was one of three who participated in the welcome address at CAA's 1916 conference in Philadelphia, yet no title for any speech he may have given was mentioned in the *Bulletin*.[65] Although one of CAA's primary concerns was the importance of studio art training, neither he nor any of his staff at the academy was listed as a member, which might seem surprising given the institution was the oldest academy of art in the United States dating back to at least the early nineteenth century. The National Academy of Design in New York was also glaringly missing, despite the fact that Samuel F. B. Morse had founded the institution and served as the first professor of art and design at New York University. Also, the school was governed by "academicians," who were elected to the academy based on the rigorous artistic merit of their work.[66] In fact, the National Academy of Design and the Art Students League in New York, which had been established in 1875, were not mentioned at all in CAA's *Bulletin* in the 1910s and 1920s.[67] Although studio art training had originated within such schools in the United States, CAA's presumed bias against professional art schools was apparent in the very makeup of its membership in the beginning.

While CAA had thus largely snubbed the professional art schools, the organization "made special efforts to interest the heads of schools of architecture

---

[65] Efland, *History of Art Education*, 44, 62; and "History and Timeline," Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, accessed July 18, 2010, http://www.pafa.org/Museum/Research-Archives/History-and-Timeline/59/.
[66] "History of the Academy," National Academy Museum and School, accessed September 1, 2010, http://www.nationalacademy.org/pageview.asp?mid=5&pid=100.
[67] "Teaching the Language of Art since 1875," Art Students League of New York, accessed October 10, 2010, http://www.theartstudentsleague.org/About.aspx.

throughout the country."[68] Architecture might have been more warmly accepted than studio art as an academic discipline because architects were perceived to be more disciplined than artists. The American Institute of Architects had been founded in 1857, and the established curriculum in architecture schools was understood to have rigorous standards and practical applications that could directly benefit U.S. culture. As a result, architectural training was sometimes discussed in CAA's *Bulletin* as a potential model for how art might be taught in colleges and universities.[69] In 1913 W. S. Parker, the secretary of the American Institute of Architects, had written to Smith asking to be kept informed of CAA's activities.[70] However, teachers from architecture schools seemed to play only a peripheral role within CAA in the early years. In 1917 only one member was listed as having an affiliation with an architecture school.[71]

Given the configuration of CAA's membership, it is no surprise that the association was removed from contemporary trends in art of the 1910s and 1920s. In 1913 the International Exhibition of Modern Art, known popularly as the Armory Show because of its venue, was organized and presented by the Association of American Painters and Sculptors, making European avant-garde art accessible to a stunned New York audience.[72] Yet Pablo Picasso, Georges Braque, Henri Matisse, and other Europeans were rarely mentioned in CAA's *Bulletin* at the time. Artists associated with

---

[68] E. Raymond Bossange, "Technical and General Education in the Arts," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 48-58.
[69] Alfred M. Brooks, "Architecture As an Academic Subject," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 68-75.
[70] W. S. Parker to Holmes Smith, June 30, 1913; and Smith to Parker, July 8, 1913, Allan Marquand Papers, 1858-1951, box 12, folder 24, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[71] Only Richard Bach of Avery Library of Columbia University's School of Architecture was listed in the January 1917 issue of the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America.* Later, in the September 1918 issue, Bach was identified as being on the staff of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Lauber, a muralist and glass designer who had previously worked at the Maryland Institute of Art, was listed as affiliated with Columbia's School of Architecture.
[72] See Wanda Corn, *The Great American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915-1935* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 49-52; and Barbara Rose, *American Art since 1900*, rev. and expanded ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975), 51-61.

U.S. modernist movements, such as the Eight and the Precisionists—even those who taught, including George Bellows, Robert Henri, and John Sloan—were not involved in CAA, and their activities were not discussed in any substantive way in the *Bulletin*.[73] In 1916 the Society of Independent Artists was founded in New York, so that artists could display their work in unjuried exhibitions; yet the likes of Marcel Duchamp, John Marin, and other avant-garde artists were never cited in CAA's *Bulletin* during that period.[74]

The type of modern art that CAA featured in its journal was usually more traditional in technique and subject matter. Articles that addressed contemporary artists tended to be written at the end of their careers or posthumously. For example, in 1918 "The Art of Auguste Rodin" appeared one year after the sculptor's death.[75] A 1920 article on the American Impressionist J. Alden Weir served as an obituary and commemoration of the artist, while a text on Elyas (Ilya) Repin referred to the then-living Russian artist as a nineteenth-century realist painter.[76] That same year CAA's *Bulletin* posted a list of books recommended for college art libraries, which included tomes on such deceased American artists as Winslow Homer, James Abbott McNeill Whistler, and William Merritt Chase.[77] In 1924 a young American sculptor named Roy Sheldon and his Arkansas war memorial were featured; such attention to a living U.S. artist and a public art project was unusual for CAA's *Bulletin*.[78] In general, the articles that focused on art objects, as opposed to pedagogy and other concerns, addressed the art of the past, particularly from the ancient and medieval periods. The reason why CAA and its *Bulletin* were

---

[73] Bellows and Henri were mentioned only in passing by Arthur Edwin Bye in "The American School," *Art Bulletin* 4, no. 3 (March 1922): 90-98.
[74] See Corn, *Great American Thing*, 43-50; and Calvin Tomkins, *Duchamp: A Biography* (New York: Henry Holt, 1996), 179-80.
[75] C. R. Morey, "The Art of Auguste Rodin," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 145-54.
[76] Duncan Phillips, "J. Alden Weir," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 4 (June 1920): 189-212; and Louis E. Lord, "A Russian Painter of the Nineteenth Century, Elyas Repin," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 4 (June 1920): 213-18.
[77] See "Books for the College Art Library," *Art Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (September 1920): 5-60.
[78] W. R. Argard, "Roy Sheldon As Creator of Form," *Art Bulletin* 6, no. 4 (June 1924): 105-6.

removed from contemporary concerns in the visual arts was that colleges and universities were quite conservative at the time, wanting to incorporate subjects with only traditionally accepted academic value.

CAA in a Larger Context: Other Art Organizations and Academic Societies

The formation of CAA and the publication of its first *Bulletin* coincided with a substantially increased interest in the visual arts throughout the United States and a desire to establish a variety of art organizations, as well as exhibition programs. CAA aligned itself with a few of these organizations and was able to distinguish itself, despite the fact that in the early years there sometimes appeared to be shared common interests, or overlaps, among some of the organizations.

One such association was the American Federation of Arts (AFA), which had been founded in 1909, two years before CAA. Serving as a national association for many local art groups, the AFA had formed a committee to investigate the teaching of art and art history in colleges and universities as early as 1910, one year before CAA was established.[79] However, the AFA had conveniently abandoned this initiative by 1913 and focused its efforts primarily on curating exhibitions of contemporary and historical art that toured the nation. By making art more accessible to the general public, the organization sought to stimulate a general interest in art and to educate the masses.[80] Although CAA wanted to promote the exhibition of art as well, its purpose was distinct from that of the AFA in this regard. As explained in the *Bulletin*, CAA wanted to encourage colleges and universities to establish museums and art galleries, and in the 1910s, this discussion tended to cover not only the acquisition of art objects, but also, and with greater

---

[79] H. Smith, "Problems of the College Art Association," 8.
[80] John Pickard, "Fifth Annual Meeting of the College Art Association of America," *American Magazine of Art* 7, no. 4 (February 1916): 149.

emphasis, the purchase of plaster casts of ancient sculptures for the purpose of teaching.[81]

Although the AFA and CAA differed in their audiences, they shared a common purpose in education, and CAA became a member of the AFA early on, in 1913.[82] The AFA published a magazine titled *Art and Progress* (later the *American Magazine of Art*), which included contributions by several of CAA's members.[83] Compared to other publications of the 1910s, the AFA's devoted greater attention to U.S. contemporary art and public sculpture, in addition to providing news items about current events and programs in the arts. For example, CAA's *Bulletin* article about Roy Sheldon would have fit well in the AFA's magazine. The formation of CAA was, therefore, part of a larger national phenomenon related to growing support for the visual arts and art education.

Among the academic organizations, CAA was definitely seen in the 1910s as a latecomer, or "infant among college societies."[84] Most of the prominent learned societies in the humanities had been founded in the latter half of the 1800s, including the American Historical Association (AHA) in 1889, the American Philological Association (APA) in 1869, the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) in 1879, and the Modern Language Association (MLA) in 1883. According to Keyes, CAA was understood to be an association dedicated to "teaching," or pedagogy, rather than "research," given the substance of the papers and discussions presented at its 1912 conference.[85] Several older associations had abandoned such discussions of pedagogy approximately ten years before CAA's *Bulletin* was first published in order to concentrate on research,

---

[81] See David M. Robinson, "On Reproductions for the College Museum and Art Gallery," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 15-21.
[82] Edith R. Abbott, "The College Art Association," *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 10, no. 5 (May 1913): 109.
[83] E.g., Keyes, "College Art Association"; and John Pickard, "Message of Art for the Collegian," *American Magazine of Art* 7, no. 4 (February 1916): 144-49.
[84] Keyes, "College Art Association," 867.
[85] Ibid., 868.

which was considered more prestigious.[86]

Of all these academic societies, the AIA developed the strongest affinity with CAA. Although CAA had grown out of an initiative from art organizations based in "drawing and manual training," it readily attracted archaeologically trained art historians in its membership. Keyes remarked:

> Many of the things for which it [CAA] stands would make natural some kind of affiliation with the Archeological Institute. In fact, many members of the one are members of the other. But, while the Institute stands primarily for research and the results of research, the Association, as has been said, stands for making those results available to youth. The two should be allies, if alliance carries with it no danger of benevolent assimilation.[87]

Lacking standards in scholarship and research, CAA was perceived as young and inferior to the more mature AIA, and CAA suffered from this perception for the next few decades. The AIA therefore acted as CAA's guiding parent. Alice Van Vechten Brown of Wellesley College recalled that "college teaching of the fine arts was un-organized as to aims and methods, and the need for an association as effective as the Archaeological Institute of America was felt in many colleges."[88] CAA's *Bulletin*, in terms of its title, design, and content, looked remarkably similar to—though its page count was smaller than—the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Institute of America.* Like similar contemporaneous publications produced by other associations and museums, these two bulletins served as means to communicate news to members and as promotional tools for their organizations. Although they sometimes featured educational reports and articles, such publications were generally not exclusively dedicated to scholarship and research.[89]

Despite Keyes's concern that the AIA might somehow consume CAA, the two

---

[86] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 24-25; and Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 57-120.
[87] Keyes, "College Art Association," 868.
[88] W. L. M. Burke, "Early Years of the College Art Association," *College Art Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1942): 104.
[89] See Fawcett, "Scholarly Journals," 16.

organizations coexisted in harmony, and their publications and conference would be interrelated on various levels. The relationship between archaeology and art history dated back to the late nineteenth century: the two disciplines shared much in terms of their early history, and courses in art history in the colleges and universities had often grown out of classical archaeology and philology departments.[90] In fact, the AIA's scholarly journal, *The American Journal of Archaeology*, had originally been titled *The American Journal of Archaeology and the History of Art*, from 1885 to 1896. After the founding of CAA, the AIA seemed to embrace the idea of including art history within its realm. In 1914 the AIA released a new publication titled *Art and Archaeology*, which was intended to replace the AIA's *Bulletin* and to serve the needs of the general public interested in archaeology. Signifying a marriage between the two disciplines, *Art and Archaeology* allowed the AIA to reach a larger audience outside its membership and promote its various causes. The magazine was intended to cater to a growing, educated U.S. public who already subscribed to such publications as *National Geographic.*[91] In 1915 CAA did not produce a *Bulletin*, and members were instead provided with copies of *Art and Archaeology.*[92] Since many CAA members also belonged to the AIA, it was not uncommon for individuals to contribute to CAA's *Bulletin*, *Art and Archaeology*, and *The American Journal of Archaeology.*

In 1916 the AIA held its annual meeting and had invited members of the APA and CAA to participate. Of the six sessions CAA was involved in one, in which papers were presented by John Pickard, David Robinson, Fiske Kimball, Alfred M. Brooks, Holmes Smith, Georgiana Goddard King, and other CAA members. While a few papers covered

---

[90] Hiss and Fansler, *Research in Fine Arts*, 26-27; and Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 10.
[91] Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores*, 203.
[92] John Pickard to members of the College Art Association, July 1, 1915, Edward Waldo Forbes, 1873-1969, Papers, 1867-2005, box 17, College Art Association [1915-1950] file, series I, Harvard Art Museums Archives.

pedagogical issues, such as Pickard's "The History of Art in Colleges and Universities," several other presentations addressed a variety of topics in architecture, including Kimball's "Foundations of Our National Architecture."[93] However, none of this activity was recorded in CAA's *Bulletin*, which remained dedicated to the teaching of studio art for the next few years. In some respects CAA's art historians seemed to have a separate agenda from that expressed in the journal. In the not-so-distant future the AIA would have a stronger impact on CAA's *Bulletin*, and several of these archaeologically based art historians would eventually take control of the journal.

CAA's Pedagogy: A Humanistic and Technical Focus

The publication of CAA's *Bulletin* was sporadic in its first decade, and the changes in the association's leadership were therefore not always reflected in the periodical. After Smith, Walter Sargent, who had founded the Art Department in the University of Chicago, served as president of CAA in 1914-15. Like his predecessor, Sargent was a painter and art teacher at a Midwestern university. He was described as "one of the outstanding art educators of his day, and an authority on color."[94] He had presented two talks at CAA's 1912 conference and served on various committees.[95] Although not much is known about his role as president of CAA, because no journal was published during his tenure, he most likely perpetuated the pedagogical mission of the organization. In 1906 he had been president of the Council of Supervisors of Manual Arts, an organization that was committed to advancing art education in public schools and was considered an elite group because its membership was limited to a small number of well-

---

[93] "General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America: December 27-29, 1916," *American Journal of Archaeology* 21, no. 1 (January-March 1917): 86–90.
[94] Frank J. Roos, Jr., "Art Department University of Chicago," *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 21.
[95] In 1913 Walter Sargent served on the Central Committee on Typical University Art Courses; see "Committees," *Bulletin of College Art Association* 1, no. 1 (January 1913): 4.

respected specialists in education.[96] In 1912 Sargent wrote *Fine and Industrial Arts in Elementary Schools*. In 1918 his essay "The Value of Art Education in Colleges" appeared in CAA's *Bulletin*, but he was best known for his numerous contributions to *The School Review* and *The Elementary School Journal*.[97]

Despite the fact that art education in elementary schools and high schools had already developed well-established standards by the 1910s, CAA's *Bulletin* rarely addressed these educational theories.[98] Herbert Spencer, Granville Stanley Hall, John Dewey, and William James, to name only some of the prominent figures in the development of art education, had done much of their ground-breaking work in the late 1800s and early 1900s, yet their names rarely, if ever, appeared in the *Bulletin*. Although CAA had developed out of an initiative from primary and secondary school art teachers, CAA's leadership clearly wanted to distance itself from art at the pre-college level, much the same way it had ignored the possible influence of professional art schools. The association obviously felt the need to distinguish itself in terms of developing standards in art education related to colleges and universities, which were generally reluctant to include studio art as part of their curricula.

In 1915 CAA made a significant change in its leadership with the election of the archaeologist John Pickard, from the University of Missouri, Columbia, as its third president. He had received an M.A. from Princeton University and a Ph.D. from the University of Munich. He then taught at Princeton before moving to Missouri. Although he was a classicist by training and taught courses in ancient Greek art and archaeology, he was fond of working with contemporary artists. As early as 1907 Pickard had taught a

---

[96] Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education*, 501-2.
[97] Walter Sargent, "The Value of Art Education in Colleges," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 83-88.
[98] The one article that addressed theories of art education in the *Art Bulletin* was presented as a play; see A. Philip McMahon, "The New Protagoras: A Pedantic Dialogue," *Art Bulletin* 11, no. 2 (June 1929): 187-205.

course on the history of U.S. painting, which was one of the first college courses on the subject ever offered in this country. While preparing the course, he enlisted the advice of living artists, which led to his developing a substantial dialogue with Albert Pinkham Ryder.[99] His diverse background and interests allowed Pickard to interact with and mediate between CAA's artists and art historians, as well as between East Coast and Midwestern members, whose agendas differed considerably. He proved to be an ingenious diplomat for CAA and served as president for the next four years.

Because CAA was somewhat fractured in its goals, Pickard's presidential address at the 1916 conference encouraged members to remain unified:

> This very multiplicity of view points [*sic*] may be a cause of weakness or it can be a source of strength to this Association. A cause of weakness if any one group among us arrogates to itself the divine right of deciding what is and what is not of value in art education: a source of strength if all the classes here represented rise to such a height above the petty things of life as to realize that the field of art is as wide as is the range of life and that no one little coterie has the monopoly of wisdom in this field.[100]

Pickard ended his speech, quoting Benjamin Franklin: "If we do not hang together we shall hang separately."[101] Despite Pickard's words, divisiveness was nevertheless apparent within the association, especially at its annual meetings. Although Pickard alluded time and again to these differences in this speech and others, the magnitude of the arguments was not always apparent within the association's *Bulletin*.

At the annual conferences of 1916–18, the stakes must have been high in terms of the young organization's wish to establish standards in art education and appreciation. As CAA attempted to address the specific concerns of its membership, the importance of the publication and the specific nature of its content became subject to debate. The issues of CAA's *Bulletin* published in January 1917, November 1917, and

---

[99] Weller, "John Pickard, Walter Miller," 12-13. For data on courses covering American art history, see Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 31.
[100] John Pickard, "President's Address," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 15.
[101] Ibid., 15.

September 1918 were much larger than the first issue of 1913.[102] Because CAA wanted to promote its agenda, and the war had prevented many members from attending the meetings, CAA chose to make the content of its conferences available to its members through the *Bulletin*. Serving as an annotated conference program, the 1917 and 1918 issues published the complete program of the most recent meeting, providing not only a list of all the presentations, but in most cases the entire papers, abstracts, or references as to where the papers had been published elsewhere, mostly in *Art and Archaeology* and the *American Magazine of Art*. The papers for the three conferences addressed a variety of topics, but the importance of pedagogy remained the foremost concern.

Countering Stereotypes

The 1916 conference concentrated on which types of art courses might be appropriate for a college curriculum. As expected, individual viewpoints varied. However, trends were apparent, and the summaries of talks that were published in the journal revealed what appeared to be a general consensus among members on what the college course should provide the future artist. Most participants believed that the current programs in studio art, with irregular hours and lack of examinations, were inadequate, and a more systematic curriculum with longer hours of training was desirable. Rigorous exercises were therefore deemed necessary, so that artists might discover their individual sense of "self-expression," "originality," and "imagination."[103]

Such demanding and meticulous training also seemed to counter stereotypes regarding the artist. Ellsworth Woodward, who was the younger brother of William Woodward and taught at Sophie Newcomb College in New Orleans, stated that the artist

---

[102] In volume 1 of the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America*, the page counts increased from issue to issue. The first issue was 16 pages long; issue no. 2 had 32 pages; no. 3 was 118 pages; no. 4 had 157 pages. The trim size for all three measured 9¼ by 6 inches.

[103] Jeannette Scott, "What Instruction in Art Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?" *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 19.

was too often seen as “a man apart from his fellows to whom is due special consideration. This is injurious to his standing as a citizen, a member of organized society.”[104] Although Ellsworth Woodward taught at the women’s college of Tulane University, and thus his teaching experience likely engaged women solely, it is interesting that he and many of his colleagues chose to label the artist as “a man.” Even though art was typically coded as feminine, such biased language was not uncommon for the period and was often meant to be all-encompassing.[105] Woodward’s statement is also useful because it addressed other preconceived notions related to artists, namely that they were undisciplined, antisocial, and immoral. CAA’s members clearly felt that their proposed curriculum had to reverse these negative stereotypes, so that art might gain entry into the college and university.

In this discussion the specific nature of different curricula for the art writer and the museum worker, as well as the layman, was also addressed.[106] According to George H. Chase, who taught art history at Harvard University, the general agreement was that two types of programs needed to be developed: one curriculum for artists that emphasized practical training along with a historical education, and another for art historians, critics, and laymen focusing on the history of art yet including a practical component. Each program would share a fundamental discussion of aesthetics.[107] These curricula, according to Leila Mechlin of the AFA, would enable a student to “take his or her place in

[104] Ellsworth Woodward, “What Instruction in Art Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 19.
[105] For a thorough discussion of gender coding in the visual arts, see Singerman’s chapter 2, “Women and Artists, Students and Teachers,” *in Art Subjects,* 41-66.
[106] Note that the terms *art historian* and *curator* were not used. *Writer* referred to both art historian and critic, and *museum worker* included curator and educator.
[107] George H. Chase, “An Art Course for Laymen,” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 25-26.

society, to become a good citizen."[108] Such ethical words showed the lingering effects of nineteenth-century educational principles that emphasized moral values.[109]

Although most discussions and articles in each *Bulletin* demonstrated a sense of agreement among the members, some dissenting voices were apparent. However, the strongest dissident viewpoints were published elsewhere, namely in the AFA's *American Magazine of Art*. For example, Cecilia Beaux's contribution to the discussion "What Should the A. B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?" must have caused controversy at CAA's 1916 conference and was ultimately published in the AFA periodical.[110] An established figurative painter from Philadelphia, she taught at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts and was therefore not listed as a member of CAA. While her fellow speakers talked about art education as a means of helping the artist become a better citizen, Beaux questioned the very founding principles of CAA. Although she understood the merits of a university education, she felt that a college education "cannot be pointed to as the best first step in the artist's life." She cautioned that courses in the history of art and drawing from plaster casts of classical sculptures, which CAA was in part promoting, might not be the best approach to foster the "potentialities" of the future artist. She even suggested that college education might rob artists of their vital youth: "There is nothing that the university can give to the artist that can make up to him for the breach in his life and the loss of those years."[111] Although no documentation exists regarding why her text was not published in CAA's *Bulletin*, these remarks, coming from such an established painter as Beaux, probably threatened the very premise of the

---

[108] Leila Mechlin, "What Instruction Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Writer on Art?" *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 21.
[109] See, for example, Efland, *History of Art Education*, 69-71; and James S. Ackerman, "Western Art History," 187.
[110] See Julia A. Sienkewicz, "Uniting the Arts and the Academy: A History of the CAA Annual Conference," in Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*.
[111] Cecelia Beaux, "What Should the College A.B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?" *American Magazine of Art* 7, no. 12 (October 1916): 480, 484.

association and thus appeared instead in the *American Magazine of Art*, where she served on the advisory board. CAA must have been considered fragile in its makeup, and its *Bulletin*, which served as the official mouthpiece for art education and appreciation at the college level, needed to show consensus, even if there was none, and opinions differed radically.

In 1916 another debate ensued that was related to the specific nature and content of CAA's *Bulletin*. Pickard noted that certain advisers had stated:

> Our Association could not hope to take important rank and position among the learned societies of our time until our meetings are characterized by profound discussions of the technical subjects—and not even then unless such learned papers are published as "original work" by our members. Original work! Original work! what crimes, what atrocities are committed in thy name![112]

Pickard also countered that another group of members had said they found such papers "tiresome," and the organization should focus its efforts on discussing syllabi and textbooks to establish standards in the field. He added, "Most counselors are insistent that we publish our proceedings. Some, however, consider that our lucubrations are not very important and ask us to remember that the chief amusement connected with hash is found in the making and not in the eating of it."[113] The issues at stake in Pickard's statement were the purpose of CAA's *Bulletin* and the rank of CAA in comparison with other learned societies, which recalled Keyes's concern a few years earlier. According to the artist and art historian Howard Singerman, Pickard's statement specifically referred to the art historians of CAA, especially the idea of publishing "original work."[114] While this statement foreshadows the eventual takeover of the journal by the faction of art historians involved in CAA, the precise meanings of the phrases *technical subjects* and *original work* should be explored in more detail: Pickard was a diplomat and his word choice was always nuanced to include both artists and art historians. If we rely on the

---

[112] Pickard, "President's Address," 13.
[113] Ibid., 13-14.
[114] Singerman, *Art Subjects*, 12.

rhetoric of the *Bulletin* itself, Pickard's phrases may be more complex than what Singerman suggests and can shed light on trends in both studio art education and art history in the early 1900s.

Since the Civil War, academia in the United States has favored the sciences more than the humanities, as the sciences are considered to have more practical applications in an industrial society.[115] By the late 1910s the fine arts and other disciplines in the humanities had therefore already adopted a language related to science and industry in an effort to bolster support.[116] As a result, Pickard and others used the word *technical* repeatedly and referred to the artist's studio frequently as a *laboratory*.[117] Such scientific language, which was typically coded as masculine, also counteracted the notion that art was feminine, effete, individualistic, and not socially productive.[118] Within CAA's *Bulletin* the word *technical* referred most often to the techniques involved in the creation of art objects and the need to learn such skills in a rational, precise manner. However, explanations of how to choose proper tools and explicit instructions for manual processes were rarely included, as was done, for example, in the *Manual Training Magazine*, which was edited by Charles A. Bennett, one of the leading experts in industrial arts education.[119] Inside CAA's *Bulletin* technical subjects were often discussed in a cursory fashion, and the goals of these articles varied. In a 1917 article titled "What Kind of Technical Art Shall Be Taught to the A. B.

---

[115] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 1. See also A. Hunter Dupree, *Science in the Federal Government: A History of Policies and Activities to 1940* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957); and Alexandra Oleson and John Voss, eds., *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).
[116] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 9.
[117] This type of terminology was not new for art education; for example, John Dewey had developed *laboratory schools* in the late 1800s, but these schools were developed for younger people; see Efland, *History of Art Education*, 169-71.
[118] See Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 41-66, especially 42.
[119] *Manual Training Magazine,* which was published by the Manual Arts Press, featured photographs and diagrams explaining technical concepts. Bennett advocated industrial art education in the pages of *Art Bulletin*; see Charles A. Bennett, "A National Program of Industrial Art Education," *Art Bulletin* 3, no. 2 (December 1920): 84-91.

Student?" the explicit purpose of such training was to help the art student eventually produce a high-quality "original work."[120] However, other goals included finding the means of self-expression and becoming a good civilian. Because CAA was a national association and represented the interests of a wide variety of individuals involved in the visual arts, it embraced a multitude of voices on the same subject, and did not always choose to commit to one type of educational philosophy in the 1910s. Ultimately, a general standard for teaching art was still unclear.

For the art historian, the requisite studio art training was often labeled *nontechnical* in nature. However, the importance of science was also relevant. In "Non-technical Laboratory Work for the Student of the History of Art," Edith R. Abbott, of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, argued in 1917: "The belief is held today that the teaching of art must be scientific in method, and that it must give the student a realization of aesthetic values, and a knowledge of the language by means of which the artist expresses his thought."[121] Having worked in the "laboratory" (i.e., the studio), art historians could thus understand the technical merits of the artists and art objects they were analyzing.

In the narrow context of the *Bulletin*'s pages, Pickard's *technical subjects* clearly related to studio art training. Yet it is useful to consider an alternative meaning of the term for the art historian. Like studio art, the discipline of art history had changed radically by the 1910s. In the late 1800s and early 1900s Harvard professor Charles Eliot Norton had often preached about ethical principles in relation to classical art, and his student Bernard Berenson had professed the importance of connoisseurship, which coincided with an increased interest in collecting on the part of many wealthy U.S.

---

[120] James R. Hopkins, William M. Hekking, and Louis Weinberg, "What Kind of Technical Art Shall Be Taught to the A. B. Student?" *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 30.

[121] Edith R. Abbott, "Non-technical Laboratory Work for the Student of the History of Art," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 92.

industrialists. Such education, with its emphasis on morals and taste, promoted art appreciation and had produced gentlemen more than scholars, and original research was not deemed important. However, in the 1910s, at the time of CAA's founding, art history would start to become professionalized, as a new generation of art historians emerged. They emphasized technical matters over moral and aesthetic principles, and U.S. universities were beginning to award the first Ph.D.s specifically in art history.[122] In the field of archaeology, which was clearly influencing art history at the time, the word *technical* was synonymous with original research based on scientific observation. According to the AIA's editors, articles published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* were deemed *technical* because they were scholarly, whereas the texts printed in the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Institute of America* and the organization's popular magazine, *Art and Archaeology*, were viewed as *nontechnical*.[123] CAA's new generation of art historians was turning to German models, in which "the aim was to establish art history and other humanities as 'scientific' disciplines," and original research was the primary purpose.[124] Despite this tendency, the importance of *original work* related to art history was not explicitly discussed in CAA's *Bulletin* in the 1910s.

Put simply, the words *scientific*, *technical*, and *laboratory* were the catchwords of the day, and the use of such terminology within the scholarship of archaeology and art history and the teaching of studio art related to CAA's need to argue for the relevance of art not only in the college and university, but in the larger sociopolitical spheres of U.S. culture. When the United States entered World War I in April 1917, the importance of technical concerns for art and its significance were dramatized. Within colleges and universities, war became a preoccupation: many students abandoned their educations to

---

[122] See, e.g., Ackerman, "Western Art History," 187–90; and Kantor, "Harvard and the 'Fogg Method,'" 169.
[123] H. L. Wilson, "The Proposed Non-technical Magazine," *Bulletin of the Archaeological Institute of America* 4, no. 1 (March 1913): 7.
[124] Ackerman, "Western Art History," 190.

fight in Europe, and college and university presidents offered their schools as institutions to support the military. The sciences more than ever reigned supreme, and applied science as opposed to pure science was deemed most important.[125] At CAA's 1918 conference in New York, most of the papers continued to address technical standards in the teaching of studio art. However, a number of papers also discussed the importance of art in wartime and the need to safeguard it. Although Pickard noted that many people were questioning the importance of art education in a world "suffering in the throes of the greatest tragedy in all history," he used the rhetoric of war itself to promote CAA's causes in his "Presidential Address: Art's Counter-Offensive."[126] Brooks's "Robbery and Restitution of Works of Art in the Present War" addressed the horrors of war and its damaging effects on art and culture. His article also expressed a growing sense of anti-German sentiment.[127] In another talk titled "Art and War," Duncan Phillips, who just a few years later would found the Phillips Collection in Washington, D.C., argued that art was useful in war because it not only provided a needed refuge from the turmoil, but also served as a useful tool to help propagate the war effort.[128]

The need to establish such creative arguments that art and art education were socially and currently relevant demonstrated that throughout the 1910s CAA's foothold within the college and university was at best tenuous. This decade, and the one that followed, represented a transitional period in studio art education and art history, and CAA clearly played a pivotal part in their development. However, the two disciplines had not played equal roles within the organization and its journal. Up until 1918, CAA had been governed by presidents from the Midwest, where studio art had become a more

---

[125] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 95.
[126] John Pickard, "Art's Counter-Offensive," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 19.
[127] Alfred M. Brooks, "Robbery and Restitution of Works of Art in the Present War," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 37-43.
[128] Duncan Phillips, "Art and War," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 24-37.

established tradition in colleges and universities. CAA's *Bulletin* had covered mostly pedagogical subjects related to studio art education. Among the thirty-six papers presented at the 1916, 1917, and 1918 conferences, just seven, or roughly 19 percent, dealt with archaeological and/or art-historical topics, and of those, only five were published in the *Bulletin*. These statistics showed the marginal role that art history had played in the early years of CAA, but the numbers would begin to change radically the following year, when a new journal was established, and CAA's leadership changed to the East Coast. As a result, CAA would begin in the 1920s to "take important rank and position among the learned societies of our time," to borrow Pickard's words.[129]

[129] Pickard, "President's Address," 13.

CHAPTER 2

THE ART BULLETIN AND THE DOMINANCE OF ART HISTORY IN CAA

The 1920s marked a substantial growth period in higher education in the United States, and as the decade unfolded, CAA would become a radically different organization. Its chief interest would change from studio art education to art history. A new journal titled *The Art Bulletin* would become the primary organ of CAA, and its goals and interests, especially by the mid-1920s, would be markedly different from those of the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America.* As *Art Bulletin* helped to promote art and art history in colleges and universities, significant individuals, namely art historians, would be endorsed in the publication and emerge as leaders in the field.[1] A specific type of scholarship and subject matter, namely an archaeological, fact-based methodology in art history focusing primarily on medieval art, would also be promoted in the journal, which enabled the field of art history to establish a clear identity for itself in U.S. higher education.

The Growth of Higher Education and the Establishment of the *Art Bulletin*

When World War I ended, student enrollment in higher education increased beyond expectations. Colleges and universities reported a 75 percent increase in students from 1909 to 1919–20, and during the 1920s, the number of students doubled.[2] The educational philosophy of colleges and universities also changed in the 1920s. As a result of anti-German sentiment, Americans rejected the once-popular German model for college education, which was focused solely on academic subjects.[3] Instead, Americans turned to the English model, which included residential colleges, honors courses, and

[1] "Constitution, Article II.: Purpose," 13.
[2] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 107–13.
[3] Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," 68.

tutorials, and concentrated on creating an educational experience that fostered the development of all parts of the student's mind and character, not just the academic aspects. As a result, the Roaring Twenties emphasized extracurricular pursuits related to sports, fraternities and sororities, and other social activities. In addition, the goals of postsecondary institutions as a whole broadened, as unprecedented sums of money were being donated by foundations to universities and colleges for the purposes of research.[4]

These fundamental shifts in higher education were beneficial to the disciplines of studio art and art history. Although statistics are spotty and inconsistent, the number of teachers and courses in the visual arts in colleges and universities increased significantly in the 1920s. According to one research report by the art historian Robert Goldwater, the number of instructors teaching art and/or art history increased 24 percent from 1910 to 1920, and by 1930, the number had increased an additional 23 percent from 1920.[5] Another historical overview by Arthur D. Efland stated that in the 1920s introductory courses in studio art and art history were becoming standard, and "in 1925 half of the colleges and universities in the country were teaching art," which was twice the number that Holmes Smith had reported in his CAA presidential address of 1913.[6] Although studio art and art history were becoming more popular, the increase in numbers was by no means in direct proportion to the overall growing enrollment of colleges and universities. In the 1920s many of the first-generation college students chose to pursue degrees related directly to such professions as business, teaching, and law.[7] Even though studio art and art history were offered at more schools, it was still difficult to major in either subject, especially studio art. The fine arts were, therefore, still

---

[4] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 115–18, 140–73.
[5] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 31.
[6] Efland, *A History of Art Education*, 219.
[7] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 116.

struggling to find a permanent position within higher education.[8]

In the aftermath of World War I, CAA made significant changes in its *Bulletin*, as the organization began to expand and rethink its focus.[9] With the September 1919 issue, the publication was retitled *The Art Bulletin*, which marked the beginning of the journal as "an illustrated quarterly." John Pickard's 1919 president's statement, "The Future of the College Art Association," which was printed in the issue, marked a new era for the association and its journal. No longer would CAA's journal focus on the organization's "problems," as Smith had discussed, or the conflicting voices of the membership, as Pickard had done previously. Instead, the general character of the new publication was defined as follows:

> We must have a periodical of our own, issued at first quarterly, ably edited, with trenchant articles by strong men, with departments of news and notes on all questions of interest in art education. No existing magazine is or can become what our cause needs. . . . Our own editors must decide what we will publish and this organization alone must dictate the policy of our publication.[10]

At this stage it was made clear that the editors had been given license to take charge of the journal's content, although the organization was in charge as the publisher. David M. Robinson, an archaeology professor at Johns Hopkins University, served as the first editor-in-chief from 1919 to 1921 and simultaneously assumed the presidency of CAA. Given that he played both roles, it seems that he was therefore given complete freedom as editor and publisher of the journal to do as he wished. John Shapley, an art history professor at Brown University, served as managing editor. The six associate editors, who would later be referred to as the editorial board, included Pickard in addition to Alfred M. Brooks of Indiana University, Arthur W. Dow of Columbia University's

[8] See Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 27.

[9] In the September 1919 issue active membership was still restricted to "those engaged in art education," but associate and sustaining membership was open to all; see *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 2.

[10] John Pickard, "The Future of the College Art Association," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 8.

Teachers College, Frank J. Mather of Princeton University, Arthur Kingsley Porter of Yale University, and Paul Sachs of Harvard's Fogg Art Museum.[11]

Altogether, the eight editors were accomplished individuals in the fields of studio art and art history. However, they did not reflect the diversity of CAA by any means; in fact, their selection revealed many of the biases that would begin to plague CAA. All the editors were men, and almost all of them were archaeologists and art historians. Only Dow was wholly interested in the teaching of studio art; he was well known for his book *Composition: A Series of Exercises in Art Structure for the Use of Students and Teachers* and was a strong proponent of abstraction in modern art and experimentation in art training.[12] He taught many well-known artists including Georgia O'Keefe.[13] Among this group, Sachs represented the interests of museums, given that he worked for the Fogg.[14] In terms of regional diversity, Pickard and Brooks represented the Midwest, while the six other editors worked in the Northeast for well-respected universities, all of which, with the exception of Johns Hopkins, would come to be identified as Ivy League schools. The selection of editors for the new *Art Bulletin,* therefore, suggested a major change for the journal and CAA.

The exact reasons for Robinson's appointment as editor-in-chief and election as president are not known, but his credentials would have been considered essential, especially for CAA's archaeologist and art-historian members. Robinson was one of the few members who held a Ph.D., which he had received in classics from the University of Chicago after studying in Germany for a short time. Two years later he joined the faculty at the Johns Hopkins University, which was well known for its graduate-level education

[11] In 1920 Porter started teaching at Harvard University; see Linda Seidel, "Arthur Kingsley Porter: Life, Legend, and Legacy," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 101.
[12] Arthur W. Dow, *Composition: A Series of Exercises in Art Structure for the Use of Students and Teachers,* 9th ed. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page, 1916). First published 1899.
[13] See Barbara Haskell et al., *Georgia O'Keefe: Abstraction* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; and New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 2009), 145.
[14] See Mongan, "Harvard and the Fogg," 49–50.

following the German academic model. He had also served as the first editor of the Archaeological Institute of America's (AIA's) *Art and Archaeology* from 1914 to 1918. His experience running a populist magazine that embraced two prominent interests of CAA was obviously seen as beneficial for the organization. However, Robinson was deemed somewhat controversial within the field. In a territorial battle with Mitchell Carroll, who ran the AIA's Washington organization, Robinson had been ousted from his editorial post at *Art and Archaeology* in 1918, one year prior to his appointment as editor of *Art Bulletin.*[15]

Robinson, unlike his predecessors Smith and Pickard, published no formal speeches or rallying calls to unite the membership. The tone of the journal was much more official. He merely requested "contributions of scholarly interest and books for review." However, the transformation of CAA's journal, from a promotional tool for the association to a journal of record for art history in the United States, occurred in stages. Robinson's first issue of *Art Bulletin* demonstrated a more selective editorial focus than the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America*. Only five articles were published in his first issue, and they demonstrated a greater sense of balance and diversity in terms of subject matter than the previous incarnation of the journal.[16] In addition to Pickard's address, two articles addressed art-historical concerns, and two focused on technical matters for the artist.

The two art-historical topics reflected very different types of subject matter and methods of scholarship. In "Sources of Romanesque Sculpture," Charles Rufus Morey, who taught art history at Princeton University, examined the stylistic similarities between manuscript pages and sculptures from the early French Romanesque period. Based on his comparisons and system of dating, he judged that manuscript illumination, which had

---

[15] Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores*, 203–4.
[16] "*The Art Bulletin*," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 2. Robinson's statement also indicated that issues 1–4, which had been published previously, made up volume 1 of the journal.

been more prominent at the time, had influenced the development of sculpture in the period. While Morey's article relied on a basic formal analysis, Ananda Coomaraswamy's "The Significance of Oriental Art" examined social issues. Coomaraswamy, whose father was Sri Lankan and mother English, had been trained in geology and botany and was currently working for the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.[17] His essay, which sometimes scolded his Western readers for their prejudice against and romanticization of the "East," focused on how the past and present roles of artist and patron in South Asian cultures differed substantially from those in industrialized Western societies. Coomaraswamy concluded that the social systems within South Asian civilizations and medieval Europe were more supportive of artists than those found in contemporary Western countries, which placed the artist in the "precarious position of a parasite."[18]

Like many papers from CAA's previous conferences, the two remaining articles, covering technical issues in art practice, addressed subjects apparent in broad national trends within academia, namely the importance of science and war. Edwin M. Blake's "The Necessity of Developing the Scientific and Technical Bases of Art" argued emphatically for the importance of encouraging "the cooperation of scientists and technologists in the study of art problems."[19] Blake demanded that CAA provide synopses of all scientific applications that had helped artistic practice in the past and insisted that *Art Bulletin* provide ongoing reports about pertinent research published in scientific journals that addressed aesthetic concerns, so that the dialogue between science and art could be further enhanced and help artists develop future projects.

---

[17] Philip Rawson, "A Professional Sage," *New York Review of Books* 26, no. 2 (February 22, 1979), accessed October 14, 2008, http://www.nybooks.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/articles/archives/1979/feb/22/a-professional-sage/?page=1.
[18] Ananda Coomaraswamy, "The Significance of Oriental Art," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 21.
[19] Edwin M. Blake, "The Necessity of Developing the Scientific and Technical Bases of Art," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 37.

The other article was Homer Saint-Gaudens's "Camouflage and Art," which addressed his recent role as a soldier-artist working in the camouflage section of the armed forces during World War I. While Saint-Gaudens's article might initially have been seen as furthering the cause for art's importance in wartime, as Duncan Phillips had proclaimed the previous year, this personal account described a mediocre experience at best, with room for improvement on the part of the military's practices. Although the army had used camouflage painters to hide its activities by disguising its vehicles, artillery, and camps, Saint-Gaudens criticized the techniques and the materials that had been employed to create such camouflage, especially the large-scale structures that were designed to cover roads and train tracks. In general, he felt that his role as a soldier-artist and its importance in the war effort had been largely misunderstood and neglected by his superiors. He encouraged further development of technical standards in the craft of camouflage painting and construction.[20]

Although Blake's article was positive and Saint-Gaudens's somewhat negative in spirit, both texts, like several others from previous issues of CAA's *Bulletin*, continued to argue for art's relevance within mainstream culture and promoted the technical advancements of various art practices. In some ways, these texts loosely correlated—albeit very loosely—with artistic programs that were developing in Europe after World War I. In "The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus," Walter Gropius outlined his 1919 curriculum for his new school. Paralleling the thoughts of Blake, Saint-Gaudens, and other contributors to CAA's journal, Gropius argued against "the isolation of the artist" and attempted to equate art with industry and craft. However, Gropius's program was far more sophisticated than anything articulated by CAA's members at this time. Gropius's comprehensive curriculum broke away from the traditional art academy, and

---

[20] On camouflage, see Diana Donald and Jane Munro, *Endless Forms: Charles Darwin, Natural Science, and the Visual Arts* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009).

his goal for the “unification of all training in art and design” was intended to help realize “the collective work of art—the Building.” With this program, he hoped to reconfigure the role of the artist in the state.[21] By contrast, CAA and its various pedagogical missions—to help the student find “self-expression,” become a “good citizen,” or realize an “original work”—represented, to put it bluntly, an assortment of sometimes innovative, sometimes dull, and often repetitive pontifications.

Although several articles in the early issues of *Art Bulletin* grappled with social concerns related to art and current trends in U.S. culture, the type of scholarship that would eventually dominate *Art Bulletin* seemed far removed from contemporary social issues. Most of the articles would eventually reflect the kind of scholarship found in Morey’s article, specifically factual and formal analysis, often focusing on ancient or medieval art objects. Although CAA would continue to represent the somewhat eclectic spirit of its members, albeit to varying degrees, the organization would become very narrow in its focus during the mid-1920s, especially in terms of the journal.

The changes in the journal’s content seemed to correlate with the journal’s relationship to CAA’s annual conference. Although Robinson and his team of editors were more selective about what they chose to publish in *Art Bulletin,* they were still initially dependent on CAA’s conferences for content.[22] In 1919, 75 percent of *Art*

---

[21] Walter Gropius, “The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus,” in Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, eds., *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 338–42, especially 339–40. Gropius’s text was originally published as *Idee und Aufbau des Staatlichen Bauhaus Weimar* (Munich: Bauhausverlag, 1923). Gropius’s ideas in the early 1920s were perhaps more advanced than the initial curriculum that he and his colleagues first implemented at the Bauhaus. For a thorough history of the Bauhaus, see Eva Forgacs, *The Bauhaus Idea and the Bauhaus Politics* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995). See also Singerman, *Art Subjects*, passim.

[22] Although all the papers from the 1917 and 1918 conferences were published in the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America*, only eleven out of the thirty-two papers (34 percent) from the 1919 conference were published in *Art Bulletin*; four of twenty-one papers (19 percent) from the 1920 conference; six of nineteen (32 percent) from the 1921 conference; one of fifteen (7 percent) from the 1922 conference; and three of 14 (21 percent) from the 1923 meeting. Percentages in the notes and chapters of this dissertation are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Bulletin's feature articles came from the conference, and the next year it was 90 percent. However, starting in the third year, the journal began to make further changes. With the September 1921 issue Shapley replaced Robinson as editor. That same year *Art Bulletin*'s dependence on CAA's meeting for its content decreased, with conference presentations making up only about 8 to 25 percent of the journal's features over the next three years.[23] While *Art Bulletin* would continue to have a close relationship with the conference (and still does to this day), the journal began to operate somewhat independently of CAA's meetings, as its content and focus developed. As a means to generate content, Shapley sometimes felt the need to solicit articles, writing to scholars to encourage contributions, especially on technical subjects.[24]

In 1922 two additional changes occurred: Dow died, and Morey replaced him on *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board, which meant that all the editors and editorial board members were now archaeologists and/or art historians. Brooks moved from Indiana University to Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania, which left Pickard as the only person in the Midwest. In fact, although Pickard remained listed among the editorial board members for many years to come, he seemed to have had little to do with CAA and *Art Bulletin* after that point.[25] In 1923 Shapley became president of CAA while serving as editor of *Art Bulletin*, and therefore acted as both editor and publisher of CAA's periodical, as Robinson had done previously. Shapley would hold both positions until the

---

[23] In volume 2 of the *Art Bulletin*, spanning September 1919 to June 1920, twelve of the fifteen articles (75 percent) were published from one or more of the annual conferences; in volume 3, it was nine of ten articles (90 percent); in volume 4, one of thirteen (8 percent); in volume 5, two out of eleven (18 percent); in volume 6, three of twelve (25 percent); and in volume 7, two of ten (20 percent).

[24] John Shapley to E. W. Forbes, January 20, 1920, Edward Waldo Forbes, 1873–1969, Papers, 1867–2005, series I, box 17, College Art Association [1915–1950] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives.

[25] The last article published by Pickard was "Some Decorations in the New State Capitol at Jefferson City, Missouri," *Art Bulletin* 3, no. 4 (June 1921): 153–57. In 1936 Pickard was honored at CAA's conference and chaired a panel titled "Twenty-five Years Viewed in Retrospect"; see "Preliminary Program of the 25th Anniversary of the College Art Association, New York City, April 8, 9, 10, 1936" *Parnassus* 8, no. 3 (March 1936): n.p.

late 1930s. Despite the stated intention to have *Art Bulletin* address "all questions of interest in art education," the makeup of its editorial board and the governance of the organization indicated that CAA would become "an elitist East Coast entity," as Stephen Dyson stated, and the journal would go on to focus primarily on art history.[26]

Erwin Panofsky, CAA, and Art History in the United States in the 1920s

In 1953 Erwin Panofsky, a well-respected German art historian who had immigrated in 1934, wrote "Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European." Panofsky identified 1923 as the demarcation when *Art Bulletin* began to focus less on the general concerns of CAA and its diverse membership and more exclusively on art history.[27]

Beginning in 1919 approximately half the feature articles in *Art Bulletin* covered traditional art-historical topics, while the others addressed a wide range of innovative and occasionally quirky topics including pedagogy, artist's techniques, conservation, and even pageantry—the latter perhaps reflecting the social activities of the Roaring Twenties. However, Panofsky reported that in 1923 "*Art Bulletin* carried ten unashamedly art-historical articles and only one on art appreciation."[28] Here, it should be noted that Panofsky's statistics are slightly askew: *Art Bulletin* published a total of thirteen articles in 1923, and ten of the articles (77 percent) dealt with art-historical topics. Although Panofsky's numbers may be slightly misleading, they nevertheless reflected a dramatic increase in the importance of art history for *Art Bulletin* in comparison with the issues of CAA's *Bulletin* from 1917 to 1918, when only 19 percent of the articles covered art-historical subjects. In 1924 nine out of ten articles (90 percent) examined art-historical subjects, and in 1925 eleven of thirteen articles (85 percent)

---

[26] Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores*, 101.
[27] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 10-11.
[28] Ibid., 10.

were art-historical. Thereafter, *Art Bulletin* would focus almost exclusively on art history. Table 1 in the appendix shows the shift in the content of *Art Bulletin* during its first decade, by providing a breakdown of articles by subject matter published in 1919–24 and 1924–29.

Because *Art Bulletin* had been concerned with a multitude of interests in the visual arts based on the needs and desires of CAA's membership, Panofsky concluded that the field of art history had been forced "to fight its way out of an entanglement with practical art instruction, art appreciation, and that amorphous monster 'general education.'" He continued: "When it was found necessary to launch a competing periodical, the short-lived *Art Studies*, the battle was won (though occasional skirmishes may occur even now)."[29] *Art Studies* first appeared in 1923—the seminal year that *Art Bulletin* began to concentrate on art history—and was published as an annual journal by the Harvard Princeton Arts Club.[30] *Art Studies* also served as "an *extra* number, *outside of the regular subscription*," of the *American Journal of Archaeology.* While *Art Studies* must have been perceived as serious competition, and its initial presence likely triggered the change in *Art Bulletin*, the world of art history was very small in those days: most of the contributors, and even the editors, were the same as those for *Art Bulletin.*[31]

What is intriguing about Panofsky's statements is that he directly referred to the same political "battles" between studio art and art history, as well as between pedagogy

---

[29] Ibid., 10.
[30] See Charles Rufus Morey, "The Harvard-Princeton Fine Arts Club," *Notes (Fogg Art Museum)* 2, no. 1 (April 1925): 30–34.
[31] Front matter, *American Journal of Archaeology* 26, no. 3 (July–September 1922): n.p. I found no information as to whether *Art Studies* was intended to serve as competition for *Art Bulletin.* However, given that *Art Studies* was published by such prominent schools as Harvard and Princeton and was endorsed by the AIA, it definitely had an influence on art history. It seems to be no coincidence that *Art Studies* was inaugurated the same year that *Art Bulletin* made a drastic change in its content. Although *Art Studies* billed itself as covering medieval, Renaissance, and modern subjects, it concentrated on medieval and Renaissance art and architecture, with very little modern art. Four of the five editors of *Art Studies* were also on *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board: Mather, Morey, Porter, and Sachs. For more information, see Paul J. Sachs, 1878-1965 Papers, 1903-2005, Box 3, file "Art Studies [1921-1931]," Harvard Art Museums Archives.

and scholarship, which Homer Eaton Keyes and Pickard had mentioned in their articles in the 1910s. The difference was that Panofsky took a side and made it unabashedly clear that art history had won. Given that Panofsky was himself an art historian who would contribute to *Art Bulletin* from the 1930s through the 1950s, his tale of victory, which was told as a second-hand account from the perspective of thirty years' hindsight, showed an obvious favoritism for art history.

Since this dissertation addresses the institutional politics of scholarship, it is necessary to grapple with some nuances in Panofsky's rhetoric. In so doing, it is useful to keep in mind the message of Philip Altbach, a scholar of educational policy: "Scholarly journals . . . provide a legitimation of knowledge by the decisions that are made on what to print. In this sense, the editors are key gatekeepers who in many ways control access to the field."[32] When viewed from this perspective, the story was not that *art history* had fought "its way out of an entanglement" with studio art education, art appreciation, and general education, as Panofsky had proclaimed. The fact was that the editors of *Art Bulletin* had chosen to extricate themselves from practical art instruction and other such matters, so that the journal would serve their needs and those of CAA's art-historian members. In short, the art historians were put in charge of *Art Bulletin* and the association, and that is how the "battle" over the journal's content was won.

When considering Panofsky's article, it is also important to keep in mind that his mission was to celebrate the field of art history as it had been practiced in the United States in the early twentieth century, when, as he said, the subject had first "evolved into an autonomous discipline." He described 1923–33 as "a Golden Age" for U.S. art history because this period marked the time when U.S. scholars "began to challenge the supremacy, not only of German-speaking countries, but of Europe as a whole." Among

---

[32] Philip G. Altbach, *The Knowledge Context: Comparative Perspectives on the Distribution of Knowledge* (Albany: State University of New York, 1987), 177.

his "founding fathers" of U.S. art history, Panofsky championed the scholarship of many individuals who comprised the editorial board of *Art Bulletin:* Morey, Mather, Porter, and Sachs, in addition to others who had been added to the board in 1925: Fiske Kimball of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Walter W. S. Cook of New York University, and William Ivins of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.[33]

These members of *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board were extremely accomplished men. However, it should be noted that they were not simply affiliated with prominent institutions. They were pioneers, fostering the early development of art history in colleges, universities, and museums. Although not much is known about the distinct roles these editorial board members played in the development of *Art Bulletin,* their presumed dedication can be seen by the fact that many of them remained on the board for twenty years, and several contributed numerous articles to the journal. Many of them also served at various times on CAA's board of directors. Given that *Art Bulletin* was one of the few U.S. scholarly journals dedicated to art history in the 1920s and was published by CAA—the only national professional organization for art historians and artist-teachers in colleges and universities—these men had considerable power and were able to influence their field through their activities. Panofsky's decision to single out these men as leaders in U.S. art history made logical sense.

In many respects, Panofsky, a German-immigrant scholar, was promoting the idea that U.S. art history had its own roots, separate from those of European art history, even from that practiced in Germany and Austria. In the process of celebrating the achievements of his U.S. colleagues, Panofsky stated that many of these founders had

[33] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 10-11. Panofsky did not mention Brooks, Pickard, Robinson, or Shapley, nor William B. Dinsmoor—an archaeologist teaching at Columbia University who was added to the board in the mid-1920s. In addition to the editorial board members, Panofsky named Howard C. Butler, Allan Marquand, E. Baldwin Smith, Frederick Mortimer Clapp, Albert M. Friend, Chandler Post, and Richard Offner. However, none of them had a strong presence in *Art Bulletin*. Smith, Post, and Friend each published one article in *Art Bulletin*.

been self-taught. He noted that these scholars “had come to the history of art from classical philology, theology and philosophy, literature, architecture, or just collecting. They established the profession by following an avocation.”[34] Among the editorial board members, only Cook and Shapley held Ph.D.s specifically in art history. The rest had been trained in other disciplines, mostly in classical archaeology and philology, and most had not earned a Ph.D., which was not uncommon for the period.

In the 1920s, art history was still somewhat dependent on classical archaeology and literature. However, the relationship between the AIA and CAA was evolving. Beginning in 1923, CAA held its conference for the next several years in conjunction with the meetings of the AIA and the APA. Among the eighteen talks in 1923, only one addressed pedagogy, two of them technical matters, two others psychological issues, while the rest were art-historical topics, most of which dealt with specific art objects or monuments from the ancient Mediterranean. In comparison with the papers on very general topics that had been read at CAA’s conference in 1912—e.g., “Art and Architecture”—CAA was by this time showing signs of maturity in terms of its scholarship.[35] The year 1923, therefore, marked a serious change for CAA not only in terms of its journal but also its conference.

Because the editors controlled both CAA’s journal and its conference, the importance of pedagogy, specifically the establishment of clear standards for studio art education within colleges and universities, was no longer a crucial topic. Research had become the primary concern, with art history sitting at the helm—even when pedagogical issues arose on occasion. In 1925, CAA’s conference included two lengthy sessions with numerous participants delivering papers devoted to the teaching of art

---

[34] Ibid., 10.
[35] See “Notes,” *Art Bulletin* 6 (March 1924): 93–95.

history, namely ancient and Renaissance art courses.[36] By the mid-1920s, the art historians had won the battle over not only *Art Bulletin,* but CAA and its general purpose as well, and this impact would be felt in the years to come.

The immediate significance of all these changes was that CAA was no longer the "infant" association, as it had been called by Keyes in 1913.[37] In the mid-1920s, CAA was starting to be recognized among the more well-established league of academic societies, and art history was becoming more accepted as an academic subject. While the art historians had initially been somewhat willing to work with artists and other practitioners in the visual arts in the 1910s to establish themselves and their field of study in colleges and universities, they chose to align themselves in the mid-1920s more openly with their parent disciplines of archaeology and philology, in order to gain acceptance in the larger framework of academia. Such a shift showed that CAA was becoming generally more conservative, given that the organization was depending upon such traditionally recognized fields in higher education for recognition rather than attempting to establish a new model integrating theory and practice.

In a historical overview of *Art Bulletin* published in 1964, on the occasion of the journal's fiftieth anniversary, Millard Meiss stated that the "true progenitor" of *Art Bulletin* was the *American Journal of Archaeology*.[38] Although he had served as editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin* in 1940–42 and knew the history of periodical well, Meiss's statement clearly ignored the importance of CAA's initial *Bulletin* and the association's original mission to promote pedagogical standards for both studio art and art history. Instead, Meiss's text proposed that art history had developed in tandem with archaeology.

In the mid-1920s many of the art historians who had been publishing in both the *American Journal of Archaeology* and *Art Bulletin* chose to contribute to the latter more

[36] See "Notes," *Art Bulletin* 8 (March 1926): 182–83.
[37] Keyes, "College Art Association," 867.
[38] Millard Meiss, "The Art Bulletin at Fifty," *Art Bulletin* 46, no. 1 (March 1964): 3.

often. Their scholarship examined periods that had been largely ignored, namely early Christian, Byzantine, and medieval art, and these scholars, including Cook, Porter, and Morey, as well as Chandler Post and Georgina Goddard King, often chose to focus on as-yet unknown monuments in remote areas, such as the Pyrenees or the deserts of the Middle East.[39] One can see a direct correlation between *Art Bulletin* and the *American Journal of Archaeology.* As more articles covering topics in early Christian and medieval art appeared in *Art Bulletin*, the *American Journal of Archaeology* focused more on antiquity. The mid-1920s therefore marked a transition for both *Art Bulletin* and the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

This division in content between the two journals allowed art history to distinguish itself, in part, from archaeology. Concentrating on medieval art, art history separated itself from classical antiquity and the classical revival of the Renaissance.[40] According to Morey, the focus on medieval art also stemmed from U.S. collecting patterns dating as far back as the exhibition of Andrew Jackson Jarves's collection of Italian primitives at Yale University in 1867 and the show of J. Pierpont Morgan's collection, with its medieval manuscripts, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1914.[41] However, other historians have argued that the concentration in higher education on medieval subject matter was also in keeping with the antimodernist spirit of the United States in the

---

[39] Throughout the early twentieth century, classical and medieval art dominated art history, especially at the graduate level. Of the "48 doctoral dissertations accepted by Harvard, Yale, and Princeton before 1930, 45 were in ancient and medieval art and the remaining 3 in Italian art before 1500"; Ackerman, "Western Art History," 191.

[40] Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," 69–70.

[41] Charles Rufus Morey, "Mediaeval Art and America," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 7 (1944): 1. Although Jarves's collection had been "somewhat unwillingly accepted" by Yale University, the ensemble of Italian primitives and other objects encouraged other U.S. collectors to seek out objects in the lesser-known field of medieval art. While many patrons might have initially been attracted to this period because the objects were relatively inexpensive and in keeping with British taste, American collectors became more sophisticated in their acquisitions in the late nineteenth century. Morey stated that "out of this collectors' [*sic*] interest, in turn, there arose what may be called the earliest American scholarship in the history of art." By the early twentieth century, U.S. collections of medieval art, like that belonging to Morgan, were quite refined. Brush added that the opening of the Cloisters in upper Manhattan in 1914 had an impact on art history; see her "German *Kunstwissenschaft*," 10.

1920s.[42] CAA's focus on medieval art was considered much less radical in higher education than its previous attempt to impose the addition of studio art education within colleges and universities.[43]

Although the fields of archaeology and art history had come to distinguish themselves from one another in terms of subject matter, their scholarship was still quite similar in the 1920s. As art history "established itself as a respectable branch of the humanities in forward-looking universities," Meiss explained, "the *Bulletin* concentrated on medieval art, and especially on philological and 'archaeological' studies, whose success was the primary reason for the gradual acceptance of the discipline."[44] The art-historical scholarship typically published in *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s was largely based on the German scientific method of archaeology.[45] Articles tended to focus primarily on facts, materials, dates, and lengthy visual descriptions. Although stylistic and iconographic analyses were found in *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s, these methods of interpretation, which tended to distinguish art history from archaeology, were typically utilized for the purposes of verification and classification, which belong primarily to the discipline of archaeology.[46]

---

[42] Brush, "German *Kunstwissenschaft*," 10. See also T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994). The antimodernist spirit was also reflected in the growth of classical archaeology after World War I. Dyson remarked: "This new appreciation of antiquity was not a call for salvation from a grim industrial world through radical aesthetics but an affirmation of the existing order and its cultural traditions, against Bolshevism and the Bauhaus. It was based on the cultivation of a benign, nonthreatening traditional humanism, which sought a return to the secure roots of Western civilization"; Dyson, *Ancient Marbles to American Shores*, 158.
[43] See Hiss and Fansler, *Research in Fine Arts*, v.
[44] Meiss, "Art Bulletin at Fifty," 3.
[45] Ackerman, "Western Art History," 190.
[46] Rhys Carpenter, "Archaeology," 113–19, and Ackerman, "Western Art History," 196–97, in *Art and Archaeology* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963). See also Charles Rufus Morey, "Research in the Fine Arts," n.d., unpublished manuscript, Charles Rufus Morey Papers, 1900–1954, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library. Morey privileged the archaeological approach over the stylistic and iconographic methods, although he clearly understood that the three worked together to further an investigation. This manuscript corresponds to his "Archaeological Research in the Fine Arts,"

Many historiographers of U.S. art history, especially those writing in the mid-1900s, including Panofsky, James Ackerman, and Colin Eisler, tended to characterize the scholarship of the 1920s as pragmatic and even provincial by comparison to that of the European art historians. According to Ackerman:

> The majority of American scholars not only accepted the prevailing antitheoretical mood, but even ignored the existing theories upon which the work of their colleagues abroad had been grounded; the study of historiography was not included in programs of higher education. . . . on the whole, Americans accepted the various European “schools” of art history, not so much by overt choice as by absorption.[47]

While Ackerman’s statements focused on the limited, ingenuous perspective of U.S. art historians in the early twentieth century, other historiographers writing in the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century, namely Kathryn Brush and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, have championed the idea that U.S. art historians in the 1920s were more worldly and sophisticated than previously thought. It should be noted that many of these U.S. art historians had studied in France, Germany, and Austria and were therefore aware of trends in European scholarship. CAA’s extensive “List of Books for a College Art Library” was quite international in scope, listing tomes by Alois Riegl, Max Dvořák, and others.[48] In addition, after World War I many U.S. art historians sought to reconnect with European art historians, especially those in German-speaking countries, who were somewhat isolated as a result of postwar animosity.[49] The U.S. art historians corresponded with European scholars and used their time away from teaching to travel throughout Europe and meet with various scholars. The European art historians who were named and cited most often in articles in *Art Bulletin* included the German

---

which was delivered at CAA’s 1936 conference in New York, celebrating the association’s twenty-fifth anniversary.

[47] Ackerman, “Western Art History,” 190.

[48] “List of Books for a College Art Library,” *Art Bulletin* 11, no. 3 (September 1929): 235–94.

[49] See Brush, “German *Kunstwissenschaft*,” 11–17; Kaufmann, “American Voices,” 131–40. Both Brush and Kaufmann seemed somewhat prone to exaggerate the accomplishments of U.S. art historians.

Adolph Goldschmidt, the Frenchman Emile Mâle, and the Austrian Josef Strzygowski.[50] In fact, Goldschmidt and Strzygowski were directly involved in U.S. art history; they both visited the United States at different times in the 1920s, lecturing and/or teaching in this country, and Strzygowski published feature articles and a review in *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s.[51] Some younger European scholars, such as Hans Henning von der Osten, also contributed to *Art Bulletin*. A transatlantic dialogue, albeit a somewhat limited one due to distance, was definitely beginning in the 1920s.

While each of the aforementioned historiographers made valuable points, an analysis of a few articles in *Art Bulletin* by prominent U.S. art historians might help elucidate some of the art-historical scholarship that was common in the mid-1920s. These articles showed that American scholarship was both pragmatic and international in its scope. According to Panofsky, the U.S. scholars' distance from Europe allowed them to examine ideas and theories from an unbiased perspective, free of national, regional, or institutional politics.[52]

In a series of six articles for *Art Bulletin,* which related to his book *Romanesque Panel Painting in Catalonia*, Cook meticulously analyzed the imagery of several panel paintings from the region. He had received his Ph.D. from Harvard, but had spent much of his time researching at Princeton, where the archaeological brand of art history had been most prominent.[53] He was the protégé of both Sachs and Morey and, as a result of his connections with the well-heeled Sachs, had been able to tour Europe extensively, becoming acquainted with numerous art historians and their institutions. Cook cited both

---

[50] Goldschmidt was named in twelve articles, Mâle twelve times, and Strzygowski twenty-four times.

[51] The editors of *Art Studies* made concerted attempts to secure contributions from European scholars and invited them to serve on the editorial board. Goldschmidt agreed to serve on the board, as did Paul Clemen, Max J. Friedländer, Georg Leidinger, Ernst Steinmann, and Aby Warburg; see Brush, "German *Kunstwissenschaft*," 19.

[52] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 13.

[53] Craig Hugh Smyth, "Walter W. S. Cook," *Art Journal* 22, no. 3 (Spring 1963): 167.

Goldschmidt and Mâle numerous times in his articles.[54] In fact, the footnotes in Cook's articles, more so than others in *Art Bulletin,* were laden with European names. His scholarship, like that employed by many of his U.S. colleagues, relied predominantly on factual analysis and visual description. Regarding a panel depicting Saint Martin, Cook described the imagery as follows:

> The central compartment contains the figure of Christ in Majesty, seated on a high wooden throne with a narrow cushion; a closed Book of the Gospels rests on His left knee and His right hand is raised in benediction. The right hand is abnormally large in relation to the size of the left, and the thumb is not bent over the finger in the Greek manner of blessing. Christ wears a crossed nimbus and a red, loose-fitting tunic, with scalloped edges and wave ornament, flaring outward slightly above the waist and falling in straight lines to the ankles. A green mantle, with outer edge indicated by a heavy yellow outline, covers the knees in stiff, cap-like folds. The bare feet, resting on a curving suppedaneum and turned outward in perfect symmetry directly on the central axis, are placed tightly together and are so appended to the lower edge of the tunic that all sense of logical structure is lost. The feet do not join the legs which the artist indicated by the folds of the tunic, and the distance between the knees and ankles is disproportionately long. The face is long and thin; small black pupils are placed beneath highly arched eyebrows; the upper eyelid is indicated by two curving lines and the lower lid by a straight line. The long nose, with nostrils shown by two lobes, the small mouth, turned down at the corners, and the diminutive ears, placed unusually high, are indicated by detached brush strokes with no shading. The figure is placed against a plain yellow background and a foliate heart motif with palmette decorates the red spandrels outside the mandorla.[55]

Such lengthy and meticulous descriptions were prevalent in many articles in *Art Bulletin.* Their thoroughness reflected the scientific method of archaeology with its emphasis on precise observation. Cook then proceeded to address the elements of the subject matter with equal care and precision. However, when he took time to examine the iconography, he did so as a means of quibbling with dating. Mâle's dating of the Saint Martin altar panel as eleventh century was incorrect, because Cook found similar motifs in other works from the early twelfth century.[56] Cook's analysis addressed neither the larger cultural meaning of the subject matter and the symbols employed nor their

---

[54] See Brush, "Unshaken Tree," 26–32.
[55] Walter W. S. Cook, "The Earliest Painted Panels at Catalonia (I)," *Art Bulletin* 5, no. 4 (June 1923): 88.
[56] Ibid., 89.

specific historical context. His purpose was to describe and analyze a largely unknown body of work, and he did so by relying upon and establishing factual information.

Like Cook's text, a 1924 article by Porter titled "Spain or Toulouse? and Other Questions" for *Art Bulletin* questioned Mâle's dating of medieval art objects. While Mâle was a well-respected scholar in France and the United States, Porter was much more openly critical of Mâle than Cook was, for the Frenchman's imprecise dating system had allowed him to state that "Toulouse was the generating center of Romanesque sculpture." Porter believed that Spain or Burgundy was a much more likely place for such an inception.[57] Porter had made many journeys throughout Europe, often to remote areas, and photographed local monuments in detail, which allowed him to make visual comparisons and track changes in the development of imagery. His 1923 book *Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads* explored the possibility that the old Roman trade routes through Italy, France, and Spain might have fostered an international exchange of artistic practices and imagery in the medieval period.[58] His analysis, therefore, questioned the nationalistic tendencies of certain European scholars, such as Mâle, who tended to celebrate the importance of their own countries in the Romanesque period.[59] Porter's scholarship was therefore somewhat different from that of his American colleagues because his analysis examined in part a larger sociohistorical context.[60] Yet as much as Porter might have been more cross-disciplinary

---

[57] A[rthur]. Kingsley Porter, "Spain or Toulouse? and Other Questions," *Art Bulletin* 7, no. 1 (September 1924): 4.
[58] Seidel, "Arthur Kingsley Porter," 103. Porter's wife referred to her husband as an archaeologist; see Lucy Kingsley Porter, "Arthur Kingsley Porter," in *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*, ed. Wilhelm R. W. Koehler, vol. 1 (Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1969), xi.
[59] Porter's *Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads* marked a change in his scholarship from following the archaeological models of French scholars to embracing those of the Germans. Porter's critical book was deemed controversial; even some Germans thought his analysis was at points too cursory; see Kathryn Brush, *The Shaping of Art History: Wilhelm Vöge, Adolph Goldschmidt, and the Study of Medieval Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 147; and Otto Schmidt, "A. Kingsley Porter, *Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads*," *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* (1927): 266–69.
[60] Ackerman, "Western Art History," 222.

than his U.S. contemporaries, his articles for *Art Bulletin* overall employed the same kind of scholarship as that of his colleagues. In the case of “Spain or Toulouse,” Porter relied on factual, material, and iconographic information in order to challenge Mâle’s nationalist bias and to support the scholarship of his colleague Cook. In many instances, the U.S. art historians were obviously quite knowledgeable about European scholarship, which they were not afraid to criticize, in the process distinguishing their work from that of the Europeans.

Although numerous articles in *Art Bulletin* garnered prestige in the 1920s, one that is still noted today in many historiographies of U.S. art history is Morey’s 1924 “Sources of Medieval Style.” Like his “Sources of Romanesque Style” of 1919, this article relied on a combination of factual and formal analysis, although it presented a much broader and more expansive theory.[61] Morey began by examining the existing literature on the origins of medieval art and boldly dismissed the ongoing conflicts among the Austrian art historians Strzygowski, Riegl, and Franz Wickhoff. As an outsider working across the Atlantic, he was not entrenched in their debates and saw merit in the findings of each of them.[62] Free from the petty complications of European feuds, Morey deftly traced the changes and continuities between two styles—illusionism and classicism—as they developed in ancient, early Christian, and medieval art throughout Europe and the Middle East. His comprehensive analysis proved to be both shocking and useful to not only American, but European art historians because it simplified the complexities of medieval art. His article garnered acclaim in the 1920s and 1930s and prompted Panofsky, in his laudatory fashion, to equate Morey’s brilliance and daring in his 1924 article with that of seventeenth-century astronomer Johannes Kepler.[63]

---

[61] C[harles] R[ufus]. Morey, “Sources of Medieval Style,” *Art Bulletin* 7, no. 2 (December 1924): 35–50.
[62] Panofsky, “Three Decades of Art History,” 13.
[63] Ibid., 11.

Panofsky's reference to Kepler was, however, clearly a stretch, given that Morey's analysis had already thoroughly been criticized in the literature by the 1950s, when Panofsky made the comparison. Some medievalists were critical of Morey's text because he seemed to have invented an "Alexandrian Style" as the source of illusionism within Hellenistic art.[64] Regardless, Morey was a significant figure for *Art Bulletin*, CAA, and art history in general in the United States, and his accomplishments should be singled out among those of his peers on the *Art Bulletin* editorial board. Morey had received an M.A. in classics from the University of Michigan in 1900 and then attended the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, where he studied archaeology and early Christian art. In 1906 he was invited to join Princeton's Department of Art and Archaeology and quickly expanded his realm of study to medieval art. Although Morey was never president of CAA nor editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin,* his contribution to CAA left an enduring impact, especially on its publications program. He was involved in the governance of the organization from its founding, serving on the board of directors for three years in 1912–14 and several other times during his lifetime.[65] According to an obituary published in *Art Bulletin* in 1955, Morey was a tremendous supporter of and fundraiser for CAA and its journal.[66] The September 1927 issue was devoted to papers written by his students at the American Academy in Rome, where Morey had taught in 1925–26 (and later served as director in 1945–47), and a December 1950 issue was dedicated in his honor with articles by his former students.

Among his many accomplishments outside CAA, Morey and his students began creating in 1917 the Index of Christian Art, a catalogued collection of photographs of late

---

[64] See Meyer Schapiro, "Review of C. R. Morey, *Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century*," *Review of Religion* 9 (1944): 165–86; Ackerman, "Western Art History," 191, 201; and Craig Hugh Smyth, "Charles Rufus Morey (1877–1955)," in Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 116–17.
[65] Smyth, "Charles Rufus Morey," 111–14.
[66] Rensselaer W. Lee, "Charles Rufus Morey, 1877–1955," *Art Bulletin* 37, no. 4 (December 1955): iv.

antique, early Christian era, and medieval works of art, which served as a reference for art historians and other scholars who wanted to engage in iconographic analysis.[67] He also taught courses at Harvard and NYU's Institute of Fine Arts. In addition, Morey became involved in Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study, helping it expand from a center for mathematics and physics into the realm of humanistic studies.

Morey and his colleagues on *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board seemed to be a tightly knit group. They were tenacious scholars, working diligently to advance the field of art history. In keeping with Leopold von Ranke's nineteenth-century positivist approach to writing history and the goal of a more objective and scientific method of historical investigation, they helped to transform art history into a so-called scientific discipline, finding a permanent niche for the subject in colleges and universities.[68] Their scholarship, which relied on archaeological practices, meticulously analyzed individual art objects. Yet these scholars were willing to make broad, sometimes brash, statements that challenged the assumptions of more established European scholars. Because these editors and editorial board members worked for many of the most prominent institutions, and they were in charge of *Art Bulletin,* their pursuits would have a lasting effect on the way the discipline subsequently developed in this country.

While this archaeological branch of art history had its positive effects, the focus of this type of study also had significant limitations. According to Ackerman, the objective nature of this scientific art history impeded the possible importance that art criticism might have played in the field in the United States.[69] Another persistent effect of this scientific art history was that, in keeping with the trend toward specialization, its practitioners tended to remain fixated on matters within the parameters of art history and

---

[67] Smyth, "Charles Rufus Morey," 111–14; and Kaufmann, "American Voices," 137.
[68] Podro, *The Critical Historians of Art*, xvii.
[69] Ackerman, "Western Art History," 139–41. Although Mather, who had served on *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board since it was founded, was a well-known art critic for the *New York Evening Post*, *Burlington Magazine*, and *Art in America*, he rarely contributed to *Art Bulletin.*

archaeology, ignoring the possible influences of other disciplines, such as literature, anthropology, or history.[70] Furthermore, this archaeological approach to the discipline rejected an entire area of art history, specifically art appreciation as it had developed in tandem with studio art courses—the type of curriculum that Holmes Smith would likely have taught. Goldwater reported that colleges and universities, especially those outside the Northeast, often "welcomed any opportunity of finding the art historian and the practicing artist in one and the same person." Goldwater's statistics, which were quite moderate, showed that 20 percent of college art teachers taught both subjects in 1920, and 18 percent in 1930, which demonstrated that a sense of professionalization existed for this hybrid field.[71] Although art appreciation sometimes functioned as a general introduction to the visual arts for the non-specialist student, the archaeologically trained art historians, in order to protect their own self-interests, reacted against this hybrid form of a single person teaching both studio art and art history. They chose also to ignore modern and contemporary art, which was closely associated with the artist-teacher at the time. Goldwater explained: "Anxious, as the representatives of the youngest college discipline, to prove their academic responsibility, they concentrated upon fields in which a truly 'scholarly' attitude seemed possible."[72] For this reason, the archaeological art historians of the 1920s focused on ancient and medieval art objects in order to separate themselves from studio art education and hybrid classes of art appreciation.[73]

For the study of art to become part of the curriculum of traditional liberal arts colleges and universities, it needed to be integrated into the existing goals of higher education. As a result, when studio art was offered, it was often implemented as

---

[70] Ibid., 190.
[71] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 31.
[72] Ibid., 27–28.
[73] As early as 1918 the architect Ralph Adams Cram acknowledged the tension between the practitioners of art appreciation and archaeology; see Cram, "Place of Fine Arts in Higher Education," *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 129–35.

something subservient to art history, and the courses related to nontechnical training for the art history student, as discussed in chapter 1, became the standard for higher education. In the process, professional studio art training for the possible future artist was set aside, and vocational education, especially that related to the industrial arts and the crafts, was largely rejected. Traditional art forms, specifically those studied in art history classes, namely painting and sculpture, as well as drawing and printmaking, would be the media taught as part of the liberal arts curriculum, that is, if studio art was offered at all. Courses in industrial design, which had been discussed in CAA's *Bulletin* in the 1910s, became a forgotten memory in higher education.[74] Thus, within ten to fifteen years of CAA's founding, the association had abandoned many of its original goals.[75]

The subjugation of studio art education in colleges and universities might simply be attributed to the conservative nature of higher education in the 1920s and not seen as related to the agenda of CAA and *Art Bulletin.* However, CAA's art historians, who were in control of CAA's journal, would repeatedly dismiss, or write off, studio art education in the association's publications program. Chapter 6 of this dissertation explains a similar situation a couple decades later with another one of CAA's journals, *Parnassus*.

One might argue that the art historians' victory over the artists within the so-called battle over the publications was inevitable simply because periodicals tend to promote writing and therefore presumably favor the art historians. But in the early twentieth century numerous artists developed a variety of periodicals, including the *391, Merz, Blaue Reiter, Blindman, La Révolution surréaliste,* and *Bauhaus.*[76] While the latter was the one that catered most to studio art education, all of them demonstrate, to

---

[74] See Hopkins, Hekking, and Weinberg, "What Kind of Technical Art Shall Be Taught to the A. B. Student?" 28–42.
[75] Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 15–16.
[76] Kirby, "Periodical §II: Historical survey."

varying degrees, the means by which artists were able to contribute to and enhance the printed format of a journal.

Some Analysis and Conclusions about *Art Bulletin* in Its First Decade

Looking at Table 1, one can see that from 1919 to 1929 *Art Bulletin* published 124 feature articles. Of those, 106 covered topics in art history. The subject categories are those that CAA uses now for its publications and membership, and they are useful because they show what was and was not covered. *Art Bulletin* was primarily Eurocentric, focusing on traditional art forms. Most of the articles covered topics ranging from Greek and Roman art to the medieval and Renaissance periods, although the number of articles on medieval art was substantially higher than any other field of study. Baroque, modern, American, Asian, and world art, as well as the decorative arts and works on paper, were largely ignored. African art, art of the Americas, and Oceanic and Australian art, as well as outsider or folk art, were completely disregarded.

Art Bulletin's primary scope of study, from Greek and Roman to Renaissance art, reflected the general parameters for most art history courses offered in colleges and universities in the 1920s, according to Goldwater's numbers. Like articles in the journal, classes addressing Baroque, modern, and U.S. art were in the minority, and Goldwater provided no data for classes covering the art of Asia, Africa, the precolonial Americas, and other categories.[77]

Surprisingly, *Art Bulletin* covered little architectural history. Although CAA had tried to unite with architects in the early 1910s, and U.S. architectural historians had already produced significant scholarship by the 1920s, *Art Bulletin* published only two articles in the 1920s that focused solely on architectural history. Among the architectural historians, some editorial board members, namely Porter and Kimball, had made

---

[77] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 27.

significant international names for themselves through their books, but their essays on architecture, along with those by other architectural historians, were rarely, if ever, published in *Art Bulletin.*[78]

Among the articles published in *Art Bulletin* from 1919 to 1929, the abundance of articles covering medieval art is worthy of further investigation. Thirty-two of the art-historical articles (26 percent) were about medieval art, which were nearly twice the number found on Greek and Roman art and almost three times that for Renaissance art. However, this emphasis on medieval art does not correspond to Goldwater's number of courses in medieval art offered by institutions of higher education: in 1920, 9 percent of the art history courses were devoted to medieval art. By 1930, the number of medieval courses had increased to approximately 11 percent.[79]

Some of the board members were the most frequent contributors to the journal. Of the thirty-two medieval feature articles, seventeen (53 percent) were written by board members. Although the editorial board members produced impressive scholarship and helped advance the field of art history in the United States, many of them clearly used their position with the journal as a means of advancing their own careers. Cook alone published ten articles in *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s, and Morey five articles.[80] Although several editorial board members may have been simply trying to fill *Art Bulletin* with enough articles, the emphasis on medieval art was clearly driven by their specific

---

[78] Porter gained an international reputation when his four-volume *Lombard Architecture* (1915–17) received the Grande Médaille de Vermeil de la Société Française d'Archéologie; see Seidel, "Arthur Kingsley Porter," 100. While A. Kingsley Porter did not publish any articles that focused explicitly on architectural history in *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s, Fiske Kimball published one such article; see Kimball, "Luciano Laurana and the 'High Renaissance,'" *Art Bulletin* 10, no. 2 (December 1927): 125-51. Many of Kimball's other published writings focused on U.S. architecture; as stated above, *Art Bulletin* did not address much art (or architecture) produced in the United States.

[79] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 27.

[80] In 1919–1929 Brooks published five articles; Shapley four; Pickard, Porter, and Robinson two each; and Kimball and Mather one each. Altogether Cook published fourteen articles, Morey eight, Brooks seven, Robinson five, Kimball and Pickard four each, and Mather two. In addition, Dinsmoor published two articles, and Ivins one. Among the editorial board members, Sachs published no articles, yet he was very involved in the governance of CAA.

interests.

The concentration on medieval art distinguished *Art Bulletin* from most other scholarly art periodicals published in Europe and the United States during the 1920s. Although the German equivalent of CAA at that time, Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, did not publish a journal in the 1920s, Germany and Austria produced numerous scholarly periodicals. *Jahrbuch der Königlich-preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, and *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* were among the most important scholarly journals of the 1920s. *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* seemed to be the most comprehensive and interdisciplinary, covering topics in the cultural history and iconography of ancient, medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque periods.[81] The other journals, by comparison, gave far more attention to Renaissance and Baroque art, as well as some modern art, than to ancient and medieval art.

Another significant contrast was that the production quality of several German journals was far superior to that of *Art Bulletin. Jahrbuch der Königlich-preussischen Kunstsammlungen* and *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* were substantially larger and featured chromolithography and other state-of-the-art reproduction methods. Moreover, the latter periodical encouraged the participation of a variety of living artists, including the Expressionists Käthe Kollwitz and Willy Jäckel, by commissioning and publishing prints that were glued individually into each copy of a specific issue. By contrast, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* and *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, considered the most serious German journals, looked the most like *Art Bulletin* in terms of size and format. When *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* first started publication in 1876, no reproductions were included because the journal was committed to "strictly scientific research" and reproductive engravings were not considered wholly reliable. As time

---

[81] Fawcett, "Scholarly Journals," 19.

passed, illustrations were added, but only a few, and they were often poor-quality black-and-white reproductions.[82] *Art Bulletin*'s lackluster design was therefore in keeping with the look of academic publications, although the journal made a successful effort to improve its illustrations in the mid-1920s.[83]

The content of *Art Bulletin* also differed from journals published in the United Kingdom and France. England's *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* focused on Renaissance and Baroque art, as did the German journals. *Burlington,* however, was different from the German scientific journals because it concentrated more on connoisseurship, as its title stated, and catered to the art market.[84] Typically half the pages featured advertising, and articles tended to be short, no more than six pages in length. By comparison, *Art Bulletin* prided itself on being free of any commercial advertising to protect the objective nature of its scholarship and featured lengthy articles that presented comprehensive discussions of the subjects under discussion.[85] France's *Gazette des beaux-arts* was somewhat like *Burlington* in that its features were always short articles; however, the French journal encompassed a broader range of art than any of the periodicals named above, featuring a well-balanced selection of articles covering painting and sculpture from the medieval period through the early twentieth century, as well as architecture and the decorative arts. The French publication was also broader in geographic scope, including as it did a fair number of articles on Asian and Middle Eastern monuments.

In the United States *Art in America*, like CAA's *Bulletin*, had begun publication in 1913. Although today the monthly magazine concentrates mostly on modern and

---

[82] Ibid., 13–14; and Kirby, "Periodical, §II: Historical survey."
[83] See, for example, Fern Rusk Shapley and Clarence Kennedy, "Brunelleschi in Competition with Ghiberti," *Art Bulletin* 5, no. 2 (December 1922): 31–34.
[84] Fawcett, "Scholarly Journals," 15. See also Michael Levey, *The Burlington Magazine: A Centenary Anthology* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
[85] College Art Association, *Endowment of the Art Bulletin* (New York: College Art Association, 1929), 3–4.

contemporary art, back in the 1910s and 1920s *Art in America* was first edited by the German immigrant art historian W. R. Valentiner and, despite its title, focused mostly on European art from the Renaissance through the nineteenth century, rarely looking at American art. Such prominent German scholars as Wilhelm von Bode and Max J. Friedländer were early contributors, along with Mather and two U.S. art historians known for their connoisseurship, Bernard Berenson and Richard Offner. *Art in America* was therefore probably the most scholarly art-historical periodical published in the United States before 1923. Afterward *Art Bulletin* and *Art Studies* served this role as well.

Art Bulletin **and the Old Boys' Network**

Among the scholarly art journals of the 1920s, *Art Bulletin* had largely created a special niche for itself in the United States because its mode of dissemination was different from that of other journals and its subject matter differed markedly from other journals (except *Art Studies*). As much as the U.S. scholars had absorbed art history from the Europeans, drawing inspiration from English and German academic models, they did not wholly copy their European counterparts in terms of their general interests. Instead the Americans focused largely on topics about which little had been published. While *Art Bulletin*'s art historians were well aware of European scholarship, they tended to cite one another as much as, if not more so than, Europeans. Porter and Morey, as well as Albert M. Friend, must have been regarded as the most esteemed U.S. scholars of the time, given that they were cited the most often in *Art Bulletin*.[86] Porter and Morey might also have served as readers for *Art Bulletin,* given that many of the journal's feature articles began by discussing, even thanking, one or both of them for their contributions to the scholarly literature. While Goldschmidt, Mâle, and Strzygowski were

[86] Porter was cited and/or named in seventeen different articles in *Art Bulletin* from 1919 to 1929, Morey fourteen times, and Friend nine times.

also cited in numerous articles, such prominent European art historians as Heinrich Wölfflin, Riegl, Aby Warburg, Giovanni Morelli, Friedländer, Jakob Burkhardt, Dvořák, and others were mentioned less often within *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s. Also, when many of these Europeans were named, they were sometimes corrected and/or criticized.

Although art in higher education was a very small world in the 1920s, *Art Bulletin* and many of its editorial board members had developed a very close academic circle, fostering and promoting their own branch of scholarship. Described in the terms of what Altbach calls "knowledge dissemination networks," many of *Art Bulletin's* board members were producing what might be called a *closed network* that operated as a means to legitimate and reinforce its own practices and those of its contributors. Altbach notes: "Those who stand at the center of any of these communications or publications systems have considerable power. They are the leaders . . . having been placed in those positions of prestige and authority by their peers." Altbach adds, "These groups control virtually all the means of communication in a field to make the basic decisions about what to publish."[87] It is important to keep in mind that the impact of these leaders, especially in the 1920s, went well beyond the immediate scope of *Art Bulletin* or even CAA. They had an influence on how the disciplines of both studio art and art history were shaped in colleges and universities throughout the country, which is why Panofsky singled them out as the founding fathers.

These men associated with *Art Bulletin* were those in power in the academic art world in the 1920s. They worked for largely similar prestigious institutions in the Northeast. They were in control of CAA and its journal. They wrote many of the articles that appeared in *Art Bulletin* and promoted a type of scholarship and subject matter that reflected their own interests. The *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board members also cited each other and sometimes supported one another in their criticisms of European scholars. In

---

[87] Altbach, *Knowledge Context*, 177–78.

addition, they promoted their own students, encouraging them to publish in *Art Bulletin.* At the time *Art Bulletin* did not engage in the judicious practice of peer review, that is, articles were not reviewed by experts in their given fields and chosen based solely on their scholarly merit. Under the leadership of the editorial board, CAA changed radically. It began as an association that had focused on the needs of artist-teachers who were working in the Midwest and wanted to create national standards for studio art education. Within a short time CAA was concentrating on the needs and desires of art historians who lived in the Northeast and engaged in German-inspired "scientific," fact-based scholarship. Such a limited practice had significant ramifications on the development of art in higher education, dismissing the importance of studio art education and many subfields within art history, namely art criticism, art appreciation, and connoisseurship, as well as areas of study outside Europe and the Middle East and time periods other than the ancient and medieval eras.

In many respects then, CAA was not operating as a national society whose purpose was "to promote art interests in all divisions of American colleges and universities." Instead, CAA—in particular, the editors and several editorial board members of *Art Bulletin*—had created what amounted to a private club, as exclusive as the gentlemen's clubs of the nineteenth century. While the intention of the editors and editorial board members was perhaps not wholly conscious and it is not my intention to equate these men with such fraternal organizations as the Freemasons or Yale's Skull and Bones, their actions resulted in a closed, elitist academic society, sometimes referred to as the "old boys' network," which was and would be a concern that distressed many art professionals who felt left outside the confines of this neatly inscribed circle.[88]

---

[88] Numerous texts have addressed the problem of the old boys' network in academia. See Thomas Bender, "Politics, Intellect, and the American University, 1945–1995," *Daedalus* 126, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 1–38; Dwight Roper, "The Waning of the Old Boy Network: Placement, Publishing and Faculty Selection," *Improving College and University Teaching* 28, no. 1 (Winter

Addendum: John Shapley as an Alternative Case Study

But what about John Shapley? He was not named among Panofsky's founding fathers of American art history, despite the fact that he was the editor in charge of *Art Bulletin* and president of CAA during the Golden Age of U.S. art history. In that capacity he was the man responsible for the significant change in the *Art Bulletin*'s content in 1923 and was clearly part of the old boys' network. The journal began to focus exclusively on art history at that time and was soon to gain an international reputation, as Panofsky later claimed. Although Shapley served as editor for eighteen years and president for sixteen years, not much is known about him. He is rarely mentioned in texts that cover the history of art history, and his few published articles are infrequently cited in scholarly journals or books. Nevertheless, this largely forgotten father of art history in the United States obviously played one of the most significant roles not only in the maturation of *Art Bulletin* and the growth of CAA, but also in the early development of art history in the United States.

Shapley had close relationships with many of *Art Bulletin*'s editorial board members, and his wife, Fern Rusk Shapley, also an art historian, was involved with CAA and its publications. John Shapley had studied with Pickard at Princeton, where he received an M.A. in art history. The two of them were instrumental in the formation of CAA. Shapley then went to the University of Vienna, where he received a Ph.D. in art history in 1914. The fact that he held a terminal degree from a European university specifically in art history, and not a related field, at a time when art history was only beginning to professionalize must have been deemed impressive within CAA.

1980): 12–18; and Curtis R. Taylor, "The Old-Boy Network and the Young-Gun Effect," *International Economic Review* 41, no. 4 (November 2000): 871–91. The subject has even been raised in CAA's publications; see, for example, Susan Bee's statement in Mira Schor et al., "Contemporary Feminism: Art Practice, Theory, and Activism—An Intergenerational Perspective," *Art Journal* 58, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 12.

Upon his return to the United States, Shapley taught at Brown University and then became the Samuel F. B. Morse professor at New York University in 1926. That same year Shapley hired Cook at NYU.[89] Shapley was clearly invested in the formation and substantiation of the "knowledge dissemination network" associated with *Art Bulletin.*[90] Given the leadership roles that Shapley played, he was presumably considered the face of CAA and *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s and 1930s. In addition, Panofsky knew Shapley, as demonstrated by their correspondence, and the fact that Panofsky contributed to *Art Bulletin* starting in the mid-1930s.[91]

So why has Shapley been seemingly erased from U.S. art history? One reason might be that although Shapley had been well trained in art history and held impressive positions in U.S. universities, he did not develop a cogent reputation as a scholar. He wrote one article for *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* in 1918 and four features for *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s. Although he was a specialist in early Christian and Byzantine art, the subjects of his articles focused on the fields of Renaissance and eighteenth-century art. It was indeed ironic that Shapley's pieces published in the various incarnations of the *Bulletin* were not wholly in keeping with the medieval perspective and archaeological mindset of the rest of journal, a journal for which he served as editor. He also never published a scholarly book, although he co-wrote, with Fern Rusk Shapley, an educational text, *Comparisons in Art: A Companion to the National Gallery of Art*, in 1957. Yet such a publication, which would have reflected art appreciation and education, would not have impressed the likes of Panofsky. In the eyes of the scholars who published in *Art Bulletin,* Shapley might have been perceived as a

[89] Maureen Joyce, "Art Historian John Shapley, 88, Dies," *Washington Post*, September 13, 1978, C8; and "In Memoriam: John Shapley," *CAA News*, December 1978, 6.
[90] Altbach, *Knowledge Context*.
[91] See, e.g., Erwin Panofsky to John Shapley, September 21, 1938, Erwin Panofsky Papers, 1904-1990 (bulk dates 1920-1968), Smithsonian Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

well-trained editor but a decidedly second-rate scholar.

Another possible reason why Shapley became a forgotten figure in art history was that in 1929 he moved to the Midwest, where he replaced Walter Sargent as chair of the Art Department of the University of Chicago.[92] Living in the Midwest, Shapley was removed from his compatriots in the Northeast. CAA had been plagued by regional conflicts, and Shapley was on different turf. My reader may also recall from chapter 1 that Chicago was typically considered the dividing line between East and West in terms of whether or not studio art education was accepted in colleges and universities. Although the University of Chicago did not offer studio art on campus, choosing to use the School of the Art Institute of Chicago for such purposes, other schools in the area embraced studio art.[93] While Shapley maintained the scholarly focus of *Art Bulletin* and the East Coast continued to dominate CAA, he allowed the association to expand its programming and publications in new directions beginning in the late 1920s, presumably to meet the needs of CAA's larger membership.

In addition, Shapley's difficulties might have simply related to the fact that he was largely an administrator and had a lot to juggle in his life, with chairing an art department, serving as president of CAA, and editing *Art Bulletin.* In the 1930s these tasks would prove to be more cumbersome in light of the Great Depression and the arrival of so many European émigrés. By the late 1930s Shapley would be ousted from his various leadership roles at both the University of Chicago and CAA.

Lastly, Shapley kept no archive; his lectures and correspondence are not to be

[92] "Prof. John Shapley Will Leave NYU: Art Authority Has Been Appointed Head of Department University of Chicago," *New York Times*, August 6, 1929, 34; and Joyce, "Art Historian John Shapley," C8; and "In Memoriam: John Shapley," 6.
[93] Roos, "Art Department University of Chicago," 21.

found in any of the places where he lived or worked.[94] His voice is therefore sadly missing in the history of art history, yet given his prominence in the field in the 1920s and 1930s, he would likely have had a lot to say.

---

[94] After consulting numerous archives and finding nothing, I contacted Shapley's daughter, who told me that she did not think her father saved his papers from his days at CAA; Ellen Fish to author, May 15, 2010.

PART 2

ART BULLETIN IN THE 1930s:

CHALLENGING THE DISCOURSE IN ART HISTORY

CHAPTER 3

ART BULLETIN FROM A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: CAA IN THE EARLY 1930s, THE GREAT DEPRESSION, AND AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP

John Shapley's sixteen-year tenure as president of CAA would not have been wholly uncommon for an academic society before World War II. In *American Learned Societies in Transition,* Harland G. Bloland and Sue M. Bloland explain that most academic societies up until the war had few assets and small memberships. Leadership positions in these societies for the president and board of directors "were allocated almost solely on the basis of scholarly accomplishment."[1] Shapley's Ph.D. from the University of Vienna would have empowered him to sustain his role as CAA's president, especially when so few others would have held such a degree at the time. Bloland and Bloland add: "As long as learned societies remained small and relatively uncomplex organizations that were conceived of ideally as homogenous 'communities of scholars,' few other organizational or political criteria competed with scholastic or scientific eminence as a basis for the selection of officers."[2] If we assume CAA was an "uncomplex organization" then, as long as Shapley and the officers of CAA wanted to stay in charge, it is unlikely that they would have been challenged. In fact, it was a standard practice that CAA's nominating committee proposed only one candidate for each position, and the incumbent officers were therefore readily "elected" year after year by the membership.

CAA was not, however, a "homogenous 'community of scholars.'" Since the

---

[1] Harland G. Bloland and Sue M. Bloland, *American Learned Societies in Transition: The Impact of Dissent and Recession* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), 9.
[2] Ibid.

content of *Art Bulletin* and CAA's conference was so focused on art history, in the mid-1920s CAA appeared to be an organization solely for art historians, but in the late 1920s and early 1930s it experienced a series of organizational changes that led to a substantial diversification in its program. The forgotten artist would return, and tensions between artist and art historian would resume. This time the battle would center not on the content of the journal and the conference, but on the entire mission of the organization. Amid the economic turmoil of the Great Depression, CAA's financial management and institutional policies would play a major role in the development of the association and *Art Bulletin.* Ultimately, the art historians would win again, and art history would eventually find a more established foothold in college and university curricula.

CAA's Expansion and Diversification

In the late 1920s CAA and its publications program expanded in new directions. In addition to publishing *Art Bulletin*, CAA began to produce a monthly magazine titled *Parnassus* in the winter of 1928–29. The publication, which is discussed in chapter 6, served as a counterpart to *Art Bulletin*, catering to the general interests of CAA's members. In 1930 CAA also took over the publication of two journals: *Eastern Art*, which focused on recent scholarship in Asian art, and *Art Studies*, which had been published by the Harvard Princeton Arts Club. The two journals needed financial help, and it was thought that CAA would be able to keep them running. *Eastern Art* had been edited privately by Hamilton Bell, Horace H. F. Jayne, and Langdon Warner, who were struggling to maintain the journal. Such individual and collective initiatives for academic journals were generally difficult to sustain in terms of funding. *Art Studies* had lost its support from Harvard in 1930, leaving Princeton to cover the costs. Typically journals published by specific departments in universities had problems surviving because they tended to promote their own faculty members and thus limited their potential audiences

and sources for financing. School administrators expected departmental journals to support themselves and were not always willing to sustain funding. In contrast, a journal published by an association had a much wider distribution, and the journal was expected to receive consistent revenue from subscriptions, membership fees, and outside sources.[3] By producing *Eastern Art* and *Art Studies,* CAA seemed to have cornered the market in the field of scholarly art-historical publishing in the United States. Despite these initiatives being added to CAA's publications program, *Art Bulletin* remained the "official organ" of the association.[4]

The late 1920s also marked what might be labeled as the beginning of the professionalization of CAA. Although the association would still be run by a small, close-knit group, its operations changed. In 1928 Audrey McMahon was named the first official administrator of the association. She was the wife of A. Philip McMahon, who was a colleague of Shapley at New York University and a member of CAA's board of directors. Previously, Shapley, likely with some assistance from his wife, Fern Rusk Shapley, ran the organization, probably out of his NYU office. The McMahons and the Shapleys were friendly and would have a strong influence on the association and its development throughout the 1930s.[5] After the Shapleys moved to Chicago in 1929, an office was set up for CAA at 20 West 58th Street in New York. Dedicated space allowed CAA to expand its programming in various directions, and in 1930 CAA was incorporated.[6]

Audrey McMahon worked part-time on a volunteer basis. Although she would become an extremely influential arts administrator, not much is known about her

[3] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 30–36.
[4] College Art Association, *What the College Art Association Does*, 2.
[5] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 6, 1940, College Art Association.
[6] John Shapley to Executive Board of the College Art Association, memorandum, March 5, 1930, Paul J. Sachs, 1878–1965, Papers, 1903–2005, box 83, John Shapley [1923–1945] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives.

background prior to CAA: she was college educated and worked as a freelance writer.[7] While Shapley and the board of directors were in charge of CAA, she was directly involved in the association's decision making.[8] Her main responsibilities included editing *Parnassus* and developing a program of exhibitions that would travel to various college art galleries and museums.[9] McMahon, in addition to CAA, was occupied with various efforts to help artists in need of work and eventually split her time between CAA and the Works Progress Administration (WPA), before devoting herself full-time to the latter. Many of McMahon's interests influenced the expansion of CAA's programming, particularly those initiatives that benefited artist members. Shapley supported McMahon in these pursuits. It is possible that Shapley's move to Chicago, where studio art had a stronger presence in higher education, encouraged his later sensitivity to the needs of both artists and art historians.

By 1933 CAA's activities had diversified substantially. In addition to publishing *Art Bulletin* and *Parnassus*, holding an annual conference, and arranging traveling exhibitions, CAA had created a lecture service that organized speaking tours for scholars around the country. CAA had also begun publishing *The Index of Twentieth Century Artists*, which included reproductions and biographical information on modern and contemporary artists.[10] Stepping outside its role as a collegiate art organization, the association was also cooperating with the Emergency Relief Bureau to provide much-needed work for artists, who like many others in the 1930s found themselves

---

[7] Résumé of Audrey McMahon, Audrey McMahon papers, 1935-1980, Smithsonian Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.
[8] Bloland and Bloland, *American Learned Societies in Transition*, 10.
[9] College Art Association, "What the College Association Does," 3. See also Cristin Tierney, "A Stimulating Prospect: CAA's Traveling Exhibition Program, 1929–1937," in Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*.
[10] *The Index of Twentieth Century Artists* was produced from 1933 to 1937. While this publication sounds like an initiative created by artist-members, it was sponsored by the Research Institute of the College Art Association, which catered strongly to the interests of the art historians. The first issue, October 1933, featured the work of John Marin (1870-1953) and Gari Melchers (1860-1932), while the second issue, November 1933, focused on Winslow Homer (1836-1910).

unemployed. The College Art Artists' Cooperative had been established, which, among other initiatives, displayed artwork in CAA's offices, so that visitors might be inspired to rent and perhaps buy a painting. In addition, CAA planned to establish regional councils, which would "ascertain the local needs and problems of the regions involved whether they be in the field of teaching art history, applied art, exhibitions, or another expression of their work."[11]

In a very short time, then, CAA had changed radically: from an elite club favoring the interests of Northeastern male art historians to a nationwide organization for numerous professionals of more diverse backgrounds working and struggling in the visual arts. CAA's multifaceted programming received mixed reactions. While artist and art historian members from smaller colleges, specifically those outside the Northeast, responded with "tremendous enthusiasm," the art historians, namely those from Princeton and Harvard Universities, as well as Smith and Wellesley Colleges, expressed little interest in these new activities. They felt that *Art Bulletin* was the primary responsibility of CAA as an academic society, and all the new and varied initiatives detracted from the importance of the journal. In addition, the new programming, which required funding and extra staff, appeared to threaten the journal financially, given the economic stress of the 1930s.[12]

Financing the *Art Bulletin* during the Great Depression

After almost a decade of relative economic prosperity in the 1920s, the U.S. stock market experienced great volatility in October 1929. On October 28, often referred to as Black Monday, the stock market plummeted 12.8 percent, and on October 29 the

---

[11] Roberta Fansler, "College Art Association: Report on Grant," July 12, 1933, Carnegie Corporation; Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 7: Art Bulletin, 1932–54, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[12] Ibid.

market declined another 11.7 percent. The ramifications of, and reactions to, such an abrupt drop devastated both U.S. and foreign economies, and the Great Depression was set in motion, lasting some ten years.[13] While businesses of all kinds soon suffered, colleges and universities were not immediately affected by the Depression's onset. According to Roger L. Geiger, schools had received substantial financial support in the economic boom of the 1920s, and their endowments continued to produce some income, because they had been more safely invested in bonds and conservative stocks. Universities also tended to establish their budgets well in advance. Many were on two-year cycles, so funds were already somewhat locked into place in the early 1930s. In addition, after the stock-market crash, enrollments increased for the 1930–31 academic year.[14]

Despite the economic uncertainty of the 1930s, the importance of research became a primary concern for universities. Previously, research projects had been deemed somewhat of an extracurricular activity for faculty, as many universities were still establishing the importance of such initiatives in the 1910s and 1920s. By the 1930s, however, research became a primary focus that such activity actually increased even while the rest of the university was feeling the economic effects of the depression. Geiger reported that "the result was a paradox of a sort."[15]

In 1930 CAA chose to promote research in an ambitious manner, developing plans to launch a research institute in the fine arts that would aid scholars with Ph.D.s and help train graduate students in "archaeology." The latter word appeared throughout the brochure produced to announce the new institute, signifying that archaeology was still a larger and more established field than art history, and at the time the distinction

---

[13] See John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Great Crash: 1929* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954); and Maury Klein, *Rainbow's End: The Crash of 1929* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
[14] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 246–47.
[15] Ibid., 246.

was not always wholly precise between the two disciplines. A major purpose for CAA's research institute was not only to promote research, but to create standards for art history.[16] Even in 1930 the CAA board of directors felt that standards in the field of U.S. art-historical scholarship were not clear.

At a meeting on January 26, 1930, the board of directors discussed methods for funding the proposed institute. Although the stock market had crashed only a few months before, the board was clearly not vexed by the economic situation. The directors stated, in an almost carefree manner, that the Frick Art Reference Library and the Morgan Library would definitely participate, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Hispanic Society of America would follow thereafter.[17] Although CAA's directors envisioned the project as an enterprise for a broad range of art-historical research, the new Research Institute was initially limited in scope to supporting work on Spanish and Islamic art. Walter W. S. Cook and Rudolf M. Riefstahl, who were experts in these fields, respectively, were named as the first research fellows.[18] The project, however, would be short-lived, lasting only one to two years.[19] Amid the turmoil of the Great Depression, CAA found it difficult to secure funding for the institute, as well as for *Art Bulletin.*

Financial problems plagued *Art Bulletin* throughout the 1930s. In 1929 CAA had

---

[16] College Art Association, *Research Institute of the College Art Association* (New York: College Art Association, 1930), n.p.
[17] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 26, 1930, College Art Association.
[18] College Art Association, "Research Institute of the College Art Association," n.p.
[19] See Matthew Israel, "CAA, Pedagogy and Curriculum: An Historical Effort, an Unparalleled Wealth of Ideas," in Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*. Israel found no evidence to support Ball's claim that CAA's Research Institute may have developed into NYU's Institute of Fine Arts (IFA). According to Amy Lucker, the IFA's librarian, in a meeting with the author, June 22, 2010, the founding history of the IFA is not clear, because its archives have not been fully processed. What has distinguished the IFA is its relationship with the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In a letter to Paul Sachs, Charles Rufus Morey stated that CAA's fledgling "Research Institute will be better off as an annex to the Metropolitan or the Frick Gallery"; see Morey to Sachs, October 30, 1931, Paul J. Sachs, 1878–1965, Papers, 1903–2005, box 64, Charles Rufus Morey, 1928–1933 [2000] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives. While this letter does not prove that CAA helped found the IFA, it suggests that there may have been a relationship or that CAA's initiative played a role in the sequence of events that established the IFA. That Cook and Riefstahl were professors at the IFA strengthens the connection.

attempted to take steps to stabilize its finances for the long run by establishing an endowment. An elaborate brochure outlined a very ambitious fund-raising program: CAA promised to pledge $25,000 annually to the journal if an outside funder would do the same. The brochure text claimed, perhaps somewhat erroneously, that *Art Bulletin*'s editorial focus was different from that of *Art Studies* and the *American Journal of Archaeology.*[20] The text likened *Art Bulletin* to the German and Austrian almanacs, or *Jahrbücher*, and explained that *Art Bulletin* was a unique operation in the United States. In aggrandizing the importance of *Art Bulletin*, the text both differentiated the practices of U.S. and European art history and revealed an inherent sense of inferiority on the part of the American scholars:

> *The Art Bulletin* is an American magazine. With due recognition of the dictum that scholarship knows no boundaries, the fact remains that it is America that has need of a scholarly art periodical. Europe has a long start in the application of enlightened scientific method to this field of study, and the results there are evident enough. In America the study of art is in its infancy; its future depends mainly on the availability of a proper medium for publication, such as the *Art Bulletin* now is. Without this, American scholars would be, as formerly, reduced to the necessity of sending their articles abroad for the always dilatory and sometimes disdainful consideration of foreign editors.[21]

Given that *Art Bulletin* was labeled "an American magazine" for "American scholars," such a statement expressed a nationalistic sentiment. Moreover, U.S. scholars clearly felt intimidated by their European counterparts, because they feared their submissions might be rejected by foreign editors. The U.S. art historians also worried about writing in a foreign language, given that so many journals were not published in English.[22] *Art Bulletin* was thus considered to be essential to American scholars' opportunities to publish, as well as a means to foster the growth of art history in the United States.

---

[20] College Art Association, *Endowment of the Art Bulletin*, 2. Although this brochure bears no date, its text mentions that *Art Bulletin* is in its tenth year of publication; therefore 1929 is the most logical date of publication.
[21] Ibid., 3–4.
[22] Ibid., 4.

As an appeal to secure new funding, the brochure outlined the future for *Art Bulletin*, including the goal of adding ninety pages per year, fifty in the features section and forty for reviews.[23] Since the inception of CAA, the field of art history had grown substantially; the number of instructors who taught solely art history had increased by 36 percent from 1920 to 1930.[24] An expanded *Art Bulletin* was therefore desired to address the needs of the growing field. In addition, a new section for news and summaries of articles was proposed. Although Shapley approached the General Education Board of New York and the Rockefeller Foundation, the financial goals outlined in the brochure were ultimately not met.[25]

Without the cushion of an endowment, the hardships of CAA and its journal persisted throughout the 1930s. Shapley and others members of the board of directors had at times given their own money anonymously to support the various functions of the association.[26] The nebulous nature of the organization's finances, and the internal politics of the association had raised concerns with enough members to bring Charles Rufus Morey, who was serving as CAA's treasurer in 1930, to caution Shapley about his strong control over the organization.[27]

Morey cautioned Shapley that too often he had heard from members that CAA was "Shapley's one man affair." He explained that Shapley needed to diversify the responsibility of running the organization and encouraged him to name James B. Munn

---

[23] Ibid.
[24] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 31.
[25] Charles Rufus Morey to Paul Sachs, February 13, 1928, Paul J. Sachs, 1878–1965, Papers, 1903–2005, box 64, Charles Rufus Morey, 1928–1933 [2000] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives.
[26] In 1925 John Shapley wrote to Paul Sachs regarding an anonymous donation: "I have noted and shall respect your wish that your personal interest should remain anonymous. The Art Bulletin is necessarily impersonal and will look upon this merely as the contribution of Harvard"; see Shapley to Sachs, February 28, 1925, Paul J. Sachs, 1878–1965, Papers, 1903–2005, box 83, John Shapley [1923–1945] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives.
[27] Charles Rufus Morey to John Shapley, September 30, 1930, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

as an officer, who would be able to share in the responsibilities of directing the organization. Morey added: "Between us, at the meeting on October 10, we could draft an amendment to the Constitution that would ensure the division of responsibility aforesaid, and protect you. . . . I am convinced that there is enough criticism going around to make it imperative that you and your friends disarm it, not only in your interest, but in the interest of the Association and its future."[28] In due course Morey's initiative was carried out as planned. Various letters encouraging new policies or changes in organizational structure can be found in records from the 1930s, revealing the volatility of the organization and the competing goals and preferences of those involved.

The instability of CAA was also evident in the association's questionable financial arrangements, especially with the primary institutional supporters of *Art Bulletin*. The journal was supposed to be largely funded by subventions: acting as sustaining institutions, the Frick Art Reference Library, Harvard University, the Hispanic Society of America, New York University, and Princeton University each presumably provided $1,000 annually, according to documentation in CAA's *Endowment for the Art Bulletin.* In addition, Dartmouth, Smith, Swarthmore, and Wellesley Colleges had signed up as contributing institutions, from which a donation of $300 per year each was expected.[29] Since 1925 these institutions had been listed in the front matter of *Art Bulletin*, although NYU, where Shapley taught, was given special prominence on the title page. The university had underwritten Shapley's office expenses as editor, which amounted to approximately $2,600 per year.[30] In 1930, after Shapley had left NYU for the University of Chicago, NYU discontinued its support of *Art Bulletin* altogether. The University of Chicago instead appeared on the title page. The latter provided greater support than

---

[28] Morey to Shapley, September 30, 1930.
[29] College Art Association, *Endowment of the Art Bulletin*, 5.
[30] James B. Munn to Morey, June 5, 1929, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

NYU had, for example, donating $6,600 in 1932.[31]

Although it was a typical practice of scholarly journals to include a list of supporters' names prominently among the first pages of issues, journals rarely highlighted the names of the editors' university or college employers by featuring them on title pages. For *Art Bulletin*, the inclusion of the university name made it appear as if the editor's host school was the journal's publisher, which would eventually annoy many CAA members.[32]

The moment the supporting institutions started to feel the economic effects of the Depression, *Art Bulletin* was threatened financially. As early as 1931, Harvard informed Shapley that it would not be able to continue its support of *Art Bulletin* at the level of $1,000 annually.[33] Although CAA had attempted to take over the publication of *Art Studies*, the annual ceased to exist after 1931 because of a lack of funding. *Eastern Art* also met a similar end that year. *Art Bulletin* would, therefore, serve as the only scholarly journal for art-historical research published in the United States, with its strongest competition in the early 1930s being *Art in America.*

By the fall of 1932 most colleges and universities began to feel the harsh effects of the Depression, primarily in the form of declining enrollments. In an attempt to recover from their declining incomes, schools chose to increase tuition charges, which had the unfortunate effect of lowering enrollments even further. Most schools had to cut their budgets severely in 1932 to make up for their losses. Many young professors were terminated from their positions, and, because the economic climate did not immediately

---

[31] Emery [T.] Filbey to G[ordon[. J[ennings]. Laing, April 17, 1933, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
[32] Helen Franc et al. to the CAA board of directors, College Art Association, April 7, 1936, in minutes of the CAA board of directors, April 9, 1936, College Art Association.
[33] George H. Chase to John Shapley, October 1, 1931. Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

improve, were neither rehired nor hired elsewhere.[34]

By 1933 the University of Chicago had to lower its contribution to *Art Bulletin* to $5,400. Apparently, most of the other institutional supporters had simply stopped donating altogether.[35] Given that *Art Bulletin* was dependent upon the contributions of colleges and universities, CAA was destitute. Nevertheless, CAA continued to print the names of its former donors in *Art Bulletin.* CAA and the scholarly and cultural institutions still needed one another to substantiate their efforts: the journal wanted to claim that it had the support and academic prestige of the schools and museums, and the educational and cultural institutions wanted to demonstrate that they supported research and scholarship in the field of art history.

In 1933 the Carnegie Corporation of New York came to the rescue and gave CAA $5,000 "for emergency help to *The Art Bulletin.*"[36] The Carnegie Corporation had been established in 1911 "to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States."[37] Since the mid-1920s the corporation had funded CAA's exams and awards program, which provided scholarships for college seniors majoring in art history, and CAA's sets of art images and list of books for colleges and universities.[38] Although Shapley had encouraged the Carnegie Corporation's director, Frederick Keppel, to fund *Art Bulletin* as well, the foundation

---

[34] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 247.
[35] Dean G[ordon]. J[ennings]. Laing to Emery [T]. Filbey, April 17, 1933, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library; and E. Baldwin Smith to Frederick Keppel, December 17, 1934, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 7: Art Bulletin, 1932–54, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[36] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, June 17, 1933, College Art Association.
[37] "Foundation History," Carnegie Corporation of New York website, accessed April 1, 2010, http://carnegie.org/about-us/foundation-history/. See also Trevor Arnett, *College and University Finance* (New York: General Education Board, 1922), 10–12; and Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 143.
[38] James B. Munn to Frederick Keppel, October 6, 1930, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 10: Study of Development of Arts Teaching in Colleges and Universities from 1900–1940, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

preferred to endorse projects that had broader educational impact. *Art Bulletin* was deemed too esoteric, because it was seen as benefiting only the advanced scholar.[39] The Carnegie preferred to fund CAA's exhibition program and encouraged CAA to produce a textbook, which did not occur.[40]

In 1934 CAA approached the Carnegie again to help bail out *Art Bulletin*.[41] E. Baldwin Smith, who was teaching at Princeton and serving on CAA's Committee on Standards, explained to Keppel some of the problems the journal was facing:

> There is no permanent assurance of life for the Bulletin by paying up the debt. It must have independence from the College Art Association and some endowment. As long as it is part of the College Art Association, it is impossible to get funds for the Bulletin because contributors feel that such funds may have to be used to meet other deficits of the College Art Association.[42]

Smith explained that it cost $6,000 per year to produce *Art Bulletin*. While the financial records were at this time nebulous, his estimate covered mostly the cost of the printing and production of the journal and might have been low. The University of Chicago's donation of $5,400 would likely have covered Shapley's office expenses and other editorial expenses, in addition to some of the printing and production.[43] Smith believed that if the Carnegie Corporation could provide an endowment of $75,000, half the journal's annual costs could be covered. CAA would certainly be able to reenlist the support of sustaining and contributing institutions to take care of the other half.[44]

He added, however, that "undoubtedly there would have to be a preference given

---

[39] Frederick Keppel to John Shapley, July 27, 1925, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folders 1–5: College Art Association, 1925–1953, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[40] Munn to Keppel, October 6, 1930.
[41] Blake-More Godwin to Frederick Keppel, September 12, 1934, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 7: Art Bulletin, 1932–54, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries; and E. B. Smith to Keppel, December 17, 1934.
[42] E. B. Smith to Keppel, December 17, 1934.
[43] Shapley's budget in College Art Association, *Endowment of the Art Bulletin*, 6, made it seem as if the costs were $50,000 annually, which was obviously inflated to attract more money from foundations.
[44] E. B. Smith to Keppel, December 17, 1934.

to articles from supporting institutions," which "might ask to have all their articles for one year published in a single issue."[45] From today's perspective, Smith's words might seem shocking. Although *Art Bulletin* had prided itself on the fact that it did not take advertising because it would compromise the integrity of the publication, the practice of allowing sustaining institutions literally to buy issues of the journal, to the benefit of their own faculty and institutional reputations, would be perhaps a far greater compromise than taking advertising would have been. It would mean that the journal's articles were not being chosen for their scholarly merit but rather for their authors' institutional affiliations. However, at this time CAA was desperate for money.

Initially, Keppel refused to support CAA's proposal. Although the Carnegie Corporation did not offer an endowment gift, it did provide $3,000 in 1935 to help *Art Bulletin*.[46] Unfortunately, the money was nowhere near enough. CAA went on to adopt Smith's scheme to allow sustaining institutions to publish their own selection of articles in *Art Bulletin*. While the records of such transactions are a bit spotty, and most of the documents regarding this policy seem to be lost today, especially in CAA's files, a letter from McMahon to Paul Sachs of Harvard communicated some of her concerns about the subsidized issues:

> As the business manager of Art Bulletin, I am entrusted with the practical arrangements. I should, therefore, be happy if you could let me know on what basis this subsidy is granted, that is to say, whether a special Harvard issue is desired or whether a general issue with a reasonable publication of Harvard material is intended. I hope the latter is the case, and I believe it to be the case in the Princeton issue. The two other subsidized issues, i.e., that of the Walters Gallery and that of the Morgan Library, are special issues, but, in addition to the managerial and editorial difficulties, I feel that the general caliber of the Art Bulletin would be lowered if a consistent policy of special issues were adopted.[47]

---

[45] Ibid.

[46] Frederick Keppel to E. Baldwin Smith, December 27, 1934, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 7: Art Bulletin, 1932–54, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[47] Audrey McMahon to Paul Sachs, March 11, 1935, Paul J. Sachs, 1878–1965, Papers, box 3, Art Bulletin [1935–1943] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives.

Sachs agreed with McMahon's suggestion, deciding that the Harvard issue should be a general one. After paying CAA $1,500, Harvard submitted a very lengthy article, "The Thirteenth Century Gothic Sculpture of the Cathedrals of Burgos and Leon" by the Harvard faculty member Frederick B. Deknatel, for the September 1935 issue. The article was a version of his Ph.D. dissertation, which had been accepted that year by Harvard.[48] Numbering more than 140 pages, the text took up most of the issue, allowing for only one additional short article, of four pages, by W. Frederick Stohlman, who was teaching at Princeton, in addition to several book reviews. The only suggestion that Dektnatel's article had been published because Harvard had paid for the privilege was in the first footnote, which stated: "The publication of this paper has been made possible by the Harvard-Radcliffe Fine Arts Series."[49]

While Harvard has some records related to its transactions with CAA, and the articles for the special issue for the Walters Art Gallery are easy enough to identify, given that all of them seem to cover objects in the museum's collection, it is not possible to track in all instances which articles were bought and which ones were selected by Shapley. Despite CAA's questionable policy of selling space in *Art Bulletin,* the 1930s was nevertheless a remarkable time for advancements in art historical scholarship, and the journal published some of the most intriguing articles generated by U.S. art historians at the time. Many of these articles are considered classics in the field and are still cited to this day, such as Meyer Schapiro's "From Mozarabic to Romanesque in Silos." However, it should be noted that these classic articles do not appear to be among the articles that were purchased by institutions.

---

[48] Paul Sachs to Audrey McMahon, March 14, 1935, Paul J. Sachs, 1878–1965, Papers, box 3, Art Bulletin [1935–1943] file, Harvard Art Museums Archives.

[49] Frederick B. Deknatel, "The Thirteenth Century Gothic Sculpture of the Cathedrals of Burgos and Leon," *Art Bulletin* 17, no. 3 (September 1935): 243 n. 1.

The Scholarship of U.S. Art Historians in the 1930s: Schapiro and Meiss

As the activities of CAA diversified in the 1930s, so did the literature published in *Art Bulletin*. In the 1920s many of the journal articles had focused on medieval art and relied upon a factual, archaeological analysis that sometimes engaged in formalist and/or iconographic descriptions. This type of subject matter and scholarly approach was heavily endorsed by CAA, which was hardly surprising because several board members were the most frequent contributors to the journal.

However, subtle changes would become apparent in the 1930s. Cook and Morey, members of the editorial board, authored fewer articles in the journal, which provided an opportunity for other scholars to make contributions. Also the discipline had experienced such continued growth in the 1920s that a new generation of scholars was emerging in the United States. These younger scholars had been trained specifically in art history and tended to produce scholarship that was more eclectic in nature and wider in methodology. According to James Ackerman, American art history of the 1930s showed that "there was no longer any case of provinciality." Members of the new generation thought beyond archaeological description and were "quick to see the implications of social sciences, which had developed so rapidly in this country, for the history of art. Social, economic, even technological interpretations of art were more congenial to Americans—particularly during the Depression, when the academic world leaned to the left politically."[50] However, the shifts in the scholarship remained subtle until the mid-1930s.

Among the most prominent art historians who emerged in the 1930s, Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Alfred H. Barr, Meyer Schapiro, and Millard Meiss are often singled out in the historiographical literature of the late twentieth century for their contributions.[51]

---

[50] Ackerman, "Western Art History," 193–94.
[51] See ibid., 193.

All four would eventually have some connection to CAA. In the 1930s, however, the architectural historian Hitchcock and the modernist Barr represented fields that were still somewhat outside *Art Bulletin*'s purview. Although the latter two were named on the editorial board in the 1940s, neither one had much, if any, presence in *Art Bulletin* in the 1930s. Hitchcock's book *The Architecture of H. H. Richardson and His Times* was reviewed in 1936, and he would have one article included, in 1941, on Frank Lloyd Wright's architecture, and another, in 1966, on the Rococo transformation of churches. Articles by Barr were never published in the journal because he focused on twentieth century art; moreover, his work was not even cited in *Art Bulletin* articles of the 1930s. It was Schapiro and Meiss then who represented the new generation of art historians of the 1930s in *Art Bulletin*'s pages. They were specialists in the medieval and Renaissance periods, and each had three articles published in *Art Bulletin* during the 1930s.[52] Their articles are significant because both of them experienced a noticeable transformation in their scholarship in the mid-1930s, in tandem with a larger shift within art-historical practice in the United States.

Schapiro was one of the most prominent U.S. art historians to emerge in the 1930s; numerous scholars of historiography have agreed upon the importance of his work.[53] Schapiro proved to be a pivotal figure in the 1930s because he worked adeptly in different periods of art, namely medieval and modern art; his methodology developed over the decade; and he engaged approaches new to art history, including Marxist and psychoanalytical theory.

Schapiro had received an undergraduate degree from Columbia University in

---

[52] Several of his books were reviewed in *Art Bulletin*.

[53] The list of articles that have celebrated the scholarship of Meyer Schapiro is enormous. Large portions of individual issues of journals, not all of which were art-historical, have discussed his contribution to both art history and scholarship at large; see *Social Research* 45 (Spring 1978); *Oxford Art Journal* 17, no. 1 (1994); and *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (Winter 1997), to name a few.

1924 and a Carnegie scholarship from CAA in 1926. Although he applied to Princeton University for graduate studies in art history, he was rejected, which, according to John Russell, Schapiro himself had said was likely due to the fact that he was Jewish.[54] While it is difficult to prove such accusations of anti-Semitism, Schapiro did indeed experience discrimination, at Columbia University, where he pursued his graduate studies. A 1924 letter from the university's executive officer, Nicholas Butler Murray, to its secretary, Frank Diehl Fackenthal, questioned whether or not Schapiro should receive a graduate fellowship, since he had "so unfortunate a personality that it would be impossible ever to recommend him for a teaching position."[55] While this letter did not specify any misgivings related to Schapiro's ethnic or religious background, a letter of 1925 also written by Murray was much more explicit in its anti-Semitism. Although Schapiro's scholarship was praised for its "distinction" and "promise," the letter stated: "Only the very obvious fact of his *race*, which will make it somewhat difficult to recommend him for teaching when he secures his degrees, prevents our giving our unqualified approval to so unusual a candidate" [my emphasis].[56] Such anti-Semitism was not uncommon in the 1920s in art history and other academic disciplines, and would become even more evident in the 1930s.

Despite the discrimination Schapiro surely experienced, whatever its extent, he nevertheless was the first person to receive a Ph.D. specifically in art history from Columbia University in 1935. He even secured a faculty position at the school. While Schapiro studied at Columbia, he was influenced by Arthur Kingsley Porter of Harvard University. Although Porter's conservative politics were markedly different from

---

[54] John Russell, "Meyer Schapiro, 91, Historian and Teacher Who Wove Art and Life, Is Dead," *New York Times*, March 4, 1996.
[55] Nicholas Butler Murray to F[rank]. D[iehl]. Fackenthal, March 13, 1924, Fellowships, School of the Fine Arts Records, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[56] Nicholas Butler Murray to F[rank]. D[iehl]. Fackenthal, February 27, 1925, Fellowships, School of the Fine Arts Records, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

Schapiro's socialist mindset, Porter had been an early pioneer in the social history of art. In fact, Porter had encouraged Schapiro to study with him, but Schapiro declined.[57] Because Schapiro's scholarship was somewhat eclectic and appeared in various journals, his work has sometimes been difficult to assess as a whole. As a result, John Plummer, a former Schapiro student, claimed in 1978 that no decisively cogent Schapiro school had ever been able to develop.[58] This would not remain entirely true, given that several books of Schapiro's collected essays were published from that time forward, and his work would be championed by many art historians—even those who represented different, and at times opposing, factions.[59] In attempts to celebrate Schapiro's contributions to his field, some historiographers, including another former student of his, David Rosand, have tended to oversimplify Schapiro's achievements, neglecting the nuances of his growth as a young scholar.[60] Yet the Schapiro of the early 1930s, as seen in *Art Bulletin*, was markedly different from the more mature scholar of the late 1930s.

In 1931 Schapiro published his first article for *Art Bulletin* titled "The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac: Part I." Since Schapiro's article comprised 169 pages altogether—one of the longest articles ever printed in the journal—it was

---

[57] Thomas Crow, *The Intelligence of Art* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 11.

[58] John Plummer, "Insight and Outlook," in "On the Work of Meyer Schapiro," ed. Arien Mack, special issue, *Social Research* 45, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 168, 174.

[59] See Meyer Schapiro*, Selected Papers I: Romanesque Art* (New York: George Braziller, 1977); idem, *Selected Papers II: Modern Art: 19th and 20th Centuries* (New York: George Braziller, 1978); idem, *Selected Papers III: Late Antique, Early Christian, and Medieval Art* (New York: George Braziller, 1979); and idem, *Selected Papers IV: Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist, and Society* (New York: George Braziller, 1994).

[60] I am singling out Rosand because his obituary/biography of Schapiro has been published several times with slight variations; see David Rosand, "Obituary: Meyer Schapiro (1904–1996)," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, no. 3 (July 1996): 547–49; idem, "Meyer Schapiro (23 September 1904–3 March 1996)," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 142, no. 3 (September 1998): 494–98; and idem, "Schapiro, Meyer," in *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly, *Oxford Art Online*, accessed April 20, 2010, http://www.oxfordartonline.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/subscriber/article/opr/t234/e0458?goto=schapiromeyer&type=biography&pos=2.

published in two parts in the September and December issues of *Art Bulletin*.[61] The article was itself a portion of Schapiro's 400-page dissertation on a French Benedictine abbey. In his opening footnote Schapiro explained that what was being reproduced in the September issue was "the first half of the description of the style of the sculptures" from his dissertation, which had been accepted for his Ph.D. in May 1929.[62] His article described at length "the postures, gestures, costumes, expressions, space, perspective, and grouping of the figures." He also grappled with what he called the "archaic representation of forms, designed in restless, but well-coördinated opposition . . . . Archaic representation implies an unplastic relief of parallel planes, concentric surfaces and movements parallel to the background, the limitation of horizontal planes, the vertical projection of spatial themes, the schematic reduction of natural shapes, their generalized aspect, and the ornamental abstraction or arithmetical grouping of repeated elements."[63] Schapiro's 1931 two-part article in *Art Bulletin* clearly focused on the complexities of the forms and techniques utilized in the making of the architecture and sculpture of the Moissac abbey. Schapiro also mentioned iconography on occasion, but mostly as a means to substantiate his formal conclusions.[64] Although this article showed signs of a very sophisticated visual analysis, it was still largely a methodological outgrowth of the scholarly conventions of the 1920s.

Despite the largely formalist nature of Schapiro's "The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac," Rosand claimed more than once that Schapiro's 1929 dissertation and 1931 article "opened entirely new critical perspectives for the study of Romanesque art," by

---

[61] Meyer Schapiro, "The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac: Part 1 (I)," *Art Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (September 1931): 249–351; and idem, "The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac: Part 1 (2)," *Art Bulletin* 13, no. 4 (December 1931): 464–531.
[62] Schapiro, "Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac: Part 1 (I)," 249, 251 n. 1.
[63] Ibid., 249, 251.
[64] Iconography is mentioned here and there in both portions of the article. A brief section is dedicated to "Some Facts from the History of the Abbey"; see ibid., 252–57.

analyzing Moissac's abbey "historically and culturally with new precision."[65] Although Schapiro was certainly thorough in his visual analysis, he did not necessarily demonstrate any new perspective in art-historical scholarship here. One reason for this exaggerated interpretation might simply be Rosand's wish to aggrandize Schapiro, raising him to the level of a young genius in the field of art history, which historiographers who focus on single figures are sometimes prone to do. However, another reason for the confusion might be that Schapiro himself denied his own formalist roots later in life. In a series of interviews in the 1990s with David Craven, Schapiro discussed the development of his Marxist method, claiming:

> The conceptual framework . . . was first used in my 1929 dissertation on Moissac. The third part of this dissertation, which has never been published, uses a Marxist concept of history. Originally, after the first part of the dissertation appeared in the 1931 *Art Bulletin,* I planned to revise the second part on iconography and then to publish the third part on the historical context for Moissac. For various reasons I never found the time to complete the revision of the second part, so the last two parts have never appeared in print.[66]

Given his statement, one might expect that Schapiro's article for *Art Bulletin* was quite different from the rest of his dissertation, the first part of the dissertation serving as the formalist component of the study and the rest encompassing the iconographic and Marxist interpretations. However, the article in *Art Bulletin,* as noted above, included some components of an iconographic analysis primarily as a means to substantiate Schapiro's formal interpretation. More importantly, when viewing the dissertation on deposit at Columbia, one can see that the 400-page text does not reflect the distinctions described by Schapiro in 1931. The dissertation is divided into two, not three, parts. Part 2 of the dissertation, "Historical Study of the Cloister and the Tympanum," also focuses on stylistic concerns, namely the historical precedents of the Romanesque style found in

---

[65] Rosand, "Obituary: Meyer Schapiro (1904–1996)," 547; idem, "Meyer Schapiro (23 September 1904–3 March 1996)," 495; and idem, "Schapiro, Meyer."

[66] Meyer Schapiro and Lillian Milgram Schapiro with David Craven, "A Series of Interviews (July 15, 1992–January 22, 1995)," *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 31 (Spring 1997): 164.

Moissac. Thus neither Schapiro's article for *Art Bulletin* nor his dissertation provided any interpretation of the social, economic, or political factors that might reflect "a Marxist concept of history."[67]

Another interrelated discrepancy about the dissertation is that although the document had been approved for the Ph.D. in 1929, Schapiro did not deposit his dissertation and receive his degree until 1935.[68] Such a gap in time seems odd for such an accomplished scholar, and no one has taken time to reflect on a possible explanation. One might be that Schapiro was still revising his dissertation for a CAA book project and wanted to deposit the revised version. Indeed, there is significant archival evidence documenting Schapiro's plans to rework the dissertation. In 1932 Shapley and Schapiro were discussing the possibility of publishing an independent book comprising Schapiro's two-part article, published in *Art Bulletin* in 1931, along with part 2 of his dissertation.[69]

Schapiro, however, took considerable time trying to revise part 2 for the book. In January 1934 Shapley explained to Schapiro that the printer could not wait any longer, and the book needed to be produced containing only part 1. Shapley added that a

---

[67] See John Williams, "Meyer Schapiro in Silos, Pursuing an Iconography of Style," *Art Bulletin* 85, no. 3 (September 2003): 444–45.

[68] Scholars have used 1929 and 1935 as the completion date for Schapiro's dissertation. The archivists in Columbia University's Avery and Butler libraries state that Schapiro completed his dissertation in 1929, but deposited it in 1935. John Williams's article, referred to in the previous note, "Meyer Schapiro in Silos," 442–68, encouraged me to examine the dissertation itself. While it may have been completed in 1929, for no references postdate 1928, there is no date of deposit on the dissertation itself.

[69] John Shapley to Meyer Schapiro, May 12, 1932; Meyer Schapiro to Ellen Hartmann, June 26, 1932; Ellen Hartmann to Meyer Schapiro, June 30, 1932; Meyer Schapiro to John Shapley, January 15, 1933; all in Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 169, folder 10, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries. The third part of Schapiro's dissertation was not referred to in Shapley's May 12 letter. The earliest mention of any third part of Schapiro's study of Moissac that I was able to find was in a letter by Schapiro to Shapley of April 2, 1934, letter: "I think I will be free in a few weeks to complete Moissac II and III for publication. They hang over my head like an incubus." Part 3 is not identified as Marxist or as using any other kind of analysis; see Schapiro to Shapley, April 2, 1934, Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 169, folder 10, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

second volume featuring part 2 could be published at a later date.[70] Another reason for Shapley's insistence that the book be produced in a rush, despite the poor economy, might have been tied to the fact that Schapiro had just learned that he, as author, was responsible for paying one-third the cost of the printing and was objecting to the practice.[71] Despite these conflicts, Schapiro's lengthy article was published, marking the first time that CAA published an article as a stand-alone book.[72] Although Schapiro and Shapley were still discussing Schapiro's completion of part 2 of his dissertation as late as 1935, part 2 was never published in any form, as Schapiro himself noted in the mid-1990s.[73] While previously Schapiro may have been waiting to complete the CAA book in order to deposit his dissertation, he finally submitted his original 1929 dissertation in

---

[70] John Shapley to Meyer Schapiro, January 5, 1934; John Shapley to Meyer Schapiro, March 13, 1934; Schapiro to Shapley, April 2, 1934; Shapley to Schapiro, September 11, 1935; all in Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 169, folder 10, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[71] Audrey McMahon to Meyer Schapiro, February 26, 1934; Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 111, folder 12, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries; Schapiro to Shapley, April 2, 1934.

[72] Meyer Schapiro, *Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac* (New York: College Art Association, n.d.). The book is essentially an offprint of the article that was bound by the printer. In fact, the pagination of the two portions published in the separate issues of *Art Bulletin* remained the same, and thus there was a break in the page numbering, with the folios reading 249–351 and 464–531. The following is printed on the title page, according to the specifications of Columbia University: "Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University." The book has no date of publication other than the 1931 reference to the article's publication in *Art Bulletin* in the title. After examining the correspondence in the Meyer Schapiro Collection cited above, I judge that the book was likely produced in 1934 or 1935, at the latest.

The decision to publish Schapiro's article as a book might have grown out of a discussion of CAA's board of directors. In 1930 David M. Robinson suggested that "there might be an organ for the publication of research such as a monograph series to supplement the *Art Bulletin*"; see minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 26, 1930. CAA would begin to publish books on a regular basis in 1944 as part of its Monographs on the Fine Arts series.

[73] Schapiro to Shapley, April 2, 1934; and Shapley to Schapiro, September 11, 1935. On July 7, 1934, Schapiro explained to Shapley: "Moissac, Part II, is coming along well. I am taking footnotes all day. I think you will have to publish this part in two installments, but I believe you will not regret the length of this part; it has lots of interesting discussion of iconographic principles, liturgy, religion, feudal customs and institutions in relation to art, and the formal aspects of iconography." While Schapiro's words suggest that he had expanded his methodological approach, the text was never printed and, as previously discussed, did not relate to the dissertation he deposited at Columbia University; see Schapiro to Shapley, July 7, 1934, Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 169, folder 10, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

1935 and simply moved on in his scholarly pursuits.[74]

Even though Schapiro began his career largely as a formalist, he would develop his Marxist methodology rapidly throughout the 1930s. As early as 1932 he began to criticize formalism "as an artificial and schematic dialectic which ignores the *meanings* of the works, the purpose of the art in Romanesque society and religion."[75] He also wrote about social issues related to modern art and artists, beginning to publish essays in a variety of journals, such as *The New Masses*, *Art Front*, and *Marxist Quarterly*, which were all affiliated with leftist politics and considered outside the realm of traditional academic art history. Many art historians have explained that Schapiro's political alignments, the impacts of the Great Depression, and his interactions with artists encouraged him to develop a Marxist analytical approach to art history. Although all of Schapiro's contributions to *Art Bulletin* covered the art of the past, namely Romanesque art, he readily applied a Marxist perspective to that period and occasionally drew parallels from past to present.[76]

In 1939 Schapiro's "From Mozarabic to Romanesque in Silos" appeared in *Art Bulletin*, applying a Marxist perspective to sculptures and manuscript illumination of a Spanish monastery in Santo Domingo de Silos, Spain. Schapiro began by questioning past scholarship that tracked artistic influences across geographic lines, in this case the influence of France on Spain in Romanesque art. He believed that this type of study "tells us nothing about the effect of the native situation on the content and style of the art. It neglects in Spain, as it does in France, the mode of operation of such factors as

---

[74] To add to all the confusion, when the book on Moissac has been reprinted since its first publication as an independent book (that is, about 1934 or 1935), the two portions from the article in *Art Bulletin* have been labeled parts 1 and 2, which do not correspond with the dissertation; see, for example, Meyer Schapiro, *The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac* (New York: George Braziller, 1985).

[75] Williams, "Meyer Schapiro in Silos," 446.

[76] See O. K. Werckmeister, "Meyer Schapiro, *Romanesque Art*" (book review), *Art Quarterly*, n.s. 2, no. 2 (Spring 1979): 211–18; and Williams, "Meyer Schapiro in Silos," 446.

religious organization and politics within the art itself." However, he did not wholly reject formalism, stating explicitly that his method was based in "the critical correlation of the forms and meanings in the images with historical conditions of the same period and region."[77] The analysis concentrated on the monastery's two dominant styles, Mozarabic and Romanesque; the development of the styles and their simultaneous production in the monastery; and their reciprocal influences. Schapiro's Marxist perspective addressed "the beginnings of an aggressive middle class" that had developed in Spain about 1100.[78] That economic shift allowed for secular subjects to be depicted in the "margins" of Christian manuscripts and architectural decoration, without any overt religious purpose. He also made connections between images conveying the carefree spirit of Romanesque jongleurs (musicians) and similar depictions found in modern art.

Although Schapiro worked in seemingly distinct fields within art history, he sometimes drew links across time periods. In addition, while he grappled with socioeconomic concerns relevant to Marxism, he still addressed the subtle nuances of the forms of the art objects under investigation. Schapiro's development as an art historian, moving from a largely formalist approach in the early 1930s to a Marxist methodology in the late 1930s, exhibited signs of a more complex, analytical, and interdisciplinary approach than the fact-based, archaeological brand of art history that had been practiced in the 1920s. Schapiro's transition also correlated with a larger shift seen in the 1930s in U.S. art history, which resulted from increasing European influence.[79] In the early 1930s Schapiro lectured at NYU and was friendly with Erwin

---

[77] Schapiro, "From Mozarabic to Romanesque," 313.
[78] Ibid., 350.
[79] Schapiro's third article of the 1930s was "New Documents on St.-Gilles," *Art Bulletin* 17, no. 4 (December 1935): 415–31. This text focused on the complexities of dating the elements of the facade of the abbey church of Saint-Gilles, offering an analysis much like the archaeological scholarship found in the previous decade. I therefore decided not to address the article explicitly in this dissertation, since it does not further my goal of demonstrating the arc of Schapiro's scholarship, which changed radically from the early to the late 1930s.

Panofsky, whom he invited to many of his social gatherings.[80]

Millard Meiss, who was the same age as Schapiro and also taught at Columbia University, wrote numerous articles appearing in *Art Bulletin*. Meiss's work experienced a similar change in the 1930s, but it was by no means as significant or dramatic as that found in Schapiro's production. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile singling out Meiss in this study because he played such a seminal role in the development of CAA and *Art Bulletin*, as well as in the international arena of art history. Although Meiss was Jewish, he, unlike Schapiro, attended Princeton as an undergraduate. He was likely able to do so because his name was less obviously Jewish than that of Schapiro, and he studied in the School of Architecture, which was separate from the Art and Archaeology Department. Meiss received his degree in architecture in 1926 and then attended Harvard in 1928 for a short time before transferring to NYU, where he received his Ph.D. in art history in 1933. As a student of Richard Offner, Meiss began his career working in the tradition of connoisseurship.[81] Neither Offner nor Bernard Berenson contributed articles or reviews to *Art Bulletin*, which had typically avoided connoisseurship in the 1920s. Regardless, Meiss's first article was published in the journal in 1931, when he was still a student, and it reflected their influence.

Titled "'Ugolino Lorenzetti,'" his text grappled with a then-current scholarly debate about the attribution of a number of Sienese trecento paintings. Berenson believed that some of these paintings had been created by an unknown painter who followed both Pietro Lorenzetti and Ugolino; hence, he made up the moniker Ugolino Lorenzetti. Ernest T. DeWald claimed that some of the works in Berenson's group, in addition to

---

[80] "Schapiro, Meyer [Meir until 1907]," Dictionary of Art Historians, accessed July 15, 2010, http://www.dictinoaryofarthistorians.org /schapierom.htm.

[81] Hayden B. J. Maginnis, "Millard Meiss (25th March 1904–12th June 1975)," in "Special Issue Devoted to the Italian Trecento in Memory of Millard Meiss," *Burlington Magazine* 117, no. 869 (August 1975): 544, 547; and Rennselaer Lee and John Pope-Hennessy, "Millard Meiss: In Memoriam," *Art Journal* 35, no. 3 (Spring 1976): 261–62.

others DeWald had identified on his own, were produced by the so-called Orvile master, who was a follower of Pietro only. In an attempt to settle the debate, Meiss focused explicitly on the paintings that fell in both Berenson's and DeWald's groupings, addressing the personal style of what he believed to be one and the same artist. Meiss noticed that the works "disclose a single purposeful personality revealed at varying intervals of time. The revelations are, indeed, very wide formal variants, since the master developed under several external influences, but they all betray a fundamental psychology, visual and manual habits which must be the exclusive complex of an individual."[82] Meiss examined the subtle stylistic influences on this unknown master and attributed new paintings to the individual, forming a third group of works and advancing an entirely new interpretation, which thus managed to complicate the previous debate even further.[83]

Meiss's second article in *Art Bulletin*, "The Problems of Francesco Traini," appeared in 1933. The topic, which related to his master's thesis, discussed a relatively underrated trecento master from Pisa.[84] Meiss questioned Giorgio Vasari's long-standing attribution of an altarpiece of Saint Thomas to Traini. However, this article expanded beyond the limits of traditional connoisseurship because it relied on iconographic interpretation in addition to the more conventional stylistic analysis. Unlike the scholarship of the 1920s that addressed iconography in order to refine the dating of works, Meiss's writing engaged iconography to address the complex meaning of symbols, in this case, those related to death.[85] While attending NYU in the early 1930s,

---

[82] Millard Meiss, "'Ugolino Lorenzetti,'" *Art Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (September 1931): 379.
[83] Ibid., 376–97. Although Pope-Hennessy noted that Meiss had addressed iconography in this article, no thorough discussion of symbols was present in this article; Lee and Pope-Hennessy, "Millard Meiss," 262.
[84] For Meiss's thesis, see "Theses and Dissertations: Fine Arts and Allied Fields," *Parnassus* 2, no. 5 (May 1930): 45.
[85] Millard Meiss, "The Problem of Francesco Traini," *Art Bulletin* 15, no. 2 (June 1933): 97–173; see, in particular, the section "A Note on the Iconography of the 'Triumph of Death,'" 168–71.

Meiss had benefited from being a student and graduate assistant of Erwin Panofsky, who would promote iconographic methodology in the United States.[86]

By the mid-1930s Meiss's scholarship had become even more complex; his 1936 article in *Art Bulletin*, "Madonna of Humility," examined several depictions of the Virgin Mary sitting on the ground (perhaps on a cushion) and nursing the baby Jesus. By reviewing various images of the subject of the humble Madonna in the beginning of the article, Meiss tracked the influence of the art of one region or country on another. In many respects, the analysis was the very kind condemned by Schapiro only a few years later. However, as Meiss's article continued, he concentrated much more heavily on the subject matter and iconography, examining the "character and power of the Virgin which arose from her motherhood." Drawing upon the writings of Petrarch, Thomas Aquinas, and others, Meiss then explained that the depiction of the Madonna of Humility, which expressed "solicitude for *all* souls, even the sinful," [Meiss's emphasis] was particularly important in trecento Florence and Siena. Her humbleness was the polar opposite of the Virgin Mary depicted as the "Woman of the Apocalypse," who was shown with stars, the moon, and sometimes the sun. That apocalyptic woman was more commonly found in other regions of Europe and in other periods. Furthermore, outside Tuscany the Madonna of Humility type was sometimes seen in combination with the Woman of the Apocalypse: the seated and nursing Mary was depicted with stars, the moon, and the sun, suggesting the simultaneous mercifulness and wrath of Christianity.[87]

Although Meiss began his career as a connoisseur and would maintain a substantial reputation in this area, he was clearly flexible in his adaptation of various

---

[86] Ackerman, "Western Art History," 217; Maginnis, "Millard Meiss," 544; and Lee and Pope-Hennessy, "Millard Meiss," 261. See also William S. Heckscher, "Erwin Panofsky: A Curriculum Vitae," in "Erwin Panofsky in Memoriam," special issue, *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 28, no. 1 (1969): 13–14. Panofsky is discussed in depth in chapter 4 of this dissertation.

[87] Meiss, "Madonna," 435 n. 2, 460–64.

analytical approaches. His most famous study, the 1951 book *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death*, dealt with not only formalism and iconography but also social history as a means to address the artistic changes in Tuscan art as a result of the plague.[88] Although Meiss was highly respected as a scholar and a professor, he was also a strong leader in CAA and the international arena of art history. He became the editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin,* serving a three-year term in 1940-42, and later was a member of CAA's board of directors for many years. He also organized the first International Committee of the History of Art in the United Sates in 1961.[89]

As Meiss's scholarship continued to expand and diversify in complex ways throughout the 1930s, so did that of many of his contemporaries in the United States, especially Schapiro. The old archaeological method, which had remained strong in the early 1930s, was being augmented by more complex forms of analysis in the mid- and late 1930s. As Ackerman claimed, the art historians emerging in the 1930s were more multidimensional in their analytical perspectives. These trends were reflected in the pages of *Art Bulletin* primarily through the articles of Schapiro and Meiss, who were expanding the envelope of what art history had been in the United States.

Two major factors in these changes were art historians' increasing interest in the social meanings of art objects, corresponding both to the vast economic dislocations wrought by the Depression and to the influence of European art historians who were arriving in United States in the 1930s. Their presence, felt in colleges and universities as well as in *Art Bulletin*, had a dramatic impact on the discipline of art history in the United States. Even though the generation of art historians emerging in the 1930s would benefit from the émigrés' presence, the foreign infiltration brought controversy and tension

[88] Millard Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1951). For critiques of this book, see William Hood, "The State of Research," *Art Bulletin* 69, no. 2 (June 1987): 174–86; and Henk van Os, "The Black Death and Sienese Painting: A Problem of Interpretation," *Art History* 4, no. 3 (September 1981): 237–49.
[89] Lee and Pope-Hennessy, "Millard Meiss," 261–62.

within both the discipline and CAA. The foreigners would undergo transitions of their own as evident in the scholarship they produced during the decade, which will be the subject of chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

ART BULLETIN FROM AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE: PANOFSKY, ICONOLOGY, AND HIS SCHOLARSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

One of the greatest impacts on U.S. art history in the mid-1930s came from the influx of European émigrés in the United States. After Adolf Hitler was named chancellor of Germany in January 1933, the National Socialists issued a policy condemning all non-Aryans and those who opposed their party politically or ideologically.[1] As a result, approximately 250 German art historians, who amounted to almost one-quarter of all the art historians and museum employees in Germany, were terminated from their jobs.[2] They were not allowed to continue in their academic studies or work, even in a self-employed capacity, and in many instances were barred from museums, archives, and collections.[3] Many of these art historians and museum workers fled Nazi Germany and came to the United States, which would ultimately change the trajectory of art history as it was practiced in this country.[4] While prejudice and politics obviously played a significant role in the process, my concern in this chapter is primarily with the scholarship of the European émigrés as a means of understanding their impact on American art history. The issues of prejudice and politics will be addressed in the next chapter.

Several art historians and historiographers active in the last twenty years have grappled with the transformation that occurred in art-historical scholarship in the 1930s. Among them, Karen Michels has written:

---

[1] Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury, *The Rescue of Science and Learning: The Story of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), 4-5; Maurice R. Davie, *Refugees in America* (New York: Harper, 1947), 300, 315-18; and Stephanie Barron, "European Artists in Exile: A Reading between the Lines," in Barron with Eckmann, *Exiles + Emigrés*, 12.

[2] Michels, "Transfer and Transformation*,"* 305.

[3] Kevin Parker, "Art History and Exile: Richard Krautheimer and Erwin Panofsky," in Barron with Eckmann, *Exiles + Emigrés,* 317.

[4] Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 306.

> The influx of leading [European] talents so advanced the evolution of art historical study in America—where it was still in its infancy—that within a few years it had attained full international parity and in some specialties had taken the lead. Such an influx of art historians would eventually reshape the field of art history.[5]

As I argued in chapter 3, a transformation did indeed occur in the scholarship of U.S. art historians in the mid-1930s in part from their reactions to the various social impacts of the 1930s economic crisis. The younger scholars in particular, including Millard Meiss and Meyer Schapiro, were also influenced by their studies and friendships with the European émigrés.

The European influence resulted in the rise of the Renaissance as a key art-historical subject in the early 1940s, and the eventual incorporation of iconology as a methodological practice in the United States. In fact, according to Michels, "[i]conology became an international approach in art history. As a method it came to dominate the field of art history and even related disciplines."[6] However, the European émigrés did not merely transplant their scholarly interests onto the United States. Iconology and the Renaissance, which had previously played only peripheral roles within this country, had to be revamped and repackaged for the U.S. audience in order for the subject matter and methodology to gain eventual prominence. Ultimately, the European immigrants thus experienced a transformation in their own scholarship, rejecting many of their former theoretical and ideological practices. The interaction of the U.S. and European art historians and their changing ideas about the discipline were key factors in the development of art history in the late 1930s. In many ways, *Art Bulletin* and CAA, as the discipline's academic presence in the United States, served as the stage on which these events transpired. Furthermore, the resulting internationalization of U.S. art history would

[5] Ibid., 304. Other texts addressing the 1930s include: Brush, "German *Kunstwissenschaft*," 7-36; Brush, "Unshaken Tree," 25-51; Crow, "Practice of Art History," 70-90; Kaufmann, "American Voices," 128-50; Michels, "Art History, German Jewish Identity," 167-79; and C. Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," 65-92.
[6] Michels, "Art History, German Jewish Identity," 175.

help the discipline achieve parity with other subjects in the humanities in colleges and universities, which had been one of CAA's primary goals from the beginning.

An International Exchange: The Early Stages

If we use *Art Bulletin* to gauge what might be called the internationalization of art history in the United States, we can see that there was already a European presence in the journal before 1933. In the 1920s *Art Bulletin* had on occasion published articles by European art historians, among them the well-known Austrian Josef Strzygowski and the young German scholar Hans Henning von der Osten. Simultaneously, major academic institutions, including Harvard University and Princeton University, were inviting European art historians to travel across the Atlantic to give lectures and teach seminars: Max J. Friedländer, Adolph Goldschmidt, and Alfred Salmony, as well as Strzygowski, were among those who participated in these activities in the 1920s.[7] In addition, some art historians, including Rudolf M. Riefstahl and Mehmet Aga-Oglu, had immigrated to the United States in the 1920s and were contributing to *Art Bulletin*.

Much of this international presence, however, was sporadic in the 1920s. It was not until the late 1920s, when CAA's publications program was expanding and the association was diversifying its activities, that *Art Bulletin* started to reveal a steady inclusion of foreign authors. From 1929 to 1932 approximately two foreigners were contributing articles to *Art Bulletin* annually, which amounted to about 15 percent of the total articles published each year.[8] The authors represented a range of European

---

[7] Brush, "German *Kunstwissenschaft*," 19.
[8] My numbers are likely conservative. Many lesser-known names appeared in the table of contents in *Art Bulletin* in the 1930s. I only counted authors as foreign when I knew for certain that they were not U.S. citizens or immigrants to the United States. I relied primarily upon Ulrike Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil: Leben und Werk der unter dem Nationalsozialismus verfolgten und vertriebenen Wissenschaftler*, 2 vol. (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1999); and Lee Sorensen, ed., *Dictionary of Art Historians,* http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org.

nationalities: among them, August L. Mayer, who also served as an editorial advisor to CAA's *Parnassus,* was German; Yoori A. Olsufiev was Russian**;** and Evelyn Sandberg Vavalà was a Briton living in Italy.

In 1933 the number of articles written by foreigners in *Art Bulletin* jumped radically to eight, which represented 50 percent of the total. This increase in foreign contributions, however, was not wholly a reflection of the exodus spurred by the Nazis' policies. Neither were all eight German nor were all affected by Nazi politics; it is therefore important to consider other factors that may have contributed to this sudden increase.[9] In 1932, the year before Hitler assumed power, three prominent German journals, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, and *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, were consolidated into one journal: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte.* With fewer periodicals available, both German and "non-Aryan" German scholars, as well as other European art historians, were looking for new venues in which to publish, and *Art Bulletin* served among the possibilities. The inclusion of more foreign authors' texts in *Art Bulletin* was also part of a larger campaign on the part of CAA. While the association had labeled *Art Bulletin* in the late 1920s "an American magazine" for "American scholars," CAA created a promotional pamphlet in the early 1930s, billing itself with the subtitle *An International Organization*.[10] In the early 1930s CAA thus seemed quite open and ready to engage the Europeans, and the internationalization of art history, at least in *Art Bulletin* in the United States, was already somewhat under way before the Nazis took power.

That said, this information represents only one side of the story of a transatlantic exchange, and it is necessary to consider briefly the other side as well. How receptive

---

[9] They were Julius Baum, Arif Mufid Bey, Joan Evans, T. H. Fokker, Heinrich Schmidt, Georg Stuhfauth, and Hans Tietze. Tietze is the only one who immigrated to the United States, but not until 1938; see Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch,* 2:580.
[10] *Endowment of the Art Bulletin*, 2; and College Art Association*, College Art Association: An International Organization* (New York: College Art Association, 1933), 1.

were European art historians to *Art Bulletin*? In 1929 CAA had claimed that the circulation for *Art Bulletin* was more than 600 copies, with 200 of them going to foreigners.[11] While no information remains in CAA's files today about where exactly those foreign copies were sent, the journal was presumably available at large libraries and therefore would have been accessible to some European art historians. By no means, however, was *Art Bulletin* widely distributed across Europe.[12] The journal was better known in the United Kingdom than it was in Germany and other European countries, given that the *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* summarized certain articles and cited *Art Bulletin* throughout the 1920s, while German, French, and Italian journals only occasionally mentioned *Art Bulletin.* The logical reason for this radical discrepancy, of course, was that *Art Bulletin* was published in English, which was not a common academic language in Europe before World War II.[13] However, starting in 1933, articles in *Art Bulletin* were regularly summarized and cited in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*.[14]

---

[11] *Endowment of the Art Bulletin*, 2.

[12] John Shapley to Meyer Schapiro, April 21, 1932, Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 169, folder 10, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[13] Colin Eisler, interview with the author, June 22, 2010.

[14] Some examples of articles and reviews published in *Art Bulletin* and cited before 1933 in non-English journals follow. These examples are in no way comprehensive, since many of the prominent art-historical periodicals have not been indexed or have not been indexed this far back, if still in existence, especially those that were produced in pre-Nazi Germany. The list here was compiled from searches in JSTOR and my communications with Sigrun Rieger, a librarian at the Bibliothek Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich, and Carola Wenzel, Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte Bibliothek, Munich. A. Kingsley Porter, "Leonesque Romanesque and Southern France," *Art Bulletin* 8, no. 4 (June 1926): 235–50; cited in "Literatur," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 49 (1928): 26, and Richard Hamann, "Die Salzwedeler Madonna," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 3 (1927): 77–144. A book review by Walter Cook in *Art Bulletin* is mentioned in Zuntz, "Eine Vorstufe der 'Madonna Lactans,'" *Berliner Museen* 50, no. 2 (1929): 32-35. Walter W. S. Cook, "Earliest Panel Paintings of Catalonia (III)," *Art Bulletin* 8, no. 2 (December 1925): 57-104; cited in Hamann, "Der Schrein des Heiligen Aegidius," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 6 (1931): 114-64. Joseph Wilpert, "Early Christian Sculpture: Its Restoration and Its Modern Manufacture," *Art Bulletin* 9, no. 2 (December 1926): 89-141; cited in René Dussaud, "Les monuments syriens a l'Exposition d'art byzantin," *Syria* 12, no. 4 (1931): 305-15. Fern Rusk Shapley, "A Student of Ancient Ceramics, Antonio Pallajuolo," *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 2 (December 1919): 78-86; cited in Werner Meinhof, "Leonardos Hieronymus," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 52, nos. 1–2 (1931): 105. Marion Lawrence, "Maria Regina," *Art Bulletin* 8,

Although the gap between American and European art historians was already beginning to close before 1933 as a result of CAA's initiatives, Nazi policies dramatically escalated the interchange and altered the situation because so many German scholars were forced to leave their nation, and a large portion of them came to the United States. However, the migration was slower than one might expect. According to Michels, most art historians first went to other European countries, such as France, Switzerland, or the United Kingdom. About eight art historians came to the United States as early as 1933–34, another six in 1935, and the rest later, at the end of the 1930s or in the early 1940s. Many of these art historians were able to secure teaching positions through nonquota visas issued through the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Scholars. [15]

Among the émigrés from Europe who contributed articles to *Art Bulletin* in the 1930s were Walter Friedländer, H. W. Janson, Ulrich Middeldorf, Erwin Panofsky, Hanns Swarzenski, and Martin Weinberger. Other noteworthy immigrants, including Charles de Tolnay, Paul Frankl, Julius S. Held, Adolf Katzenellenbogen, Richard Krautheimer, Karl Lehmann, Wolfgang Stechow, Kurt Weitzmann, and Edgar Wind, would have feature articles published at later dates. Many of these scholars had been prominent figures in the field of art history in German-speaking countries, and their contributions thus elevated the status of *Art Bulletin* internationally.

With these foreign scholars came new perspectives in scholarship. While the U.S. art historians had been focusing largely on medieval art and employing an archaeological, scientific-based methodology that sometimes addressed formal and iconographic concerns, the German-speaking art historians were considered to be more theoretical and tended to focus on the Renaissance. In Germany and Austria many of

---

no. 4 (1925): 149-61; summarized in Georg Stuhlfauth, "Literatur," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 52, nos. 1–2 (1931): 164-65.
[15] Michels, *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft*, 195-200. See also See Duggan and Drury, *Rescue of Science and Learning,* passim.

these scholars had been engaged in radical, formalist debates that examined the larger historical, philosophical, and theological issues in the production of art objects, even questioning the Renaissance as a distinct period.[16] The art historian Colin Eisler has remarked that, as a result of these differences, in the 1930s the Europeans were "about twenty years ahead" of the Americans and offered a "more intellectually challenging approach."[17]

For the Europeans transplanted to the United States, the new academic environment meant they needed to adapt. Thomas Crow observed:

> The first wave of European professors, as they stepped in to meet the demand for trained personnel, found their new American charges lacking the level of erudition they would have assumed in their European counterparts (and cultural misunderstandings doubtless led these professors to exaggerate both the norms they had known and the deficiencies they were discovering). Thus they tended to prune away many of the more complex and speculative elements of art history in favor of conceptually simple and often mechanical tasks: decoding iconography, tracing fragments of dispersed ensembles, identifying hands, dating.[18]

In order to meet the needs of their U.S. colleagues and students, who were more practical-minded and focused on art objects themselves, the Europeans therefore tended to simplify the conceptual nature of their lectures, abandoning the theoretical discussions that they had been developing in their homelands.[19]

Such a transition is difficult to measure. Moreover, it can be dangerous to generalize too much about these very heterogeneous European émigrés, whose scholarly pursuits and immigrant experiences varied considerably. Not all were Jewish, and some might have had those roots without identifying as Jewish. Not all specialized in the Renaissance or were engaged in theoretical problems related to formalism or the conception of the Renaissance. In many respects, they were much more diverse in their

---

[16] Michael Podro, "Panofsky, Erwin," in *Grove Art Online*, *Oxford Art Online*, accessed Mar. 1, 2008, http://www.oxfordartonline.com. See also Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984).
[17] Eisler, "*Kunstgeschichte* American Style," 603, 611.
[18] Crow, "Practice of Art History," 77.
[19] Kaufmann, "American Voices," 143-44.

interests than were American art historians. Because of this complexity, it makes sense to narrow the focus of this study to Panofsky, who can be singled out above all for his unique contributions to art history in the United States and his pivotal role in the 1930s. His focus on iconography and iconology in particular transformed the field of art history and served as one of the factors in American art history's ability to attain "full international parity" and even move ahead of European scholarship "in some specialties."[20] As a result *Art Bulletin* was able to establish itself as "the world's leading art-history periodical."[21] In addition, Panofsky is significant because, although he served neither as president of CAA nor editor of *Art Bulletin*, he would later play a major role in the development of the association's publications program when he was a member of CAA's board of directors.

Panofsky and the Development of Iconology: Establishing a Methodology

A discussion of the complete transformation in Panofsky's scholarship and his influence after he arrived in the United States is best introduced by a bit of background about the man. Panofsky studied with Goldschmidt and Wilhelm Vöge, receiving his Ph.D. in art history in 1914 from the University of Freiburg for a dissertation on Albrecht Dürer's theories about art.[22] Unlike most German Jewish scholars, Panofsky was fortunate to obtain an assistant professorship (known as a *Privatdozent*) in 1921 at the University of Hamburg and a full professorship (called an *Ordinarius*) in 1926.[23] Hamburg was considered a particularly liberal city, and at that time Panofsky was one of only three

---

[20] Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 305.
[21] Kirby, "Periodical §II: Historical survey."
[22] The biographical information is pulled from several sources: Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*; idem, "Panofsky, Erwin," in *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly, *Oxford Art Online*, accessed March 10, 2010, http://www.oxfordartonline.com; Heckscher, "Erwin Panofsky," 4-21; Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 7-27; and Podro, *Critical Historians of Art,* 178-208.
[23] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 7, 8, 19 nn. 3, 4.

Jewish scholars to become a full professor of art history in Germany.[24] In 1931 Panofsky came to the United States as a visiting scholar. On the recommendation of Goldschmidt, who had close ties with U.S. art historians, Panofsky had been asked to teach at New York University and would continue to do so one semester per year for the next two years. However, in 1933 the situation radically changed: while he was in New York Panofsky received a telegram informing him that he had been dismissed from his teaching post in Hamburg because he was Jewish. Panofsky went back to Germany, where he was allowed to wrap up some of his teaching obligations, and was able to return to the United States with his family in 1934.[25]

Although he was forced to emigrate, Panofsky, unlike most other art historians who had to leave Germany, was fortunate since he arrived with a job in hand. Walter W. S. Cook of NYU and Charles Rufus Morey of Princeton University were able to make an arrangement in which Panofsky would be teaching what amounted to full-time between the two institutions. In 1935 he became a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, where he pursued his research, and taught part-time at NYU.[26] The research position allowed Panofsky to write and publish numerous books in English including *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*, *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis and Its Art Treasures*, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, and *Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character.*

While Panofsky would have a tremendous impact on the field of art history as it developed throughout the twentieth century in both Germany and the United States, several historiographers have noted that Panofsky as a young German scholar in the

---

[24] Michels, "Art History, German Jewish Identity," 169-70. The other two were Adolf Goldschmidt and Paul Frankl.
[25] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 7, 8, 19 nn. 3, 4.
[26] Walter [W. S.] Cook to Charles Rufus Morey, May 2, 1935, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

late 1910s and 1920s was markedly different from what he would later become as a mature art historian active in the United States in the 1930s and thereafter.[27] Influenced by neo-Kantian theory, his earlier writings were much more theoretical and interdisciplinary in nature. The young scholar was quick to dismiss the naïveté of art appreciation and the oversimplifications of antiquarians. Panofsky was also brash enough to criticize the writings of such prominent art historians as Heinrich Wölfflin and Alois Riegl. While Panofsky appreciated their formalist analyses because they examined the rationale for stylistic change, he criticized Wölfflin for concentrating too much on visual elements and not enough on expressive content.[28] Panofsky was more interested in Riegl's ideas related to what the latter called *Kunstwollen*.[29] A complex term that is difficult to define, *Kunstwollen* is sometimes translated as "that which wills art," "will-to-form," or "artistic volition." The term addresses not only the larger cultural issues that help to generate stylistic change but also the artist's individual concerns and creative psychological impulses when engaging in new artistic undertakings.[30] Panofsky believed

---

[27] Among these historiographers, Holly is most explicit regarding Panofsky's change in scholarship from Germany to the United States; see Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*; and Holly, "Panofsky, Erwin." See also Kaufmann, "American Voices," 144. My summary of this early German period in Panofsky's career relies heavily upon Holly's writings. For the most part, each of the chapters in *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* pairs Panofsky with one of his influences: Ernst Cassirer, Alois Riegl, and Heinrich Wölfflin. Holly's pairings address Panofsky's somewhat erroneous interpretations of their views. However, the chapter that the reader would expect to pair Panofsky with Aby Warburg is titled "Contemporary Issues," thereby giving short shrift to the interactions between these two scholars; see Stephen Bann, review of *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* by Michael Ann Holly, *History and Theory* 25, no. 25 (May 1986): 199-205; and Carl Landaurer, review of *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* by Michael Ann Holly, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 44, no. 1 (Fall 1985): 82-83.

[28] Erwin Panofsky, "Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst," *Zeitschrift für Asthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 10 (1915): 460-67. Holly points out that Panofsky's criticism of Wölfflin's ideas was somewhat misleading in its oversimplification; see Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* 57-68.

[29] Holly, "Panofsky, Erwin."

[30] Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* 74, 209 n. 15; and Margaret Olin, "Riegl, Alois," in *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly, *Oxford Art Online,* accessed May 10, 2010, http://www.oxfordartonline.com. Holly points out the difficulty for some modern readers in reconciling the contradictions between the larger cultural phenomena implicit in *Kunstwollen* and the artist's individual concerns. The translation "that which wills art" comes from Otto Pächt, "Art Historians and Art Critics: IV, Alois Riegl," *Burlington Magazine* 105, no. 722 (May 1963): 190. Pächt's essay criticized Ernst Gombrich's translation "will-to-form" because Riegl used the term

that Riegl's definition was incomplete; rather *Kunstwollen* was something that engaged the total phenomenological experience of art, which was relevant to his analysis of individual art objects within the broader social and philosophical contexts of given places and times.[31]

In Hamburg Panofsky was inspired by like-minded scholars, among them the cultural theorist and art historian Aby Warburg and his assistant, the art historian Fritz Saxl, as well as the philosopher Ernst Cassirer. Warburg's library, the Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliothek Warburg, was interdisciplinary in its organization: personal diaries, anthropological studies, astrological texts, and theological volumes were interspersed with art-historical books covering similar subjects. Warburg's diverse scholarly pursuits, which explored links between ancient, medieval, and Renaissance cultures through the continuities, in varying forms, of ancient gods, mysticism, and scientific thought, led him to develop a new methodology called iconology as early as 1912. By 1923 Panofsky, who had been living in Hamburg for only two years, was beginning to work under the influence of Warburg's method, assisting Saxl with the iconological text *Dürers "Melencolia I": Eine quellen- und typengeschichtliche*

Kunstwollen and not *Kunstwille*; see Ernst Gombrich, *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation,* 2nd rev. ed. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), 18. The phrase "artistic volition" comes from a translation of Panofsky's 1920 essay in German criticizing Riegl's concept of *Kunstwollen*: see Panofsky, "The Concept of Artistic Volition," trans. Kenneth J. Northcott and Joel Snyder, *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 1 (Fall 1981): 17-33. See also the English version of Riegl's essay "The Main Characteristics of the Late Roman *Kunstwollen*," in *The Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s,* ed. Christopher S. Wood (New York: Zone Books, 2000), 87–104. Wood translates *Kunstwollen* as "artistic will," which for me sounds too much like artist's intention.

[31] See Podro, *Critical Historians of Art,* 178-82. For Panofsky's sometimes problematic reactions to Riegl's ideas, see Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* 79-96; and Panofsky, "Concept of Artistic Volition." Ultimately, Panofsky rejected the importance that Riegl presumably placed on artistic intention, which cannot be deciphered simply based on looking at a painting. We cannot rely on our personal responses to works of art either, because we cannot measure our own responses. In addition, artists' statements and theories cannot be taken for granted; they need to be evaluated and interpreted.

Untersuchung.[32] In 1930 Panofsky published his first iconological study independently as a monograph: *Hercules am Scheidewege und andere antike Bildstoffe in der neueren Kunst.*[33] Cassirer, who was also stimulated by Warburg's library, intensified Panofsky's interest in neo-Kantian theory. Cassirer's *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* inspired Panofsky to write *Perspective as Symbolic Form* in 1927.[34]

Historiographers have often claimed that Panofsky was the person who introduced the practice of iconology to U.S. art historians.[35] However, Olsufiev was the first to use and define the term in an *Art Bulletin* article. Published in 1930, Olsufiev's "The Development of Russian Icon Painting from the Twelfth to the Nineteenth Century" predated Panofsky's first extended stay in the United States by a year and Panofsky's book *Studies in Iconology* by nine years. Olsufiev differentiated the "archaeological iconographic school" from iconology. The former was "taken up with a historical analysis of the subjects represented, with the question of *what* is expressed rather than *how* it is expressed, and, above all, with the dating of compositions on the basis of their iconographical details" [Olsufiev's emphasis]. For Olsufiev, iconology was broader in scope, and should consider the subjects or symbols found in art objects as well as the intricacies of their forms and the "psychological phase" occurring during their creation, that time when artists generated a mental image of the thing that they were trying to

---

[32] In English the title might translate as *Dürer's "Melancholia I": A Study in the History of Its Sources and Types.*

[33] In English the title might translate as *Hercules at the Crossroads and other Classical Subjects in Early Modern Art.* See Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* chaps. 4 and 5; and Holly, "Panofsky, Erwin." See also Ernst Gombrich, *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography* (London: Warburg Institute, 1970), 317. In 1932 another iconological text by Panofsky appeared: "Zum Problem der Beschreibung und Inhaltsdeutung von Werken der bildenden Kunst," *Logos* 21 (1932): 103-19.

[34] Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* chap. 5; Holly, "Panofsky, Erwin"; Erwin Panofsky, *Perspective As Symbolic Form,* trans. Christopher S. Wood (New York: Zone Books, 1991). The German original was published as Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als 'symbolische Form,'" *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, ed. Fritz Saxl, vol. 1924-25 (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927).

[35] See, for example, Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* 21-45; Holly, "Panofsky, Erwin"; and Heckscher, "Erwin Panofsky."

produce. Ultimately, Olsufiev emphasized that the study of icon painting "should be pursued from every angle," which is "what we mean by 'iconology.'"[36] While his definition of iconology was not as precise as Panofsky's definition would be, the publication of Olsufiev's article demonstrated that broader methodological practices, such as iconology, were already available to U.S. scholars as early as 1930.

Panofsky's first article for an American publication, co-written with Saxl, was published in *Metropolitan Museum Studies* in 1933. In "Classical Mythology in Mediaeval Art," the two authors set out "to demonstrate the methods of research developed by Aby Warburg and his followers" by examining the iconographic links between the classical and the medieval periods.[37] Despite the fact that Panofsky had engaged in the practice of iconological analysis as early as the 1920s and had already discussed the research methods of Warburg's program in the early 1930s, his articles published in *Art Bulletin* during the mid-1930s, after his immigration, did not demonstrate the same in-depth iconological analysis nor address the theoretical issues that had been under discussion in Germany in the 1910s and 1920s.

According to Michael Ann Holly, Panofsky's scholarship of the mid-1930s "took a decidedly 'practical' turn."[38] In "Three Decades of Art History in the United States," Panofsky himself remarked on this phenomenon, but from a much more general perspective, mentioning how the German-speaking art historians had to adapt to American academic culture:

> It was a blessing to come into contact—and occasionally into conflict—with an Anglo-Saxon positivism which is, in principle, distrustful of abstract speculation; to become more acutely aware of the material problems which in Europe tended to be considered as the concern of museums and schools of technology than universities; and, last but not least, to be forced to express himself, for better or

---

[36] Yoori A. Olsufiev, "The Development of Russian Icon Painting from the Twelfth to the Nineteenth Century," *Art Bulletin* 12, no. 4 (December 1930): 347, 348.
[37] Erwin Panofsky and Fritz Saxl, "Classical Mythology in Mediaeval Art," *Metropolitan Museum Studies* 4, no. 2 (March 1933): 229.
[38] Holly, "Panofsky, Erwin."

worse, in English.[39]

Although Panofsky had had a successful career in Germany and was openly embraced in the United States, he, like others, clearly felt the need to curtail his theoretical arguments. Indeed, his 1930s articles for *Art Bulletin* focused predominantly on attribution and patronage, often depended heavily upon stylistic analysis, and only sometimes engaged in iconographic study. In some respects his texts seemed to be addressing the very "material problems" of museums that he described above.

Panofsky's earliest article for *Art Bulletin* was published in 1935 and titled "The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece." The text, which would generate substantial scholarly debate, served largely two purposes: to reexamine the problematic attribution of an early Northern Renaissance painting of an Annunciation scene that had been donated to the Metropolitan Museum of Art by Colonel Michael Friedsam, and to address some of the ongoing discussion related to the Ghent Altarpiece. Relying upon "*quality* and *iconography*" [Panofsky's emphasis], much of his analysis of the Friedsam *Annunciation* engaged in standard connoisseurship. Panofsky attributed the "richness" and "homogenous density" of the painting, as well as the lack of linear perspective, to Hubert van Eyck. His interpretation refuted the previously published analyses by the German curator Max J. Friedländer, who had attributed the painting to Petrus Christus despite having acknowledged that the work showed the influence of Jan van Eyck.[40] In terms of iconography, Panofsky focused on the difference in the architectural detailing on either side of the church's entryway, where the Virgin

---

[39] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 14.

[40] Erwin Panofsky, "The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece," *Art Bulletin* 17, no. 4 (December 1935): 433, 434. Panofsky acknowledged in note 1 that his attribution of the *Annunciation* to Hubert van Eyck was suggested to him by Hanns Swarzenski; see also "Errata: The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece," *Art Bulletin* 18, no. 1 (March 1936): 126. Panofsky's article responded to Hermann Beenken, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Genter Altars, Hubert und Jan van Eyck," *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch* (1933-34): 176-32; and Beenken, "The Ghent van Eyck Re-examined," *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 63, no. 365 (August 1933): 64-72.

Mary stood. On the left the pilaster and capital were Romanesque, and on the right Gothic. Such a peculiar juxtaposition followed the Northern Renaissance convention of flanking Mary with both old and new things, which signified the change from the Old to the New Testament as a result of Mary's receiving the Annunciation. Otherwise Panofsky's article did not address many of the painting's symbols in detail.[41]

In taking on the second controversy, about the Ghent Altarpiece, Panofsky largely rejected Hermann Beenken's conclusions about the work. Beenken, a German art historian who had stayed in his homeland, had claimed that Hubert van Eyck had contributed little to the making of the altarpiece and that the lower central panel, the *Adoration of the Lamb*, had been trimmed at the top by eleven centimeters, so that it would fit within the entire arrangement of the altarpiece in an aesthetically pleasing manner. Panofsky countered that the *Adoration of the Lamb* was probably trimmed on all sides, not just the top, and that Jan van Eyck had likely reconfigured and reworked a series of "more or less unfinished works by Hubert" to create the Ghent Altarpiece.[42]

Panofsky's criticism garnered a vicious reply from Beenken in the form of a feature article two years later in *Art Bulletin.* Beenken criticized Panofsky, stating: "Confusion cannot fail to result if the borderline between the activity of intellectual-speculative construction of theories, on the one hand, and that of connoisseurship founded on the trained eye, on the other, is so completely disregarded as has been done by Panofsky." Among his many points of contention, Beenken claimed that the Friedsam *Annunciation* demonstrated a system of two-point linear perspective, with the orthogonal

---

[41] Panofsky explained that the reason for the short iconographic analysis of the Friedsam *Annunciation* was that another scholar, David Robb, had prepared a general article about this motif in art of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Panofsky had served as an adviser on the article, the publication of which was planned for the following year in *Art Bulletin.* See Panofsky, "Friedsam Annunciation," 441 n. 17. Because Panofsky was considered such an accomplished scholar and had an impressive reputation in the United States, Robb cited him several times. However, Robb, like Panofsky, did not examine the Friedsam *Annunciation* in depth from an iconographic perspective; Robb, "The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *Art Bulletin* 18, no. 4 (December 1936): 480-526.
[42] Panofsky, "Friedsam Annunciation," 459-62.

lines converging to either a single vanishing point outside the left edge of the panel or another point in the upper right of the painting, and supplied a diagram to prove his point.[43] Such a spatial construction served as one of his grounds that the work was by Christus.

In this feud regarding the Friedsam *Annunciation*, Harry B. Wehle of the Metropolitan Museum of Art sided initially with Panofsky. In fact, Wehle lamented to Panofsky in a letter: "I have been reading with headaches and depressed spirits Beenken's article about our Flemish Annunciation. Am I correct in thinking he has faked his perspective drawing? How outrageous! I hope you are exposing him soon."[44] Following Wehle's lead, Panofsky responded with another feature article one year later in *Art Bulletin*: "Once More 'The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece.'" Equally, if not more, antagonistic, Panofsky's rejoinder refuted Beenken's conception of the painting's perspective.[45]

Although the nuances of the arguments were quite complex, it was surprising that the Friedsam *Annunciation* generated so much debate. Three articles in four years in the *Art Bulletin* alone was quite unusual, especially given that the work was in such poor condition that its attribution was anything but stable. Panofsky simply had enough clout in the United States in the 1930s that his article was able to challenge the previously existing attribution and generate support from curatorial staff of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. However, as a result of this argument and the numerous others that followed, Wehle eventually chose to attribute the Friedsam *Annunciation* to

---

[43] Hermann Beenken, "The Annunciation of Petrus Cristus in the Metropolitan Museum and the Problem of Hubert van Eyck," *Art Bulletin* 19, no. 2 (June 1937): 220, 222-23 fig. 3. Beenken also pointed out that another one of his articles came out "simultaneously" with Panofsky's 1935 essay; see Beenken, "Der Stand des Hubert van Eyck Problems, Fragen um den Genter Altar," in *Oud Holland* 53, no. 1 (1936): 7.

[44] Harry B. Wehle to Erwin Panofsky, December 22, 1937, Petrus Christus file, Department of European Paintings, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Wehle used the German word *unverschämt* for outrageous.

[45] Erwin Panofsky, "Once More 'The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece,'" *Art Bulletin* 20, no. 4 (December 1938): 421–24, 426 fig. 5.

"Jan van Eyck and helpers" in a 1947 museum catalogue and in subsequent publications, which some scholars criticized as a weak compromise on the museum's part.[46] In 1953 Panofsky would develop his arguments further in the well-known book *Early Netherlandish Painting*, although his analysis was less emphatic and more speculative.[47] In 1994 Maryan W. Ainsworth, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, would disagree with Panofsky's analysis of the Friedsam *Annunciation*, restoring the attribution of Christus on the basis of an X-radiograph study and other technical evidence, yet this attribution may still be subject to contention.[48]

The importance of the dialogue between Panofsky and Beenken with regard to *Art Bulletin*, however, is not so much which art historian was correct and which painter actually created the work of art. In fact, the exchange was merely an academic dispute in which neither art historian wanted the other to have the last word on the subject, like two dogs marking the same fire hydrant. What is significant is that the debate marked the first time that *Art Bulletin* served as a forum for a larger, ongoing transatlantic debate. Throughout the 1920s American art historians had been engaging in what might have been called a one-sided dialogue. Most of the contributors to *Art Bulletin* then were

---

[46] Harry B. Wehle and Margaretta M. Salinger, *A Catalogue of Early Flemish, Dutch, and German Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1947), 12-16. See Julius [S.] Held, review of *A Catalogue of Early Flemish, Dutch, and German Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* by Harry Wehle and Margaretta M. Salinger, *Art Bulletin* 31, no. 2 (June 1949): 141. The list of texts that attributed the work to Petrus Christus, or to Hubert or Jan van Eyck, is simply too long to mention here; for a bibliography click on "References" under accession number 32.100.35 at "Works of Art: Collection Database," Metropolitan Museum of Art website, accessed May 1, 2010, http://www.metmuseum.org/works_of_art/collection_database/.

[47] Erwin Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), 230-32.

[48] See Maryan W. Ainsworth with Maximiliaan P. J. Martens, *Petrus Christus: Renaissance Master of Bruges* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994), 117-25; and Ainsworth and Keith Christiansen, eds., *From Van Eyck to Breughel: Early Netherlandish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998), 100-102. Ainsworth with Martens, *Petrus Christus*, explained that a tracing of the painting on Mylar revealed that the orthogonal lines on both the left and the right sides do not converge to one point. Also an X-radiograph showed that the underpainting and diagramming related more to the technique of Christus than that of either Hubert or Jan van Eyck. For a discussion of the iconography, see John Malcolm Russell, "The Iconography of the Friedsam Annunciation," *Art Bulletin* 60, no. 1 (March 1978): 24-27.

U.S. citizens, and their articles, some of which were critical of European scholarship, did not seem to garner much of a response from European scholars: *Art Bulletin* was rarely cited in European journals at the time. By the mid-1930s, when this academic brawl between Panofsky and Beenken was fought, the reputation of the journal had changed. While it was no surprise that Beenken wanted to refute Panofsky's criticisms, given that the latter had been such a respected scholar in Germany, it was significant that Beenken, a well-known figure who had earlier been writing in German publications as well as *Burlington Magazine*, felt the need to counter Panofsky directly in *Art Bulletin*. The journal clearly had garnered a reputable position in the international realm of art history. Given each writer's defensiveness, the journal presumably had sufficient clout to enhance or tarnish the reputations of scholars.

The exchange of articles also signified the importance of Panofsky in the United States. As evident from this debate on the *Annunciation*, he was able to use *Art Bulletin* as a personal forum for himself and his scholarship. One additional article by Panofsky was published in the 1930s in *Art Bulletin*: "The First Two Projects of Michelangelo's Tomb of Julius II," which dealt with the artwork's patronage and how it influenced the creative process.[49] Throughout his career Panofsky published a total of six articles, two notes (short articles), and six letters to the editor in the *Art Bulletin*.

In his notes and letters to the editor, Panofsky simultaneously claimed for himself the role of gatekeeper for the field of art history, while correcting facts as a means to promote his own ideas. His December 1939 "Note on the Importance of Iconographical Exactitude" in *Art Bulletin* was written as a response to Andrew (Andor) Pigler's article on the same subject, which had appeared in the previous issue.[50] Pigler, a Hungarian art

[49] Erwin Panofsky, "The First Two Projects of Michelangelo's Tomb of Julius II," *Art Bulletin* 19, no. 4 (December 1937): 561-79.
[50] Andrew Pigler, "The Importance of Iconographic Exactitude," *Art Bulletin* 21, no. 3 (September 1939): 228-37; and Erwin Panofsky, "Note on the Importance of Iconographical Exactitude," *Art*

historian, had argued that too often art historians had followed in the footsteps of the nineteenth-century art historian Giovanni Morelli. They were concerned too much with formalism and ignored the importance of subject matter in their interpretations of art. As a result, the content of many paintings had been superficially or erroneously identified. Pigler added that while the task of iconography might be difficult at times, given the obscurity of some sources, many artists of the Renaissance and Baroque periods depicted familiar classical and biblical subjects and largely relied upon the same visual sources, including Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*, when creating their images. Pigler concluded that the importance for art historians in recognizing subject matter was useful not just for the sake of precision but for the identification of unknown masters' works and similar applications.

In response, Panofsky wrote a short, and perhaps ironic, statement that criticized Pigler for his own lack of exactitude in mistakenly identifying the primary figure of Michelangelo's *A Dream of Human Life* as Somnus or Hypnos (the god of sleep). Rather, according to Panofsky, the composition as a whole represents the Sogno, or Dream: the young man represents the Human Mind being called back to Virtue, or Good, from its state in the world of dreams. Although Panofsky valued precision in deciphering symbolic imagery, his motivation for correcting Pigler was likely that he had previously published his article on Michelangelo's *Tomb of Julius II* in *Art Bulletin* and thus wanted to stake his claim as the expert on Michelangelo's art. More importantly, Panofsky's first book in English, *Studies in Iconology,* which reworked and simplified Warburg's ideas related to the methodology, had been published in 1939, and a chapter in the book

---

Bulletin 21, no. 4 (December 1939): 402. Since Panofsky nitpicked at basic facts in an article published in a previous issue, Panofsky's note read more like a letter to the editor than a short article promoting a new discovery, the typical content of such brief "notes" in *Art Bulletin*. Panofsky's note was not likely published as a letter to the editor because John Shapley, then the editor of *Art Bulletin*, refrained from printing such letters. He felt that they were mere self-promotional items; see Shapley to Schapiro, September 11, 1935.

covered Michelangelo. The fastidious Panofsky, who would be perceived as the father of iconography and iconology in the United States, felt the need stake his claim in more than one area.

The introductory essay in *Studies in Iconology* explained several of the theoretical issues related to iconological analysis that had been under discussion in Germany.[51] In keeping with Anglo-Saxon pragmatism, this essay marked the first time that these ideas were articulated in a cogent, systematic manner with a step-by-step explanation of the various procedures involved in an iconological analysis. Previously, Panofsky's iconological texts written in German did not follow a coherent model; furthermore Olsufiev's definition of iconology in his 1930 article for *Art Bulletin* was somewhat general in its description.[52] The significance of Panofsky's text, especially for an American audience, should therefore not be taken lightly.

The immediate reception of *Studies in Iconology* was on the whole positive, although critics quibbled with some of Panofsky's visual references. Two scholars were chosen to review the book for *Art Bulletin*: Allan H. Gilbert, an English professor at Duke University, and H. W. Janson, who was teaching art history at Iowa State University.[53] Given that Gilbert taught English, Panofsky's book was considered to be of interest to people outside the field of art history, likely because so much of his iconographic analysis depended on an extensive knowledge of literature.[54] Gilbert's review addressed

---

[51] Erwin Panofsky, "I. Introductory," in *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), 5-8, 14-15. The 1962 publication of the original 1939 book included a new preface by Panofsky. In keeping with his fastidious nature, the preface to this edition included numerous corrections and addenda to the first printing. He admitted that he wanted to rewrite the entire book, but was not able to do so given his age and lack of time (p. v).

[52] Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* 159.

[53] Allan H. Gilbert and Horst W. Janson, review of *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* by Erwin Panofsky, *Art Bulletin* 22, no. 3 (September 1940): 172–75.

[54] In addition to art history, Panofsky's work was influential for other academic fields, such as anthropology, history, literature, science, music, and film; see Irving Lavin, ed., *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside: A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968)* (Princeton, N.J.: Institute for Advanced Study, 1995).

the specific connections between literature and art, explaining that Renaissance poets and playwrights had drawn from the same sources as painters and sculptors. While he believed in the overall "excellence of the work" by Panofsky, Gilbert seemed somewhat dismissive of it.[55] Like Panofsky's note from 1939 on Pigler's scholarship, Gilbert nitpicked at length about the various visual inaccuracies in Panofsky's analysis of a Bronzino painting, *Exposure of Luxury*. Indeed, the importance of exactitude would be an issue again and again in the development of iconology.

Janson was chosen as the second reviewer likely because he was already somewhat familiar with the book's content, for he had been Panofsky's student at the University of Hamburg before leaving Germany in 1935. Unlike Gilbert, Janson addressed the art-historical context for *Studies in Iconology*, explaining how the book related to, even represented, the scholarship of the Warburg Institut, to which Panofsky belonged. Janson also discussed the book's broader importance:

> It raises issues critically important to the future development of the history of art as a branch of the humanities. This authoritative treatment of the problem will be valuable in combating the still current assertion that subject-matter is extraneous to the formal aspects of a work of art and is therefore outside the province of the art historian. Even though dictated by its social, political, literary, philosophical, or religious milieu, the subject-matter of a work of art ultimately unites with form and technique in what Dr. Panofsky calls the "intrinsic meaning" of the whole. . . . Through its intrinsic meaning the work of art reflects the "basic attitude" of that civilization which produced it. The visual arts thus take their place among all the other documents of man's past; and on this basis Dr. Panofsky makes a vigorous plea for recognition of this unity among all the humanities. . . . The author's words . . . will assuredly help to pave the way for a more successful integration of the still youthful field of the history of art with the rest of the humanities in the Liberal Arts curricula of our colleges and universities."[56]

Following Janson's logic, not only would *Studies in Iconology* open up a new dimension in art history, namely the importance of subject matter, but the book, useful to those working in other disciplines, would help art history to be recognized on par with other disciplines in the humanities. Although CAA had been established in 1911 and

---

[55] Gilbert in Gilbert and Janson, review of *Studies in Iconology,* 172.
[56] Janson in ibid., 174.

CAA began publishing a journal in 1913, the field of art history was still considered new within the academy and, if we read Janson's words carefully, was finally beginning to come into its own. The rest of Janson's review, however, was much like that by Gilbert. He criticized a few of the visual references and agreed with Gilbert about his doubts related to Panofsky's analysis of Bronzino's *Exposure of Luxury.*[57]

One might expect that Panofsky would have been flattered by the review, especially the words of Janson, but Panofsky's letter to the editor in the next issue of *Art Bulletin* was quite defensive and argumentative, much like the articles he had written in exchange with Beenken. Panofsky expressed his disagreement with both Gilbert and Janson about their criticisms of his analysis of Bronzino's *Exposure of Luxury.* Panofsky also corrected facts about Michelangelo, which were directed at Janson. Panofsky ended by stating that while he fully understood that Gilbert's and Janson's criticisms were "of small importance," he felt that the word "importance" was somewhat relative, and the need to be as accurate as possible was imperative, although one's conclusions might vary.[58]

While Panofsky's *Studies in Iconology* might have garnered another tedious academic dispute, the impact of the book cannot be underestimated. Numerous scholars have addressed its importance. William S. Heckscher, who, like Janson, had been one of Panofsky's students, stated that *Studies in Iconology* marked "the turning point at which iconology ceased to be an ancillary discipline and became an *indispensable part of art-historical method*" [my emphasis].[59]

Because of the book and its success, Panofsky's scholarship and perhaps the man himself became synonymous with iconography and iconology, especially in the

---

[57] Janson in ibid., 175. Janson referred to Bronzino's *Exposure of Luxury* as *Love, Folly, Time.* The work has also been called *An Allegory of Venus and Cupid* and *A Triumph of Venus.*
[58] Erwin Panofsky, "Letters to the Editor," *Art Bulletin* 22, no. 4 (December 1940): 273.
[59] Heckscher, "Erwin Panofsky," 15.

United States. The European émigrés in general were also strongly linked with these two methodologies, as well as with the Renaissance period. According to Michels, "The success of iconology and the perception of the Renaissance art that emerged through the iconological perspective are thus closely linked to the emigration of Jewish art historians to America and to America's acceptance of the innovative methodology they brought with them."[60] Although Michels may have overstated the relationship of iconology and Jewish scholars, her general point that the Renaissance and iconology were linked with the influx of the Europeans seems accurate.[61] The rising prominence of the Renaissance as an appropriate subject for art history and the growing interest in iconography and iconology helped to internationalize U.S. art history. However, the immediate "success" of the Renaissance as a subject for scholarship and the use of the iconological method in *Art Bulletin* should be examined more closely.

The presence of the European émigrés encouraged U.S. art historians to branch out from the medieval period and investigate the Renaissance. Previously, the Renaissance had been considered somewhat off limits, since it was often linked to classical art and thus suggestive of archaeology. The period also had been associated with antiquarians and connoisseurs.[62] Table 1 shows that articles covering the Renaissance increased throughout the 1930s, and the subject would actually dominate the *Art Bulletin* and the field of art history beginning in the 1940s for the next several decades.

Although I have gone to great lengths to explain the development of iconology and its importance in the internationalization of art history in the United States, it seems necessary to address the general acceptance of the methodologies of iconography and

---

[60] Michels, "Art History, German Jewish Identity," 175.
[61] For criticism of Michels and other historiographers who perhaps have given too much weight to the relationships between Jewish identity and art-historical scholarship, see Kaufmann, "American Voices," 147-50.
[62] C. Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," 69.

iconology in the pages of *Art Bulletin*. While there may have been a tendency to conflate the two methodologies, simple word searches using JSTOR reveal that in the 1940s the word *iconography* and all its various incarnations was mentioned exceedingly more often than the word *iconology* and all its etymological manifestations, in a ratio of more than ten to one. While such searches cannot quantify how many times the methodologies were actually employed by a scholar, or determine how successful each analysis was, the use of the words can, to some degree, help determine the critical reception of the terms. In the 1940s, iconology was referred to directly in only twenty different articles, notes, reviews, and letters to the editor.[63] Despite the critical acclaim that historiographers have attributed to Panofsky's *Studies in Iconology,* twenty times is a small number for an entire decade of *Art Bulletin,* especially given that Panofsky, who discussed the general term on three of those occasions, was the one who used it most often. While Panofsky presented a theory of iconology that might have been palatable for his American audience, the methodology did not seem to be immediately embraced or employed by U.S. scholars in the beginning, at least in the pages of *Art Bulletin.*

When writers used the word *iconology,* most of them were simply citing Panofsky's book, and there was not much of an iconological analysis of specific art objects. Among the more significant texts in *Art Bulletin*, Ernst Gombrich of London's Warburg Institute, which was the proponent of iconology, discussed the methodology at length in his review of Charles Morris's *Signs, Language and Behavior,* addressing the relationships between iconology and linguistics. However, the most critical and opinionated interpretation of iconology was found in Meyer Schapiro's review of Francis Taylor's *Babel's Tower: The Dilemma of the Modern Museum* of 1945*.* Taylor, who was the director of the Worcester Art Museum in Massachusetts and had sat on CAA's board

[63] In the 1940s, the word *iconography* and its various forms were used in a total of 218 articles, notes, reviews, and letters to the editor, while *iconology* and its variants was used only 20 times: 5 of 146 articles, 0 of 66 notes, 10 of 211 reviews, and 5 or 52 letters.

of directors in the 1930s, was clearly anti-German in his analysis. According to Schapiro, Taylor blamed the failure of the modern museum on the "aesthete and the art historian, especially the German art historian." Schapiro also explained that Taylor felt that iconology should be "singled out as dangerous. It is the work of the same kind of men who in Germany prepared their pupils for Nazism by their indifference to 'human values.' We owe it to our returning soldiers, he warns us, to combat this influence." The rest of Schapiro's review lacerated Taylor's arguments for their prejudice and their lack of logic and accuracy.[64] However, Taylor's book might explain one reason why iconology, and perhaps theory in general, was considered somewhat taboo, given that it was occasionally associated with German culture and Nazism and not only with Jewish scholars, as Michels claims. It seems ironic that the three categories—German academia, Nazism, and Judaism—sometimes blurred together in the minds of some U.S. scholars. It was not until the 1960s that the word *iconology* would be used much more often in the pages of *Art Bulletin,* demonstrating that the methodology had finally gained a general acceptance as a fundamental methodology of art history, that is, if we follow the logic of my searches on JSTOR. Such a fact is intriguing, given that the 1960s marked the beginning of a new period when art history would begin to expand methodologically once again, and iconology would eventually be supplanted by new methodologies.

While the legacy of Panofsky's iconology is significant, my main purpose in this chapter is to address Panofsky's texts published in *Art Bulletin* during the 1930s, which presumably reflected, to varying degrees, his initial adaptation to the United States following his 1934 immigration. While his scholarship had been largely theoretical in nature when he lived in Germany, criticizing and extrapolating upon such broad, abstract

---

[64] Meyer Schapiro, review of *Babel's Tower: The Dilemma of the Modern Museum* by Francis H. Taylor, *Art Bulletin* 27, no. 4 (December 1945): 272-76.

concepts as *Kunstwollen*, Panofsky's writings for *Art Bulletin* were markedly different, focusing on more practical concerns. In fact, much of his writing for *Art Bulletin,* especially if the letters to the editor are included, focused on the precise identification of subject matter, the resolution of attributions and formal problems, the redating of art objects, and the like. This type of scholarship related not only to iconography but also to the factual and formalist analytical models that had been largely popular in *Art Bulletin* up until this time and had been exemplified in the writings of Cook and Morey, who had supported Panofsky's immigration. While Panofsky served as a leader in his new country, offering a new methodology by which to interpret art, he also chose to adapt to his surroundings and follow in the footsteps of his U.S. colleagues.

Art History and Some General Observations on Theory

The discipline of art history in the United States was radically changing in the mid- and late 1930s. Many U.S. art historians were expanding beyond the archaeological mode of art history, as it had been practiced earlier in the United States. By the mid-1930s, as discussed in chapter 3, Meiss was beginning to investigate the methodologies of iconography and social history in relationship to connoisseurship, and Schapiro was starting to develop new methodologies, by applying Marxist strategies of analysis to art history. In turn, the Europeans in America, many of whom had been engaged in radical debates from an intuitive and theoretical perspective, were now exploring the more practical applications of their earlier inventive ideas. Working on the same turf, both U.S. and European scholars appeared to have been united in a single cause, namely to develop standards of analysis in "the still youthful field of the history of art," in Janson's words, and thus elevate its position to its rightful place among the humanities.

In his 1940 essay "The History of Art as a Humanistic Discipline," Panofsky offered an explanation that seemed to clarify the methodological concerns at play. He

examined the seemingly factional divisions within the discipline and chose to define them in combination with one another. In the process, he wedded connoisseurship and art history, as well as art theory and art history, seeing each pairing as happily united and working in tandem, one enhancing the other. Regarding the art historian and the art theorist, Panofsky stated:

> The relation between the art historian and the art theorist may be compared to that between two neighbors who have the right of shooting over the same district, while one of them owns the gun and the other all the ammunition. Both parties would be well advised if they realized this condition of their partnership. It has rightly been said that theory, if not received at the door of empirical discipline, comes in through the chimney like a ghost and upsets the furniture. But it is not less true that history, if not received at the door of a theoretical discipline dealing with the same set of phenomena, creeps into the cellar like a horde of mice and undermines the groundwork.[65]

Although Panofsky did not assign the role of “art historian” to the U.S. scholar and “art theorist” to the European immigrant academic, such a division seems somewhat implicit in his text. Originally published one year after World War II had started in Europe, Panofsky’s essay might also have seemed at the time somewhat political in its motivation. Time and again, in this essay and others, he chose to present a harmonious picture to his reader such that the European émigrés and U.S. scholars appeared to be working together for a greater cause. However, Panofsky also stated later that the theory of art—whose application generally differentiated the European from the American art historian—became “largely obsolete.”[66]

Ultimately, what therefore transpired was a compromise, especially on the part of the European émigrés. Historiographers working recently to reinterpret the 1930s have attempted to address the motivations of the Europeans more explicitly. While Crow explained that the Europeans had simplified their ideas because they wanted to adapt to the needs of their U.S. students and colleagues, Christopher Wood speculated that the

---

[65] Erwin Panofsky, “The History of Art As a Humanistic Discipline,” in Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Papers in and on Art History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), 22.
[66] Erwin Panofsky, “Preface,” in Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, v.

European immigrants had turned away from their radical formalism of the 1920s and early 1930s because such deliberations seemed somehow abstract and antithetical to their troubled situation. Focusing on iconography and iconology allowed them to distance themselves from the radical formalist theoretical debates of which they had been a part in their homelands and to concentrate specifically on the intellectual content and meaning of particular works of art. In addition, European immigrants were no longer critical of the Renaissance or questioned its existence, as they had in the past, but readily accepted the period for its humanistic nature. Their scholarship emphasized such Renaissance values as individualism, independent reason, and human dignity; the importance of mysticism, irrationalism, and totemism, which had been important to Warburg, withered away in favor of Neoplatonism.[67] The balance, order, and harmony, as well as the basic rationality, of the Renaissance might have provided a sense of refuge from the chaos and disruption of World War II.

While Wood's interpretation suggests that Europeans rationally turned to humanistic themes as part of their migration process, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has suggested that the motivations of the European émigrés might have been much more political: "The German exiles may have intentionally avoided theorizing when they came to America, because they believed that the innocent Americans should be kept untainted by the dangers of abstract thinking—that they thought had been the causes for the collapse of their fatherland."[68] The European exiles' dismissal of theory was, therefore, perhaps a cautious and conservative political reaction. With such prejudicial books as Taylor's *Babel's Tower* in print, their reaction might have been considered necessary, even justifiable. According to Kaufmann, students of the German émigré professors in the 1940s and 1950s said that they never heard them discuss theoretical issues. When

---

[67] C. Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," 81.
[68] Kaufmann, "American Voices," 146.

students tried to submit various papers of a theoretical nature to their European professors, either the paper was ignored or they were told not to bother with such matters. Further evidence exists that when Panofsky assembled his earlier texts written in German for publication in English in the 1955 book *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, he reworked them and "left out many of the theoretical or philosophical points of his arguments," much as he had done with *Studies in Iconology.*[69] As a result, U.S. art history and its students were protected from intuitive, theoretical abstractions. Such concepts therefore remained foreign to the American art historian. In fact, throughout much of its existence, the discipline in this country has often struggled with the acceptance of such models, and *Art Bulletin* in particular would on more than one occasion demonstrate a strong resistance to theoretical interpretations, allowing the archaeological model of promoting factual and descriptive analyses to persist.

While chapter 4 has focused primarily on scholarship, in particular the work of Panofsky, the leading figure among the émigrés, chapter 5 examines the reception of the Europeans in the United States in terms of the institutional and cultural politics of academia as shown in universities, CAA, and the *Art Bulletin*'s editorial policies.

[69] Ibid., 144, 146-47.

CHAPTER 5

ART BULLETIN AND CAA IN THE LATE 1930s:

INSTITUTIONAL POLITICS AND THE RECEPTION OF THE EUROPEAN ÉMIGRÉS

> It was time for the old timers to get out and leave the running of the [College Art] Association to younger men.
> —Charles Rufus Morey and Paul J. Sachs, minutes of the CAA board of directors[1]

> The feeling of the Mid-west, West and South is that they do not want to be dominated by the East.
> —Myrtilla Avery, minutes of the CAA board of directors[2]

> The [Editorial] Board should consist of Americans from American institutions.
> —Walter W. S. Cook, minutes of the CAA board of directors[3]

In chapter 3 I addressed some of the internal politics of CAA and the effects of the Great Depression on the association in the early 1930s, in addition to general changes in the scholarship of U.S. art historians throughout the decade. In chapter 4 I largely focused on the scholarship of Erwin Panofsky by interpreting his work as exemplary among the European émigrés of the 1930s. While the work of the immigrant art historians varied considerably, my purpose was not only to reflect upon the larger changes that occurred in the scholarship of the European émigrés in the mid-1930s, but also to address what might be called the internationalization and standardization of U.S. art history. Iconology, along with the formalist and archaeological practices of art history, became the fundamental methodologies of the discipline, and the Renaissance began to dominate as the primary subject matter.

This chapter, in contrast, focuses on the issues of prejudice and institutional politics that occurred during the latter half of the 1930s in the reception of the European émigrés in colleges and universities, as well as CAA and *Art Bulletin*. As a result of the ongoing Great Depression, the additional activities of the association, and the journal's

---

[1] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 9, 1940, College Art Association.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

questionable editorial and financial policies, CAA was in jeopardy. Members with substantial reputations in the field of art history protested, and John Shapley would eventually be ousted as editor-in-chief and president. My purpose in discussing separately the internal politics of CAA and the changes in scholarship in the 1930s is to avoid too much generalization, if possible, so that the complexities of the issues at stake can be addressed in full. Ultimately, as the field of art history changed to synthesize the perspectives of both the U.S. and European émigrés scholars and established a new set of methodological standards for the discipline in the late 1930s, the governance of CAA and *Art Bulletin* changed as well, resulting in a set of professional standards for CAA as an academic society and *Art Bulletin* as its journal of record.

Historiography and the Reception of the European Émigrés

Although numerous scholars have written about the reception of the European émigrés and the synthesis of U.S. and European art history in the 1930s, the German art historian Karen Michels has stated as recently as 1997 that:

> there remain problems of communication and the mutual comprehension between "American" and "European" or "German" art history—so much so that one has to ask whether this transplant of a whole academic tradition was really so smooth and successful, so irreversible in its outcome, as it might seem. The process has not yet been analyzed in all its complexity; nor have the conditions under which it took place been examined.[4]

One of the reasons for the ongoing confusion and the emphasis on the "smooth and successful" nature of the amalgamation has largely been due to the fact that Erwin Panofsky interpreted the union in such a positive manner in his 1953 essay "Three Decades of Art History in the United States." Because this text represented one of the first historiographical accounts of the 1930s, many scholars have relied upon it—as I have—as a means of understanding this complex situation. However, few historians

[4] Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 304.

have questioned his somewhat rosy interpretation.

Panofksy described the synthesis of European and U.S. art history as the result of "the providential synchronism between the rise of Fascism and Nazism in Europe and the spontaneous efflorescence of the history of art in the United States." Although he alluded to some conflicts in terms of the foreigners communicating in English, he mentioned that the European émigrés were "at once bewildered, electrified, and elated" by their new surroundings. They "feasted on the treasures assembled in museums, libraries, private collections, and dealers' galleries." Panofsky added that these immigrant art historians were interested to learn that technical studies in art were being conducted at Harvard University, that the Index of Christian Art was available at Princeton University, and that "a wealthy lady in New York had founded a reference library containing thousands and thousands of photographs." In the latter case, Panofsky was referring to Helen Clay Frick and the Frick Art Reference Library, which had also supported *Art Bulletin* in the past. These institutions numbered among the "spiritual blessings" that the United States had to offer the European émigrés.[5]

What Panofsky's sanguine essay did not explain was that several U.S. universities and colleges, especially those that now comprise the Ivy League, were anti-Semitic, some of them quite openly. The art historian Kevin Parker has therefore recently suggested that the situation in pre-Nazi-controlled Germany was perhaps ironically somewhat better for the Jewish scholar than it was in the United States in the 1930s.[6] In addition to the anti-Semitism that these refugee art historians might have faced, they also encountered anti-German sentiments, which added to their trauma. The

---

[5] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 11, 15 16.

[6] In 1927 Harvard had three Jewish scholars on its faculty, Columbia had two, while Yale, Princeton, and Johns Hopkins each had one; see Kevin Parker, "Art History and Exile: Richard Krautheimer and Erwin Panofsky," in Baron with Eckmann, *Exiles and Émigrés,* 318. My reader may recall the situation Schapiro experienced in the 1920s regarding his rejection from Princeton and his troubled recommendation for his fellowship at Columbia; see chapter 3, notes 56 and 57.

Frick Art Reference Library, for example, had adopted a policy that did not allow Germans to use the facilities, which meant that these German-Jewish refugees were also not allowed to use the library and thus encountered a double dose of prejudice.[7]

Although Panofsky ignored these serious impediments that he and his colleagues had endured when they came to the United States, he was fully aware of the anti-Semitism in the United States and was sometimes quite glib about the situation. In 1936, two years after his immigration, Panofsky wrote about his U.S. experience to Fritz Saxl, his former Hamburg colleague who was living in London. He scoffed that there might be "a reunion of our whole circle of friends in Honduras or Liberia in 1940. By then things will have gone so far here too that the Jews and Liberals will no longer be welcome."[8] Such sarcasm indicated that the situation was stressful and uncertain, even for Panofsky, whose immigration was by far easier than that of his colleagues because he arrived with a job in hand. In many respects, Panofsky's essay was therefore an attempt to mask the trauma that he and his fellow émigrés had experienced. Time and again he wanted to demonstrate that the U.S. scholars and the European émigrés had been knit together seamlessly.

However, many European émigrés struggled to obtain a U.S. visa and find work in a college or university, even though the U.S. Emergency Committee for Displaced Foreign Scholars had been established in 1933 and provided support for European émigrés by issuing nonquota visas for college teachers.[9] According to Michels, among the roughly 130 émigrés who came to the United States, a majority of them were able to find work of some sort in their field; however, many of these jobs were often temporary and sometimes part-time positions. The Emergency Committee also had very strict

---

[7] Walter W. S. Cook to Charles Rufus Morey, January 14, 1939, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, Walter Cook file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[8] Michels, "Art History, German Jewish Identity," 171.
[9] Duggan and Drury, *Rescue of Science and Learning,* 8.

criteria for these appointments. Immigrant scholars had to provide evidence that they had taught for at least three years immediately before they had emigrated. Such a practice favored certain types of scholars, namely well-established, mid-career art historians. Younger scholars with no substantial record and elderly art historians who had not taught successively just before 1933, as well as women, had greater difficulty in securing visas and had to wait.[10]

To help these European immigrant scholars, several U.S. art historians offered their support. Among them, Walter W. S. Cook of the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University and Charles Rufus Morey of Princeton University are most often singled out. Cook, the director of the IFA, hired the greatest number of émigrés including Richard Ettinghausen, Walter Friedländer, Julius Held, Richard Krautheimer, Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, Panofsky, Alfred Salmony, Guido Schoenberger, and Martin Weinberger.[11] In fact, by the late 1930s, half of the IFA's faculty was refugees. Morey, acting as an advisor to the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, recommended positions for Paul Frankl, William Heckscher, Adolf Katzenellenbogen, Panofsky, Charles de Tolnay, and others.[12]

While Cook and Morey are often given credit for helping the most refugees, it should be noted that Panofsky worked closely with both of them, encouraging them to sponsor certain individuals, many of them his former students and colleagues from Hamburg. By the late 1930s, the criteria for securing employment was changing, as money in the relief funds was drying up. Letters between Cook and Panofsky discuss not only the strength of each refugee's scholarship, but also the level of their English fluency, the ability to serve multiple roles within a school (e.g., instructor, librarian, and/or curator), and sometimes the need for the scholars to be able to fund their own positions

---

[10] Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 306.
[11] Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History," 17; and Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 309;
[12] Lee, "Charles Rufus Morey," v; and Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 309.

somehow. As much as foundations, agencies, and wealthy individuals had been paying for many of these appointments, personal wealth on the part of the refugee was helpful and in a few instances allowed some of them to come to the United States, even when they were not able to meet the criteria for the nonquota visa. Schoenberger, for example, was considered a worthy scholar and was a trained librarian, but the reason why Cook was able to hire him was that he had "relatives or friends" in Holland who were able to pay for his position at the IFA.[13]

Although obtaining the proper paperwork and securing a job were difficult feats in themselves, the situation for foreigners once inside a college or university was still somewhat awkward. In the article "*Kunstgeschichte* American Style," Colin Eisler reported that many of the renowned faculty members at the IFA and elsewhere were kept from teaching undergraduate students and interacting with graduate students outside their specialties. Sequestered from many of the activities in their schools, many refugee scholars were also rarely advanced to leadership positions in art and art history departments and were often not given proper recognition and appointments that their abilities and accomplishments merited.[14] These types of experiences for the European immigrants likely encouraged them "to prune away many of the more complex and speculative elements of art history in favor of conceptually simple and often mechanical tasks," as Thomas Crow has discussed.[15] Although many U.S. scholars had been helpful to the émigrés, the U.S. scholars seemed to be somewhat intimidated by their

---

[13] Kaufmann, "American Voices," 141; Panofsky recommended many scholars for Cook to help including Guido Schoenberger, Adolf Katzenellenbogen, and Jenö Lanyi. Panofsky even offered his teaching post at NYU to Martin Weinberger and Walter Friedländer; see Erwin Panofsky to Walter W. S. Cook, August 31, 1938; Walter W. S. Cook to Erwin Panofsky, November 21, 1938; Walter W. S. Cook, December 15, 1938; Erwin Panofsky to Walter W. S. Cook, March 25, 1940; Walter Cook to Erwin Panofsky, February 20, 1942; Erwin Panofsky Papers 1904-1990, Smithsonian Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.
[14] Eisler, "*Kunstgeschichte* American Style," 617, 625.
[15] Crow, "Practice of Art History in America," 77.

distinguished foreign colleagues, whose intellectual achievements were likely more impressive than those of the U.S. scholars.

When considering some of the experiences of the European immigrants, one can see that their transition and reception were by no means wholly "smooth and successful," and Panofsky's overtly positive depiction of the situation was a stretch. Although several U.S. art historians had shown tremendous support and the European refugees were fortunate to be out of Hitler's reach, the situation in the United States was in some respects undoubtedly awkward and disheartening for many immigrants. A CAA conference program of 1939 provides some useful information to help assess the situation of the refugee scholars: of the fifty-three papers listed in the program, at least twenty-two were presented by displaced European scholars living in the United States, and of those twenty-two, nine of them (41 percent) were not affiliated with an institution.[16] They were listed as having worked "formerly" for their respective European institutions. While the majority of the European émigrés might have been able to find work, as Michels stated, this majority was very slight. In some respects many of the displaced European scholars might have simply left one alienating situation in Europe only to encounter another, albeit a much less threatening one, in the United States.

CAA and the Lecture Bureau

Historiographers writing on the 1930s rarely mention CAA and *Art Bulletin*, which seems peculiar, given that so many of the key players helping the immigrant art historians were deeply involved with the association and its journal. Cook and Morey were both serving on the journal's editorial board, and Morey was also vice-president of

---

[16] College Art Association, *Program of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting,* September 6-9, 1939, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University. My estimate for the number of displaced European scholars may be low, given that not all of the names are recognizable. My percentile may therefore be slightly high but not radically.

the association's board of directors. Also, Paul J. Sachs, who served on both boards, helped numerous émigrés.[17] In addition, John Shapley found funds to hire Ulrich Middeldorf on a part-time basis and Ludwig Bachhofer as a full-time professor at the University of Chicago in 1935.[18]

Given the circumstances, it stood to reason that CAA as an organization might have been directly involved in the process of helping European émigrés find jobs. Indeed, the very structure of CAA, as a national intercollegiate network for the advancement of art, would have enabled the association to help readily or even lead in the cause. Also, in the early 1930s, CAA had already demonstrated a strong humanitarian side, going to great lengths to help artists financially by developing such programs as the College Art Artists' Cooperative. In the mid-1930s, CAA's board of directors stated that the organization was appalled about the situation in Germany, but otherwise CAA did not seem to be directly involved in helping the European immigrants.[19] The association had no official job placement service at the time.

The one service that was potentially useful to the displaced scholars was CAA's lecture bureau, which had been conceived in 1931. CAA circulated a brochure of scholars' names and their list of topics for lectures annually to schools and museums across the United States, so that scholars might be invited to speak at one or more of the institutions and earn money in the process. In 1938, when Katzenellenbogen, one of Panofsky's former students in Hamburg, was planning to come to the United States, Panofsky passed his résumé to Cook and asked him to send it to CAA. Although the young Katzenellenbogen had few academic credentials, his English was good, and he

---

[17] Michels, "Transfer and Transformation," 309.
[18] G. J. Laing to Emery Filbert, July 11, 1935, Division of the Humanities, University of Chicago Library.
[19] Minutes of the CAA annual member meeting, n.d. (1934?), College Art Association.

had some money. He was coming to the United States to "take his chance."[20] The idea was that the lecture bureau would give him exposure and help him make contacts with various schools that might be able to hire him. According to a CAA report, the lecture bureau helped Katzenellenbogen secure his U.S. visa. Another immigrant scholar Otto von Simson was able to find a permanent job as a result of the lecture bureau.[21]

While this service was therefore potentially helpful to the European émigrés, Eisler, who has researched this period in depth, told me that he had heard of neither CAA's involvement in helping the European émigrés nor CAA's lecture bureau and speculated that the lecture bureau would likely have been intimidating to most immigrants. In general, their English was simply not good enough to tour the country and give lectures.[22] Indeed many institutions complained that the speaking abilities of each lecturer varied radically and asked CAA to keep confidential notes regarding their communication skills.[23] Strangely enough, the tables had turned: before 1933, U.S. scholars had often felt embarrassed about their foreign language skills and feared that foreign editors might reject their manuscripts for publication in their journals, yet after 1933, many European émigrés worried that their English was not good enough for teaching jobs in U.S. colleges and universities.

CAA and *Art Bulletin* in the Latter Half of the 1930s: The Ongoing Great Depression, the Threat of Xenophobia, and the Possibility of Reorganization

Although the treatment of the displaced European émigrés was sometimes egregious, the situation for everyone in the latter half of the 1930s was topsy-turvy in

[20] Panofsky to Cook, September 21, 1938, Erwin Panofsky Papers.
[21] Caroline Bergh, Report on the Lecture Bureau, minutes of the CAA board of directors, May 12, 1940, College Art Association.
[22] Colin Eisler, interview with the author, June 22, 2010.
[23] College Art Association, "Analysis of Questionnaire," 1936, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

such a poor economy. The story I provide below has never been told before and is pulled together from the minutes of CAA's board of directors and numerous letters exchanged between individuals serving on CAA's board of directors and several prominent art historian members. In many respects, the story is somewhat piecemeal, given that certain archives are not completely available, particularly those of Shapley and Cook, but the story is still useful because it addresses the finances and editorial policies of *Art Bulletin*, in conjunction with an episode in CAA's history related to the reception of the displaced European scholars and the association's identification as either a national or international academic society.[24] The story demonstrates how divisive CAA was becoming in the mid-1930s not only in terms of professional politics between artists and art historians or regional differences between members in the Northeast versus those in the rest of the country, but more importantly among the art historians themselves.

In the mid-1930s a group of prominent art historians expressed their dissatisfaction with the editorial practices of *Art Bulletin* and Shapley as president of CAA and editor of the journal. In the battle that ensued, the governance of CAA and the *Art Bulletin* would be radically transformed. While typically such a story might have a good side versus a bad side, this one perhaps has neither. In fact, some of the information I will present might be surprising, given who was involved and what they said and did. My story contradicts some of the standard information found in historiographies of the 1930s. While the immediate impact of the actions that took place may or may not have had a direct effect on the scholarship of art history in the 1930s, the outcomes of the battle in the late 1930s and very early 1940s would be significant, and new standards would be established regarding the editorial practices of *Art Bulletin* and the

---

[24] The Institute of Fine Arts of New York University has not processed its archive in full, especially the papers of Walter W. S. Cook.

governance of CAA.

As the Great Depression wore on in the latter half of the 1930s, the financial situation for CAA and its need to support *Art Bulletin* became a growing problem. CAA had already received two bailouts from the Carnegie Corporation in 1933 and 1935 and had chosen to adopt a questionable policy that permitted such institutions as Harvard and Princeton to underwrite individual issues of *Art Bulletin*. In 1935 CAA also began to investigate the idea of reorganizing the association entirely. In one instance the art historian E. Baldwin Smith of Princeton, who served on CAA's Committee for Standards, proposed that CAA concentrate its efforts on *Art Bulletin* and form a separate or subsidiary organization to manage the more recent projects that CAA had implemented including its exhibition program, the *Index of Twentieth Century Artists,* and its monthly magazine *Parnassus.* Smith's separation of the initiatives was designed to help CAA clarify its main purpose as a learned society, or put differently, CAA would become an academic society for scholarly art historians, while the other organization would be for the artists and the rest of the members.[25] Although Smith's idea was never fully put into effect, the desire to reassess the activities of CAA would remain an ongoing concern.

In an effort to cut costs, CAA approached the American Federation of Arts (AFA) in 1936 about the possibility of the two organizations merging and/or finding ways to consolidate their efforts. Although the AFA did not publish a scholarly journal like *Art Bulletin*, the two institutions shared similar initiatives. The AFA's *American Magazine of Art* and CAA's *Parnassus* were thought to be remarkably similar in their content, and several people from both organizations felt that the two publications were needlessly in competition with each other. The possibility of merging the two publications therefore seemed to make sense. Also CAA was publishing an *Index of XXth Century Artists,*

---

[25] E. Baldwin Smith to Audrey McMahon, 15 January 1935, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

which was quite similar to the AFA's *Who's Who in American Art*. In addition, both organizations were producing touring exhibitions, and CAA discussed the possibility of one or the other taking over this task completely.[26] As the 1930s unfolded, negotiations between CAA and the AFA would continue, but the situation would become even more complex when a group of CAA's members sent a letter of protest to the board of directors regarding the *Art Bulletin.*

The Letter of Protest: A Need to Restructure

Before World War II, the governance of most academic societies was quite simple: authority rested in the hands of the president and the board of directors. Although the annual business meeting provided an opportunity for members to be involved in the governance process, these meetings were typically sparsely attended, and the board's decisions were therefore ratified by default.[27] However, on April 9, 1936, a letter of complaint was read to the CAA board of directors prior to the annual business meeting, which was out of character for most academic societies at the time. Sixteen CAA members, all of whom were art historians, including Millard Meiss and Meyer Schapiro, as well as two editorial board members, Cook and William Bell Dinsmoor, stated that *Art Bulletin* had been the "chief activity" of CAA and "the only scholarly art periodical in America." Although their facts were somewhat erroneous, they nevertheless felt that CAA's new publications and new activities that had been initiated in the late 1920s were to "the consequent detriment, we feel, of the original purpose."[28] The

---

[26] Philip Youtz to Charles Rufus Morey, May 19, 1936; E. Baldwin Smith to Philip Youtz, May 25, 1936; and Smith to Audrey McMahon, January 15, 1935, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[27] Bloland and Bloland, *American Learned Societies in Transition*, 10.
[28] Helen M. Franc et al. to A. Philip McMahon (CAA secretary), April 7, 1936, minutes of the CAA board of directors, April 9, 1936. The sixteen signers included William Bell Dinsmoor, Meyer Schapiro, Millard Meiss, Donald Young, Myrtilla Avery, Agnes Rindge, Marvin C. Ross, Adelyn

members also stated:

> We particularly feel, however, that in view of the numerous European periodicals, it would only be fair to restrict the articles, except in very exceptional circumstances, to the work of American scholars, or to scholars affiliated with American institutions, since it is their sold [*sic*] outlet for publication of research in fields other than those covered by the *American Journal of Archaeology* or the publications of individual institutions, such as the *Metropolitan Museum Studies* or the *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.*[29]

They added that the journal had previously gained an international reputation because of the contributions published by U.S. scholars, and the recent inclusion of so many texts by foreigners made it more difficult for them to have their essays published and significantly slowed down the production process for everyone involved, sometimes by several years.[30]

Such a statement to protect the national identity of *Art Bulletin* was significant and, from today's perspective, might seem quite shocking and even perplexing. The protestors' desire to restrict the journal to contributions by U.S. citizens and immigrants/foreigners working for U.S. institutions suggested a sense of xenophobia and heavily hinted at anti-Semitism, given that so many recent immigrants were Jewish refugees. In 1936 many of them were still struggling to find work and were therefore not affiliated with a U.S. institution.[31] Also, most of these immigrants were not allowed to publish in Germany, and *Art Bulletin* would therefore have been one of the logical places to publish, especially for junior scholars who needed to bolster their résumés to find work in the United States.

What is most peculiar about the letter is the identity of some of the people who signed it. Cook, who was known for hiring so many Europeans, was one of the leaders in

---

Breskin, Eleanor P. Spencer, Walter Muir Whitehill, James Rorimer, Belle da Costa Greene, Walter W. S. Cook, Marion Lawrence, and Dorothy Miner. Franc signed the letter on behalf of the committee.

[29] Franc to McMahon, April 9, 1936.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Paul J. Sachs to John Shapley, April 16, 1938, Paul J. Sachs, 1878-1965, Papers 1903-2005, box 83, file "John Shapley [1923-1945]," Harvard Art Museum Archives.

this protest and continued to play a role in this nationalist campaign during the subsequent negotiations. Although he was willing to open the doors of the IFA to foreigners, he seemed to feel quite differently when it came to *Art Bulletin*. Also, several of the letter signers were Jewish including Meiss and Schapiro, which suggests that the letter might not have been wholly intended to be anti-Semitic in spirit. Furthermore, Schapiro was a Marxist, and such a letter seemed antithetical to the egalitarian nature of his politics. Although both Meiss and Schapiro were copied on correspondence related to the letter, it is not clear what roles the two of them might have played in the whole process.

While the letter was clearly discriminatory, the situation was complex, and the identification of CAA as either a national or an international organization was one of the major issues. In 1931, the College Art Association of America, as it had been called, was incorporated and dropped "of America" from its name, and by 1933, the association was referring to itself as "an international organization." As stated in chapter 4, a substantial number of European scholars had been publishing articles in the journal in the mid-1930s. In 1933, foreigners published eight of the sixteen articles, or 50 percent; in 1934, it was five of eighteen, or 28 percent; and in 1935, four of sixteen, or 25 percent. From 1933 to 1935, only two European émigrés scholars living in the United States, specifically Middeldorf and Panofsky, published articles in *Art Bulletin,* and both of them were affiliated with U.S. institutions.[32] In all the correspondence I read, I found nothing disparaging stated about the refugees or anyone's Jewish faith. In 1936, the members who signed the letter of protest simply felt, rightly or wrongly, that *Art Bulletin* was "the only scholarly periodical in America," and the inclusion of so many foreigners limited their opportunities.

---

[32] Hans Tietze, R. Wittkower, and Julius Baum published articles during 1933-35. While each of them had been affected by Nazi policies, none of them was living in the United States, and I therefore counted them as foreigners.

Most of the other issues raised in the letter of protest related to the editorial administration and finances of the *Art Bulletin.* Contributors were annoyed that they were seldom given advance notice when their articles were going to be published, they were not allowed to review their edited manuscripts, and because the journal was printed in Italy, they had no opportunity to see proof in order to make corrections. In addition, the letter writers protested *Art Bulletin*'s continual "plea of poverty" in recent years, given that the journal listed so many sustaining and contributing institutions.[33] The dissenters were presumably not aware that many of CAA's sustaining institutions had stopped giving money to *Art Bulletin* and that their names continued to be posted only for the sake of adding prestige to the publication.[34] The activists were, therefore, probably unaware of the debt that continued to haunt *Art Bulletin.* The letter did not mention the journal's egregious policy that allowed sustaining institutions to buy editorial control of individual issues, possibly because three of the signers worked for the Walters Art Gallery and the Pierpont Morgan Library, which were participating in the scheme. The June 1936 issue, for example, covered objects in the Walters Art Gallery. The dissenters therefore likely knew what was happening in terms of the journal's editorial control, and this problem would come up later in the protest.

While CAA's board of directors stated that many of the issues raised in the letter, particularly those related to the finances, were incorrect, they felt that the grievances of these members, many of whom were significant contributors to *Art Bulletin* and prominent art historians, needed to be addressed. The board encouraged the letters' signatories to form a three-person committee to meet with the association's executive board, so that some of the issues could be clarified and the grievances might be handled

---

[33] Franc to McMahon, April 9, 1936.
[34] Minutes of the CAA annual business meeting, April 9, 1936, College Art Association.

in a diplomatic manner.[35] Although the three members of the so-called grievance committee changed over the next few years, Marion Lawrence of Barnard College remained in charge of the group, and Myrtilla Avery of Wellesley College, as well as Cook, were among those who stayed involved in the project. The board of directors tried to create a comparable committee, but it had difficulty securing enough people to represent its interests.[36] In the end Morey handled many of the negotiations with the small committee. In fact, Morey tended to act as the shepherd for most of CAA's interests at the time, not only regarding the grievance committee but also the negotiations with the AFA and even with Shapley.

The letter of protest was timely because it coincided with the association's discussions about rethinking its various initiatives, and its conversations with the AFA to discuss the possibility of a merger. The grievance committee became involved in this larger process, and in some instances advised the board of directors on the negotiations. At one point in the discussion, Lawrence cautioned Morey not to let CAA be consumed by the AFA. While it made sense for the AFA to take over certain projects, she objected to the fact that CAA might lose its name in the process and erase the association's history. She wanted art historians to continue to have an organization

---

[35] Ibid.

[36] E. Baldwin Smith refused to be part of the board's committee, which was labeled the Committee for Reorganization. He did not believe that the process would be handled in a democratic manner and told Morey the following: "As I see the situation, the directors have allowed the present condition to develop and the majority of them are still in favor of the existing organization. The appointment of a Committee on Reorganization is unconsciously the passing of the buck without any assurances that a controlling majority of the directors intend to do anything except oppose any drastic revision. The new committee may spend a year making recommendations, but it has no control over the nominations for officers. Therefore, if the directors next year nominate the present officers, they can preserve the status quo, more or less, indefinitely.

"My feeling is that the only answer to the present condition is for all dissatisfied members to resign until such time as new officers are appointed, with the purpose of bringing about a complete reorganization. . . ."; see E. Baldwin Smith to C. R. Morey, May 11, 1936, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

similar to those for archaeologists and historians.[37] Throughout the conversations she and others expressed concern about the need to set up a more democratic system for the election of officers. Up until this time, CAA's president and board of directors had been a self-perpetuating entity, because the board had control over the nominations, and they continuously chose to nominate themselves. Elections were therefore at best an autocratic process, and many felt that CAA was suffering from stagnation. Shapley had been in power too long and needed to go.[38]

Ultimately, the two sides were generally divided as follows: (1) Shapley and most of the board of directors wanted to remain in control of CAA on an ongoing basis. Although many issues of *Art Bulletin* were edited by the individual sustaining institutions, Shapley and others were still able to effect enough editorial control when they wanted to have the *Art Bulletin* include an international array of scholarly voices. Shapley also wanted CAA to sponsor a wide range of activities for all its members. (2) Lawrence, Cook, Avery, and others wanted new management. They felt that the organization had been run poorly and the diversification of activities was damaging the purpose and finances of the academic society. They were also quite frankly nationalist minded, at least with respect to CAA and *Art Bulletin*.

On December 5, 1936, the executive board considered the final proposals of the grievance committee regarding *Art Bulletin*. The group offered a total of thirteen suggestions. Most of them related to the governance and administration of the journal, and the committee still demanded that articles by foreigners not affiliated with U.S.

---

[37] Marion Lawrence to Charles Rufus Morey, June 5, 1936, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[38] Marion Lawrence to Charles Rufus Morey, June 16, 1936, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library; Frances Henry Taylor to Frederick Keppel, February 27, 1936, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, College Art Association file, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

institutions should be limited to contributions of extraordinary significance. Although this initiative had been a primary concern in their initial letter of protest, it was listed last in the document presented to the board of directors. After reviewing the thirteen suggestions, the board of directors rejected or tabled most of the proposals, including restricting the job of editor-in-chief to a three-year term, hiring a managing editor, printing the journal in the United States, and showing authors proofs. Ultimately, the board of directors agreed only to one proposal: the editorial board members should represent a wider variety of fields in the fine arts, and the editor-in-chief should submit articles to editorial board members for their review. Regarding the proposal to limit foreign contributions, the board of directors reworded the policy to read *"Art Bulletin* is primarily for American scholars."[39] The phrasing of the latter was much more ambiguous and less xenophobic than the committee's proposed language, although it still promoted the idea that *Art Bulletin* was American.

It is difficult to measure the effects of the letter of protest and the proposals, especially because it is not clear if the board of directors ever took time to respond directly to the grievance committee. While Shapley would make future efforts to address some of the concerns related to editorial production, namely finding a U.S. printer so that authors could see proofs, the implementation of the policy regarding foreign contributions was not clear. I found no records regarding the acceptance or rejection of any manuscript in the 1930s. Although no foreigner seemed to have published any article in *Art Bulletin* in 1936, the so-called policy against foreigners was not put into effect until the end of the year, and editorial control was largely in the hands of the

---

[39] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, December 5. 1936. Ultimately, the executive board disagreed with the idea of changing the governance and finances of the journal. They opposed the idea that the editor-in-chief should be limited to a three-year term and elected by a majority vote from chairs of art departments in U.S. colleges and universities. The board also refused to hire a managing editor to ensure that contributors would be dutifully notified as to the acceptance or rejection of their submitted articles. In addition, they dismissed the idea of lowering fees for subscriptions.

institutions who had bought their individual issues. But the statistics for 1937 nevertheless show that Shapley and the board of directors did not want to follow any nationalist policy for contributors to *Art Bulletin*. That year three of the twenty-one articles (14 percent) were by foreigners living in Europe. One of them was Hermann Beenken's article regarding the Friedsam *Annunciation*, which I discussed in chapter 4. Much of the effort of the grievance committee, therefore, seemed to have been in vain, and the battle would wear on with Shapley remaining at odds with the committee—Cook in particular.

The year 1937 was pivotal in many respects for CAA, and despite some monetary relief for *Art Bulletin*, the situation would continue to deteriorate. Although CAA finally received a $30,000 endowment for *Art Bulletin* from the Carnegie Corporation, the sum was too small and came too late. The interest from the endowment was simply not enough, and CAA, which was suffering from so much back indebtedness, was in a financial crisis. Several of CAA's programs had to be terminated, among them the traveling exhibition program and the *Index of Twentieth Century Artists.* Only *Parnassus* and the lecture bureau survived in addition to *Art Bulletin.* That same year Shapley was put in an awkward position because he was forced to resign from his position at the University of Chicago and leave by the end of 1939. He had been traveling and missed an excessive number of classes, which prompted the dean to ask for his resignation.[40] The bottom line was that Shapley had been trying to do too much and was feeling the pressure from all sides.

Despite all the initiatives for reorganization and the demand for more democratic governance, CAA's board of directors nominated once again the same individuals to serve as officers at the annual meeting on November 7, 1937.[41] However, at this meeting, Cook, who was not a member of the board of directors, made an extraordinarily

---

[40] John Shapley to Dean Richard P. McKeon, October 20, 1937; John Shapley to Dean Richard P. McKeon, July 9, 1937; Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
[41] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, November 7, 1937, College Art Association.

bold move that was out of character for most academic societies in the 1930s and suggested initiatives that would begin to challenge the status quo of the governance of CAA. Cook proposed that the presidency be rotated yearly among CAA's "constituent institutions," which was in keeping with the practices of several other academic societies, and that the president's institution be responsible for organizing and hosting the annual meeting.[42] Cook also proposed that a managing editor be hired for the publications program. Both initiatives were passed, although they would not be implemented immediately.

With Shapley soon to be out of work, the issue of CAA's finances continued to be a major concern. It turned out that the debts were much larger than anyone knew, and Shapley had tried to take care of many of the arrears with the help of his own life insurance policy. CAA almost faced liquidation in 1938.[43] In an effort to help Shapley, Morey proposed the idea that Shapley should serve as a paid editor of *Art Bulletin.* Up until this time, he had received no compensation for his efforts. Morey approached all of the journal's sustaining members, which were each giving $1,500, and asked each of them to recommit to *Art Bulletin* and to the idea of keeping Shapley on board as a paid editor. While most institutions were willing to support this idea, Chandler Post of Harvard was reluctant because the final editing of Harvard's issue in September 1937 had been quite poor. Illustrations had been accidentally interchanged, and sentences had been reworded such that the original meaning had changed considerably.[44] Morey explained

---

[42] Ibid., and Bloland and Bloland, *American Learned Societies in Transition,* 9-10. Cook's reference to "constituent institutions" is not clear. CAA's publications did not list institutional members; only institutions that (presumably) supported *Art Bulletin*.

[43] Audrey McMahon to Frederick Keppel, March 9, 1938, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folders 1–5: College Art Association, 1925–1953, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[44] The scholars Harvard chose to promote in its September 1937 issue of Art Bulletin included Edward L. Mills of Columbia University, Harold E. Wethey of Bryn Mawr College, S. A. Callisen of the University of Rochester, and A. M. G. Little of the Fogg Art Museum; see Paul J. Sachs to Audrey McMahon and John Shapley, n.d., Paul J. Sachs Papers, box 3, file "Art Bulletin [1935-

that the problem related to the fact that *Art Bulletin* had started to print the journal in the United States beginning with his issue, and Shapley had not edited the texts himself, but someone else in CAA's offices had done the job.[45] Although Post remained disgruntled, Harvard continued to give money, and perhaps as an incentive or as an acknowledgement, Post would be named to *Art Bulletin*'s new editorial board.

Although Shapley was in trouble and he was not officially a paid editor, he refused to acquiesce to the grievance committee in terms of following their nationalist doctrine. Beginning with the March 1939 issue, Shapley had largely reconceived the *Art Bulletin* Editorial Board. Although William M. Ivins, Fiske Kimball, Morey, and David M. Robinson remained from the previous long-standing editorial board, Shapley removed several others including Cook and Dinsmoor, who had signed the 1936 letter of discontent. In turn, Shapley added a number of prominent art historians from different fields, among them Alfred H. Barr, Ludwig Bachhofer, Bernard Berenson, Walter Friedländer, Herbert Kühn, A. Philip McMahon, and Arthur Pope. Although most of the old editorial board had been specialists in classical and medieval art, the new one was much more diverse covering modern, Asian, and more Renaissance art, as well as aesthetics. The trouble was that among the board members, Kühn was a German art historian living in Germany, and Bernard Berenson, although he was American, was an expatriate living in Italy.[46] Also in 1938 and 1939 foreigners continued to publish in *Art Bulletin.*

Such changes bothered Cook, and he made several moves to oust Shapley.

1943]," Harvard Art Museum Archives. For information on the editorial mistakes, see Audrey McMahon to Paul J. Sachs, October 20, 1937; Audrey McMahon to Paul J. Sachs, November 2, 1937; Harold E. Wethey to Mrs. Gilbert Lucas, October 31, 1937; Paul J. Sachs Papers, box 3, file "Art Bulletin [1935-1943]," Harvard Art Museum Archives.

[45] Chandler Post to Charles Rufus Morey, October 25, 1938; Charles Rufus Morey to Paul Sachs, October 27, 1938; Charles Rufus Morey to Chandler Post, October 27, 1938, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

[46] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 6, 1940.

Morey needed to find new sustaining institutions for *Art Bulletin* and approached Cook, asking that NYU commit similar funds. Cook and Morey had been friendly ever since Cook had studied with Morey at Princeton in the early 1920s. Ultimately, Cook was agreeable to helping *Art Bulletin* and Shapley. However, in a bit of political maneuvering, he took advantage of Morey. In December 1938, Cook encouraged Morey to increase the CAA board of directors from six to twelve members: "If six directors were added, I feel quite sure there would then be enough people to go out and finance the *Art Bulletin* . . . and put the whole thing on a sound business basis." Given that he was going to ask his school to support *Art Bulletin,* Cook proposed himself as a director. He also named Lawrence and Middeldorf as possible new directors. His rationale appeared to be all based on fundraising.[47] The addition of Cook to the board of directors was quite easy because NYU had been named the constituent institution in charge of the conference for 1939. By February 1939, Cook was named president of CAA and placed in charge of the conference.[48]

In July 1939, Cook wrote Morey again, explaining that he knew Shapley was up for a half-time job at Johns Hopkins. Cook added that he was quite pessimistic about Morey's plan to have Shapley remain editor of *Art Bulletin* because Shapley had been so "shiftless." Cook said he was willing to recommend Shapley for the job and hoped that Hopkins would hire him, which Cook explained to Morey "would let you out in this embarrassing situation trying to raise money to pay him [Shapley] to edit the *Art Bulletin.*"[49] In September 1939, Morey followed Cook's lead and proposed adding more members to CAA's board of directors. In addition to Avery, Blake-More Godwin,

---

[47] Walter W. S. Cook to Charles Rufus Morey, December 5, 1938, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[48] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, February 17, 1939, College Art Association.
[49] Walter W. S Cook to Charles Rufus Morey, July 30, 1939, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

McMahon, Morey, Sachs, Shapley, and Robinson, who were already serving on the board, Cook, Lawrence, and Middeldorf were added, as well as Rennselaer Lee of Northwestern University, Lester Longman of the University of Iowa, and Sumner McK. Crosby of Yale University.[50] The new directors showed a greater sense of geographic diversity, with half of them representing the Midwest.

Once Cook, Lawrence, and Avery were officially placed on the board, the three of them used the opportunity at the next meeting to reassert their initiatives to change the *Art Bulletin,* namely its editorial policies and governance. At the January 6, 1940, meeting, they submitted a letter that re-established their previous causes from more than three years ago:

> At the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association in April, 1936, a committee was appointed to submit suggestions to the Board of Directors concerning the *Art Bulletin.* This committee presented a list of suggestions in writing for the consideration of the Directors, but to our knowledge, little or no action was taken. Inasmuch as we feel that the *Art Bulletin* is one of the most important activities of the Association, we submit herewith a revised list of the recommendations submitted in April, 1936, upon which we request action at the business meeting of January 6, 1940.[51]

The letter was dated January 5, the day before the meeting, and therefore took the other members of the board of directors by surprise. Not only did the former grievance committee propose that the editor-in-chief be limited to a three-year term, but they suggested Meiss as the new editor. After the letter was read aloud, the board of directors chose to take a break, and Shapley, who had run the organization and the journal for the last twenty years, did not return. He knew a coup was in full swing, and his head was on the chopping block. Among the long-standing board members, Sachs and Morey returned to negotiate with the new directors.[52]

In what must have been a heated discussion, many concerns were discussed

---

[50] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, September 9, 1939, College Art Association.
[51] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 6, 1940.
[52] Ibid.

regarding not only *Art Bulletin,* but CAA in general*.* Avery explained that "the feeling of the Mid-west, West, and South is that they do not want to be dominated by the East." Cook said that *"Art Bulletin* was a mess and that *Parnassus* was almost as bad." He "strenuously objected" to having Kühn and Berenson on the *Art Bulletin* editorial board, stating that "the Board should consist of Americans from American institutions." Again, his nationalist sensibility seemed out of character for someone who had helped so many foreigners find work in the United States, but nevertheless he was adamant in his position.

Lawrence stated that CAA "had been dominated for a long time by two families, Mr. and Mrs. Shapley and Mrs. and Mrs. McMahon." Other stories arose about past scandalous editorial policies of *Art Bulletin.* Cook read a 1935 letter written by Fern Rusk Shapley. As the wife of John Shapley and a trained art historian with a Ph.D. from the University of Missouri, she had worked with her husband on the journal and sometimes took a salary if money was available.[53] She told two graduate students that *"Art Bulletin* was obliged to give preference to the institutions which contributed money for the publication." The grievance committee was obviously aware of *Art Bulletin*'s egregious editorial policies. Such a statement revealed that *Art Bulletin*, which had prided itself on no advertising for the sake of scholarly objectivity, was nevertheless indebted and beholden to its sustaining institutions. The journal was merely part of an economic network that was partial to the schools that supported it, reinforcing the academic status quo for such prestigious schools as Harvard, Princeton, and the University of Chicago, all of which were financial supporters of *Art Bulletin.*[54] One of the missions of the grievance committee had, therefore, been to abolish the editorial practice that allowed institutions to buy issues of *Art Bulletin.*

---

[53] Audrey McMahon to Paul J. Sachs, February 16, 1936, Paul J. Sachs Papers, box 3, file "Art Bulletin [1935-1943]," Harvard Art Museum Archives.
[54] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 6, 1940.

A substantial portion of the discussion related to the need to replace Shapley. Avery and Lawrence proposed Meiss as the new editor, despite the criticisms of Sachs and Morey, who stated that he was inexperienced. In an attempt to assuage the situation, Lee and Longman proposed that Shapley not be removed as editor for another year or two, so that a proper transition could take place. However, as the conversation transpired, Sachs and Morey finally acquiesced, responding that "it was time for the old timers to get out and leave the running of the Association to younger men." Longman expressed concern about Shapley's employment, but Cook responded that Shapley's job was not their affair. Such aggressive action demonstrated that CAA's members were determined to put new scholars in power. It was evident that the journal and the association needed to be run in a more egalitarian manner and a more concrete system of rules needed to put in place, in keeping with the proper governance of a national academic society.[55]

In the end, the grievance committee was able to achieve almost all of its objectives for *Art Bulletin.* Meiss was named editor-in-chief, and the position was restricted to a three-year term, renewable once, so that no one person would have control of the journal for too long. In the March 1940 issue, a short acknowledgment of Shapley's service and that of the first editorial board was mentioned. Shapley was then placed in charge of *Parnassus,* but only for a brief time. One of the first initiatives that Cook and Lawrence proposed was that the association return to using the name *College Art Association of America* for all its projects. Although the words *of America* had been officially dropped nine years earlier, the new board of directors wanted the organization to identify itself as a national association.[56] As World War II raged on, the contributions to *Art Bulletin* from foreigners living in Europe diminished almost completely, although

---

[55] Ibid.
[56] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, May 12, 1940.

some of the European immigrants who were not necessarily associated with U.S. institutions succeeded in publishing articles.[57] In some ways the accomplishments of the grievance committee are difficult to characterize: from today's perspective their actions and motivations seem almost contradictory. On one level, they were much more egalitarian in terms of advocating a system of changing governance for the board of directors and a changing editorship of *Art Bulletin*. On another level, they seemed xenophobic, restricting the publishing opportunities of foreigners including European émigrés who were not affiliated with U.S. institutions. Yet the new board of directors accepted many of the European émigrés who were affiliated with U.S. institutions.

In the March 1940 issue the new editorial board epitomized the very synthesis of U.S. and European art history. Although Shapley had reconceived the board a year earlier, Meiss expanded the board from twelve to twenty members who represented a wider spectrum of fields in art history than those of the previous editorial board.[58] Among the previous board members, Barr, Robinson, and Kimball were retained, presumably for their expertise in their respective areas of study and to maintain a sense of continuity. Kühn and Berenson were removed, following Cook's mandate. Interestingly, significant newcomers included several German immigrants: Ettinghausen, Friedländer, Held, Krautheimer, and Stechow, all of whom were affiliated with U.S. institutions. The architectural historian Henry-Russell Hitchcock was also listed as board member. In addition, two women were named: Dorothy Miner of the Walters Art Gallery and Sirarpie Der Neresessian of Wellesley College. Lastly, the editorial board also reflected a somewhat broader geographic distribution, with five of the twenty working for institutions

---

[57] Hans Tietze and Erica Tietze-Conrat published several articles. In 1938 they worked for the Toledo Museum of Art, but then came to New York and were not affiliated with any one institution, writing for various catalogues and journals; see Eisler, "*Kunstgeschichte* American Style," 579.
[58] In 1935, Shapley himself had wanted to reconfigure the editorial board because he wanted more active members. Minutes of the CAA Special Officers and Directors Meeting, December 27, 1935, College Art Association.

in the Midwest. The new editorial board members were expected to review submissions within their specialized areas of study and "to make recommendations as to their acceptance, revision, or rejection."[59] The year 1940 therefore marked the first time *Art Bulletin* explicitly adopted the editorial policy of being a peer-review journal, reflecting the policies of most other academic societies. Also, after Meiss completed his first issue, he stated that contributors from sustaining institutions were no longer favored in the acceptance of articles, and the policy of buying issues to promote one's institution seemed to have vanished.[60]

Regarding the content of *Art Bulletin*, it was decided that the features should cover a wider range of art-historical fields and that the scholarship should differ from that found in the *American Journal of Archaeology*. As a result, fewer submissions were to be accepted in ancient art unless an article also addressed later periods in art or was significant for the art historian in terms of its content or method.[61] In the early 1940s the most noticeable shift in the content of *Art Bulletin* was not only that the Renaissance began to dominate the other fields, even medieval art, but that many of these articles had been written by European émigrés. In fact, although they might have received a somewhat lukewarm reception in the United States, their influence clearly had an impact on the journal and art history in general. Also the influence of the Europeans would create a new generation of U.S. scholars in the 1940s, and such articles as Lee's *"Ut Pictura Poesis:* The Humanistic Theory of Painting," which engaged theoretical issues and acknowledged the advice of Panofsky, would be published in the December 1940 issue of *Art Bulletin*. In addition, scholarly articles that covered topics in modern art were particularly encouraged, and James Johnson Sweeney published "Picasso and Iberian Sculpture" in September 1941.

---

[59] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, May 12, 1940.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Millard Meiss, "The Art Bulletin at Fifty," *Art Bulletin* 46 (March 1964): 3.

By the late 1930s and early 1940s, *Art Bulletin,* and by extension U.S. art history, was transformed rapidly and radically, changing from a provincial operation to an international enterprise. As a result of several factors including the European exodus, new approaches in art history were being established, from iconology to Marxism, and the discipline was no longer in its infancy. Some blood was shed in the process, and no one looked completely good in the story. Given the xenophobia and the specter of anti-Semitism, the process was by no means "smooth and successful" or even "intellectually frictionless," as Christopher A. Wood recently described it.[62] But *Art Bulletin* would nevertheless become "the world's leading art-history periodical," that is, if we follow the claim of *Grove Art Online*.[63] At the time *The Art Quarterly,* which began publication in 1938, served as *Art Bulletin*'s biggest competitor in the United States. Edited by the art historian W. R. Valentiner, who had originally started *Art in America, Art Quarterly* had a broader perspective than *Art Bulletin,* including many more articles on American art. Also, *Art Quarterly* published more European émigrés. However, *Art Quarterly* ceased publication in 1974, and *Art Bulletin,* because it was published and distributed by a national academic society, would have a greater influence on the discipline.

In the early 1940s CAA's board of directors also established several significant initiatives for art historians. Although many of the new board members seemed to demonstrate a sense of xenophobia, the lecture bureau was expanded to include a job placement bureau in 1942, so that scholars, including refugees, might find employment. CAA also expanded its publications program in 1944 to include a monograph series, which was co-published with the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) and called Studies in Art and Archaeology.[64] Many articles submitted to *Art Bulletin* were quite lengthy, some of them numbering over one hundred pages. For example, Meyer

---

[62] C. Wood, "Art History's Normative Renaissance," 66.
[63] Kirby, "Periodical §II: Historical survey."
[64] Minutes of CAA board of directors, October 6, 1945, College Art Association.

Schapiro's "The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac," which I discussed in chapter 3, had to be published in two issues (September 1931 and December 1931) and was later printed as a separate book. However, as a result of CAA's evaluation of its publishing program in the late 1930s, it was decided that the journal should strive to strike a balance between long and short articles, and only one long article could be printed per year in *Art Bulletin*. Within the standards of publishing, these lengthy texts did not seem to fit the definition of either an article or a book, but existed as something in between. In an effort to promote this type of scholarship, which might not otherwise be published, CAA's monograph series was established.[65]

Although CAA's new board of directors of the 1940s would be able to chart new positive directions for the association, the problem of institutional politics would continue to plague the organization, and the art historians would wage a war with the artist members in the early 1940s, changing both the nature of CAA and studio art education in one blow.

The Old Boys' Network Again

But what about those "old timers"? Shapley was gone, and with him went most of his cronies. He had tried to manage too much, and all his initiatives that attempted to address the diverse constituency of CAA were too difficult to finance in an ongoing depression. After the January 6, 1940, meeting, Sachs and Morey, as well as other long-standing board members including Godwin and McMahon, submitted their resignations.

[65] Minutes of CAA board of directors, January 29, 1944, College Art Association. The first monograph was published in 1944. Titled the *Flabellum of Tournos,* the text was written by a non-Jewish, Czechoslovakian-born immigrant named Lorenz Eitner. While attending Duke University as an undergraduate, he "wrote a somewhat positive account of his experiences in Hitler's Germany for the school literary magazine." After World War II, he received his Ph.D. from Princeton and eventually ran the Department of Art and Architecture of Stanford University in California; see "Eitner, Lorenz," *Dictionary of Art Historians,* accessed October 20, 2010, http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/eitnerl.htm.

Morey told Shapley that he "did not like the way it was done."[66] McMahon explained that after the meeting they looked like "masons coming back from a funeral."[67] He added:

> It is tragic, after so much self-sacrificing time and money has been put into it, that the Association should come to this pass. But the advancement of scholarship in the Fine Arts in this country, which was the reason I believed to justify the time I gave the Association, would not be furthered by my continued membership on the board and I thought it better to resign before I was dismissed.[68]

The old boys were out, and the younger boys and girls moved in. After a couple of years Morey and Sachs were invited back as honorary directors of CAA. While Sachs declined, Morey leaped at the chance.[69] Having devoted so much of his time to founding CAA and establishing *Art Bulletin*, he still wanted to be involved.

And what about Panofsky? And his overtly positive depiction of the 1930s in "Three Decades of Art History in the United States"? Panofsky championed the early efforts of the first editorial board members of *Art Bulletin* and even labeled the work of this generation as the "Golden Age" of art history. He stressed their innovation and their expertise. He went to great lengths to congratulate these old timers and discussed all the "spiritual blessings" that the United States had to offer the European émigrés, to the extent that he blinded himself to the anti-Semitism and nationalism that he and his fellow immigrants had encountered. In some respects his essay reads like an elaborate thank-you note to this generation of art historians who saved him and his European colleagues. But did Panofsky know about *Art Bulletin*'s editorial practices? Was he aware that Cook, the man whom he touted so highly for helping so many refugees, was

---

[66] Charles Rufus Morey to John Shapley, January 8, 1940, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[67] A. Philip McMahon to Charles Rufus Morey, January 14, 1940, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Walter W. S. Cook to Charles Rufus Morey, February 4, 1943, Department of Art and Archaeology Records, box 3, College Art Association file, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

quite nationalistic, even perhaps xenophobic? How would Panofsky be able to reconcile such a contradictory behavior pattern?

Over and over again Panofsky went to great lengths to discuss “the providential synchronism between the rise of Fascism and Nazism in Europe and the spontaneous efflorescence of the history of art in the United States.”[70] Much of his mission seemed to be that of an ambassador trying to unite two groups, the U.S. art historians who seemed intimidated by their foreign counterparts, and the European émigrés who in their need to adapt to a new environment had to confront and submit to a more practical and less theoretical form of art history. He appeared to be assuaging the fears of both the U.S. art historians and the European émigrés. In “The History of Art as a Humanistic Discipline,” Panofsky focused on unions within the practice of art history. He united the seemingly factional divisions between connoisseurship and art history, as well as art theory and art history. He saw each pairing as happily united, working in tandem together, one enhancing the other. Yet, as I explained in chapter 4, numerous compromises were made in these seemingly happy unions, especially on the part of the European émigrés. As much as art history in the 1930s advanced in this country, becoming more multidimensional and addressing more social issues, it still followed the previous status quo. Art history was allowed to continue, to varying extents, as it had in the past. Theory was abandoned for the sake of maintaining an archaeological exactitude along with formalism and iconography. For better or worse, a standard was set for art history by the end of the 1930s, and in the process CAA and *Art Bulletin* developed new standards as well. The association and the journal would serve as the gatekeeper for art history, endorsing and celebrating scholars who followed the course.

In the 1950s a few of the old editorial board members would receive their ultimate form of legitimation and praise. In 1952, one year before Panofsky wrote his

---

[70] Panofsky, “Three Decades of Art History,” 16.

laudatory essay "Three Decades of Art History in the United States," Creighton Gilbert, who would later become editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin* in the 1980s, wrote a letter to CAA's board of directors, encouraging them to present annual awards, as other academic societies did. He suggested that one prize should be given for art criticism that had been published in a column or series of essays in a newspaper or periodical and the other for art-historical scholarship published in the form of a book.[71] His suggestions were "warmly approved," and as the discussion continued over the next two years, it was decided that the first award would be named after Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., while the other award was referred to as the Award for Art Historical Scholarship.[72] In 1955, Morey served as the chair of the committee for the latter, and the award was presented to Panofsky for his book *Early Netherlandish Painting*.[73] The old boys' network was therefore still in play in the 1950s. In 1953, Panofsky had written his essay congratulating U.S. scholars for their contributions to art history, and he in turn was congratulated for his book in 1955. And the circle of legitimation continued from there: in 1956, this Award for Art Historical Scholarship was renamed the Charles Rufus Morey Award, and a third award was created in honor of Arthur Kingsley Porter for the best article to have appeared in the previous year in *Art Bulletin* by a scholar under the age of 35.[74] These men who had served on *Art Bulletin*'s first editorial board and worked so hard to advance the field of art history in the United States had finally established their position as the "founding fathers" of U.S. art history, as Panofsky had proclaimed, and their legacy in the field of art history was thus preserved.

---

[71] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, May 4, 1952, College Art Association.
[72] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 27, 1954, College Art Association.
[73] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, January 26, 1955, College Art Association.
[74] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, October 26, 1956, College Art Association.

PART 3

CAA'S SECOND JOURNAL AND THE DEMISE OF STUDIO ART EDUCATION

CHAPTER 6

PARNASSUS AND *COLLEGE ART JOURNAL:*

THE QUIETING AND DISQUIETING OF STUDIO ART EDUCATION

Although chapter 1 addressed mostly studio art education, the rest of this dissertation has otherwise focused largely on art history. In my discussion I have alluded to battles within CAA between artist-teachers and art historians, but I have not provided substantive evidence of any such battle, meaning a fight *back and forth* between the artists and art historians. In chapter 2, I explained that the artist-teacher's voice, which had been so loud in the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* during the 1910s and even in *Art Bulletin* in the early 1920s, had disappeared by the mid-1920s, when the art historians began to use the journal solely for their own purposes; this, I argued, represented a defeat for the artists. From then on, their voices and their concerns went largely missing from CAA in its publications program, as well as the annual conference, but I found no record of any retort from the artists. The result was that the program for studio art education changed in the college and university. Although the artist-teacher in the 1910s had strived to make innovations encouraging the incorporation of both fine and industrial art within the curriculum of higher education, studio art education by the mid-1920s tended to be subservient to the needs of the art historian, being treated as a tool to help the art historian learn the technical practices of the old masters.[1] However, the artist would return to CAA in the early 1930s, and the friction between the artists and art historians would grow throughout the decade. In the process CAA's publications program would once again play a factor in the disputes.

In the winter of 1928-29, CAA began to produce a second journal titled *Parnassus.* If *Art Bulletin* represented the "official organ" or primary journal of CAA,

[1] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 24; and Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 15-16.

Parnassus might be labeled CAA's secondary periodical simply because it had less clout, less money, and fewer pages. While *Art Bulletin* was committed to art history and remained steadfast in that purpose, CAA's secondary journal was much broader in scope. Its mission, unlike that of *Art Bulletin*, was supposed to cater to the diverse needs of CAA's membership at large, not only the art historian, but the artist, critic, museum professional, and numerous others working or interested in the visual arts. In this capacity, CAA's second journal was much more vulnerable to the changing whims of the board of directors and the membership at large.

Parnassus and the Return of the Artist Members

No records are available regarding the inception of *Parnassus*. The title was presumably chosen as a reference to Mount Parnassus, the mythological home of the muses. In the first issue, the journal billed itself as a publication of "news and topical value devoted largely to art activities in Europe and edited by authorities in the field."[2] In some respects *Parnassus* initially reflected CAA's general desire to become more international in the late 1920s, and most of its contributing editors were affiliated with museums, schools, and journals throughout Europe.[3]

In the first issue of *Parnassus*, the activities of France, Italy, the Soviet Union, and England were covered. Among the reports, Theodor Schmit's "The Study of Art in the U.S.S.R. (1917-1928)" was by far the most comprehensive and the most political. Schmit, who was the director of Leningrad's Institute for the History of the Fine Arts,

---

[2] *Parnassus* 1, no. 1 (January 1929): 12.

[3] The contributing editors were listed as follows, with some of the spellings reflecting at times an Anglicization of the names of the individuals and their institutions: Abraham Efros, Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow; Joaquin Folch i Torres, Junta de Museos, Barcelona; Heinrich Gluck, Oesterreichisches Museum, Vienna; Roger Hinks, British Museum, London; August L. Mayer, Alte Pinakothek, Munich; Louis Reau, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts,* Paris; Theodor Schmit, Institute of Art History, Leningrad; and A. W. VanBuren, American Academy, Rome. In addition to these Europeans, A. Philip McMahon and Walter W. S. Cook of New York University were listed as contributing editors. This list of contributing editors disappeared by the October 1929 issue.

provided an overview of activities in pre- and postrevolutionary Russia. The new socialist government had reorganized the old support systems for the study of art and art history. The Imperial Archaeological Commission, for example, had become the Academy for the History of Material Culture, and new organizations, such as his own, had been established. In general, Schmit painted a deliberately positive picture of the Soviet Union and implied that his country had a stronger infrastructure to aid the study of the visual arts than did the United States. Because the Soviet Union had been largely isolated since its revolution, Schmit felt that his general summary was necessary for U.S. scholars before they could fully understand the radical artistic activities of the Soviet Union.[4]

While the next issue of *Parnassus* included an article on avant-garde Soviet theater, featuring a stage set by Isaac Rabinowitz of the Jewish State Theater in Moscow, *Parnassus* was by no means dedicated to contemporary art.[5] Within its first year, the journal's initial purpose began to grow and expand beyond its Eurocentric focus. In the second issue the original intention was no longer stated, and by the third issue the lead article addressed art activities in New York. In general, the journal was eclectic, publishing short articles covering a wide range of periods and regions in the visual arts. A special section was devoted to the art market each month, and news for CAA members was published including information on the annual conference. In some instances, the breadth of *Parnassus* seemed to make up for the narrow focus of *Art Bulletin*. Although the latter was largely devoted to medieval art, *Parnassus* concentrated on the very areas that *Art Bulletin* seemed to overlook, especially modern, American, and Asian art. Perhaps as a means to differentiate itself further from *Art Bulletin*,

---

[4] Theodor Schmit, "The Study of Art in the U.S.S.R. (1917-1928)," *Parnassus* 1, no. 1 (January 1929): 9-10.
[5] Abram Efros, "The Russian Theatre and Its Artists since the Revolution," *Parnassus* 1, no. 2 (February 15, 1929): 6-9.

Parnassus covered very little medieval art. Another difference was that *Parnassus* had to support itself with advertisements: galleries and book dealers, as well as restaurants and even a hotel, promoted themselves in the periodical. The distinctions between the two journals were therefore clearly established.

As *Parnassus* changed its editorial focus, a new group of contributing editors was put in place as early as October 1931. The newcomers, all of whom were Americans, included Frances Henry Taylor, the director of the Worcester Art Museum; and Horace H. F. Jayne, one of the editors of *Eastern Art.*[6] But the driving force behind *Parnassus* was Audrey McMahon, CAA's executive secretary. She was responsible for the publication, given that it served as the members' magazine; and her husband, A. Philip McMahon, who was on CAA's board of directors, wrote the entire book review section each month.

Because *Parnassus* was largely a house organ for CAA, Audrey McMahon occasionally reported on projects that related, sometimes indirectly, to her role as executive secretary. In a 1933 essay "May the Artist Live?" McMahon expressed her heartfelt concern about the effects of the Great Depression on artists. She explained that CAA had petitioned the Gibson Committee's Emergency Work and Relief Bureau of New York City in 1932 to create jobs for artists.[7] Murals and other types of projects had been created for nonprofit institutions, with the latter covering the costs of the materials, and the Gibson Committee paying the artists' wages. Some fifteen schools, churches, and community houses had benefited from CAA's efforts.[8] In addition, CAA sponsored art

---

[6] Other contributing editors were Virginia Nirdlinger and Katherine Grant Sterne.
[7] In August 1931 Harvey D. Gibson, who was president of Manufacturers' Trust Company, founded the Gibson Committee, which took over the Emergency Relief Bureau, renaming it the Emergency Work and Relief Bureau; see John David Millett, *The Works Progress Administration in New York City* (Chicago: Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council by Public Administration Service, 1938), 5-6.
[8] Audrey McMahon, "May the Artist Live?" *Parnassus* 5, no. 5 (October 1933): 1-4.

classes at more than fifty community houses and boys' clubs in the New York area.[9] According to McMahon's assistant, Mildred Constantine, the Gibson Committee had no offices at the time, so CAA's office space was used to interview and classify artists for various types of work.[10] This information was also used by other agencies including the Public Works of Art Project and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.[11] Although John Shapley as president of CAA was supportive of McMahon's initiatives, Constantine said that many others on CAA's board of directors were generally not. McMahon nevertheless continued in her dual roles with CAA and the Gibson Committee, as well as other projects. As a result of McMahon's efforts, the artist members began to return to CAA in the early 1930s.[12]

Although several other articles addressed the troubled U.S. economy for the struggling artist, *Parnassus* was generally quite international in the mid-1930s. For example, at least one issue per year was dedicated to Asian art and edited by Jayne, who had already lost his other journal, *Eastern Art,* due to lack of funding. This international sensibility was also reflected in CAA's exhibition program, another project that McMahon managed. The shows that were featured and advertised in *Parnassus* revealed a wide spectrum in the arts: *Japanese Sword Furniture, Miro and the Surrealists,* and *Soviet Russia.*[13] However, the latter garnered criticism from one of CAA's funders, specifically Helen Clay Frick. She wrote Shapley that she had been asked to patron the exhibition and stated:

> I wish to express my surprise that an institution such as yours should sponsor anything emanating from a communistic source.

---

[9] Forbes Watson, "Art and the Government in 1934," *Parnassus* 6, no. 8 (January 1935): 16.
[10] Mildred Constantine, interview with Harlan Phillips, October 14, 1965, Smithsonian Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.
[11] Watson, "Art and the Government in 1934," 16.
[12] Constantine, interview with Phillips, October 14, 1965.
[13] John G. Frey, "Miro and the Surrealists," *Parnassus* 8, no. 5 (October 1936): 13-15; Robert Hamilton Rucker, "Japanese Sword Furniture," *Parnassus* 7, no. 7 (December 1935): 21-23; and advertisement for *Contemporary Art of Soviet Russia, Parnassus* 8, no. 6 (November 1936): 34.

> I feel so strongly about this matter, that I wish to make it clear that if the College Art Association has any affiliations with communistic agencies, I will never have anything more to do with it, directly or indirectly.[14]

Although CAA held the show at the Squibb Galleries in New York in 1936, it is difficult to judge the effects of Frick's threat. The Frick Art Reference Library had been a sustaining institution for CAA's publications program in the 1920s and early 1930s, and its name had been dropped from the list of funders earlier in 1936. The reason was that the Frick, like many of the other sustaining institutions, had stopped giving money as a result of the poor economy.[15] However, in 1939 the Frick hosted sessions for CAA's annual conference when it took place in New York, so ties were not completely severed.

Although CAA might have suffered from criticism now and again for its international and sometimes liberal programming, the association wanted on some level to reach an audience outside the realm of academic art history. *Parnassus,* which was offered as a benefit of membership or by subscription, was successful to the extent that it ended up drawing half the membership of CAA.[16] *Parnassus* was therefore by no means an esoteric art magazine, given that many of CAA's projects in the 1930s addressed socioeconomic and political issues. However, the journal suffered from comparisons with other art magazines. When Shapely had tried to secure funding from the Carnegie Corporation to distribute *Parnassus,* his idea was quickly dismissed because the publication was considered too similar to the American Federation of Art's *American Magazine of Art*.[17] In fact, at the time many of the art magazines, including *Art*

---

[14] Helen Clay Frick to John Shapley, November 10, 1936, College Art Association, Correspondence, Frick Art Reference Library, New York. The exhibition *Soviet Russia* was November 12-16, 1936, in Squibb Galleries.
[15] E. B. Smith to Keppel, December 17, 1934, Carnegie Corporation.
[16] Frederick Keppel, memorandum of interview with Keppel and Blake-More Godwin, September 30, 1935, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folders 1–5: College Art Association, 1925–1953, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[17] John Shapley to Frederick Keppel, April 25, 1929; and Frederick Keppel to Andrew Wright Crawford, June 7, 1929, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records,

News and *Art Digest,* were all quite similar. The desire to cover a wide expanse of art activities seemed paramount in the field: each of the periodicals needed a large enough constituency to sustain publication and therefore remained general in scope.

Parnassus: **A Makeover**

In the early 1940s, major changes occurred within CAA's governance and publications program, already discussed at length in chapter 5. The outcome of the discussions resulted in Shapley's being placed in charge of *Parnassus* in October 1939 and soon thereafter being deposed of his editorship of *Art Bulletin.* McMahon, who had already left her position as CAA's executive secretary to become the regional director of the Works Progress Administration, was still editing *Parnassus* and was named consulting editor of *Parnassus*. In all the ensuing discussions, the only complaint directed specifically at *Parnassus* was that Audrey McMahon and A. Philip McMahon seemed to have been in control of the latter publication for too long.[18] Another related concern, although not stated explicitly against *Parnassus*, was that many CAA members felt that the organization tended to favor the Northeast too much.

Amid all the change in the CAA's publications program, most board members thought that CAA would simply expunge *Parnassus,* the reason being that Shapley, not CAA, officially owned the publication, and he was resigning altogether from the association. However, Lester D. Longman of the University of Iowa proposed a substantial makeover for *Parnassus*. He sat on CAA's board of directors and had been involved in the restructuring of *Art Bulletin.* He was also involved with the Midwestern College Art Conference, which had been established to address the specific needs of

---

1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folders 1–5: College Art Association, 1925–1953, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[18] Minutes of CAA board of directors, January 6, 1940. Although Shapley had named himself editor of *Parnassus* in the October 1939 issue, the change of title was not made official until January 1940.

the region. Although he was a trained art historian with a Ph.D. from Princeton University and had written on early Christian art, he was also interested in contemporary art. As a means of helping the association reach out to more members, Longman proposed a makeover for *Parnassus*. He explained that "the College Art Association needs an organ which will give it unity and can serve as a ready means of propaganda. It should be a magazine which would assist in increasing the membership and supporting the regional associations, and in making the College Art Association genuinely national in scope." He added that the new journal "might carry short articles written by college art teachers on problems of art education."[19] In many respects, his proposal directly reflected the needs of CAA and its members, especially the artist-teachers and those outside the Northeast. As a result, Longman replaced Shapley as editor, and the new *Parnassus* was released in October 1940.

In this first issue, Ulrich Middeldorf, CAA's president and a professor at the University of Chicago, acknowledged that the organization needed to recognize the diversity of its membership, so that it might become "the common meeting ground for all art teachers, both scholars and art teachers, and all those interested in art in higher education, for thus it was originally designed." He stated that the new journal would engage "questions on art criticism and art education with which we all have to struggle in our daily teaching, and will provide the news and comment which will bind us together." Middeldorf also commented on CAA's desire to engage all regions of the United States (and Canada), not only the East Coast.[20] Serving as the vehicle for all these causes, the new *Parnassus* focused more specifically on modern and contemporary art, studio techniques, college art departments and art schools around the country, as well as art faculties and exceptional students. The editorial board was composed of fourteen

---

[19] Lester D. Longman, minutes of CAA board of directors, 1940. No specific date is given.
[20] Ulrich Middeldorf, statement, *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 3.

eminent scholars from all over the country including Walter W. S. Cook of New York University; Lamar Dodd of the University of Georgia, Athens; Stephen C. Pepper of the University of California, Berkeley; Agnes Rindge of Vassar College; and H. W. Janson of the University of Iowa, who was the book reviewer.[21] The geographic diversity of *Parnassus*'s editorial board signified a more democratic board than that of *Art Bulletin,* which was typically composed of individuals from elite institutions.

In his first editor's statement, Longman was more explicit than Middeldorf about the changes within the journal, stating that it would no longer be "a heterogeneous series of papers on various phases of art history," but would serve to become "an educational magazine fighting for good art, good scholarship, and good teaching."[22] As a result, the look of the journal changed considerably. Many images showed artists at work in their studios or teaching in classrooms, in addition to reproductions of work by the teachers and their students. Also, such techniques as lithography and woodworking were demonstrated in step-by-step processes. In eleven years *Parnassus* had moved radically away from its initial Eurocentric focus to a much more nationalist perspective, concentrating on art criticism, pedagogy, and technical issues.

In fact, the new *Parnassus* was adamant about improving the visual arts and art education in the United States. In the second part of his first editorial titled "Better American Art," Longman argued that America's taste was too conservative, favoring illustration over art. He saw 1940 as a pivotal time for art in the United States and cautioned Americans who disliked Hitler and Stalin for their politics but liked the reactionary "propagandistic drivel" they promoted as art in their respective countries.

---

[21] Other editorial board members included Middeldorf, as well as John Alford, University of Toronto; Amy W. McLellan, University of Southern California, Los Angeles; Jane Martin, Newcomb College, New Orleans; Paul Parker, Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center; Frank J. Roos, Jr., Ohio State University, Columbus; William S. Rush, Wells College, Aurora, New York; Esther Isabel Seaver, Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts; and Harold Wethey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
[22] Lester D. Longman, "The New *Parnassus*," *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 4.

Longman singled out the American Regionalist painter Thomas Hart Benton as an artist who understood the current situation in the visual arts all too well. According to Longman, Benton had been "a popular illustrator" and had improved his painting in due course, but Longman also felt that even Benton needed "to protest aloud with brush and voice" much more strongly. To promote a "better American art," Longman encouraged Benton and others to "give up advertising" and "paint to suit his [their] conscience." Given Longman's condemnation of illustration, one might have expected that his text would ultimately champion the cause of abstraction, which in the 1930s had met its demise in favor of the figurative work of the Regionalist and American Scene painting. However, from today's perspective, Longman's arguments may seem somewhat arbitrary, given that he named Aaron Bohrod and Alexander Brook as the leaders of his pursuit.[23] Both artists had been singled out publicly for their work just before Longman wrote his editorial. Bohrod had been featured earlier in the year in an article as one of *Parnassus*'s Contemporary American Artists. Categorized in the realm of Regionalism, his subject matter included still lifes, cityscapes, landscapes, and figures. Brook, who was an American Scene painter, was best known for his figurative paintings. He had been involved in the Whitney Studio Club in the mid-1920s and had received first prize for one of his paintings at the 1939 Carnegie International exhibition.[24]

The new *Parnassus* was also interested in creating a forum for discussion, stating its desire to publish letters to the editor, so that members might help shape the content. Most of the twenty-eight letters in the November 1940 issue congratulated

---

[23] Lester D. Longman, "Better American Art," *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 5. Longman would develop much more critical views of Regionalist painting. He and Janson had difficulties with Grant Wood at the University of Iowa. As a Regionalist painter, Wood detested European modern art. After Janson took his class to see a Picasso show in Chicago in 1939, Grant succeeded in having Janson fired in the middle of the semester. Longman succeeded in restoring Janson's position. Although neither Janson nor Longman wrote about Wood's work in *Parnassus*, they would later equate Wood's work with fascism; see Wanda Corn, *Grant Wood: The Regionalist Vision* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983), 59.

[24] See "Alexander Brook (1898-1980)," *New Georgia Encyclopedia*, accessed September 25, 2008, http://georgizencyclopedia.org/nge/Article.jsp?id=h-3435.

Longman on the way in which he had revamped *Parnassus*. The artist Stuart Davis, whose work fell more in the domain of cubism and abstraction, commented that the journal "seemed to be the authentic voice of the new generation in art education on a national scale. Your editorial on American art is challenging and provocative and I hope you keep up this live approach."[25] However, Davis's praise for Longman's criticism might have been motivated by his intense dislike of Benton. In 1935 the latter, who had been living in New York since 1912, had moved back to his native Missouri and had become highly outspoken against abstraction and the New York art scene.[26]

Among the rest of the letters, only two dissented. T. J. Damon was critical of *Parnassus*'s "fighting for good art" and Longman's choices because his criteria for such a discussion were highly subjective. Meyer Schapiro wrote a flippant comment that *Parnassus* "once looked like a dealer's organ, now it seems to be a students' monthly." In the same issue, Longman replied to the latter's criticism, using the opportunity to differentiate the missions of the *Parnassus* and *Art Bulletin.* He stated that "the new *Parnassus* is of less value to mature scholars of the history of art and to specialists in the various phases of archeology than it is to art teachers as a whole. On the other hand, we feel that the old *Parnassus* was also of little value to advanced scholars, to whom *The Art Bulletin* rather than *Parnassus* is addressed."[27] The new *Parnassus* was therefore quite different from the old one. Although they were both conceived to be different from *Art Bulletin* and meet the needs of CAA's more diverse membership, the old *Parnassus* was eclectic and international, engaging at times with socioeconomic issues, while the new version focused more specifically on the teaching and criticism of art produced in the United States.

---

[25] Stuart Davis, letter to the editor, *Parnassus* 12, no. 1 (November 1940): 2.
[26] Justin Wolff, "The Politics of American Modernism," in *Art in America: 300 Years of Innovation,* ed. Susan Davidson (New York: Guggenheim Museum, 2007), 205-6.
[27] Meyer Schapiro, letter to the editor, *Parnassus* 12, no. 1 (November 1940): 2.

Although Longman's version of *Parnassus* met with the general acceptance of CAA's constituents, some members of the board of directors who represented the voices of *Art Bulletin* and the professionalization of art history eventually voiced their disapproval of *Parnassus*. The board of directors had been recently reconfigured because Shapley and so many of his fellow board members had resigned in January 1940. Among those who had stayed on the board were Myrtilla Avery of Wellesley College, Cook, Sumner McKnight Crosby of Yale University, Marion Lawrence of Barnard College, Rensselaer Lee of Smith College, Longman, and David M. Robinson of Johns Hopkins. New appointees included John Alford of the University of Toronto, Grace McCann Morley of the San Francisco Museum, Erwin Panofsky of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, and Agnes Ringe of Vassar College. With the changing of the guard, the organization appeared to be run in a much more egalitarian manner. While most of the board members still worked in the Northeast, a few members represented other areas of the country. Also more women were included, and Avery served as vice-president of CAA. In addition, board members were now serving specific term limits as opposed to staying on the board in perpetuity as they had in the past. However, the new system was perhaps not much better: although board members had to leave after they served four consecutive years, they could be re-elected one year later and start the process again.[28] The election process was also somewhat nebulous, even to the CAA's members: individuals seemed to be elected by the board of directors itself, which made it a closed network once again.[29]

---

[28] Sumner McKnight Crosby, "Current Policy and Activities of the College Art Association," *College Art Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1942): 116.

[29] In a letter to the editor of 1942, William Sener Rusk of Wells College in New York applauded the more democratic initiatives of the board of directors, but he also said that "the new, democratic method of electing directors should be made clear"; see Rusk, "Letter to the Editor," *College Art Journal* 2, no. 1 (November 1942): 25.

The new board members brought financial stability to CAA and *Art Bulletin* because they were able to convince their institutions to become sustaining and contributing institutions of the journal. However, many of these board members seemed to have an agenda, namely they wanted CAA to become a fully recognized learned society and no longer be seen as an organization for educators. The new *Parnassus,* which was dedicated to art education, was therefore perceived as a potential threat to CAA as an academic society. Among the new board members, Panofsky was the one who initiated the process that would eventually lead to the suppression of *Parnassus.* On December 6, 1940, Panofsky wrote Lee, then secretary of CAA, a long diatribe against *Parnassus* and the mission of CAA in general:

> I do not overlook that the C.A.A., as constituted at present, is not a Learned Society but has to run with the hare of scholarship and to hunt with the hounds of the supposedly more vital interests which are focused on problems of practical instruction, appreciation of “Living Art,” current news and technical equipment. It is for this reason that the C.A.A. publishes two periodicals which are supposed to cover these two different fields. However, as long as this dual nature of the C.A.A. continues to exist and to be expressed by two different periodicals, neither of these should be conducted in such a way as to compromise the character of the organization as a whole. In my opinion, the new *Parnassus* does precisely this and I regret to say even more so than the old one.[30]

Panofsky’s words, which accurately saw CAA as divided among its two main constituents—the art historian versus the artist-teacher—clearly felt that the new *Parnassus* reflected poorly upon CAA as a learned society, and the rest of his letter criticized everything about the periodical from its scholarship to its typography. At a CAA board of directors meeting on March 15, 1941, a heated discussion ensued regarding *Parnassus* and the mission of CAA: was CAA an organization for art historians or educators? Given that almost all the members of board of directors were art historians, and they had been appointed and/or elected by each other, the question seemed rhetorical at best. McMahon, who had championed artists’ concerns, was gone, and so

---

[30] Erwin Panofsky to Rensselaer Lee, December 6, 1940, Erwin Panofsky Papers, Smithsonian Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

was Shapley, who had supported many of the earlier initiatives for artists. The discussion therefore seemed very weighted, with Longman on one side and the majority of the board members on the other. Finally, Panofsky took control of the discussion. According to the minutes, he stated:

> the Association was first art historians and humanists. The Association was not an institution to try to educate people. It was an organization of art historians in relation to colleges. Mr. Panofsky indicated that the second publication of the Association should be an expression of its interest in the life of the colleges. He proposed to abolish Parnassus as extant and replace it by a College Art Association quarterly, which would convey information of interest to students and professors. . . . It should not duplicate the Art Bulletin or compete with such periodicals as the Art News, Art Digest, etc.[31]

Many of Panofsky's remarks were, quite simply, biased and wrong. Although he was a historian who prided himself on the importance of accurate research, his words demonstrated a lack of knowledge regarding the inception of CAA. The association had been founded by artist-teachers of the Western Drawing and Manual Training Association and the Eastern Art and Manual Training Teachers' Association, and much of CAA's focus, especially in its early years, had been to improve the teaching of art at the college level and to secure for art teaching the same academic recognition that was accorded to other subjects. Nevertheless, the board terminated *Parnassus.*

In the final issue dated May 1941, Crosby, who was then president of CAA, attempted to justify the decision in a statement titled "C.A.A. Policy Altered—*Parnassus* Abolished." He blamed much of the decision on the budget, especially the costly fees for reproductions and diminished advertising sales. The board of directors also felt that the journal often seemed to duplicate material found in other art magazines including *Art News,* the *American Magazine of Art,* and *Art Digest*. While such a criticism had been true of the old *Parnassus*, the board did not recognize that Longman had changed the

---

[31] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, March 15, 1941, College Art Association.

periodical substantially and its purpose did not duplicate those of the other publications. More importantly, Crosby stated that CAA's mission had changed:

> its primary function is the support and promotion of the teaching of the history, analysis, and interpretation, rather than the creation, of art. The history and criticism of art, since it reveals and interprets human values, finds its nearest educational kinship, not among the ateliers of creative art in our college, but among the other departments which serve the ends of a liberal, humanistic education: history, literature, and philosophy.[32]

In this political battle over CAA and its publications, it appeared that the art historians felt they had to sever their ties with artists. By aligning themselves with other fields in the humanities, ones that had a stronger prominence in colleges and universities, the art historians hoped to elevate their status within higher education. Although the art historians had *Art Bulletin* as their scholarly publication, *Parnassus* was thought to distract from the main purpose of CAA and prevent it from being acknowledged as a learned society.

Crosby's statement was published along with many letters from outraged members who were "shocked," "disappointed," and "deeply grieved" by CAA's decision. Alford, who was serving on the board of directors, threatened to resign from CAA as a result and expressed anger that the organization had chosen to limit itself to art history. Pepper, who taught both philosophy and aesthetics at the University of California, Berkeley, said that "it seems to be especially unfortunate to have this old issue of history of art *versus* practice—appreciation—aesthetic theory—criticism of art erupt in the College Art Association just as we were beginning to think that this Association was to be the national harmonizing agent for these diverse interests." Clarence Ward of Oberlin College in Ohio encouraged members to turn to their regional conferences because it appeared that "a national organization can not [*sic*] meet the needs of the art teachers at all levels, and in both the history and practice of art." Ray Faulkner, the head of the Art

---

[32] Sumner McK. Crosby et al., "C.A.A. Policy Altered—*Parnassus* Abolished," *Parnassus* 13, no. 5 (May 1941): 162.

Department of Teachers College at Columbia University, warned that "if the interests of the Association are confined to only one aspect of art teaching and study, the organization will fail in its potentialities." Finally, Longman thanked all those who had been involved in the production of *Parnassus* and expressed his hope that the organization would one day focus on the importance of art education in all its dimensions, following the much broader policy outlined by President Middeldorf in his first issue of October 1940.[33]

Despite the protests of artist members whose interests would no longer be served by the professional organization they had started, it appeared that the art historians had won another battle, much as they had done in the mid-1920s. The publications program, which represented and promoted the association on a public level, was the victory prize once again. However, in 1941 the consequences of this battle would be more severe, especially for studio art education.

College Art Journal

Crosby's statement also mentioned that *Parnassus* would be replaced by a new publication titled *College Art Journal.* In the first issue, which was published in November 1941, Crosby explained that the new publication would "function as an organ of the College Art Association rather than as a publication in competition with other periodicals." Crosby acknowledged the volatile reaction from the membership regarding CAA's change in policy, and as a means to assuage many members' fears that the organization was being redefined only for art historians, he stated, "There is no intention to limit discussion to problems concerning the history of art. Different approaches and methods must be analyzed in order to reach a sound understanding that will ultimately lead to fruitful collaboration between all teachers of art." Crosby also announced that the

---

[33] Ibid., 162-63. Alford did not leave the board of directors.

new journal would feature “reports of experimental courses and programs,” as well as information on “exhibitions of significant value to college art departments” and “short reviews of those books which are of special value to undergraduate teaching.”[34]

In some respects, the *College Art Journal* was therefore not dramatically different from the previous version of *Parnassus* in terms of its general content. Both were intended to concentrate on pedagogy. However, within the *College Art Journal*, there were no editorials, and the focus of each article tended to address broader issues in education, whereas in *Parnassus*, individual art programs, teachers, techniques, and even equipment had been singled out to a much greater extent. What distinguished the two journals even more was their design. By comparison with *Parnassus*, *College Art Journal* was quite plain, reduced in size and printed on uncoated paper without illustrations or advertising.[35] In other words, it looked drab and academic like many of the scholarly journals that were produced by academic societies.

The first issue of *College Art Journal,* which was edited by Avery, demonstrated that CAA wanted to explore new subjects in art, and even new methods by which to study them. In “Television: A New Means of Art Education,” Harry D. M. Geier discussed how the Metropolitan Museum of Art was using television as a means to examine and discuss art objects in its collection. Elizabeth Wilder’s “Call for Pioneers” encouraged the study of Latin American art, while Alfred H. Barr, who was in charge of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, argued for the importance of analyzing the art of the twentieth century. Barr complained that college art historians did not seem to be interested in modern art. He recounted how in all his days as an undergraduate at Princeton and a graduate student at Harvard, only three of his professors had ever lectured on the subject and usually with great disdain. Barr argued that “the twentieth century . . . is our

---

[34] Sumner McK. Crosby, “College Art Journal,” *College Art Journal* 1 (November 1941): 2.
[35] Henry R. Hope, “Editor’s Report,” *Art Journal* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1966): 268-69.

century: we have made it and we've got to study it, understand it, get some joy out of it, *master* it" [Barr's emphasis].[36]

While these first texts showed that CAA was definitely interested in expanding its scope, the content was still very much limited to the realm of the art historian, given that the practice of art was still not being discussed. In "Theory and Practice in Art Education," Alfred Neumeyer, a German refugee, talked about how art departments in the United States, more so than those of Europe, tended to combine studio art and art history. While most of his article focused on art history, he closed by saying that it was important for the two fields to work together:

> In its position as a learned society, the College Art Association should neither be a professional organization of art historians nor a league of artists interested solely in creative art, but should mirror the fact that in the art departments of American colleges a mutual exchange between creation and criticism is taking place. These different tasks, in my opinion, could find reflection in an organ especially devoted to these objectives. It would seem worthwhile to try it out in the College Art Journal.[37]

Although the first issue demonstrated that the *College Art Journal* catered largely to the interests of art historians, it was also considered a tool by which to keep the membership united on some level.

While CAA appeared to be trying to mend itself to some extent after abolishing *Parnassus,* Florence Anderson had replaced Frederick Keppel as the staff member of the Carnegie Corporation who addressed the needs of CAA.[38] She reported that the situation was still volatile. After attending CAA's 1942 annual conference, she wrote: "The rift between the scholars and the practical artists doesn't seem to be healing; the

---

[36] Alfred H. Barr, Jr., "Modern Art Makes History, Too," *College Art Journal* 1, no. 1 (November 1941): 3.
[37] Alfred Neumeyer, "Theory and Practice in Art Education," *College Art Journal* 1, no. 1 (November 1941): 13.
[38] Frederick Keppel served as president of the Carnegie Corporation from 1922 to 1941, and Florence Anderson joined the Carnegie's staff in 1934. After twenty years of service, she finally became "Secretary, making her one of the few women of the time to hold an executive position in a major foundation"; see Abigail Deutsch, "Investing in America's Cultural Education," Carnegie Corporation of New York, accessed September 20, 2010, http://carnegie.org/publications/carnegie-reporter/single/view/article/item/265/.

latter are of course the more belligerent; the former evidently would really like to bring about cooperation but are not willing to grant full equality." This rift also extended into the geographic divide between the Northeast and the rest of the United States. At CAA's annual business meeting, Henry R. Hope, who taught at Indiana University and would later edit *College Art Journal,* complained that there was an obvious lack of parity between CAA's journals: *Art Bulletin* received substantial funds from its sustaining institutions, mostly in the Northeast, and therefore could afford numerous art reproductions, while *Parnassus* had been terminated in favor of an inexpensive stripped down *College Art Journal.* Crosby defended the board's position and added that "if Indiana, Iowa, and other universities wished to support a publication for the teaching of practical and creative art, the Association would be only too glad to have such a magazine."[39] Put simply, CAA publications still seemed to be for sale. A significant issue in this battle then was fundraising and subventions and the fact that the heavily endowed schools in the Northeast tended to support scholarly publications more so than colleges and universities elsewhere in the United States. Such a support system had allowed the elite Northeast schools to promote their own interests time and again, which benefited their faculty and students and enabled them to serve more readily as leaders in their respective fields.

Another issue Crosby raised was the apparent boycott of *College Art Journal*. Members for whom the journal was intended were in effect refusing to submit material.[40] This phenomenon would explain why *College Art Journal* seemed to be struggling to include material suitable for the artist-teacher. To encourage submissions, CAA's board of directors appointed G. Haydn Huntley of the University of Chicago as editor in May

---

[39] Florence Anderson, "College Art Association," Carnegie Corporation, January 23-24, 1942, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folders 1–5: College Art Association, 1925–1953, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[40] Ibid.

1942. Because he lived in the Midwest, Crosby stated that CAA hoped "to make the Journal more readily accessible to members away from the Atlantic seaboard." Under Huntley's watch, the content of the journal addressed all interests in "the teaching of art in colleges."[41] Subjects included the introductory art history survey, color film, and museum education. In addition, feature articles covering modern and contemporary art and aesthetics gradually began to appear, with topics ranging from the fourth dimension to the Bauhaus to Andre Masson.

Anderson's report also explained that CAA "is obviously in the hands of the younger group of scholarly educators who consider the Association as a learned society and are in fact hoping to have it accepted as a member of the ACLS."[42] The American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) had been established in 1919 as the "preeminent representative of American scholarship in the humanities and related social sciences." The art historians wanted CAA to be part of this group because it would put the association on par with such older, more established academic societies as the American Historical Association, the American Philosophical Society, and the Modern Language Association, which had been members of the ACLS from the beginning.[43] These organizations also represented the very disciplines that Crosby had named in "C.A.A. Policy Altered"—history, philosophy, and literature—which art history had found to be its new "nearest educational kinship." In addition, these organizations, which had been founded in the late 1800s and early 1900s, had abandoned their pedagogical concerns long ago in the early 1900s, long before CAA was established.[44] In these more

---

[41] Crosby, "Current Policy and Activities of the College Art Association," 119.
[42] Anderson, "College Art Association," Carnegie Corporation, January 23-24, 1942.
[43] "Mission," American Council of Learned Societies, accessed May 10, 2010, http://www.acls.org/mission/.
[44] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 24–25; and Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University,* 57–120.

established learned societies, scholarship trumped pedagogy, and CAA wanted to follow their lead.

In some ways, this situation recalled the words of CAA's third president, John Pickard, who in 1916 had suggested that CAA needed to publish an academic journal to "take important rank and position among the learned societies of our time."[45] Although CAA published *Art Bulletin,* which was its scholarly journal, *Parnassus,* which emphasized the practice, teaching, and criticism of art, was thought "to compromise the character of the organization," as Panofsky had said. *Parnassus* therefore needed to be abolished, and *College Art Journal,* which looked like every other scholarly journal, had to be created to help CAA promote itself as a learned society.

In 1942 CAA was accepted as a member of the ACLS. In order to achieve this status, it appeared that CAA's board of directors felt they had to diminish the role of the artist members, making them second-class citizens within the association. Eliminating *Parnassus* was a necessary part of the process. Put differently, the art historians had to make the contemporary artist and the teaching of art *invisible,* so that they might be noticed and gain acceptance in the larger realm of the humanities.

A Bias against Studio Art

Although CAA had been recognized as an academic society, the prejudice against studio art education would continue to be a problem, even when the issue of pedagogy was a topic. In 1943 CAA published "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the United States," which had been funded by the Carnegie and was intended to be published in *Art Bulletin*.[46] Robert Goldwater, under the supervision of Millard Meiss, had surveyed fifty schools across the country, trying to establish a balance between schools

---

[45] Pickard, "President's Address," 13.
[46] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 3 n. 1.

in the Northeast and those of other regions in the country. His statistics, which I have relied upon throughout this study, demonstrated that art and art history grew substantially from 1900 to 1940. However, the inherent biases in the study against studio art were noticeable.

In September 1942 Meiss showed a draft of the study to Florence Anderson.[47] Although she thought the article was "a very good piece of work," Anderson countered that "one criticism, however, to which it is laying itself wide open is the usual one that the C.A.A. pays too little attention to the practice of art. . . . In the introductory paragraph it is stated that one of the most debated questions is the relationship between history and practical courses and how each fits into the liberal arts program."[48] While Goldwater had analyzed the development of the art history survey course and had addressed trends in the subject matter of the more specialized art history courses from 1900 to 1940, he had only briefly mentioned the introductory studio art course in his draft report, and his statistics for the latter were not fully developed. Anderson recommended:

> To balance the picture I think something should be added on the positive side of the creative arts. It would be interesting to have a paragraph on the development of these courses: if there were 1000 in 1940, how many were there in the earlier periods; did their growth parallel the growth of history courses or come at a different time; has the geographical spread changed; is there anything that can be said to distinguish between the laboratory course which is an adjunct to the history course, the studio "appreciation" courses and the almost professional painting and sculpture courses found in Georgia, Iowa, and California. Goldwater is quite right in saying that the practical courses reveal a less well-defined picture and it is a harder job to present this picture in an article, but I think it should be attempted.[49]

---

[47] Millard Meiss to Florence Anderson, September 4, 1942, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 10: Study of Development of Arts Teaching in Colleges and Universities from 1900–1940, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[48] Florence Anderson to Millard Meiss, September 10, 1942, Carnegie Corporation, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 10: Study of Development of Arts Teaching in Colleges and Universities from 1900–1940, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.
[49] Anderson to Meiss, September 10, 1942, Carnegie Corporation.

While the final version of Goldwater's analysis seemed to explore some of Anderson's concerns, the discussion of studio art education comprised only five-and-one-half pages out of the total twenty-eight-page study. His analysis covered mostly the introductory studio course and rarely any upper-level courses. No statistics regarding the growth in the number of courses or a course breakdown was provided. After Goldwater had reworked his study for Anderson, Meiss told her that "[t]he content of the paper as it has developed has led me to conclude that it would be much better to publish it in connection with the College Art Journal than the Art Bulletin."[50] Clearly, studio art education and pedagogy in general had no place in *Art Bulletin,* and a special supplement of the *College Art Journal* had to be created for "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the United States."

Although Goldwater's study reflected the institutional politics of CAA and was thus limited in its analysis, his article was still somewhat useful because it demonstrated that the number of instructors teaching courses in the practice of art had been growing steadily throughout the twentieth century. From 1920 to 1930, the number of studio art teachers, among Goldwater's fifty schools, increased from 95 to 154 (60 percent), and from 1930 to 1940 the number increased to 202 (30 percent more). The numbers also showed that more courses were offered in studio art than in art history. In 1940, over one thousand courses were offered in studio art while approximately eight hundred were given in art history. Although studio art had been growing and courses in the discipline outnumbered those in art history, studio art did not have the same clout that art history had in the university. One reason might have been that studio art education was not consistently included in the curricula of all colleges and universities, even those that

[50] Millard Meiss to Florence Anderson, January 14, 1943, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folder 10: Study of Development of Arts Teaching in Colleges and Universities from 1900–1940, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

offered art history. In 1940, eight schools in the Northeast out of Goldwater's total of fifty offered no studio art courses. Most of the activity regarding studio art was taking place in the Midwest and the South. According to Goldwater, most schools emphasized the media of the fine arts, namely drawing and painting. The applied arts, which had played such a large component in CAA's discussion in the 1910s, were found less often in the university and college in the 1920s and 1930s, except of course in schools of architecture and professional art schools, which may or may not have been affiliated with universities.[51]

While art and art history had shown steady growth from 1900 to 1940, both fields felt threatened by the impact of World War II. After war erupted in Europe in 1939, the U.S. government wasted no time and started mobilizing its efforts to bolster the country's national defense as early as June 1940. Rather than set up separate state-run laboratories with soldier-scientists, the government wrote contracts directly with universities, research organizations, and industrial facilities to develop and refine the country's defense systems on all levels.[52] As higher education began to focus its attention on the war, the humanities were cast to the side much as they had been during World War I.

In response to the changes in colleges and universities during World War II, CAA felt the need to fight for the visual arts. Two separate committees, one for art history and the other for studio art education, were established to produce statements intended to promote their respective disciplines. In the March 1944 issue of the *College Art Journal,* CAA published "A Statement on the Place of the History of Art in the Liberal Arts Curriculum." Such prominent art historians as Meiss, Barr, Morey, Panofsky, and Schapiro explained that World War II had advanced "technological training on a greatly

---

[51] Goldwater, "Teaching of Art," 23-26, 30-31.
[52] Roger L. Geiger, *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities since World War II* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 2009), 3-5.

extended scale," and "all the 'useless' areas" of study in universities and colleges had been curtailed. As a result the humanities in general were "seriously challenged," and the study of the visual arts, which was less popular than literature and music, had been marginalized or sometimes not included in the curriculum at all. Too often, art was considered "a frill, a dessert." Much of the committee members' statement stressed the humanistic and universal appeal of art history, their argument demonstrating how the discipline was useful to everyone, and courses were not simply a tool to train those interested in careers in the visual arts. Art history, they stated, "aims to promote enjoyment, insight, and judgment, not the learning of names, dates, and formal peculiarities for purposes of classification."[53]

Although these words appeared to promote art appreciation, "The Statement on the Place of the History of Art" took time to distinguish courses in art history versus those reflecting art appreciation and design principles. Classes in the latter two areas were disparaged as only introductory and limited in nature "unless the insight of the student is enlarged and deepened by historical knowledge." The committee members also emphasized distinctions between art history and other fields in the humanities, namely literature and music. The study of art objects, they explained, has "pedagogical advantages." Unlike the analysis of foreign literature, which requires knowledge of the language or a good translation, art history is not impeded by "linguistic barriers." Foreign cultures, both past and present, are readily accessible to students of art history. In addition, the committee argued, art objects have an immediate presence and do not

---

[53] A Committee of the College Art Association, "Statement on the Place of the History of Art in the Liberal Arts Curriculum," *College Art Journal* 3, no. 3 (March 1944): 82. The entire committee included Millard Meiss, chairman, Columbia University; Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Museum of Modern Art, New York; Sumner McK. Crosby, Yale University; Sirarpie Der Nersessisan, Wellesley College; George Kubler, Yale University; Rennselaer W. Lee, Smith College; Ulrich Middeldorf, University of Chicago; C. R. Morey, Princeton University; Erwin Panofsky, Institute for Advanced Study; Stephen Pepper, University of California; Chandler R. Post, Harvard University; Agnes Rindge, Vassar College; Paul J. Sachs, Harvard University; Meyer Schapiro, Columbia University; and Clarence Ward, Oberlin College.

necessarily require the need to "unfold in time," as literature and music do by the very nature of their media.[54] Such distinctions were intended to help art history be recognized as a unique discipline that held a vital place within the humanities.

The art historians wanted their statement to have the strongest impact possible. The text was, therefore, published not only in *College Art Journal,* but was also reproduced as a separate brochure and sent to colleges, universities, museums, and academic societies across the country. The ACLS and Rhode Island School of Design both asked for extra copies to distribute themselves, and it was stated by CAA's board of directors that a small (unidentified) Midwestern college chose to establish a fine arts department as a result of seeing the brochure.[55]

In November 1944 the other committee, chaired by Peppino Mangravite of Cooper Union and Columbia University of New York, published a similar document in *College Art Journal* for studio art education titled "A Statement on the Practice of Art Courses." However, this statement, by comparison to that of the art historians, read quite differently. While the art historians had argued for their rightful place within the college curriculum and distinguished the importance of art history from other subjects in the humanities, the statement by the artist-teachers bemoaned that there was an "inconsistency" in the practices of studio art education at the college level. Although teachers of studio art had received funding in the past to develop art courses, the artists' statement explained that "art courses in many colleges have been segregated and isolated and in some have been regarded as extra-curricular activities."[56]

---

[54] Ibid., 85-86.
[55] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, May 26, 1944, College Art Association; and Israel, "CAA, Pedagogy and Curriculum."
[56] Committee of the College Art Association, "A Statement on the Practice of Art Courses," *College Art Journal* 4, no. 1 (November 1944): 33. Peppino Mangravite, Cooper Union and Columbia University; George Biddle (no affiliation); Jean Charlot, University of Georgia; Bartlett H. Hayes, Addison Gallery of American Art; Daniel Catton Rich, Art Institute of Chicago,;

The artists' statement also addressed the interrelationship between art and art history. While Mangravite and his committee recognized the importance and need for art history, they also explained that studio art tended to be overshadowed by art history and theory. Often students had "been taught to look at art under the cloak of history only." However, they contended that "[v]isual statements cannot be grasped wholly out of historical facts." In order to rectify the situation, the committee suggested that a succession of courses be established from primary to secondary school and into the college level, with each course emphasizing both the "analysis and practice" of art. Students would therefore experience "a cumulative visual conception" of the structural principles of art. In the process the student's general education would be expanded from focusing primarily on the word to include the importance of sight. Such an expansion of the student's curriculum "is bound to have its effect not only on the student while in school but afterwards as a fully functioning member of society."[57]

While some of the ideas in the "Statement on the Practice of Art Courses" represented new approaches to teaching studio art, many of the arguments were familiar, recalling those found in the *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* in the 1910s, which I discussed in chapter 1. Both the "Statement on the Practice of Art Courses" and CAA's *Bulletin* explained that studio art education was inconsistent and emphasized the need for stronger standards. Also, both explained that studio art was too often "segregated and isolated" in colleges and universities. In addition, the importance of seeing the art student as a "fully functioning member of society" in CAA's 1944 statement recalled previous goals discussed in CAA's *Bulletin*, such as helping the art

Boardman Robinson, Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center; Edward W. Root (no affiliation); and Franklin C. Watkins, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts.

[57] Ibid., 34-35.

student "take his or her place in society, to become a good citizen."[58] While these arguments regarding studio art education were indeed relevant both in the 1910s and 1940s, the similar wording implied, in some respects, that little had changed in the rhetoric of the artist-teachers over the course of thirty years.

Although studio art education had advanced to a certain degree and the number of courses and teachers had increased since the inception of CAA, the discipline had not developed as distinctively as art history had in the same time frame. The art historians were able to draw clear distinctions with other disciplines and argue for their importance in the curriculum of the liberal arts, while the teachers of studio art courses still struggled to define art's place in the college curriculum. By the early 1940s, the art historians who had taken control of *Art Bulletin* were able to establish the fundamental methodological foci in their field that I discussed in chapters 3 and 4. However, the artist-teachers, who had aspired to the very same ambitions since the inception of CAA, were still acknowledging an "inconsistency" in terms of standards. The original purpose of CAA's journal back in 1913 had been "to quell the confusion of tongues," but these artist-teachers, without a continual journal, or mouthpiece, had only a shaky platform from which to speak within CAA or, for that matter, within the larger realm of higher education. The problem of arguing for a goal and establishing a proper standard continued to plague studio art education until well after World War II.

CAA and the Societies for Literature and Music

What about similar fields in the larger spectrum of the arts and humanities? How might the politics of scholarly organizations that represent literature and music teachers help to interpret the divisiveness of CAA? The assumption is that literature and music

---

[58] Mechlin, "What Instruction Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Writer on Art?" 2.

might have experienced similar types of conflicts, given that they, too, are made up of historians, theorists, and practitioners. Like art historians and artists who end up in one department, the same is generally true for teachers of literature and creative writing, as well as professors of musicology and music. As it stands, there seem to be more educational and academic associations for literature and music than there are for those in the visual arts. While some literary and music associations are substantially larger and more broadly defined than CAA, others are much more specific. CAA does not, therefore, have a true counterpart in the fields of either literature or music. Perhaps the one thing that CAA and the literary and music associations share in common is that the histories of all these organizations are few, and it is therefore difficult to draw precise parallels.

Within the disciplines of art, music, and literature, the latter is by far the largest and most established of the three fields. Among the educational organizations and learned societies for literature, the Modern Language Association (MLA) is perhaps the closest counterpart to CAA. Founded in 1883, almost thirty years before CAA, the MLA began with the purpose to promote the disciplines of modern languages and literature, including English, French, and German. Previously, the ancient languages of Greek and Latin had dominated higher education, and teachers of modern language and literature had felt that they were not wholly respected in higher education. A. Marshall Elliott, a professor of romance languages at Johns Hopkins University, was the founder of the association and served as the first secretary, and Franklin Carter, a former German instructor at Yale and the president of Williams College, served as the first president of the MLA.[59] Like many academic associations, the MLA published two journals, both starting in 1884: *Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America* and the *Modern Language Association of America. Proceedings.* They were combined into one

[59] See William R. Parker, “The MLA, 1883-1953,” *PMLA* 68, no. 4 (September 1953): 3-6.

journal in 1886 and then replaced by a larger journal titled *PMLA,* which began publication in 1889 and is still published today. The MLA also produced a variety of other publications including a monograph series.

In the 1880s, if there were any conflicts among the MLA members, they seemed to focus on pedagogical concerns, somewhat like those that CAA would later encounter in the 1910s. One concern at the MLA's first meeting was whether or not conversation should be a necessary component in learning French and German. Opinions varied on the subject. While no vote was taken, the general feeling was that conversation was necessary, but such work "should not interfere with the theoretical study of the languages."[60] Another source of tension might have existed among the teachers of the different languages, namely English teachers, who were outnumbered one to three by teachers of French and German. The latter two languages were considered more academic in the late 1800s and would likely have been deemed more important than English.[61]

In the early 1900s, the MLA began to experience a variety of changes. The pedagogical focus of the association disappeared, and regional societies formed, such as the New England MLA in 1903, which addressed teaching concerns on a local level. In addition, organizations dedicated to education in languages were being established, including the National Council of Teachers of English in 1911. Over the years the *PMLA* had gained a successful reputation as an academic journal, but in the mid-1920s, competition arose from new publications including the *Philological Quarterly,* which began publication in 1922, and *Speculum,* which started in 1925. As the field of modern languages began to splinter, and the *PMLA* felt pressure from its competitors, the MLA

---

[60] Ibid., 12-13.

[61] An 1884 report in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* stated that English was not even taught in colleges and universities; however, Parker provided statistics indicating that that was not the case; see ibid., 12.

decided in 1927, quite abruptly and without any formal discussion, to change its mission to concentrate solely on the "advancement of research" in modern languages and literature.[62] In the 1920s the MLA, like CAA, therefore also experienced a need to focus on research. Although the MLA was substantially larger than CAA, the two organizations sometimes faced similar challenges, and CAA, which was younger than the MLA, often turned to the latter for advice.[63]

One major distinction between CAA and the MLA, however, was that the latter did not necessarily have to contend with the needs of practitioners, that is, creative writers. In fact, creative writing as a discipline in colleges and universities was not professionalized until much later, when, in 1967, the Associated Writing Programs (AWP) was established. Its membership consisted of fifteen writers from twelve academic writing programs. The AWP's original purpose was to "support the growing presence of literary writers in higher education. Because, at that time, Departments of English were mainly conservatories of the great literature of the past, scholars fiercely resisted the establishment of creative writing programs." The AWP, which was renamed the Association of Writers and Writing Programs, has over the decades been able to oversee a tremendous increase in the number of writing programs in higher education. For example, the number of M.F.A.'s awarded in creative writing increased ten times from 15 in 1975 to 153 in 2009.[64] The field of literature has, therefore, been largely separate from that of creative writing, despite the fact that they tend to coexist in the same departments in colleges and universities.

---

[62] Executive Secretary, "The Beginning, Development, and Impact of the MLA as a Learned Society 1883-1958," *PMLA* 73, no. 5 (December 1958): 33, 36.
[63] Susan Ball, interview with author, June 2, 2010.
[64] David Fenza, "About AWP: The Growth of Creative Writing Programs," *Association of Writers and Writing Programs,* accessed October 15, 2010, http://www.awpwriter.org/aboutawp/index.htm.

In comparison to art and literature, music associations developed earlier, but much more slowly and more erratically. The first national organization for music education was the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA), founded in 1876. The association was very broad and catered to music teaching at all educational levels. Although music was considered by some to be a highly respected social activity, especially in sophisticated society, music also seemed to suffer from the same discrimination as art in the U.S. educational system for largely the same reasons. In 1890 Waldo Selden Pratt, a professor of church music at the Hartford Theological Society, claimed that U.S. musicians were not highly regarded because of “the low standard of intellectual vigor which we tolerate.”[65]

In the early twentieth century the tide began to turn, much as it did for art. In 1907 a small group of Midwestern music teachers met in Keokuk, Iowa, and three years later formed the Music Supervisors National Conference, which later became the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). The latter caters to the music teachers at the primary- and secondary-school level and published the *Music Supervisors' Journal.*[66] That same year a small group of musicologists who wanted to promote the scientific study of music history formed a U.S. chapter of the International Musik-Gesellschaft (IMG). The latter met as a subgroup of the MTNA, and some of their papers were published in the MTNA’s *Proceedings.* When World War I erupted in Europe, the IMG disbanded. However, musicology survived in the United States: in 1915 the music publisher G. Schirmer began to publish *The Music Quarterly,* which became the leading journal for musicology in the United States.[67]

---

[65] Richard Crawford, *The American Musicological Society: An Anniversary Essay* (Philadelphia: American Musicological Society, 1984), 2.
[66] *MENC: A Century of Service to Music Education: 1907-2007* (Evansville, Ill.: M.T. Publishing Company, 2007), 1-14, 18.
[67] Crawford, *American Musicological Society,* 3.

After World War I the musicologists did not immediately regroup to recreate the IMG. They were mostly librarians of music collections, professors, and editors, and their numbers seemed to be smaller than the art historians of CAA, although musicology would later grow with the help of the Carnegie Corporation and the ACLS. In the mid-1920s, the Carnegie funded efforts to promote music education and, in the 1930s, provided phonographs and educational materials for schools across the country. In 1929 the ACLS established the Committee on Musicology "to take such . . . measures as may be calculated to promote research and education."[68]

While the musicologists, in comparison with art historians, seemed less organized in the 1920s and early 1930s, the musicologists founded their own national scholarly society called the American Musicological Association in 1934. Later it was called the American Musicological Society (AMS). The AMS initially used the *Music Quarterly* as its scholarly journal while publishing a *Bulletin of the American Music Society* for its general news and short articles.[69] Eventually, in 1948, the bulletin became a journal and is now considered the leading scholarly periodical in the field of musicology. Although the AMS initially met in conjunction with the MTNA's conference, much like the IMG had done before World War I, the musicologists were in the mid-1930s a separate entity from the MTNA, unlike the art historians of CAA. Put simply, the difference between CAA and the field of music education was that the musicologists and music teachers did not attempt to form a single professional organization. The AMS caters specifically to musicology, and the MTNA promotes the importance of music education in general.

After World War II, the College Music Society (CMS) would be formed, which united all aspects of music education at the college level including performance, music

[68] Ibid., 4-6; "The Founding of the Society," *Bulletin of the American Music Society,* no. 1 (June 1936): 1-2.
[69] Crawford, *American Musicological Society,*1, 4 8.

education, musicology, ethnomusicology, composition, and theory. While this organization might therefore be somewhat like CAA because both concentrate on college-level curricula, the CMS is more broadly defined. The CMS has some ten thousand individual members and functions as an umbrella organization, catering to over three hundred music organizations, working to establish a sense of unity among them, in addition to promoting interdisciplinary projects with other disciplines. Many members belong to both the CMS and a more specialized group.[70]

While all the associations named above are distinctive, they share the desire to support and standardize individual fields in higher education. In doing so, they expanded and modernized a largely antiquated educational system. As each of these organizations matured, it tended to specialize in some way. Some focused more on research, which was in keeping with the trends of academia at the time, while others remained dedicated to pedagogy. Among these associations, CAA is somewhat unique because it has continued to address the needs of not only historians but also practitioners in the visual arts, and although CAA was recognized as a learned society, it continued to operate as an educational organization, albeit to a lesser degree. CAA, therefore, might be considered more complicated in its makeup than the MLA and the AMS, and its institutional politics were and are perhaps more apparent. In the fields of literature and music, the institutional politics of educational organizations and learned societies do not appear to be so fraught with tension, at least according to the existing histories, all of which are official documents published by the associations themselves and may not address the subtleties of my study. Although institutional politics are likely unavoidable in any academic association, the fact that CAA has remained intact, representing both

[70] "The Mission of the CMS"; and Henry Woodward, "Annals of the College Music Society," *College Music Society*, accessed July 31, 2010, http://www.music.org.

studio art and art history, as well as other fields, has seemed both to help and to hinder the organization.

CAA and Affiliated Societies

In the 1930s and 1940s the institutional politics within CAA caused the association to lose members. Specialized groups in the visual arts would begin to separate themselves from CAA. Certain individuals felt left out because the association had catered so intently on art history, specifically medieval and Renaissance art and a positivist method of scholarship, and the Northeast played such a strong role in its governance. As already noted, the Midwestern College Art Conference (later the Mid-America College Art Association) was established in 1936 to address the interests of art historians and others working in the Midwest. Among the other academic organizations, the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) was founded in 1940, the American Society for Aesthetics in 1942, and the National Art Education Association in 1947.[71] Each of the latter three groups published its own journal. In keeping with the logic of the educational historian Roger L. Geiger regarding the formation of academic societies and the establishment of their journals, such a practice marked the professionalization of these specific subfields, although art education had already been established on more than one occasion by various organizations including CAA.[72]

Amid the small bifurcations in its membership, CAA would lose some members and, in the process, its complete control over the field of the fine arts in colleges and universities in the United States. While it is difficult to determine CAA's reaction to the

---

[71] The Society of Architectural Historians was originally called the American Society of Architectural Historians; the word *American* was dropped in 1947; see "History: The Society of Architectural Historians—Seven Decades of Scholarship," accessed May 22, 2010, *Society of Architectural Historians*, http://www.sah.org/index.php?submenu=About&src=gendocs&ref=SAHHistory&category=About.

[72] Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge,* 21.

formation of each of these groups, an announcement in *Parnassus* regarding the formation of the SAH expressed a sense of resentment:

> Since the first number of the *Journal [of the Society of Architectural Historians]* asks for suggestions, *Parnassus* wishes to ask why the purposes of the new society could not be met under the auspices of the College Art Association, most of whose members are very much interested in the history of architecture, and are in contact with one another through both regular meetings and publications. Could not the *Art Bulletin* with its wide audience of scholars satisfy the need of publication? Or are Americans just keen on organization?[73]

When one looks at the statistics regarding the number of articles covering architecture published in the *Art Bulletin,* the answers to the questions are easy. Only 8 of 168 articles concentrated on architecture, and it is interesting to note that the architectural historian Henry-Russell Hitchcock did not publish in *Art Bulletin* until 1941, the year after the SAH was founded. While the architectural historians felt the need to separate themselves from CAA, the SAH nevertheless held its annual conferences with CAA for the next several decades.

Although the formation of the SAH might have caused controversy in CAA, no announcements of the American Society for Aesthetics or the National Art Education Association were made in the *College Art Journal* at the time of their founding. However, the formation of all the new societies did not go unnoticed. In 1947 the art historian Dimitri Tselos cautioned in 1947 that there seemed to be too many societies for art and art history and thought that all the existing groups including CAA, the SAH, the American Federation of Arts, and the Archaeological Institute of America, needed to band together to form one society.[74] He also proposed that only one journal be published to cover everything. While his efforts were intended to help unify the visual arts, Tselos's suggestion was not followed.

---

[73] "General News," *Parnassus* 13, no. 2 (February 1941): 86.
[74] Dimitri Tselos, "Too Many Societies?" *College Art Journal* 6, no. 4 (Summer 1947): 303-5.

Ultimately, CAA was not operating as an association that was supposed to be promoting “art interests *in all divisions* of American colleges and universities,” as its original purpose was defined in 1913 [my emphasis].[75] By the early 1940s CAA’s obvious favoritism toward art history, which was most evident in its journals, was encouraging a number of subgroups in the visual arts to separate from the association as a means to establish themselves as distinct professions. However, despite the fact that a clear friction between the artist and art historian members was obviously apparent, the two main constituents stayed together in CAA, and as the years unfolded after World War II, the chasm between CAA’s artists and art historians would continue to grow. It was not until the 1970s and 1980s, when academia became more factional amid the rise of leftist politics and identity politics that the rift within CAA between the artists and art historians regarding its publications program would become a critical topic, and new initiatives would finally be created to meet the needs of the artist members.

---

[75] “Constitution, Article II.: Purpose,” 13.

CONCLUSION

THE ONGOING POLITICS OF SCHOLARSHIP AND A TURNING OF THE TIDE WITHIN CAA

Throughout this study my general purpose has been to explain quite simply that CAA is a social organization that has been affected not only by its own internal struggles, but by larger economic and political forces, as well as the doctrines of higher education. Although CAA influenced the fields of studio art and art history in colleges and universities, the role of the association has not been considered adequately in the historiographies of the two disciplines.

From the 1910s through the mid-1940s, CAA changed considerably, and in due course, so did studio art education and art history, as they were practiced in U.S. colleges and universities. A reciprocal relationship was at play. While individual scholars and their schools helped to shape the two disciplines, CAA and its journals acted as the authority in the fields, serving as the professional organization that disseminated knowledge and thereby endorsed these scholars and their institutions. CAA and the academic institutions appeared to work together, such that one fueled the other as a means to professionalize the teaching of art and art history.

According to Philip G. Altbach, "[i]t is no exaggeration to state that without the support, direct and indirect, of academic institutions, all scholarly journals would collapse. Thus, it is important to look closely at the relationship between scholarly journals and universities." My purpose in this dissertation has been to focus on the nature of this very relationship between the journals and the academic institutions, specifically the financial support. As I have shown, scholarship, like any other business, has a price and can be bought and sold. More importantly, as a result of this exchange—that is, money for scholarly endorsement—colleges and universities "hold something of a

monopoly on the validation of knowledge [that] gives them enormous power and also special responsibilities in these matters."[1] As a result, specific universities, particularly those that would comprise the Ivy League and the Seven Sisters, were allowed to act as the decision makers, or gatekeepers, of knowledge in the visual arts.

Scholarship is clearly political, and many of the debates within CAA involved a tug of war over the journals. They were the mouthpieces of the disciplines that they served, especially in the early years, and held a particular importance in academic societies. Also, a significant part of the association's budget and administrative activity was devoted to the journals. Was CAA an organization for both artists and art historians? Was CAA truly national, given that it catered substantially to the interests of members in the Northeast? To what degree should foreigners and émigrés be allowed to publish in the journals? All of these questions were at stake for CAA in the early years, and the debates affected the scholarship of art and art history. However, a substantial part of the internal politics within CAA also related to the fact that both studio art and art history, which were both considered young disciplines, suffered somewhat from an inferiority complex within higher education. In addition, CAA was threatened financially during the Great Depression, and the association's survival was at times tenuous.

By the mid-1940s, however, the situation within CAA had already begun to change. Not only had CAA finally been recognized as an academic society by the ACLS, but CAA was no longer the only association acting as the educational organization and the learned society for studio art and art history. The field began to bifurcate with the formation of the Society of Architectural Historians and other associations. To put it simply, CAA was not the only game in town, although the association would continue to wield a significant influence in academia, especially art history. While my study has concentrated on the early decades of CAA and the social, economic, and political

[1] Altbach, *Knowledge Context,* 72.

changes that occurred at the time, the story does not stop there. My purpose in this conclusion is therefore to examine the aftermath of the situation that developed in the mid-1940s.

The Aftermath: CAA after World War II

Let me begin by asking some basic questions: What were the ramifications of CAA's policy to cater more intently to the interests of art history? How was studio art education affected over time? How did the relationship between the art historians and the artist-teachers continue to develop? How did the role of higher education itself change after World War II and what effect did these changes have on the disciplines of art history and studio art? How did the role of CAA or academic societies in general change? What changes took place in academic publishing? In order to address these questions, this conclusion, by comparison with the rest of this book, spans a much broader period of time, covering the mid-1940s up through more recent years. My analysis is therefore much briefer, although I concentrate somewhat on the 1970s and 1980s because, during these decades, liberal politics and socially contentious member groups changed the focus of CAA, causing the relationship between the artists and the art historians within CAA to shift. Throughout my conclusion I alternate between *Art Bulletin* and *College Art Journal,* which would be retitled *Art Journal* in 1960, in order to make effective comparisons. I also address a book-length study published by CAA titled *The Visual Arts in Higher Education.*

Some Statistics in Higher Education

After World War II the role of higher education in the United States changed radically. From 1945 to approximately 1975, higher education in the United States showed astronomical growth in terms of enrollment. The 1944 G.I. Bill served as the first

boost to college and university enrollments because the government offered to pay tuition for World War II veterans to pursue their studies in higher education. Almost two million veterans chose to take advantage of the government plan, which doubled the number of enrollments from 1938 to 1948 in colleges and universities.[2] The second boost came in the 1960s when undergraduate enrollments more than doubled as a result of the population increase from the Baby Boom and the passing of the National Defense Education Act. The latter allowed young men to attend college as a means of deferring their service in the armed forces, which enabled many to avoid the Vietnam War. Also in the 1960s graduate education escalated: In “The Marketplace of Ideas,” Louis Menand reported that every year from 1960 to 1969 the number of people obtaining their Ph.D. degrees increased threefold, and more professors were hired in this decade than at any time in the entire history of the U.S. higher education system going all the way back to the colonial period.[3]

Although the sciences continued to be privileged in higher education after World War II, much as they had been previously, the humanities benefited as well. *The Visual Arts in Higher Education*, a book-length analysis published by CAA in 1966, reported various statistics related to the study of art history and studio art. From 1940 to 1950, the number of undergraduates receiving degrees in art history grew from 96 to 176, increasing about 80 percent, and by 1960 the figure rose another 70 percent to 299. By comparison, the statistics for undergraduates receiving a degree in studio art were more erratic: from 1940 to 1950, the number grew radically from 126 to 608, almost five times, but then declined slightly in 1960 to 599. In addition, the number of graduates who had

---

[2] Roger L. Geiger, “The Ten Generations of American Higher Education,” in *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges,* ed. Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 61.

[3] Louis Menand, “The Marketplace of Ideas,” *American Council of Learned Societies Occasional Papers,* no. 49 (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2001), 4.

elected to major in a combined program of art and art history showed a continuous growth, more than doubling from 118 in 1940 to 310 in 1950 and then increasing approximately another 38 percent by 1960 to 424.[4] The bottom line was that the fields of art history and studio art were experiencing sizable growth in colleges and universities.

While these statistics were impressive, the *Visual Arts in Higher Education,* which was intended to focus on "the history of art, the practice of art (excluding architecture), and the art museum," demonstrated a clear sense of favoritism toward the art historian.[5] Despite the fact that the number of studio art majors was substantially higher than that of art history majors, the *Visual Arts in Higher Education* devoted twice as many pages to art history as it did to studio art education. The book also included a chapter on statistics for museum workers. However, this section was substantially small as well, and the statistical data examined the relevance of museum work as a career possibility for the art historian, not the artist. Such a study and its bias toward art history recalled the same discrimination found in CAA's 1943 "The Teaching of Art in College and Universities" by Robert Goldwater.

***College Art Journal* and CAA's Position on Studio Art Education from the Late 1940s through the 1960s**

Although CAA focused its efforts primarily on art history in the 1940s and 1950s, the topic of studio art education did not wholly disappear, and some members complained about CAA's policies in the *College Art Journal*. A 1946 committee report titled "The Practice of Art in a Liberal Education" stated: "The following remarks are the result of the realization of facts which have troubled many members of the College Art

---

[4] Andrew C. Ritchie et al., *Visual Arts in Higher Education: A Study Prepared for the College Art Association of America under a Grant from the Ford Foundation* (New York: College Art Association of America, 1966), table 3, 126-27.
[5] Ibid., ix-x.

Association but have never been aired in the open." The four members who wrote the report consisted of John Alford of Rhode Island School of Design and Amy Woller McClelland of the University of Southern California, both of whom had served on the editorial board of *Parnassus* in 1940, as well as Wolfgang Stechow of Oberlin College and Henry R. Hope of Indiana University. The latter had protested CAA's decision to abolish *Parnassus* and was serving then as editor of *College Art Journal*. The committee felt that the artist members did "not receive sufficient benefits from their membership fees." The article protested that CAA's directors did "not use their influence in impressing upon college administrators the importance of teaching the practice of art in their institutions." The authors also pointed out that the articles in *Art Bulletin* and the papers read at the annual conference were of little interest to artists. In addition, the report explained that *College Art Journal*, because it had no illustrations, was of little use to artists in terms of discussing any technical matters. Finally, the report mentioned that although CAA had adopted a policy that intended to focus on art history, the by-laws had not been changed accordingly. As such, they felt that their cause needed to be heard and addressed.[6] They concluded:

> The following summary may testify to our intention to be as objective as possible: If and when every college teacher of the practice of art believes in the necessity of synthesizing vocational aims with the essential requirements of liberal education; if and when every college teacher of the history of art believes in the same necessity in regard to his work; if and when both of them find a common ground through mutual understanding and interest in disciplines governing or effecting both; then—and only then—the misunderstandings which trouble our Association will disappear and make place for the true collaboration which is the final aim of its members as it was of its founders.[7]

Despite these complaints and efforts to create a union among artists and art historians, it was not until the spring 1951 issue of *College Art Journal* that the situation was publicly acknowledged by CAA's president at the time. Intriguingly, in a bizarre turn

---

[6] A Committee of the College Art Association, "The Practice of Art in a Liberal Education," *College Art Journal* 6, no. 2 (Winter 1946): 91-92, 97.
[7] Ibid., 97.

of events, Hope was the president from 1949 to 1952. Serving as a leader in CAA, he tried to advance the causes of the artist members and encourage the sense of unity that he and his fellow committee members had argued for only five years earlier. He stated:

> The Association has accepted the fact that the teaching of art in colleges now includes practice of art as well as history of art and all the ramifications between these two fields, such as appreciation, criticism, museum work, art education, etc. We have made our bid for membership from all of these fields and we accept the responsibility of meeting all their interests even if, in moments of crisis, they seem to conflict. We must encourage research and scholarship and maintain the high quality of the *Art Bulletin,* but we must also stand behind the fine tradition that the *College Art Journal* has built up and furthermore, the time will soon come when we can speak of reaching the highest standards of creative art in the work of our faculties and their students.
>
> If the times ahead get tough and we are faced with a sharp decrease in memberships and subventions, there are likely to be differences of opinion about our complex policy. It is my aim, while in office, to establish a tradition of unity so firmly that it will continue indefinitely.[8]

In this statement, a CAA president was acknowledging that a sense of harmony needed to be established among the members, namely between the artists and art historians. However, this statement was markedly different from the rallying cries of John Pickard, who had alluded to a similar divisiveness in CAA during his presidency of 1915-18. Although Pickard expressed a need to unify, stating "[i]f we do not hang together, we shall hang separately," Hope's tone, which conveyed the same general message, seemed more subdued by comparison.[9] His wish to create a sense of unity did not come to pass during his presidency, nor did his desire that CAA might be able to reach "the highest standards of creative art."

After his presidency ended in 1952, Hope returned to his position as editor of *College Art Journal* and held the position for the next twenty years. In 1960 the journal dropped the word *college* from its title to make the publication more marketable for

---

[8] Henry R. Hope, "A Letter from the President to the Membership of the CAA," *College Art Journal* 10, no. 3 (Spring 1951): 275.
[9] Pickard, "President's Address," 15.

advertisers, although the content remained largely the same.[10] While a substantial number of articles ultimately supported the idea of including studio art education in the college or university in some form or another, there was a general consensus that art simply could not be taught and that artists were unteachable.[11] One read the following statements in the *College Art Journal*: "all one can teach are techniques, but that artistry is completely a matter of endowment and self-induced personal growth," "Art cannot, of course, be 'taught,' nor can artists be 'educated,'" and "the artist's distaste for learning in the academic sense is positively legendary."[12] While such remarks had been likely voiced within CAA in its early years, these negative arguments, even in passing, were rarely published in the *Bulletin of the College Art Association* or *Parnassus*. However, it should be noted in this discussion that many of these negative comments were stated by the artist-teachers themselves. At the time, a general trend existed among the Abstract Expressionist generation that art could not be taught.[13] Nevertheless, CAA was by no means a strong proud advocate of studio art as it had been in the 1910s and early 1940s, and the problem that studio art education lacked standards continued.

In fact, this tendency to doubt the standards in studio art education led to questioning the need for an advanced degree in the field. Despite the fact that artists had been earning MFA degrees since the 1920s and one of CAA's major objectives from

---

[10] Henry R. Hope served as editor of *College Art Journal* from 1944 to 1949 and 1953 to 1960. He also served as editor of *Art Journal* from 1960 to 1972.

[11] See Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 7. After attending CAA's 1952 conference, Florence Anderson reported that "[t]here is agreement that academic institutions should not try to train professional artists, but that the practice of art is an important part of understanding and appreciating it"; see Anderson, "College Art Association," January 26, 1952, Carnegie Collections, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000, series III, subseries A, box 108, folders 1–5: College Art Association, 1925–1953, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

[12] Leo Steppat, "Can Creative Art Be Taught in College?" *College Art Journal* 10, no. 4 (Summer 1951): 385; Joseph C. Sloan, "The Scholar and the Artist," *Art Journal* 23, no. 1 (Autumn 1963): 17; Howard Conant, "On the Education of Artists," *Art Journal* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1965): 241. See also David B. Manzella, "The Teaching of Art in Colleges of the United States: A Comparison of Current Trends with Those of 1940," *College Art Journal*, 15, no. 3 (Spring 1956): 241-51.

[13] See Singerman, *Art Subjects,* 7, 125-54.

the beginning had been to establish a degree in fine art, CAA did not choose to recognize the MFA as the terminal degree for studio art teachers until 1960, forty-nine years after its founding.[14] Even then, the MFA was only approved because the Midwestern College Art Conference, which traditionally had supported studio art initiatives, had recently endorsed the MFA over the Ph.D. in studio art, and CAA decided to follow suit.[15] However, the significance of the MFA or any other academic degree in studio art was questioned in the 1966 *Visual Arts in Higher Education*. The latter argued that "degrees in art have no ultimate value in the assessment of artistic competence. The quality of the school in which the degree has been earned is a better index to its value, but even that measure is unreliable."[16] These types of disparaging comments that were published by CAA—the very organization that was supposed to have promoted studio art education at the college level—plagued the discipline throughout the 1950s and 1960s and seemed to stagnate its potential growth.

***Art Bulletin* and CAA's Position on Art History in the 1950s and 1960s**

While studio art and the value of degrees awarded in the field were ripe for dismissal in CAA's publications, this type of criticism was not applied to art history and the Ph.D. degree. In fact, one of the primary objectives in the *Visual Arts in Higher Education* was to encourage more art historians to complete their degrees to meet the demand of the increasing number of students who would need well-trained teachers.[17] In the 1960s CAA's overt preferential treatment of art history over studio art was reflected in the corresponding situation found in the job market. Despite the fact that higher education was experiencing such rapid growth, college artist-teachers were finding that

---

[14] Ibid., 6.
[15] Allen S. Weller et al., "The Ph.D. for the Creative Artist," *College Art Journal* 19, no. 4 (Summer 1960): 343-52.
[16] Ritchie, *Visual Arts in Higher Education*, 84.
[17] Ibid., 38.

jobs were scarce, with three or four candidates applying for every one job available, while art historians found an excess of jobs and were largely guaranteed work.[18]

Although artist-teachers were suffering, the need to help art historians was considered more important, especially in terms of publications. A concern raised in the *Visual Arts in Higher Education* was that the high cost of production had forced so many journals in the past to stop publication. *Art Bulletin* and *The Art Quarterly,* among other journals, had survived over the decades, but the concern was that these periodicals simply did not have enough space to accommodate the increasing number of art historians. A fear was that many of the younger scholars might be silenced as these established journals would favor the senior art historian, and new voices and ideas might not be heard.[19] *Art Bulletin,* therefore, needed to increase its page count to accommodate the growing number of submissions. Although the Carnegie Corporation had been helpful to CAA and *Art Bulletin* before and during World War II, the foundation had chosen to focus on other interests after World War II, and CAA needed to find a new funder, choosing to cultivate its relationship with the Samuel Kress Foundation in the early 1960s.

H. W. Janson was the person who brokered the deal with Kress and proved to be a seminal figure within CAA and its publications program. In terms of *Art Bulletin,* he served as the book reviews editor from 1952 to 1955 and editor-in-chief from 1962 to 1965. Previously, he had been on the editorial board of *Parnassus* from October 1940 to May 1941, during which time he wrote the entire book reviews section each month. He also served twice on the CAA board of directors, from 1959 to 1963 and from 1976 to 1980, and as president of the organization from 1970 to 1972.[20] Throughout his

[18] See “Annual Meeting,” *Art Journal* 22, no. 3 (Spring 1963): 139; and “The Annual Meeting of the CAA,” *Art Journal* 25, no. 4 (Summer 1966): 390.
[19] Ritchie, *Visual Arts in Higher Education*, 46-47.
[20] Lucy Freeman Sandler, *CAA Newsletter,* Winter 1982, 2.

involvement with CAA, he was well known for his entrepreneurial thinking. In the 1950s, Janson kept encouraging the organization to publish a textbook for the introductory art history survey course.[21] After nothing transpired within CAA, he eventually wrote the book with his wife, Dora, publishing the first edition in 1962, and thereafter many college students were introduced to the discipline from his perspective. In fact, his book was often referred to as "Janson."

As the number of art historians grew in the 1950s and 1960s, the scholarship of *Art Bulletin* continued to focus on medieval and Renaissance subjects, although more articles began to cover nineteenth-century subjects. The methodological approaches remained largely the same as those employed in the late 1930s and 1940s. Among them iconography was one of the most dominant practices found in *Art Bulletin.* Although iconology, which had promised to revolutionize art history in the late 1930s and early 1940s, played an increasing role in the 1950s and 1960s, it was met with criticism in terms of both its theory and its practice.[22] As early as 1952 Creighton Gilbert, who would serve as an editor-in-chief of *Art Bulletin* in the early 1980s, wrote an article for the journal that seemed somewhat reactionary to Erwin Panofsky's methodological model. It is significant to note that Gilbert was the son of Allan B. Gilbert, the English professor who had written a somewhat lukewarm review of Panofsky's book back in 1940. Like his father, Creighton Gilbert criticized Panofsky, but the son's comments questioned the relevance of the methodology altogether, by simply stating that iconology did not always seem warranted because the artist's intent was not always wholly invested in the subject matter and some works do not necessarily convey a deeper intrinsic meaning.[23]

---

[21] Minutes of the CAA board of directors, October 27, 1956, College Art Association.
[22] Although the word *iconology* and its variations was mentioned in *Art Bulletin* in only twenty different articles, notes, reviews, and letters to the editor in the 1940s, the term was referred to in thirty-six different texts in the 1950s, 65 in the 1960s, and 111 in the 1970s.
[23] Creighton Gilbert, "On Subject and Non-Subject in Italian Renaissance Pictures," *Art Bulletin* 34, no. 3 (September 1952): 202-216.

Additional criticisms could be found in other journals and books: In 1956, Otto Pächt, an Austrian-born Jewish art historian who had immigrated to the United Kingdom, argued in a review of Panofsky's 1953 *Early Netherlandish Painting*, that the program for hidden symbols was so extensive and consistent in the Northern Renaissance that their decoding was not truly iconological but more iconographical by default.[24] Another criticism was that although Panofsky had belabored the distinction between iconography and iconology, the difference between the two often became negligible in practice. As late as 1974, Henri Zerner commented that over time "the ultimate iconological level has been generally abandoned and, what is worse, iconographical deciphering has too often taken the place of meaning."[25] Although Panofsky had presented iconology in such a clear didactic manner, there seemed to be in the 1950s and thereafter some resistance to the need for such a theory, and its supposed practitioners were lacking in their ability to utilize the theory.

In addition to the plethora of iconographical studies in *Art Bulletin,* the scientific-based archaeology, which had dominated art history in the 1920s and 1930s, still persisted in the journal. In 1958, James S. Ackerman, who was serving as editor-in-chief of the *Art Bulletin*, publicly addressed his concerns related to the state of U.S. art historical scholarship. He felt that the positivist tradition in U.S. academia had encouraged overspecialization and promoted the importance of establishing and perpetuating facts to such an extent that there was no room for criticism and theory. He felt that such a situation was making the discipline of art history too esoteric and

---

[24] Otto Pächt, "Panofsky's *Early Netherlandish Painting—II*," *Burlington Magazine* 98, no. 641 (August 1956): 276.
[25] Henri Zerner, "L'art," in *Faire de l'histoire: Nouveaux problèmes*, ed. J. LeGoff and Pierre Nora (Paris: 1974), 2:188; quoted in Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History,* 174.

advocated “reevaluating our approach to scholarship.”[26] In a letter to Meyer Schapiro, Ackerman was much more glib about the situation and dismissive of *Art Bulletin*:

> I am more than ever convinced that we have to have another journal in this country which will not force everyone to publish fussy archaeology. There is no place for essays or for criticism of a higher order or for the discussion of problems in the field. Riegl and Dvorak would have been silenced by a situation like this. I feel it more keenly because I am not primarily interested in doing the Art Bulletin sort of thing, and shall be following your lead into journals that most of our colleagues don’t see.[27]

Since the 1930s Schapiro had been publishing in both *Art Bulletin* and other journals, and often times his scholarship found in other journals was more provocative and theoretical than what he submitted to *Art Bulletin*. While Ackerman continued to write book reviews for *Art Bulletin* after his editorship, he published his feature articles in a variety of other periodicals including *Daedalus* and *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. However, the reevaluation that Ackerman had advocated in the late 1950s would not transpire for many years to come, especially in *Art Bulletin.*

The 1970s and Changes for CAA

If the 1950s and 1960s represented decades of academic growth yet stagnant infighting within CAA, coupled with a methodological stasis in the association’s publications, the 1970s brought about a sea of radical transformations, and the tide finally turned in the relationship between artists and art historians within CAA. Such change stemmed from a variety of socioeconomic factors. Within higher education, college enrollments began to decline in the early 1970s. Some of the reasons included the end of the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, the abolishment of the National Defense Education Act, the leveling-off of the college-age population, and the recession

---

[26] James S. Ackerman, “On American Scholarship in the Arts,” *College Art Journal* 17, no. 4 (Summer 1958): 362. See also idem, “Art History and the Problems of Criticism,” *Daedelus* 89, no. 1 (Winter 1960): 253-63.
[27] James Ackerman to Meyer Schapiro, June 28, 1959(?), Meyer Schapiro Collection, 1919–2006, box 169, folder 10, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

in the U.S. economy. In addition, the monetary value of a college education became less significant: the general difference between the income of a college graduate versus that of a high school graduate was narrowing in the 1970s.[28] As undergraduate enrollments declined, liberal arts colleges were put in precarious positions, and academics began to experience a job crisis. Learned societies, such as CAA, were therefore put under pressure from their constituents to help the situation.

In addition to these socioeconomic concerns, a need for political and social reform within many academic societies was already somewhat underway by the end of the 1960s. Several liberal-minded academics and activists saw these associations as opportunities to transform the existing standards and practices within their individual disciplines and higher education in general, and therefore chose to establish reform caucuses. Among their general goals, these caucuses wanted to challenge the dominance of the lingering positivist model within scholarly practice, which emphasized value neutrality and political detachment. In fact, these caucuses wanted the very opposite. They wanted their learned societies to be more political by acknowledging and fighting the problems affecting their individual fields. Because learned societies typically played such a significant role within the rewards system of academia, these caucuses also wanted to make the governance of academic societies more democratic. In addition, the caucuses wanted *all* constituents within their academic societies to be fully recognized, as well as all the subfields of the discipline that the association was supposed to be representing. The establishment of these reform caucuses was quickly followed by the development of feminist and minority groups who wanted to challenge the dominance of the white male in academia and create a greater sense of diversity in higher education.[29]

---

[28] Menand, “The Marketplace of Ideas,” 4.
[29] Bloland and Bloland, *American Learned Societies in Transition*, 1, 27-28.

In 1970, CAA began to experience change with the establishment of a reform caucus called the New Art Association (NAA). Among their concerns, this group of largely younger scholars wanted to reexamine the value systems of art and art history and be more involved in the decision-making processes, especially those of the CAA board of directors.[30] They also wanted CAA to oppose the Vietnam War, which the organization did by sending an official letter to President Richard Nixon that year.[31] In 1971, the NAA became more aggressive about its concerns related to art. While President Janson was speaking at the annual business meeting of the CAA conference, a group of the NAA activists snatched the microphone out of his hand, and a list of demands was chanted including that CAA "declare the arts a 'national disaster area' requiring emergency relief from state and Federal governments." Members of the NAA were experiencing "dissatisfaction with art, art history and education as they are now being defined and practiced." In an open letter to President Janson, the leader of the reform caucus, Lawrence Boding, chose not to be wholly explicit about the caucus's aims, stating that change would be ongoing: "There can be no program for adapting to new situations. The NAA and CAA will have to deal with it day by day." However, Boding stated that both art and art history needed to be more socially aware in their purposes. Art history should address the "cultural forces that condition art" and "consider a much broader range of methods and subject matter," and artists should be recognized as full members of CAA.[32] While the NAA was short lived and CAA officials rebuked the NAA for its theatrical means of attracting attention, the general need for change was not disputed. One of the ramifications of the NAA's efforts was that CAA finally developed and promoted specific standards for the MFA in 1977 and the BA and BFA in studio art

---

[30] "New Art Association," *Art Journal* 30, no. 1 (Autumn 1970): 90.
[31] Albert Elsen, "College Art Association Policies and Activities, 1969-1970," *Art Journal* 30, no. 1 (Autumn 1970): 86; and Judith K. Brodsky, "Shuttling between Inclusion and Elitism: From the Beginning to 1973," in Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind.*
[32] Lawrence Boding, "From New President of NAA," *Art Journal* 30, no. 3 (Spring 1971): 306.

in 1979.[33] Here, it should be emphasized how shockingly long it took CAA to realize one of its initial missions: although CAA had discussed the importance of establishing standards in studio art education from its beginning in 1911 and Irene Sargent had specifically spoken about "A Plea for Granting a Degree in Fine Art" as early as 1912, it took over six decades for the MFA and the BA and BFA in studio art to be fully recognized as degrees with standards in CAA.[34]

In 1972, the Women's Caucus for Art (WCA) and the Committee for the Status of Women in the Arts were formed. CAA came somewhat late to this development because many other academic societies, such as the Modern Language Association, had established such feminist groups a few years earlier in 1969. Although women had been present in CAA from the very beginning, and some had served on the board of directors, women had not been recognized in full leadership positions within CAA. Anne Coffin Hanson was named the first female president of CAA in 1972.[35] At the first meeting of the WCA, the keynote speaker Ann Sutherland Harris explained that "women held only 4.5 percent of full professorships in art and art history departments, as against a 9 percent national average in all fields, although women now receive about one-third, and have never received less than 20 percent of the Ph.D.'s in art and art history and are now publishing at a rate comparable to or higher than the men in the field." Harris warned that within the dismal job market of the 1970s, women needed to organize together to avoid the "pattern of the 1930's and 1950's, which brought about nepotism

---

[33] Israel, "CAA, Pedagogy and Curriculum."
[34] See *Bulletin of the College Art Association,* 11.
[35] The word "feminism" first appeared in *College Art Journal* in 1950. In a rare article that addressed such social issues, especially for a time that was often considered repressive toward women, Lura Beam argued: "Women who are not of the temperament for charity and social service and have no pattern for the use of their intelligence in art, turn increasingly to political education, legislation, and current forms of feminism"; Beam, "College Fine Arts or What?" *College Art Journal* 9, no. 4 (Summer 1950): 388.

rules and discrimination against women."[36] Such statistics noting the low level of women who held full professorships in the arts, especially by comparison to those working in other fields, seemed quite bizarre, given that more than half the students studying art and art history traditionally tended to be women and, as a result, the arts had been often coded as feminine.

***Art Journal* and Its Embrace of Change**

The immediate impact of the activist groups on CAA's publications was most apparent in *Art Journal*. The changes in *Art Journal* also stemmed from a members' survey that CAA had conducted in 1969. In general, members had complained about the content of the journal. Among their requests, they stated that *Art Journal* should address "more material directly relating to contemporary studio problems." In a rare editorial, Hope, who had been serving as editor for almost thirty years, defended the journal, saying that "*Art Journal* is open to new ideas, criticisms and proposals for improvement." He also explained that "this is a modest operation: no salaries, no expense funds, a minimal staff . . . we don't even have a typist, much less an editorial assistant. . . . Therefore to the readers who request changes and improvements in *Art Journal*, we say help us to achieve them by getting us good material."[37] Nevertheless, at a CAA board of director's meeting, Hope said he would try to make the journal less "stuffy."[38]

As a result of all the sociopolitical changes within academia and learned societies, as well as the development of new trends in scholarship in the visual arts, *Art Journal* would become quite vulnerable to change. Starting in the early 1970s, and roughly every decade thereafter, the journal would experience significant alterations in

[36] Judith Pratt, "Meeting for Women Members of the College Art Association," *Art Journal* 31, no. 3 (Spring 1972): 322.
[37] Henry R. Hope, "Editorial Note," *Art Journal* 30, no. 1 (Fall 1970): 89
[38] Minutes of CAA board of directors, January 27, 1971, College Art Association.

design, content, and/or editorial structure. These shifts seemed to parallel the world of contemporary art, which was also subject to continual shifts, much more so than the world of art historical scholarship The first of these occurred after Hope stated that he wanted to be replaced. He had retired from teaching and had been living in Florida since 1970. Although he had provided the journal with a sense of consistency during his lengthy tenure, he felt that the journal needed a change, and another person should take charge, preferably someone who lived in or around New York, where CAA's offices were located. In an amusing farewell statement, he wrote, "It is high time that this journal had some new ideas, new design, new printing, and above all a new editor."[39]

In 1973 the art historian Diane Kelder became the editor, and the journal was given a fresh look as a result. One of Kelder's missions was to have the journal concentrate more specifically on nineteenth- and twentieth-century art, although articles addressing other time periods and non-Western art also appeared. By comparison with previous issues, fewer articles covered the teaching of art and art history. Several of Kelder's issues were also arranged in a loosely thematic format. The themes included feminism, twentieth-century sculpture, museums and alternative spaces for exhibitions, and artists' concerns with health hazards. Each of these themes spoke to current topics in the visual arts, and the latter was a direct means to meet the needs of CAA's artist members in a more useful manner. In fact, CAA published a book on health hazards as a result of the issue titled *Safe Practices in the Arts and Crafts: A Studio Guide*. Kelder also solicited and encouraged artists to write on other artists whose work inspired them.[40] Along these lines, Rackstraw Downes wrote on Fairfield Porter.[41] In general, Kelder's version of *Art Journal* attempted to speak to members of CAA who had felt that

---

[39] Eugenia Robbins, "Art News from Colleges and Elsewhere," *Art Journal* 32, no. 4 (Summer 1973): 455.
[40] Houser, "Changing Face of Scholarly Publications."
[41] Rackstraw Downes, "Fairfield Porter: The Painter as Critic," *Art Journal* 37, no. 4 (Summer 1978): 306-312.

their concerns had theretofore not otherwise been met, namely artists and women, but also art historians who specialized in modern and non-Western subjects.

In Kelder's hands, *Art Journal* was well regarded and received praise from many CAA board members. Advertising increased and paid for color reproductions on the covers of the periodical.[42] However, in the late 1970s, the need for change came again. Some CAA board members wanted to rethink the mission of the journal in general. If *Art Journal* was not supposed to be like *Art Bulletin* or newsstand art magazines, what should its purpose and identity be? Many board members stated that they did not want the content of *Art Journal* to appear as the "rejects" of *Art Bulletin*. Such a comment seemed erroneous, given that the content of the two journals was quite different. Other board members simply wanted to terminate the *Art Journal*, with one of them even shouting, "Kill it!" However, the latter option was dismissed because it wouldn't necessarily save CAA money, given that a significant portion of the content relating to news and opportunities would then have to be included in an expanded newsletter.[43]

In an effort to revive the publication, a new approach was taken. No single editor was placed in charge, and each issue was based exclusively on a theme that was developed and produced by a guest editor. A small editorial board, consisting of both artists and art historians including Hanson, Ellen Lanyon, George Sadek, and Irving Sandler, supervised the thematic section of the publication. Later Hanson and Sadek resigned, and Susan Ball, who was executive director of CAA; Cynthia Carlson; Barbara Novak; and Robert Storr were added. Together the editorial board was in charge of choosing guest editors and reviewing the contents of each issue as necessary.

In the 1980s *Art Journal* covered a wide range of themes. Single issues looked at specific art movements, such as futurism and earthworks; nontraditional art forms using

---

[42] Houser, "Changing Face of Scholarly Publications."
[43] Minutes of CAA board of directors, April 29, 1978, College Art Association.

words, photography, and performance; individual artists including Willem de Kooning, Edward Hopper, and Edouard Manet; and interdisciplinary subjects addressing art and science, art and politics, and art and mysticism; as well as classicism, African art, studio art education, and public art. The broad range of topics found in *Art Journal*'s theme issues attempted to cater to the diverse membership of CAA, and some of the issues had practical applications such that they could be used as course packets.[44]

A few issues of *Art Journal* were devoted explicitly to new trends in art and art history that had been developing since the 1970s. In a theme issue of 1980 titled "Modernism, Revisionism, Pluralism, and Post-Modernism," Irving Sandler grappled with the complexities of some of the new rhetoric found in contemporary art and art history. He stated: "Recently, fundamental premises of modern architecture and the visual arts and of their history have been called into question. To put it directly, modernism has become problematic. Some artists, architects, historians, and critics have gone so far as to proclaim that modernism never even existed or that if it once had then it is now dead."[45] Art and art history were experiencing radical changes, and Sandler's issue attempted to summarize the multitude of concerns that were being bandied about in the process.

Two years later, Zerner focused more specifically on what he called "the new art history" in his issue "The Crisis in the Discipline." Like Sandler, he, too, began by talking about the recent changes, except Zerner was much more critical of the practice of art history:

> A growing minority of art historians, especially those of the younger generation, are convinced that art history, which at the turn of the century seemed to be at the forefront of intellectual life, has fallen behind; that far from progressing it has deteriorated and reduced the thought of its founders, Morelli, Riegl, Wolfflin, and

---

[44] Weisberg, "Art Journal at Fifty," 7.
[45] Irving Sandler, "Modernism, Revisonism, Pluralism, and Post-modernism," *Art Journal* 40, nos. 1 / 2 (Autumn-Winter 1980): 345.

others, to an uninspired professional routine feeding a busy academic machine.[46] Zerner was explicit in his mission: he purposefully chose authors including Rosalind Krauss and O. K. Werckmeister, who would discuss new constructive directions for art history and not simply gripe about the situation. Zerner added: "The new art history promises to be much more thoroughly historical than the old, because it believes that art is not purely aesthetic but that it has many functions."[47] Zerner's words seemed to answer the call that Ackerman had made over twenty years earlier in the late 1950s about the need for "reevaluating our approach to scholarship."[48]

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, *Art Journal* demonstrated a willingness to address the needs of CAA's membership and embraced the calls of the NAA and the WCA for change. However, the production of the journal was sometimes erratic because each issue had a different editor, and some of them had little editorial experience. At times the editorial board struggled to publish the journal in an ongoing timely fashion. In fact, in 1986, no issues at all were published. Such inconsistency and irregularity had the potential effect of damaging the identity and reputation of the journal.

Art Bulletin and Its Resistance to Change

While *Art Journal* experienced numerous changes in the 1970s and early 1980s, *Art Bulletin* remained largely the same, even when Kathleen Weil-Garris (later Brandt) became the first female editor-in-chief in 1977. According to Rose Weil, who was CAA's executive secretary from 1973 to 1986, the WCA was made up more of artists than art historians, and the latter group, whether male or female, tended to resist change.[49]

---

[46] Henri Zerner, "Editor's Statement: The Crisis in the Discipline," *Art Journal* 42, no. 4 (Winter 1982): 279.
[47] Ibid. For a critique of Zerner's issue, see Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 1-21.
[48] Ackerman, "On American Scholarship in the Arts," 362.
[49] Rose Weil, interview with the author, July 23, 2010.

Brandt herself recalled that the situation within art history in the 1970s was such that the "socialization in the profession was largely a process of integration or initiation into a shared enterprise and a common language." Such a phenomenon might explain why Brandt said that no one had ever publicly acknowledged that she was the first female to serve as editor-in-chief, despite the fact that feminism in general had been on the rise since the 1960s. In private, Linda Nochlin, Harris, and others had acknowledged Brandt's appointment as a break-though in the field for women, but otherwise Brandt said that people commented more on her youth when she became the editor. She explained: "This stuck me then as funny because I was still recovering from the shock of my fortieth birthday—decidedly the end of female youth in those days. Today, I think this odd perception was a coded response to my status as a new initiate into the world of Old Boys."[50]

Although women were serving in leadership roles in CAA's publications program in the 1970s and 1980s, the scholarship in *Art Bulletin* continued to focus on Renaissance and Baroque art, as well as a few articles on medieval and nineteenth-century art, much as it had in the 1950s and 1960s.[51] Ancient, non-Western, and contemporary art, as well as architecture and theory (including feminism, psychoanalysis, and Marxism), were subjects found far less often in the journal. In 1982 Gilbert stated that the main reason for this bias was that certain areas of study received more submissions than others, and in the end the editors were largely bound by the submissions that they received. Articles covering Renaissance and Baroque art were simply more numerous.[52] As a result, most editors-in-chief were specialists in these

[50] Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt, "Editorial Ruminations: An Open Letter to Nancy Troy," *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 202.
[51] Creighton Gilbert, "Inside the *Art Bulletin*," *CAA News* (April 1981), 12; Richard Spear, "Editorial Ruminations," *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 206 n. 1; and Walter Cahn, "Editorial Ruminations," *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 207.
[52] Gilbert, "Inside the *Art Bulletin*," 12.

periods. In fact, *Art Bulletin* employed ten consecutive editors who were experts in the fields of Renaissance and/or Baroque art, starting in 1956 with Ackerman and ending in 1988 with Spear.[53]

However, the self-perpetuating nature of this insular system that favored Renaissance and Baroque art did not go unnoticed, and in the late 1980s, changes began to take place. The appointment of a medievalist, Walter Cahn (1988–1991), broke the lineage, followed by a classicist, Richard Brilliant (1991–1994), and a modernist, Nancy J. Troy (1994–1997), all of whom were appointed to the job to change the status quo and help increase submissions in areas outside Renaissance and Baroque art.

A few editors speculated that another reason that *Art Bulletin* received so many submissions in certain fields and so few in others was that many new scholarly journals of a specialized nature had emerged during and after World War II, which created competition for *Art Bulletin*. Some examples included *Art History*; *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*; *Gesta*, which concentrates on art of the Middle Ages; *The American Art Journal*; *Woman's Art Journal*; *Artibus Asiae*, which covers the art and archaeology of Asia; and *October*, which focuses on contemporary criticism and theory related to various art practices.[54] Each of these journals was established by specialists in that field, and their existence likely robbed *Art Bulletin* of potential submissions. However, some of these journals were created because it was felt that the subjects and ideas that they promote had been too often historically underrepresented in *Art Bulletin*. On another note, other specialized periodicals were established because their subject matter and/or art historical methods represented the "new art history," which was thought

---

[53] Gilbert, "Editorial Ruminations," 204.

[54] Gilbert, "Inside the *Art Bulletin*," 12; Spear, "Editorial Ruminations," 206; Richard Brilliant, "Editorial: The Squeaking Wheel, or *The Art Bulletin* at Seventy-eight," *Art Bulletin* 73, no. 3 (September 1991): 358.

to be less readily acceptable within the pages of the more conservative *Art Bulletin.*[55] Reflecting upon the situation in 1991, Brilliant asked the obvious question: "Can it be that the would-be contributors have assumed that only certain kinds of articles would obtain a favorable reading from the editor who, together with the anonymous reviewers, must represent the so-called art-historical establishment, and its traditional values? Such a 'catch-22' mentality is, of course, self-defeating."[56] Yet Brilliant's concern was definitely the case, and some scholars actually preferred to publish in more specialized journals because they felt that acceptance was more likely and their article would receive greater recognition from their immediate circle of colleagues.

While the lack of change within *Art Bulletin* related somewhat to the submissions the journal received, another factor that played a role in the conservative nature of the periodical was its archaic governance system. In the late 1960s, Janson began to serve as chair of the Publications Committee, which was responsible for all of CAA's publications projects and reported to the board of directors. While Janson was chair, some individuals commented that he tended to manage CAA's publications program single-handedly. When big decisions needed to be made regarding CAA's publications, Janson was quoted as having stated, "I used to meet with myself behind closed doors."[57] Gilbert described the days of Janson as "the old period of the oligarchy, when the benevolent despot H. W. Janson ran everything out of his hat."[58] Because Janson was one of the few leaders in CAA's governance who was able to handle both intellectual content and administrative budgetary issues, he was allowed to act like a bit of a maverick for a presumably democratic membership organization. Weil noted that "Peter [Janson] showed up to all the meetings of the CAA board of directors whether he was

---

[55] Kirby, "Periodical §II: Historical survey."
[56] Brilliant, "Editorial: The Squeaking Wheel," 358.
[57] Susan F. Rossen, "Report on the Publications Program of the College Art Association" (New York: College Art Association, February 8, 1989).
[58] Gilbert, "Editorial Ruminations," 205.

invited or not. He chose all the editors himself and even had to strong arm many of them to serve in the role. Not everyone was willing to take on the task."[59]

In the mid-1970s, amid all the changes taking place within CAA, Janson told the board of directors that he wanted to reduce the bureaucracy and abolish the Publications Committee. The *Art Bulletin* Committee, which had been in existence since 1962, would take care of the publications program. This group was separate and different from the *Art Bulletin* Editorial Board. While the latter was comprised of art historians representing various subspecialties in the discipline and was supposed to help the editor review the journal's content, the *Art Bulletin* Committee was "composed of the past and present editors-in-chief, book reviews editors, and editors of CAA's Monographs on the Fine Arts."[60] They served on the committee indefinitely, which allowed the committee to operate as a closed, self-perpetuating, elite society. By the late 1980s, the committee was made up of twenty-one people, with fifteen of them specializing in the Renaissance or Baroque, three in medieval art, and the remaining few in other fields. Of the twenty-one members, seven were women, and most of them had served as editors of the monograph series. In addition, most of these women worked at New York University with Janson, who had hired them. The committee was responsible for appointing future editors of the *Art Bulletin* and CAA's monograph series, as well as selecting the recipients of the Millard Meiss Publications Fund, which awarded money for book projects to publishers.[61] The group therefore wielded considerable power not only in CAA's publications program, but also over scholarly art publishing in general. In some respects this group controlled the discipline of art history.

Although the *Art Bulletin* Committee was presumably beholden to CAA's board of

---

[59] Weil, interview.
[60] See, e.g., *Art Bulletin* 70, no. 4 (December 1988): 2. In 1988 the *Art Bulletin* Committee was renamed the *Art Bulletin* Editorial Board.
[61] Ball, interview.

directors, and the committee appeared to be working with the board of directors, given that the president signed the committee's letters of appointment, the journal tended to operate independently from the board, acting as a separate entity within the larger activities of CAA. The editors-in-chief typically had complete autonomy after receiving their appointments, and Anne Hoy, who served as the manuscript editor from 1970 to 1994, recalled that she had little contact with the office or the board of directors in the 1970s and 1980s. While she worked closely with the editor-in-chief, she merely submitted bills to the office to pay.[62] *Art Bulletin,* as an autonomous entity within CAA, was thus able to establish its own rules and had considerable freedom.

Janson's motivation for abolishing the Publications Committee has been interpreted as a reaction to the changes that had taken place within CAA as a result of initiatives from the NAA, the WCA, and other groups. The board of directors, which had for many decades been made up of esteemed art historians from the most prominent colleges and universities of the United States, was becoming more diverse, as more artists and art historians from a variety of schools across the country were being elected.[63] Janson's abolishment of the Publications Committee, which might be seen as a reactionary gesture, was designed to create a sense of autonomy for the *Art Bulletin* and uphold the prestige of its highbrow reputation.

While Janson's motivations might have been to protect *Art Bulletin*, the problem in the 1980s was that the journal was becoming obsolete in the field, given that so many art historians preferred to contribute to other journals. Philip G. Altbach has analyzed the institutional politics of scholarly journals and the problem of intellectual stagnation that can arise when leadership does not change regularly:

The publishers usually rely on the leaders in a field to make the basic decisions

---

[62] Houser, "Changing Face of Scholarly Publishing."
[63] Robert Motherwell, Wayne Thiebaud, and Grace Hartigan had been members of the board of directors.

> about what to publish, and these leaders, in turn, usually rely on their peers for advice. Thus the network is sometimes closed to outside development, often to the detriment of new ideas and developments. When a field becomes too moribund because of narrow or outdated leadership, alternative loci of development sometimes spring up, creating competing [scholarly journals]. This process is a complicated one, and it is often difficult for the knowledge network to adjust to such bifurcations in a field.[64]

Following Altbach's logic, it is easy to see why other journals were created in reaction to *Art Bulletin*'s favoritism of the Renaissance and Baroque art. The field of art history had been changing and scholars simply needed a place to publish. Amid all the new art history, *Art Bulletin* represented the old art history. Although it was still well known for its rigorous scholarship, the journal had nevertheless become, in Brilliant's words, "authoritative, a little stodgy, and, alas, all too often largely unread."[65]

In the late 1980s change finally came for *Art Bulletin* in terms of the journal's governance. Ball said that many of CAA's members had expressed their grievances that CAA's publications program was allowed to be governed by such a small select group of people. Ball explained that the situation regarding *Art Bulletin* came to a climax when an outside auditor, who had been examining CAA's budgets, addressed the issue with her. The auditor explained that from a monetary and administrative perspective, the *Art Bulletin* Committee had too much control over CAA's publications, and such control was supposed to be in the hands of the board of directors who had fiduciary responsibility for the financial well-being of the association. CAA's existing procedures entitled the committee to establish policies and spend money without any direct accountability to CAA's board of directors or staff. Given that publications represented one of the biggest expenses of the association, the decisions of the *Art Bulletin* Committee, which had changed its name to the *Art Bulletin* Editorial Board in 1988, could potentially affect the finances of the organization. While the members of the committee had not taken such

---

[64] Altbach, *Knowledge Context,* 178.
[65] Brilliant, "Editorial: The Squeaking Wheel," 358.

license in the past, the association was nevertheless vulnerable. As a result, the CAA board of directors commissioned Susan F. Rossen, who was the director of the Publications Department of the Art Institute of Chicago, to study CAA's publishing program and write the "Report on the Publications of the College Art Association" (hereafter referred to as the Rossen Report).[66]

The Rossen Report and Changes in the Governance of the Publications Program

The Rossen Report addressed CAA's publications program in general, not only *Art Bulletin*, but CAA's Monograph on the Fine Arts and *Art Journal* as well. The first recommendation was to undo what Janson had done and abolish the current structure of the editorial boards. The Publications Committee was reinstated, and its purpose was designed to represent the interests of all CAA's publishing projects, such that no one publication would dominate the publications program. Editorial boards reported to the Publications Committee, and all substantial decisions related to the appointments of editors and editorial board members, as well as budgetary concerns, had to be officially approved by first the Publications Committee and then the CAA board of directors. Also members of the editorial boards and Publications Committee were to serve only limited terms, no more lifelong appointments, and the makeup of the boards was supposed to reflect a scholarly and geographic diversity, so that the editorial board would not be dominated by one specialization in the field or favor people from the East Coast, which had occurred since the inception of *Art Bulletin*. In addition, all future editors and members of the editorial board would have to apply for their positions by submitting a proper résumé and cover letter. Finally, a manager of publications was hired to supervise the editing and production of the publications program, to help control costs,

[66] Ball, interview.

and to ensure prompt publication of both *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal*.[67] Virginia Wageman served as the first manager.

While many of these recommendations might seem insignificant, they had serious consequences for both *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal.* One former member of the *Art Bulletin* editorial board, who preferred to remain nameless, described the situation as follows: CAA, especially in terms of its publications program, had largely been operating as a gentlemen and ladies club, and as a result of the Rossen Report, the lights were being shut off. The former editor said that editorial appointments were assigned without any preliminary discussion with the potential candidate(s). An invitation to serve as editor simply arrived one day. The former editor also said that the position had significant benefits: tenure and book contracts came readily.

Many of the editorial board members of each journal expressed their unhappiness over the Rossen Report. They were upset that not all of them had been consulted in Rossen's research and were uncomfortable that so much control was being taken away from them.[68] Also, with regard to diversity, they used such phrases as "democracy doesn't work" and complained that the quality of the journals might go downhill as a result.

Art Bulletin and the Quality of Scholarship: The Need to Revive the Journal

Before the Rossen Report had been submitted, the quality of the scholarship in *Art Bulletin* had already been an issue for many years. Not only had Ackerman complained in the late 1950s about the lingering archaeological method in *Art Bulletin,* but later editors raised their concern that most of the manuscripts came from junior scholars. In fact, all seven of the editors whom I interviewed for this project disparaged

---

[67] Rossen, "Report on the Publications Program of the College Art Association."
[68] Richard Spear, "Report from the Art Bulletin Editorial Board in Response to the Rossen Publications Report," Publications Department, College Art Association, n.d.

the submissions they received throughout their editorship. Submissions were too often chapters or portions of dissertations, and, as such, they often read as incomplete articles, lacking a strong enough thesis and a logical beginning, middle, and end.[69] In 1977, during the turmoil of the academic job crisis, Howard Hibbard, who was then completing his editorship of *Art Bulletin*, reported to the CAA board of directors that publishing in *Art Bulletin* had become the main hope for new Ph.D.s "trying to get or keep a teaching job, and most of our contributions come from this group. We want to serve our membership in this way. . . . The present contents of the *Art Bulletin*, however, composed as it is of articles by relatively junior scholars, is at odds with its traditional place as one of the leading international journals of art history."[70] Before and during World War II, many senior scholars, including editorial board members, contributed to the journal, some of them quite frequently. However, in the 1970s and 1980s, the more accomplished academics no longer seemed interested in writing articles. According to Brandt, they wanted to publish books, which had become more prominent in scholarly publishing after World War II.[71] Her statement has some validity when one looks at the increase in the number of the books published over the decades from the 1950s to the 1980s. In 1950 *Art Bulletin* received only seventy-one books for possible review from publishers, whereas in 1980 the journal received 326. This significant jump not only reflected the unprecedented growth in academia and the economic prosperity of the time period but the need on the part of art historians to publish books to secure tenure and attain a full professorship.

In an effort to breathe new energy and life into the journal, many editors-in-chief tried to introduce new measures to make the journal more stimulating. However, change

---

[69] Houser, "The Changing Face of Scholarly Publishing."
[70] Howard Hibbard, minutes of CAA Executive Committee, October 21, 1977, College Art Association.
[71] Brandt, "Editorial Ruminations: An Open Letter to Nancy Troy," 203.

was sometimes difficult to accomplish in a journal that had such a grand history and a somewhat "stodgy" reputation. In some ways, *Art Bulletin,* as a journal of record for a national academic society, seemed unchangeable, impervious to the forces of innovation. The editors were dependent to an enormous degree on the contributions they received, and radical alterations to the journal's format might be met with resistance from the *Art Bulletin* Editorial Board, the CAA Publications Committee, the CAA board of directors, and sometimes staff. Each modification, however simple it might seem, was therefore not always easy to effect.

The first serious change in the scholarship of *Art Bulletin* came in 1986. That year Richard Spear was the first editor to address his concerns publicly about the poor state of scholarship he found in the general submissions to *Art Bulletin*. In turn, he chose to revive "The State of Research" series, which had begun in the mid-1960s. Previously, the series examined the literature to date on specific topics, such as "Rubens Drawings" and "Recent Literature on the Chronology of Chartres Cathedral." However, in an effort to encourage art historians to think on a broader scale, Spear commissioned texts that were meant to be "stock-taking" essays addressing "the current state of art-historical research. The aim is not bibliographic. Rather by providing a critical overview of representative new writings, the aim is to stimulate thinking about what research methods are producing the most promising results."[72] Each of the essays explored a different period in Western art history, including ancient, medieval, Southern Renaissance, Northern Renaissance, nineteenth-century, twentieth-century, and American art, or focused on a methodological practice, specifically feminism and psychoanalysis. Spear felt that the latter two topics were the most productive areas of new art historical study at the time.

Several of these essays were well received, especially Larry Silver's "The State

[72] Richard Spear, "From the Editor," *Art Bulletin* 68, no. 1 (March 1986): 6.

of Research in Northern European Art of the Renaissance Era" and Wanda Corn's "Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art."[73] However, Thalia Gouma-Peterson and Patricia Mathews's essay "The Feminist Critique of Art History" garnered a heated debate from several prominent feminist art historians, namely Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard. They felt that the article presented a "biased and polemical account" because Gouma-Peterson and Mathews had seemingly divided the field of feminist art history into an older American versus a younger British generation, with the former generation relying upon the "conservative methodologies" of the discipline of art history, and the more recent generation embracing "'new methodologies' of postmodernism, poststructuralism, deconstructive theory, psychoanalysis, etc." Broude and Garrard felt that Gouma-Peterson and Mathews's assessment was "inaccurate and incomplete" in its ageist and perhaps nationalist account, and that its polarized viewpoint ignored any possible links between the two groups of feminist art historians, especially the ways in which more recent scholars may have drawn upon the ideas of the earlier one. While "The Feminist Critique of Art History" might have produced friction in the field of feminism, Spear's series of articles was nevertheless useful because it produced a dialogue and encouraged more critical thinking on the subject.[74]

Spear's project made a significant impact on the field of art history, and other editors-in-chief have produced similar types of projects in an effort to encourage more senior scholars to contribute and examine new subjects in the journal. H. Perry Chapman, who was editor-in-chief in 2000-4, commissioned essays on fields that had

---

[73] Wanda Corn, "Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art," *Art Bulletin* 70, no. 2 (June 1988): 188-207; Larry Silver, "The State of Research in Northern European Art of the Renaissance Era," *Art Bulletin* 68, no. 4 (December 1986): 518-35; and H. Diane Russell and Richard Spear, "On the 'State of Research' Series," *Art Bulletin* 70, no. 1 (March 1988): 138.

[74] Thalia Gouma-Peterson and Patricia Mathews, "The Feminist Critique of Art History," *Art Bulletin* 69, no. 3 (September 1987): 326-57; Norma Broude et al., "An Exchange on the Feminist Critique of Art History," *Art Bulletin* 71, no. 1 (March 1989): 124-27. See also Russell and Spear, "On the 'State of Research' Series," 138.

traditionally fallen outside the canon of *Art Bulletin*, such as photography and Japanese art. Nancy J. Troy, editor-in-chief in 1994-97, created a series titled “Critical Perspectives,” in which she invited several scholars to discuss a general topic. While she was able to involve more senior scholars than any other editor-in-chief and some of the individual texts were later cited quite often, her topics, which included “The Subject in/of Art History” and “Art > < History,” were perhaps too general. The idea of any substantial dialogue among the participants sometimes fell flat. Marc Gotlieb, editor-in-chief from 2004-7, reexamined the process of these commissioned essays, and created what he labeled “Interventions.” Organized somewhat like a series of roundtable discussions, Gotlieb’s “Interventions” consisted of an initial essay exploring a methodological or research practice within a particular field of art history. In the same issue he also included invited responses from other scholars, followed by a reply from the initial author(s). The idea was to foster a dialogue on a given topic and make it accessible within one issue of the journal. Given the complicated nature of the project and the number of pages it inevitably consumed within one issue of the journal, Gotlieb developed a select number of “Interventions,” including “Toward a New Model of Renaissance Anachronism,” “The Boy in Bed: The Scene of Reading in N. C. Wyeth’s Wreck of the ‘Covenant,’” and “The Melancholy Art.” In many respects, *Art Bulletin* has become known for these “stock-taking” types of articles, which have proven useful to practitioners in the discipline of art history.

Although these types of essays have revitalized the journal in many respects, it is necessary to be somewhat critical in this discussion. While many of these essays have reassessed, revived, and sometimes examined underrepresented subfields, most of these historiographic articles, quite frankly, looked to the past and evaluated what had already been done as opposed to proposing new directions in scholarship, say on the level of Meyer Schapiro and the development of his Marxist methodology back in the late

1930s. In fact, many of these types of articles have appeared late in comparison to other journals. "The Feminist Critique of Art History," for example, was published in 1987, fifteen years after the WCA was established, yet according to Spear, feminism had already been making a serious contribution to the field for quite some time. If *Art Bulletin* was supposed to be the journal of record for art history, why did it take so long for a provocative discussion regarding the subject of feminism to appear in the journal? The answer is simple: in many respects CAA's art historians were not always interested in embracing new methods of scholarship.

The Association for Art History (AAH): An Attempt to Separate from CAA

CAA's growing interest in the new art history and its frequent desire to embrace issues related to identity politics in the 1990s were eventually met with open resistance from certain art historian members. In one attempt to denounce the then-current "post-modern mish-mash" of art history and "the forces of political correctness," Bruce Cole of Indiana University and Andrew Ladis of the University of Georgia founded a separate organization called the Association for Art History. These dissident art historians felt "disenfranchised by what's going on at the CAA." They wanted to promote a "forum free from narrow doctrinal and political orthodoxies" that was dominating the field in the mid-1990s and wished to promote a more traditional art history that focused on "quality, universal meaning, masterpiece, [and] objectivity."[75] The AAH posed a definite threat to the makeup of CAA, with the art historians one more time demonstrating a desire to distinguish themselves as a separate entity. Although the situation was reminiscent of CAA's 1941 battle, when the art historians tried to excommunicate the artist members,

---

[75] Bruce Cole, quoted in Tim Cornwell, "Art History Enters PC Fray," *Times Higher Education,* October 6, 1995, accessed September 11, 2010, http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode; and Association for Art History, accessed September 11, 2010, http://mypage.iu.edu/~aah/.

the circumstances in 1997 were different. This time the art historians wanted to excommunicate themselves. While the familiar dissension between the artist and art historian members might have been part of the contention, the situation for the art historians related more to a larger liberal phenomenon within the rhetoric and practices of academia and learned societies at the time. Although the AAH did not see itself as conservative per se, Cole said, "The pendulum has swung too far to the left that somebody who stands in the middle looks like they are on the right."[76] In the end, the AAH did not survive; Cole was named chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities in 2001 by President George Bush, and CAA remained intact in terms of its membership. Another likely reason for the demise of the AAH was that the organization did not have funding to produce a journal, and the art historians needed such a venue to publish their research.

Art Journal as a Forum for the Artist and Exhibition

If *Art Bulletin* struggled with current trends in the field during the 1980s, *Art Journal* continued to try to explore new issues and strived to produce the publication in a timely manner. Following the Rossen Report, CAA hired Lenore Malen, an artist with a master's degree in art history, as the executive editor for *Art Journal* to work closely with the guest editors and CAA's new manager of publications to ensure that issues of the periodical were published in a timely manner. The editorial board continued to be thoughtful in its selection of topics for theme issues, trying to strike a balance among the chosen themes. Some catered to urgent, timely concerns within the visual arts. In 1991 Storr and Barbara Hoffman, CAA's legal counsel, produced two consecutive issues titled *Censorship I* and *II*. These issues covered the controversy surrounding the National Endowment for the Arts and the government's restriction and reduction of its funding for

[76] Cornwell, "Art History Enters PC Fray."

the arts at the time. Bemoaning the conservative politics that had affected U.S. art and culture for the last ten years, Storr and Hoffman advocated for freedom of speech and reproduced, among other artists' projects, Robert Mapplethorpe's *X Portfolio.*

Other themes found in *Art Journal* during the 1990s embraced art in relationship to gender, sexuality, ecology, scatology, conservation, genetic coding, computer and digital technology, as well as Latin American, South Asian, and performance art. While some of these subjects represented important trends in the visual arts, others might have been perceived as topics outside the mainstream. *Art Journal* wanted to differentiate itself from newsstand art magazines and offer a forum for ideas that might not be published elsewhere. Along these lines, the editorial board also wanted to expand the diversity of voices within the publication. The editors were aware that scholarship, especially in the modern and contemporary fields, followed trends, and at various moments certain individuals or certain groups of scholars were sometimes celebrated to the extent that other voices were expunged. *Art Journal* did not therefore readily solicit the most popular writers or the trendiest scholarship on a given subject, but rather looked to find alternative voices, ideas, and methods of approach whenever possible.

A need for a change came again in the late 1990s. When Malen's term as executive editor was ending in 1996, the editorial board began to discuss whether or not to continue the single-theme issues. Malen herself observed that during her tenure publishing had changed. She explained that in the early 1990s, a complete thematic discussion including essays by different authors and contributions by artists covering a single period or subject in art was still somewhat of a novelty. However, by the mid-1990s, more and more academic publishers were producing anthologies on specific topics and were able to do so faster and more extensively than *Art Journal*.[77] Also the thematic format did not always engage artists as much as it could. While a section of the

---

[77] Houser, "Changing Face of Scholarly Publishing."

journal called Artists' Pages showcased the work of various artists, the production value of the journal was low quality, and the artists were not involved in the publication as much as they could have been.

After Janet Kaplan became the executive editor in the late 1990s, the theme issues soon died out. Kaplan reported that, early in her tenure, a theme issue could not be published as scheduled. As a result there was a desperate need to fill an issue quickly. Instead of moving a future theme issue into the open slot, another tactic was chosen. A statement from the editorial board explained that *Art Journal* would "no longer be strictly theme-based."[78] The journal began to publish a variety of texts, from roundtables, interviews, and debates to scholarly essays and editorial remarks, as well as artists' portfolios. The texts covered a wide range of subjects, most of them related to twentieth-century art, theory, and pedagogy. While the content was therefore still somewhat similar to that found in previous years, a noticeable trend was that the journal seemed to pay more attention to contemporary art in the late 1990s and global issues in the visual arts, for example, by publishing various articles on different biennales.

A new design for the journal helped to signify the change in editorial format, and the board used this opportunity to rearticulate its mission, stating, among other concerns, that it wanted the journal "to operate in the spaces between commercial publishing, academic presses, and artist presses." The board also wanted the journal "to be responsive to issues of the moment in the arts, both nationally and internationally" and "to prompt dialogue and debate."[79] Kaplan recalled that the new design helped to promote the new format for the journal, and the number and quality of submissions increased in due course.[80]

As the journal took new form, it received greater recognition. As a result, CAA

---

[78] "From the Editorial Board." *Art Journal* 57, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 2.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Houser, "Changing Face of Scholarly Publishing."

made efforts to establish a stronger sense of parity between *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal*, which for too long had held a subordinate position in CAA's publications program. The need for such a change had been somewhat evident since the early 1990s: at the time CAA started to allow members to choose between *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal*, and more of them chose to receive the latter.[81] In the summer 1999 issue, the *Art Journal* Subvention Fund was created, which provided funding to "ensure that the journal remains a most vital, intellectually compelling, and visually engaging publication devoted to art of the 20th and 21st century."[82] The change did not go unnoticed. In 2002 *Art Journal* received the *Utne* Reader Award. The *Utne* explained its decision as follows: "Visually compelling without glitz, rich in ideas without succumbing to art-theory-speak, *Art Journal* presents substantial essays and wide-ranging Q&As that bring readers deep into the minds of today's artists."[83] In 2003 CAA changed the title of the editor of *Art Journal* from executive editor to editor-in-chief to demonstrate that the role and responsibility of the job was similar to that of the *Art Bulletin*.

While the journal has continued to change in recent years, the most important phenomenon as of late is that artists are now being engaged with the journal on their own terms, namely in the form of exhibiting their work. In the past, CAA's publications had typically involved artists by addressing pedagogical and technical issues, commissioning articles, or creating conversations related to relevant topics in modern and contemporary art. However, while Patricia C. Phillips was editor-in-chief from 2002 to 2007, a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts helped pay for a new series titled Special Artists Projects. The individual projects, all of which were designed to work with the format of the journal itself, were created by Barbara Bloom, Clifton Meador,

---

[81] Ibid.
[82] "*Art Journal* Subvention Fund," *Art Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 2
[83] "*Art Journal* wins *Utne* Independent Press Award," College Art Association, accessed June 6, 2009, http://www.collegeart.org.

William Pope.L, and Mary Lum.[84] Because these projects were considered successful and helped meet the artist members' needs in a more substantial manner, CAA continued to produce similar types of projects. In 2010 Katy Siegel, the new editor-in-chief of *Art Journal,* made even stronger efforts to engage more artists on this level. In fact, a substantial portion of the journal now seems to be a forum for artists' projects. Siegel's first issue featured work by Katie Mannheim and Kerry James Marshall. At the same time scholarly articles addressing topics in contemporary art are also being published.

Contemporary Art and Contemporary Art History

In recent years CAA's artists and art historians have in some ways united on more equal footing. While some of this phenomenon has had to do with rethinking the mission of *Art Journal* and the improvement in its design and production quality, it also relates to the fact that art history in general has increasingly become more focused on contemporary art. Although in the past modern and contemporary art history were missing in *Art Bulletin* and tended to play a small role in art history programs in general, today it is much stronger. In fact, some art historians think that modern and contemporary art seem to be almost dominating the field. A Society for Contemporary Art Historians was established at the 2009 CAA annual conference in Los Angeles "to foster strong scholarship and promote collegiality within the vital field of contemporary art history."[85] Even the stodgy old *Art Bulletin* has published significant articles on contemporary art in recent years. The work of the African American artist Kehinde Wiley, for example, was featured on the cover with an accompanying article in the December 2009 issue, signifying perhaps that a larger change has taken place in the field of art

[84] Patricia C. Phillips, "In this Issue: Art of Attention," *Art Journal* 64, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 3.
[85] "Welcome to the Society of Contemporary Art Historians," Society of Contemporary Art Historians, accessed June 12, 2010, http://www.scahweb.org.

history. Contemporary art, now the exclusive focus of *Art Journal,* has begun to appear also in *Art Bulletin.*

Regarding the internal politics between the artists and art historians, the tide seems to be turning in CAA as of late. In the past the artists had felt time and again pushed out because their agendas had been dismissed and even erased within the pages of the journals. However, the current situation regarding CAA's publications suggests that art historians, especially those who specialize in the art of past, may be feeling pushed out, given that *Art Bulletin* has become intrigued in part with contemporary art. Are the artists taking over the sacred turf of the art historians?

Recent Concerns for CAA's Publications Program: Cronyism and Peer Review

At various times in its history, CAA chose to examine the policies of its publications program to make sure it was operating in an efficient and egalitarian manner. As noted in chapter 5, the editorship of *Art Bulletin* became limited to a three-year term in 1940, to ensure that no one person, such as John Shapley, would have control of the journal for an overly extended period of time, and that new ideas and voices might be included in the journal.[86] At the same time sustaining institutions were no longer allowed to buy issues of *Art Bulletin* to promote their own students and faculty or their own ideological interests. While the Rossen Report of 1989 had created substantial changes, CAA commissioned Rossen again to write a follow-up report in 1997, and the primary result was that CAA eventually chose to abolish its Monographs on the Fine Arts. The series, which consisted of books that were essentially very long articles and/or had numerous reproductions, was perceived as too "esoteric" within the field of scholarly publishing. As the publishing industry was changing in the 1990s, university presses found it difficult to justify books with small or medium print runs like CAA's monographs,

[86] Among all the editors-in-chief, only Creighton Gilbert served two terms, from 1980 to 1985.

and libraries were simply not purchasing enough copies.[87]

While many of the changes in the late 1980s and 1990s helped to improve CAA's publications program, the need to revisit the existing procedures occurred again in the following decade. In 2001 a special Publications Task Force was mandated. CAA's board of directors established a new position called the vice president for publications. Sitting on the board of directors, the vice president was supposed to watch over and support the interests of *Art Bulletin*, *Art Journal,* and other CAA publications. Another outcome was that the editors and editorial board members for CAA's publications were discouraged from promoting themselves and their work by publishing in their respective journals except in a limited capacity (for example, editorials, discussions, and interviews).[88] In the process CAA was trying to take a stand against the cronyism that had infected the journals so vehemently in the past. In the 1920s several editorial board members had published numerous articles in CAA's publications, and this practice continued after World War II. As I stated in chapter 2, Walter W. S. Cook alone published ten articles in *Art Bulletin* in the 1920s. While instances of such cronyism have been substantially fewer in recent years, it should be noted that in the 1920s and 1930s, the fields of art history and studio art at the college level were very small. It might have stood to reason that essays by editorial board members would therefore have appeared in the journals. However, since World War II, the fields of art and art history, as already explained, grew substantially, and the practice of allowing editors and editorial board members to contribute to the journals again and again needed to stop.

The Publications Task Force also instituted a new policy regarding peer review. Although the assumption is that peer review helps a journal maintain the quality of its scholarship, the nature of peer review is extremely complicated. In *Peer Review: A*

---

[87] Susan F. Rossen, "Report on the Publications Department of the College Art Association" (New York: College Art Association, September 1, 1997), 49-58.
[88] "CAA Governance Handbook" (report, College Art Association, 2004).

Critical Inquiry, David Schatz explains that the process in general is fraught with all kinds of biases that can sometimes unfairly affect the acceptance or rejection of a submission. Among them, reviewers may demonstrate bias for or against a manuscript because they know the individual who submitted the manuscript, they already agree or disagree with the ideological position of the author, or they hold an opinion about the institution where the contributor went to school or currently works.[89] In fact, some CAA members who preferred to remain anonymous explained that too often contributors to *Art Bulletin* were affiliated with the Ivy League schools and other prominent institutions for the study of art history. In an attempt to avoid all these types of biases and not favor certain schools, CAA has adopted a system of double-blind peer review, which means that authors are anonymous, and two sets of eyes review each text, so that the submission might be judged fairly, or put better, as fairly as possible.[90]

Schatz, however, raises other critical concerns about peer review. The process in general is often thought to promote a conservative agenda in scholarship. Tests have shown that peer review tends to favor studies that avoid significant issues in their respective field, do not dispute long-standing beliefs, and employ complicated methods that rely on academic jargon. As a result, an innovative or challenging article typically has a more difficult time being accepted for publication. Another somewhat related concern regarding innovative scholarship is that the peer review process is often time consuming.[91] The time it takes to publish an article in *Art Bulletin* is typically two to three years, which can make an innovative article, especially one that follows a very recent trend in art, look somewhat passé by the time it appears in print. As a result, *Art Bulletin,* which attempts to cater to all periods of art history, may be destined to appear behind

[89] David Schatz, *Peer Review: A Critical Inquiry* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), 1-4, 37-42.
[90] Linda Downs, interview with author, July 21, 2010.
[91] See Schatz, chapter 3, “Is Peer Review Inherently Conservative? Should It Be?” 83-108.

the times, no matter how earnest an editor's efforts might be to promote a new type of scholarship. Such a lengthy process can also be very distressing to the junior faculty member who might represent new developments in scholarly practice and needs to publish in a short time frame to secure tenure. While the peer review process is therefore fraught with problems, such a process is necessary to maintain the academic quality of the journals, and the double-blind peer review process is often considered the safest approach.

CAA in Transition: The Internet and the Ongoing Problem of Building Consensus

But what about the Internet and its effects on CAA's publishing program? Scholarly publishing is going through a major transformation, and many of the rules that applied to print production are no longer valid. The old rules are changing, and new problems are arising. Although CAA has published a website and an online reviews journal for over ten years, CAA's venture into the realm of online publishing has developed largely in fits and starts.

In 1998 CAA began publishing *caa.reviews*, an online journal for reviews and essays. However, the idea had grown out of a need within CAA and art book publishing some time before web-based publishing became popular. In 1989 Larry Silver, who was serving on CAA's board of directors, encouraged the association to create a new publication strictly for reviews.[92] Although *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal* had both been reviewing books and sometimes exhibitions, the two journals covered only a small number of them. The reviews also often appeared a long time after the tomes had initially been released or the shows had taken place, and thus sometimes read as dated material. Silver envisioned a new publication that would be inexpensive and most likely printed on newspaper stock; this would allow for many more reviews and make it

---

[92] Minutes of CAA executive committee, March 25, 1989, College Art Association.

relatively easy and quick to produce.[93] However, nine years later, when the idea began to become a reality, the Internet had become a viable source for such a publication, and *caa.reviews* was officially launched.

To help finance the start of *caa.reviews,* CAA received a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for the first three years.[94] The annual production budget for the online journal represents a fraction of the costs of *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal* because paper, printing, and postage are not necessary. However, the need for technological upgrades and equipment, as well as additional staff, dramatically affected the overall budget. In the beginning CAA did not anticipate what was needed to invest properly in its online journal or website. As with any new technology and new publication, it was also difficult to predict the impact on staff, and at times a backlog of reviews mounted, slowing the publishing process down considerably. However, most of these so-called glitches were corrected in due course.[95]

Aside from its website and reviews journal, CAA is also trying to find ways to produce its print journals online. While *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal* are available via JSTOR and other library databases, CAA has been slow to venture forward in the online realm. One reason was that many scholars continued to favor the old print journal. A peer-reviewed published article in an online format is simply not considered as prestigious as that published in a printed journal and is often not considered for promotion, tenure, or grant or job applications. However, the costs of print production have grown substantially over the past decades, and CAA had to cancel one issue each from *Art Bulletin* and *Art Journal* in 2010 as a result of budgetary concerns related to the poor economy. Although the quarterly format will be restored in 2011, CAA realizes that

---

[93] Houser, "Changing Face of Scholarly Publishing."
[94] Elaine Koss, memorandum to CAA Board of Directors, February 4, 1998, Publications Department, College Art Association.
[95] Minutes of *caa.reviews* Editorial Board, May 9, 2002, College Art Association.

change needs to occur, and according to a recent survey, the majority of the members have recently concurred that digital publications do indeed have value.[96] In fact, some scholars are now using the Internet as a means to bypass the traditional peer-review process by posting their articles online before submitting them to journals.[97]

As part of its exploration into digital publishing, CAA joined forces with the Society of Architectural Historians to explore the possibility of collaborating on a digital project. The idea was to see whether or not the two professional organizations could share resources in order to publish their print journals online. Out of these discussions, CAA has identified both the obstacles and the possibilities for expanding its online presence. In general, the project helped to clarify the staffing concerns and the financial questions.[98] However, according to Downs, the biggest impediment for developing an online journal is the issue of reproduction rights, given that CAA wants to secure such rights in perpetuity.[99] From the beginning CAA's membership was supposed to be predominantly for artists, art historians, and museum professionals. While the latter were not always present in full force, the number of museum workers in CAA has increased somewhat in recent years, as museums have become more academic, and curators

---

[96] Fahlund, "2009 Member Survey Results."

[97] See, e.g., Patricia Cohen, "Digital Shift Pushes Scholars to the Web for Peer Reviews," *Business Daily,* August 26, 2001. Having articles reviewed online before they are submitted to academic journals could potentially have a negative impact on learned societies, such as CAA. Downs expressed concern that such a practice could diminish the importance of scholarly journals, whose purpose is to publish new research; Downs, interview.

[98] My brief study does not address all the complexities related to learned societies creating online publications. For more information, see Mary Waltham, "The Future of Scholarly Journals Publishing among Social Science and Humanities Associations: Report on a Study Funded by a Planning Grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation" (report, February 18, 2009); Bill Davis, memorandum to National Humanities Alliance Board of Directors, May 19, 2009, American Anthropological Association, Arlington, Va.; Kevin Guthrie, Rebecca Griffiths, and Nancy Maron, "Sustainability and Revenue Models for Online Academic Resources: An Ithaka Report" (San Francisco: Creative Commons, May 2008); "Transitioning a Society Journal Online: A Guide to Basic Financial & Strategic Issues," (draft, limited for CAA use only, October 4, 2008), Publications Department, College Art Association. See also Hilary Ballon and Mariët Westermann, *Art History and Its Publications in the Electronic Age: Report on a Study Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation* (Houston: Rice University Press, 2006).

[99] Downs, interview.

have felt more pressure to secure Ph.D.'s in their chosen areas of study.[100] Negotiating reproduction rights has therefore become a very thorny issue because CAA itself represents the interests of all constituents involved, including scholars, artists, photographers, and museum representatives. CAA therefore cannot take a definitive stand on the copyright law related to the fair use doctrine, despite the fact that the scholarly, not-for-profit nature of CAA's publications should allow its authors to bypass the need to secure permissions and pay reproduction fees.[101] Downs explained that CAA does not want to challenge the laws associated with fair use and realizes that its current policy, which does indeed require authors to obtain permissions and pay all reproduction rights, will not necessarily work for the online journals.[102] The association itself will likely have to take care of such costs, although an official policy has not yet been determined.[103]

In my interview with Downs, she noted one general concern, which has been an overarching theme of mine throughout this dissertation: CAA has a difficult time building consensus. In many respects the diversity of CAA has time and again been its best asset and its worst drawback. As crude as it may sound, the marriage of art and art history has been, and continues to be, a peculiar codependent relationship. Artists and art historians have needed each other in many respects to fight for their common interests, but as I have shown throughout this study, the two constituents have both helped and hurt each other by remaining united within CAA, locked in what has at times looked like an unhappy marriage. Although historians of the two disciplines have tended to treat art and art history as separate entities, or favored one over the other in their

[100] Fahlund, "2009 Member Survey Results."
[101] See "Fair Use," U.S. Copyright Office, revised September 2010, accessed September 28, 2010, http://www.copyright.gov/fls/fl102.html.
[102] See, e.g., "The Art Bulletin: Submitting a Manuscript for Consideration" and "Clearing Permissions for Images," College Art Association, accessed September 15, 2010, http://www.collegeart.org/artbulletin/guidelines.
[103] Downs, interview.

analyses, the histories of the two disciplines have been linked together from the beginning and their relationship will continue to muddle onward, for better or worse, for richer or poorer, so long as they remain united within one academic society.

Table 1: *Art Bulletin* articles 1919-1944

	Sept. 1919-June 1924	Sept. 1924-Dec. 1929*
African Art	0	0
Architectural History/Historic Preservation	1	1
Art of the Middle East/North Africa	0	4
Art of the United States	2	1
Chinese Art	0	1
Visual Studies	0	0
Decorative Art/Textiles/Design History	5	3
Drawings/Prints/Photography/works on paper	1	0
Early Christian/Byzantine	1	8
Early Medieval/Romanesque/Gothic Art	10	22
Egyptian/Ancient Near Eastern Art	0	0
Eighteenth Century Art	2	1
Greek/Roman Art	10	7
Japanese/Korean Art	1	1
Latin American/Caribbean Art	0	0
Native American Art	0	0
Nineteenth Century Art	1	0
Oceanic/Australian Art	0	0
Outsider/Folk Art	0	0
Pre-Columbian Art	0	0
Prehistoric Art	0	0
Renaissance Art	5	7
Baroque Art	0	1
South/Southeast Asian Art	1	2
Twentieth-Century Art	4	1
World Art	1	0
Other categories		
Pedagogy	7	1
Artistic technical issues	2	0
Art appreciation	2	0
Art and pageantry	2	0
Art collecting	1	0
Conservation	1	0
Presidential address	1	0
Art and design	0	1
Art and economics	0	1
Jewish art	0	0
Total	61	63

Table 1: *Art Bulletin* articles 1919-1944

	Mar. 1930-Dec. 1934	Mar. 1935-Dec. 1939	Mar. 1940-Dec. 1944
African Art	0	0	0
Architectural History/Historic Preservation	4	4	7
Art of the Middle East/North Africa	8	1	0
Art of the United States	1	1	0
Chinese Art	0	3	4
Visual Studies	0	3	0
Decorative Art/Textiles/Design History	9	2	1
Drawings/Prints/Photography/works on paper	1	0	1
Early Christian/Byzantine	9	8	2
Early Medieval/Romanesque/Gothic Art	24	26	17
Egyptian/Ancient Near Eastern Art	0	0	0
Eighteenth Century Art	2	2	3
Greek/Roman Art	2	7	5
Japanese/Korean Art	0	0	1
Latin American/Caribbean Art	0	1	1
Native American Art	0	0	0
Nineteenth Century Art	2	2	4
Oceanic/Australian Art	0	0	0
Outsider/Folk Art	0	0	0
Pre-Columbian Art	0	0	0
Prehistoric Art	0	0	0
Renaissance Art	16	21	22
Baroque Art	3	4	6
South/Southeast Asian Art	0	2	1
Twentieth-Century Art	0	0	2
World Art	0	0	0
Other categories			
Pedagogy	0	0	0
Artistic technical issues	0	0	0
Art appreciation	0	0	0
Art and pageantry	0	0	0
Art collecting	0	0	0
Conservation	0	0	0
Presidential address	0	0	0
Art and design	0	0	0
Art and economics	0	0	0
Jewish art	0	1	0
Total	80	88	77

WORKS CITED

Unpublished sources:

Ball, Susan. Interview with the author. June 2, 2010.

Carnegie Collections. Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, 1872–2000. Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University Libraries.

College Art Association. "CAA Governance Handbook." New York: College Art Association, 2004.

______. Minutes of the *Art Bulletin* Editorial Board.

______. Minutes of the *Art Journal* Editorial Board.

______. Minutes of the CAA annual business meeting, April 9, 1936.

______. Minutes of the CAA board of directors.

______. Minutes of the CAA Executive Committee.

______. Minutes of *caa.reviews* Editorial Board.

Columbia University in the City of New York. School of the Fine Arts Records. Fellowships. Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Columbia University Libraries.

Constantine, Mildred. Interview with Harlan Phillips. October 14, 1965. Smithsonian Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution.

Department of Art and Archaeology Records. Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division. Princeton University Library.

Downs, Linda. Interview with the author. July 21, 2010.

Eisler, Colin. Interview with the author. June 22, 2010.

Forbes, Edward Waldo, 1873-1969, Papers, 1867-2005. Harvard Art Museums Archives.

Frick, Helen Clay. Letter to John Shapley. November 10, 1936. College Art Association. Correspondence. Frick Art Reference Library, New York.

Marquand, Allan, Papers, 1858-1951. Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division, Princeton University Library.

Morey, Charles Rufus, Papers, 1900–1954. Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Manuscripts Division. Princeton University Library.

Panofsky, Erwin, Papers, 1904-1990 (bulk dates 1920-1968). Smithsonian Archives of

American Art.

Publications Department. College Art Association.

Rossen, Susan F. "Report on the Publications Program of the College Art Association." New York: College Art Association, February 8, 1989.

______. "Report on the Publications Department of the College Art Association." New York: College Art Association, September 1, 1997.

Sachs, Paul J., 1878–1965, Papers, 1903–2005. Harvard Art Museums Archives.

Schapiro, Meyer, Collection, 1919–2006. Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Columbia University Libraries.

University of Chicago. Division of the Humanities, University of Chicago Library.

______. Special Collections Research Center. University of Chicago Library.

Wehle, Harry B. Letter to Erwin Panofsky. December 22, 1937. Petrus Christus file. Department of European Paintings. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Weil, Rose. Interview with the author. July 23, 2010.

Published sources:

Abbott, Edith R. "The College Art Association." *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 10, no. 5 (May 1915): 108-10.

______. "Non-technical Laboratory Work for the Student of the History of Art." *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 91-96.

Ackerman, James S., and Rhys Carpenter. *Art and Archaeology.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Ackerman, James S. "Art History and the Problems of Criticism." *Daedelus* 89, no. 1 (Winter 1960): 253-63.

_____. "On American Scholarship in the Arts." *College Art Journal* 17, no. 4 (Summer 1958): 357-62.

______. "Western Art History." In *Art and Archeology* by James S. Ackerman and Rhys Carpenter, 123-229. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Ainsworth, Maryan W., with Maximiliaan P. J. Martens. *Petrus Christus: Renaissance Master of Bruges.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994.

Ainsworth, Maryan W., and Keith Christiansen, eds. *From Van Eyck to Breughel: Early*

Netherlandish Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1998.

"Alexander Brook (1898-1980)." In *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Accessed September 25, 2008. http://georgizencyclopedia.org/nge/Article.jsp?id=h-3435.

Altbach, Philip G. *The Knowledge Context: Comparative Perspectives on the Distribution of Knowledge.* Albany: State University of New York, 1987.

American Association of Museums. "About AAM." Accessed August 11, 2010. http://www.aam-us.org/aboutaam/.

American Council of Learned Societies. "Mission." Accessed May 10, 2010. http://www.acls.org.

American Federation of Arts. "About the AFA." Accessed July 12, 2010. http://www.afaweb.org/about/.

[American Music Society]. "The Founding of the Society." *Bulletin of the American Music Society,* no. 1 (June 1936): 1-2.

Ankeny, John S., Edward J. Lake, and William Woodward. "Final Report of the Committee on the Condition of Art Work in Colleges and Universities." In *Proceedings of Meetings,* 161-87.

Ankeney, John S. "Report: International Congress of Art." In *Proceedings of Meetings,* 158-60.

Antler, Joyce. *The Educated Woman and Professionalization: The Struggle for a New Feminine Identity, 1890-1920.* New York: Garland, 1987.

Appelbaum, Stanley. *The Chicago World's Fair of 1893: A Photographic Record.* New York: Dover, 1980.

[Archaeological Institute of America]. Announcement: Art Studies: Medieval, Renaissance and Modern. *American Journal of Archaeology* 26, no. 3 (July–September 1922): n.p.

______. "General Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America: December 27-29, 1916." *American Journal of Archaeology* 21, no. 1 (January-March 1917): 86–90.

Argard, W. R. "Roy Sheldon As Creator of Form." *Art Bulletin* 6, no. 4 (June 1924): 105-6.

Arnett, Trevor. *College and University Finance.* New York: General Education Board, 1922.

Art Institute of Chicago. "1879-1913: The Formative Years." Accessed September 1, 2010. http://www.artic.edu/aic/aboutus/wip/formative/index.html.

[*Art Journal* Editorial Board]. "From the Editorial Board." *Art Journal* 57, no. 2 (Summer

1998): 2-3.

______. "*Art Journal* Subvention Fund." *Art Journal* 58, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 2.

Art Students League of New York. "Teaching the Language of Art since 1875." Accessed October 10, 2010. http://www.theartstudentsleague.org/About.aspx.

Askew, Pamela. "The Department of Art at Vassar: 1865-1931." In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 57-64.

Association for Art History. Accessed September 11, 2010. http://mypage.iu.edu/~aah/.

Ball, Susan. "The Beginnings: 'Art for higher education, and higher education for Artists.'" In Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*.

______, ed. *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind: A Cultural History of College Art Association*. Piscataway, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming.

Ballon, Hilary, and Mariët Westermann. *Art History and Its Publications in the Electronic Age: Report on a Study Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.* Houston: Rice University Press, 2006.

Bann, Stephen. Review of *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* by Michael Ann Holly. *History and Theory* 25, no. 25 (May 1986): 199-205.

Barr, Jr., Alfred H. "Modern Art Makes History, Too." *College Art Journal* 1, no. 1 (November 1941): 3-6.

Barron, Stephanie, with Sabine Eckmann, eds. *Exiles + Émigrés: The Flight of European Artists from Hitler.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1997. An exhibition catalogue.

Barron, Stephanie. "European Artists in Exile: A Reading between the Lines." In Barron with Eckmann, *Exiles + Emigrés*, 11-29.

Beam, Lura. "College Fine Arts or What?" *College Art Journal* 9, no. 4 (Summer 1950): 383-88.

______. "The Place of Art in the Liberal College." *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (May 1927): 265-89.

Beaux, Cecelia. "What Should the College A.B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?" *American Magazine of Art* 7, no. 12 (October 1916): 480-84.

Beenken, Hermann. "The Annunciation of Petrus Cristus in the Metropolitan Museum and the Problem of Hubert van Eyck." *Art Bulletin* 19, no. 2 (June 1937): 220-41.

______. "Der Stand des Hubert van Eyck Problems, Fragen um den Genter Altar." In *Oud Holland* 53, no. 1 (1936): 7-32.

______. "The Ghent van Eyck Re-examined," *Burlington Magazine for*

Connoisseurs 63, no. 365 (August 1933): 64-72.

______. “Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Genter Altars, Hubert und Jan van Eyck.” *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch* (1933-34): 176-32.

Bender, Thomas. “Politics, Intellect, and the American University, 1945–1995.” *Daedalus* 126, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 1–38.

Bennett, Charles Alpheus. *History of Manual and Industrial Education 1870 to 1917.* Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1937.

______. “A National Program of Industrial Art Education,” *Art Bulletin* 3, no. 2 (December 1920): 84-91.

Blake, Edwin M. “The Necessity of Developing the Scientific and Technical Bases of Art.” *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 31-38.

Bloland, Harland G., and Sue M. Bloland, *American Learned Societies in Transition: The Impact of Dissent and Recession.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Boding, Lawrence. “From New President of NAA.” *Art Journal* 30, no. 3 (Spring 1971): 306, 308.

Bossange, E. Raymond. “Technical and General Education in the Arts.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 48-58.

Brandt, Kathleen Weil-Garris. “Editorial Ruminations: An Open Letter to Nancy Troy.” *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 202-4.

Brilliant, Richard, et al., “Editorial Ruminations,” *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 202-9.

Brilliant, Richard. “Editorial: The Squeaking Wheel, or *The Art Bulletin* at Seventy-eight.” *Art Bulletin* 73, no. 3 (September 1991): 358.

Brodsky, Judith K. “Shuttling between Inclusion and Elitism: From the Beginning to 1973.” In Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind.*

Brooks, Alfred M. “Architecture As an Academic Subject.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 68-75.

_____. “Robbery and Restitution of Works of Art in the Present War.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 37-43.

Broude, Norma, et al. “An Exchange on the Feminist Critique of Art History.” *Art Bulletin* 71, no. 1 (March 1989): 124-27.

Brush, Kathryn. “German Kunstwissenschaft and the Practice of Art History in America after World War I: Interrelationships, Exchanges, Contexts.” *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 26 (1999): 7-36.

______. *The Shaping of Art History: Wilhelm Vöge, Adolph Goldschmidt, and the*

Study of Medieval Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

______. "The Unshaken Tree: Walter W. S. Cook on German Kunstwissenschaft in 1924," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 52–53 (1998–99): 24–51.

Burke, W. L. M. "Early Years of the College Art Association." *College Art Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1942): 100-4.

Bye, Arthur Edwin. "The American School." *Art Bulletin* 4, no. 3 (March 1922): 90-98.

Cahn, Walter. "Editorial Ruminations," *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 207-8.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. "Foundation History." Accessed April 1, 2010. http://carnegie.org/about-us/foundation-history/.

Carpenter, Rhys. "Archaeology." In *Art and Archaeology* by James S. Ackerman and Rhys Carpenter, 1-122.

Chase, George H., Arthur Pope, and Chandler Post. "Faculty of Arts and Sciences." *Harvard Gazette* (1930): 30.

Chase, George H. "An Art Course for Laymen." *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 25-26.

Cohen, Patricia. "Digital Shift Pushes Scholars to the Web for Peer Reviews." *Business Daily,* August 26, 2001. Accessed September 10, 2010. http://www.businessdailyafrica.com/Digital%20shift%20pushes%20scholars%20to%20the%20web%20for%20peer%20reviews/-/539444/996736/-/6orr9fz/-/index.html

"The College Art Association." *American Art Annual* 11 (1914): 38.

[College Art Association]. Advertisement for *Contemporary Art of Soviet Russia. Parnassus* 8, no. 6 (November 1936): 34.

______. "Annual Meeting." *Art Journal* 22, no. 3 (Spring 1963): 139, 178, 190.

______. The Annual Meeting of the CAA." *Art Journal* 25, no. 4 (Summer 1966): 390, 416, 418.

______. "*The Art Bulletin*." *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 2.

______. "*Art Bulletin* Mission Statement," College Art Association. Accessed September 15, 2010. http://www.collegeart.org/artbulletin/.

______. "The Art Bulletin: Submitting a Manuscript for Consideration." Accessed September 15, 2010. http://www.collegeart.org/artbulletin/guidelines.

______. "Article III.: Membership." *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 31.

_______. "*Art Journal* Wins *Utne* Independent Press Award." College Art Association. Accessed June 6, 2009. http://www.collegeart.org/artjournal/utneaward.

_______. "Books for the College Art Library." *Art Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (September 1920): 5-60.

_______. "Clearing Permissions for Images." Accessed September 15, 2010. http://www.collegeart.org/artbulletin/guidelines.

_______. *College Art Association: An International Organization.* New York: College Art Association, 1933.

_______. Committee of the College Art Association. "Statement on the Place of the History of Art in the Liberal Arts Curriculum." *College Art Journal* 3, no. 3 (March 1944): 82-87.

_______. Committee of the College Art Association. "A Statement on the Practice of Art Courses." *College Art Journal* 4, no. 1 (November 1944): 33-38.

_______. Committee of the College Art Association. "The Practice of Art in a Liberal Education." *College Art Journal* 6, no. 2 (Winter 1946): 91-97.

_______. "Committees." *Bulletin of College Art Association* 1, no. 1 (January 1913): 4-5.

_______. "Constitution, Article II.: Purpose," *Bulletin of the College Art Association* 1, no. 1 (January 1913): 13-15.

_______. *Endowment of the Art Bulletin.* New York: College Art Association, 1929.

_______. "General News." *Parnassus* 13, no. 2 (February 1941): 86-87.

_______. "In Memoriam: John Shapley." *CAA News,* December 1978, 6.

_______. "List of Books for a College Art Library." *Art Bulletin* 11, no. 3 (September 1929): 235–94.

_______. "Mission Statement." Accessed October 1, 2010. http://www.collegeart.org/about/mission.

_______. "New Art Association." *Art Journal* 30, no. 1 (Autumn 1970): 90.

_______. "Notes." *Art Bulletin* 6 (March 1924): 93–95.

_______. "Notes." *Art Bulletin* 8 (March 1926): 182–83.

_______. *Program of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting.* New York: College Art Association, September 6-9, 1939.

______. *Research Institute of the College Art Association.* College Art Association, New York, 1930.

______. "Theses and Dissertations: Fine Arts and Allied Fields," *Parnassus* 2, no. 5 (May 1930): 44-45.

______. *What the College Art Association Does.* New York: College Art Association, 1930.

College Music Society. "The Mission of the CMS"; and Henry Woodward, "Annals of the College Music Society." Accessed July 31, 2010. http://www.music.org.

Conant, Howard. "On the Education of Artists." *Art Journal* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1965): 240-43.

Cook, Walter W. S. "The Earliest Painted Panels at Catalonia (I)." *Art Bulletin* 5, no. 4 (June 1923): 88.

Coomaraswamy, Ananda. "The Significance of Oriental Art." *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 17-22.

Corcoran College of Art and Design. "History: Dedicated to Art." Accessed September 2, 2010. http://www.corcoran.edu/about_the_college/history.php.

Corn, Wanda. "Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art." *Art Bulletin* 70, no. 2 (June 1988): 188-207.

______. *Grant Wood: The Regionalist Vision.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983.

______. *The Great American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915-1935.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Cornwell, Tim, "Art History Enters PC Fray." *Times Higher Education.* Last modified October 6, 1995. Accessed September 11, 2010. http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode.

Cram, Ralph Adams. "Place of Fine Arts in Higher Education." *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 129–35.

Craven, David. "Meyer Schapiro." Special issue, *Oxford Art Journal* 17, no. 1 (1994).

Crawford, Richard. *The American Musicological Society: An Anniversary Essay.* Philadelphia: American Musicological Society, 1984.

Crawshaw, Fred D. *Manual Arts for Vocational Ends.* Peoria, Ill.: Manual Arts Press, 1915.

Crosby, Sumner McK[night], et al. "C.A.A. Policy Altered—*Parnassus* Abolished." *Parnassus* 13, no. 5 (May 1941): 162-63.

Crosby, Sumner McK[night]. “College Art Journal.” *College Art Journal* 1 (November 1941): 2.

______. “Current Policy and Activities of the College Art Association.” *College Art Journal* 1, no. 4 (May 1942): 116.

Crow, Thomas. *The Intelligence of Art.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

______. “The Practice of Art History in America.” *Daedalus* 135, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 70-90.

Davie, Maurice R. *Refugees in America.* New York: Harper, 1947.

Davis, Bill. Memorandum to National Humanities Alliance Board of Directors. May 19, 2009, American Anthropological Association, Arlington, Va.

Davis, Stuart. Letter to the editor. *Parnassus* 12, no. 1 (November 1940): 2.

Deknatel, Frederick B. “The Thirteenth Century Gothic Sculpture of the Cathedrals of Burgos and Leon.” *Art Bulletin* 17, no. 3 (September 1935): 243-389.

Dilly, Heinrich. “Germany, §XVII: Historiography.” In *Oxford Art Online.* Accessed September 1, 2010. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/subscriber/article/grove/art/T031531pg17?q=international+congress+of+art+historians&search=quick&pos=12&_start=1#firsthit.

Donald, Diana, and Jane Munro. *Endless Forms: Charles Darwin, Natural Science, and the Visual Arts.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009. An exhibition catalogue.

Dow, Arthur W. *Composition: A Series of Exercises in Art Structure for the Use of Students and Teachers,* 9th ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page, 1916.

Downes, Rackstraw. “Fairfield Porter: The Painter as Critic.” *Art Journal* 37, no. 4 (Summer 1978): 306-312.

Draper, Joan E. “Introduction: The White City and Its Interpretation: Historians, Critics, and the Chicago World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893.” In *The Final Official Report of the Director of Works of the World’s Columbian Exposition* by Daniel H. Burnham. New York: Garland, 1989.

Duggan, Stephen, and Betty Drury. *The Rescue of Science and Learning: The Story of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars.* New York: MacMillan, 1948.

Dupree, A. Hunter. *Science in the Federal Government: A History of Policies and Activities to 1940.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Dussaud, René. “Les monuments syriens a l’Exposition d’art byzantine.” *Syria* 12, no. 4

(1931): 305-15.

Dyson, Stephen. *Ancient Marbles to American Shores: Classical Archaeology in the United States.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.

Efland, Arthur D. *A History of Art Education: Intellectual and Social Currents in Teaching the Visual Arts.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1990.

______. "USA, §XV: Art education: XVI. Art education." In *Oxford Art Online.* Accessed September 1, 2010. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/subscriber/article/grove/art/T087095pg15?q=efland&article_section=contributors&search=article&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit.

Efros, Abram. "The Russian Theatre and Its Artists since the Revolution." *Parnassus* 1, no. 2 (February 15, 1929): 6-9.

Eisler, Colin. "*Kunstgeschichte* American Style: A Study in Migration." In *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960.* Edited by Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, 544-629. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969.

"Eitner, Lorenz." Dictionary of Art Historians. Accessed October 20, 2010. http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/eitnerl.htm.

Elsen, Albert. "College Art Association Policies and Activities, 1969-1970." *Art Journal* 30, no. 1 (Autumn 1970): 86-89.

"Errata: The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece." *Art Bulletin* 18, no. 1 (March 1936): 126.

Fahlund, Michael. "2009 Member Survey Results." *CAA News*. Last modified July 16, 2010. Accessed July 30, 2010. http://www.collegeart.org/news/2009/07/16/2009-member-survey-results/.

Fawcett, Trevor. "Scholarly Journals." In *The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines.* Edited by Trevor Fawcett and Clive Phillpot, 13-22. London: Art Book Company, 1976.

Fenza, David. "About AWP: The Growth of Creative Writing Programs." *Association of Writers and Writing Programs.* Accessed October 15, 2010. http://www.awpwriter.org/aboutawp/index.htm.

Forgacs, Eva. *The Bauhaus Idea and the Bauhaus Politics.* Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995.

Frey, John G. "Miro and the Surrealists." *Parnassus* 8, no. 5 (October 1936): 13-15.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The Great Crash: 1929.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954.

Garrett, Wendell, and Allison Eckardt Ledes. "Seventy-five Years of 'The Magazine Antiques,' 1922–1997." *The Magazine Antiques* 151 (January 1997): 178-83.

Geiger, Roger L. *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

______. *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities since World War II.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 2009.

______. "The Ten Generations of American Higher Education." In *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges.* Edited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport, 126-45. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Gilbert, Allan H., and Horst W. Janson. Review of *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* by Erwin Panofsky. *Art Bulletin* 22, no. 3 (September 1940): 172–75.

Gilbert, Creighton. "Editorial Ruminations," *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 204-6.

______. "On Subject and Non-Subject in Italian Renaissance Pictures." *Art Bulletin* 34, no. 3 (September 1952): 202-216.

______. "Inside the *Art Bulletin*." *CAA News,* April 1981, 12.

Goldwater, Robert. "The Teaching of Art in Colleges of the United States." *College Art Journal* 2, no. 4, supplement (May 1943): 1-31.

Gombrich, Ernst. *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography.* London: Warburg Institute, 1970.

______. *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation.* 2nd rev. ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Gouma-Peterson, Thalia, and Patricia Mathews. "The Feminist Critique of Art History." *Art Bulletin* 69, no. 3 (September 1987): 326-57.

Gropius, Walter. "The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus." In *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas.* Edited by Charles Harrison and Paul Wood, 338–42. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Guthrie, Kevin, Rebecca Griffiths, and Nancy Maron. "Sustainability and Revenue Models for Online Academic Resources: An Ithaka Report." San Francisco: Creative Commons, May 2008.

Haney, James Parton. "The Development of Public Schools." In *Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States.* Edited by James Parton Haney, 21-78. New York: American Art Annual, 1908.

Hamann, Richard. "Der Schrein des Heiligen Aegidius." *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 6 (1931): 114-64.

______. "Die Salzwedeler Madonna," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 3

(1927): 77–144.

Harris, Jonathan. *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Harris, Neil, et al. *Grand Illusions: Chicago's World's Fair of 1893.* Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1993.

Haskell, Barbara, et al., *Georgia O'Keefe: Abstraction.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; and New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 2009. An exhibition catalogue.

Heckscher, William S. "Erwin Panofsky: A Curriculum Vitae." In "Erwin Panofsky in Memoriam." Special issue, *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 28, no. 1 (1969): 13–14.

Held, Julius [S.]. Review of *A Catalogue of Early Flemish, Dutch, and German Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* by Harry Wehle and Margaretta M. Salinger. *Art Bulletin* 31, no. 2 (June 1949): 139-43.

Hiss, Priscilla, and Roberta Fansler. *Research in Fine Arts in the Colleges and Universities of the United States.* New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1934.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Wilson Smith, eds. *American Higher Education: A Documentary History.* 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Holly, Michael Ann. *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984.

______. "Panofsky, Erwin." In *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly. *Oxford Art Online*. Accessed March 10, 2010. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.

______. "Schapiro Style." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 6-10.

Hood, William. "The State of Research." *Art Bulletin* 69, no. 2 (June 1987): 174–86.

Hope, Henry R. "Editorial Note." *Art Journal* 30, no. 1 (Fall 1970): 89.

______. "Editor's Report." *Art Journal* 25, no. 3 (Spring 1966): 268-69.

______. "A Letter from the President to the Membership of the CAA." *College Art Journal* 10, no. 3 (Spring 1951): 274-75.

Hopkins, James R., William M. Hekking, and Louis Weinberg. "What Kind of Technical Art Shall Be Taught to the A. B. Student?" *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 28-42.

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.

Houser, Craig. “The Changing Face of Scholarly Publishing: CAA’s Publications Program.” in Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, and the Mind.*

Israel, Matthew. “CAA, Pedagogy and Curriculum: An Historical Effort, an Unparalleled Wealth of Ideas.” In Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*.

Jacobs, Ralph, and Bill D. Francis. “Ninety Years of the Western Arts Association.” *Art Education* 38, no. 4 (July 1985): 32-37.

Joyce, Maureen. “Art Historian John Shapley, 88, Dies.” *Washington Post*, September 13, 1978, C8.

Kantor, Sybil Gordon. “The Beginnings of Art History at Harvard and the ‘Fogg Method.’” In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 161-74.

Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta. “American Voices: Remarks on the Earlier History of Art History in the United States and the Reception of Germanic Art Historians,” *ARS* 42 (2009): 128-49.

Keyes, Homer Eaton. “The College Art Association.” *Art and Progress* 4, no. 4 (February 1913): 867-68.

Kimball, Fiske. “Luciano Laurana and the ‘High Renaissance.’” *Art Bulletin* 10, no. 2 (December 1927): 125-51.

Kirby, John, et al. “Periodical, sec. II Historical survey; 2. After c 1850; (i) Art history; (a) c. 1850–1930s.” In *Oxford Art Online.* Accessed March 20, 2008. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.

Klein, Maury. *Rainbow’s End: The Crash of 1929.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Kleinbauer, W. Eugene. *Modern Perspectives in Western Art History: An Anthology of 20th Century Writings on the Visual Arts.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

______. *Research Guide to the History of Western Art.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1982.

Kubler, George. *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1962.

Kultermann, Udo. *The History of Art History.* [New York?]: Abaris Books, 1993.

Landaurer, Carl. Review of *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* by Michael Ann Holly. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 44, no. 1 (Fall 1985): 82-83.

Lavin, Irving, ed. *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside: A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968).* Princeton, N.J.: Institute for Advanced Study, 1995.

Lavin, Marilyn Aronberg. “Princeton: The Beginnings under Marquand.” In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 7-10.

______. *The Eye of the Tiger: The Founding and Development of the Department of Art and Archaeology, 1883-1923, Princeton University.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1983.

Lears, T. J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Lee, Rensselaer W. “Charles Rufus Morey, 1877–1955.” *Art Bulletin* 37, no. 4 (December 1955): iii-vii.

Lee, Rennselaer, and John Pope-Hennessy. “Millard Meiss: In Memoriam.” *Art Journal* 35, no. 3 (Spring 1976): 261–62.

Levey, Michael. *The Burlington Magazine: A Centenary Anthology.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003.

“Literatur.” *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 49 (1928): 26.

Longman, Lester D. “Better American Art.” *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 4-5.

______. “The New *Parnassus*.” *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 4.

Lord, Louis E. “A Russian Painter of the Nineteenth Century, Elyas Repin.” *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 4 (June 1920): 213-18.

Mack, Arien, ed. “On the Work of Meyer Schapiro.” Special issue, *Social Research* 45, no. 1 (Spring 1978).

Maginnis, Hayden B. J. “Millard Meiss (25th March 1904–12th June 1975).” “Special Issue Devoted to the Italian Trecento in Memory of Millard Meiss,” *Burlington Magazine* 117, no. 869 (August 1975): 544, 547.

Mansfield, Elizabeth C., ed. *Art History and Its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

______., ed. *Making Art History: A Changing Discipline and Its Institutions.* New York: Routledge, 2007.

Manzella, David B. “The Teaching of Art in Colleges of the United States: A Comparison of Current Trends with Those of 1940.” *College Art Journal* 15, no. 3 (Spring 1956): 241-51.

Mattick, Paul. “Form and Theory: Meyer Schapiro’s: Theory and Philosophy of Art.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 16-18.

McDermott, Patrice. *Politics and Scholarship: Feminist Academic Journals and the Production of Knowledge.* Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

McMahon, Audrey. “May the Artist Live?” *Parnassus* 5, no. 5 (October 1933): 1-4.

McMahon, A. Philip. “The New Protagoras: A Pedantic Dialogue.” *Art Bulletin* 11, no. 2 (June 1929): 187-205.

Mechlin, Leila. “What Instruction Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Writer on Art?” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 21-22.

Meinhof, Werner. “Leonardos Hieronymus.” *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 52, nos. 1–2 (1931): 105.

Meiss, Millard. “The Art Bulletin at Fifty,” *Art Bulletin* 46, no. 1 (March 1964): 1-4.

______. *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1951.

______. “The Problem of Francesco Traini.” *Art Bulletin* 15, no. 2 (June 1933): 97–173.

______. “‘Ugolino Lorenzetti.’” *Art Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (September 1931): 376-97.

Menand, Louis. “The Marketplace of Ideas.” *American Council of Learned Societies Occasional Papers,* no. 49. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 2001.

[MENC: The National Association for Music Education]. *MENC: A Century of Service to Music Education: 1907-2007.* Evansville, Ill.: M.T. Publishing Company, 2007.

Metropolitan Museum of Art. “Works of Art: Collection Database.” Accessed May 1, 2010. http://www.metmuseum.org/works_of_art/collection_database/.

Michael, John A. “The Emergence of the Regionals and the NEA Art Departments: The National Art Education Association Is Born.” In *The National Art Education Association: Our History—Celebrating 50 Years, 1947-1997*, 1-22. Reston, Va.: NAEA, 1997.

Michels, Karen. “Art History, German Jewish Identity, and the Emigration of Iconology.” In *Jewish Identity in Modern Art History.* Edited by Catherine M. Sousloff, 167-79. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

______. “Transfer and Transformation: The German Period in American Art History.” In Barron with Eckmann, *Exiles + Émigrés,* 304-16.

______. *Transplantierte Kunstwissenschaft: Deutschsprachige Kunstgeschichte im amerikanischen Exil.* Studien aus dem Warburg Haus 2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999.

Middeldorf, Ulrich. Statement. *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 3.

Millett, John David. *The Works Progress Administration in New York City.* Chicago: Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council by Public Administration Service, 1938.

Minor, Vernon Hyde. *Art History's History.* 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2001.

[Modern Language Association] Executive Secretary. "The Beginning, Development, and Impact of the MLA as a Learned Society 1883-1958." *PMLA* 73, no. 5 (December 1958): 23-44.

Mongan, Agnes. "Harvard and the Fogg." In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 47-51.

Morey, C[harles]. R[ufus]. "The Art of Auguste Rodin." *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 145-54.

______. "The Harvard-Princeton Fine Arts Club." *Notes (Fogg Art Museum)* 2, no. 1 (April 1925): 30–34.

______. "Mediaeval Art and America." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 7 (1944): 1-6.

National Academy Museum and School. "History of the Academy." Accessed September 1, 2010. http://www.nationalacademy.org/pageview.asp?mid=5&pid=100.

Neumeyer, Alfred. "Theory and Practice in Art Education." *College Art Journal* 1, no. 1 (November 1941): 11-13.

New York Times. "Prof. John Shapley Will Leave NYU: Art Authority Has Been Appointed Head of Department University of Chicago." August 6, 1929.

Oleson, Alexandra, and John Voss, eds. *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Olin, Margaret. "Riegl, Alois." In *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly, *Oxford Art Online.* Accessed May 10, 2010. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.

Olsufiev, Yoori A. "The Development of Russian Icon Painting from the Twelfth to the Nineteenth Century." *Art Bulletin* 12, no. 4 (December 1930): 346-73.

Os, Henk van. "The Black Death and Sienese Painting: A Problem of Interpretation." *Art History* 4, no. 3 (September 1981): 237–49.

Pächt, Otto. "Art Historians and Art Critics: IV, Alois Riegl." *Burlington Magazine* 105, no. 722 (May 1963): 188-93.

______. "Panofsky's *Early Netherlandish Painting—II*," *Burlington Magazine* 98, no. 641 (August 1956): 266-77, 279.

Panofsky, Erwin. "The Concept of Artistic Volition." Translated by Kenneth J. Northcott

and Joel Snyder. *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 1 (Fall 1981): 17-33.

______. “Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst.” *Zeitschrift für Asthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 10 (1915): 460-67.

______. *Early Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

______. “The First Two Projects of Michelangelo’s Tomb of Julius II.” *Art Bulletin* 19, no. 4 (December 1937): 561-79.

______. “The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece.” *Art Bulletin* 17, no. 4 (December 1935): 432-73.

______. “The History of Art.” In *The Cultural Migration: The European Scholar in America.* Edited by Frances L. Neumann et al., 82-111. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.

______. “Introduction: The History of Art as a Humanistic Discipline.” In Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts,* 1-25.

______. “Letters to the Editor,” *Art Bulletin* 22, no. 4 (December 1940): 273.

______. *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Papers in and on Art History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

______. “Note on the Importance of Iconographical Exactitude.” *Art Bulletin* 21, no. 4 (December 1939): 402.

______. “Once More ‘The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece.’” *Art Bulletin* 20, no. 4 (December 1938): 419-42.

______. *Perspective as Symbolic Form.* Translated by Christopher S. Wood. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

______. “Preface.” In Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, v-viii.

______. *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

______. “Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European.” *College Art Journal* 14, no. 1 (Autumn 1954): 7-27.

______. “Zum Problem der Beschreibung und Inhaltsdeutung von Werken der bildenden Kunst.” *Logos* 21 (1932): 103-19.

Panofsky, Erwin, and Fritz Saxl. “Classical Mythology in Mediaeval Art.” *Metropolitan Museum Studies* 4, no. 2 (March 1933): 228-80.

Parker, Kevin. “Art History and Exile: Richard Krautheimer and Erwin Panofsky.” In Barron with Eckmann, *Exiles + Emigrés,* 317-25.

Parker, William R. “The MLA, 1883-1953,” *PMLA* 68, no. 4 (September 1953): 3-39.

Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art. “History of the School.” Accessed September 1, 2010. http://www.pafa.org/School/Overview/History-of-the-School/350.

______. “History and Timeline.” Accessed July 18, 2010. http://www.pafa.org/Museum/Research-Archives/History-and-Timeline/59/.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. *Academies of Art: Past and Present.* New York: DaCapo, 1973.

Phillips, Duncan. “Art and War.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 24-37.

______. “J. Alden Weir.” *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 4 (June 1920): 189-212.

Phillips, Patricia C. “In This Issue: Art of Attention.” *Art Journal* 64, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 3.

Pickard, John. “Art’s Counter-Offensive.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 19-24.

______. “Fifth Annual Meeting of the College Art Association of America.” *American Magazine of Art* 7, no. 4 (February 1916): 149.

______. “The Future of the College Art Association.” *Art Bulletin* 2, no. 1 (September 1919): 5-9.

______. “Message of Art for the Collegian.” *American Magazine of Art* 7, no. 4 (February 1916): 144-49.

______. “President’s Address.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 13-15.

______. “Some Decorations in the New State Capitol at Jefferson City, Missouri.” *Art Bulletin* 3, no. 4 (June 1921): 153–57.

Pigler, Andrew. “The Importance of Iconographic Exactitude.” *Art Bulletin* 21, no. 3 (September 1939): 228-37.

Plummer, John. “Insight and Outlook.” In “On the Work of Meyer Schapiro,” ed. Arien Mack. Special issue, *Social Research* 45, no. 1 (Spring 1978): 168-74.

Podro, Michael. *The Critical Historians of Art.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982.

______. “Panofsky, Erwin.” In *Grove Art Online*. *Oxford Art Online*. Accessed March 1, 2008. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.

Porter, A[rthur]. Kingsley. “Spain or Toulouse? and Other Questions.” *Art Bulletin* 7, no. 1 (September 1924): 2-25.

Porter, Lucy Kingsley. “Arthur Kingsley Porter.” In *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*, ed. Wilhelm R. W. Koehler, vol. 1. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.

Pratt, Judith. “Meeting for Women Members of the College Art Association.” *Art Journal* 31, no. 3 (Spring 1972): 322.

Preziosi, Donald, ed. *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

______. *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989.

Pulos, Arthur J. *American Design Ethic: A History of Industrial Design: A History of Industrial Design to 1940.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983.

Rawson, Philip. “A Professional Sage.” *New York Review of Books* 26, no. 2 (February 22, 1979). Accessed October 14, 2008. http://www.nybooks.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/articles/archives/1979/feb/22/a-professional-sage/?page=1.

Riegl, Alois. “The Main Characteristics of the Late Roman *Kunstwollen*.” In *The Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s.* Translated and edited by Christopher S. Wood, 87-104. New York: Zone Books, 2000.

Ritchie, Andrew C., et al. *Visual Arts in Higher Education: A Study Prepared for the College Art Association of America under a Grant from the Ford Foundation.* New York: College Art Association of America, 1966.

Robb, David. “The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.” *Art Bulletin* 18, no. 4 (December 1936): 480-526.

Robbins, Eugenia. “Art News from Colleges and Elsewhere.” *Art Journal* 32, no. 4 (Summer 1973): 455-56.

Robinson, David M. “On Reproductions for the College Museum and Art Gallery.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 3 (November 1917): 15-21.

Roos, Jr., Frank J. “Art Department University of Chicago.” *Parnassus* 12, no. 6 (October 1940): 20-22.

Roper, Dwight. “The Waning of the Old Boy Network: Placement, Publishing and Faculty Selection.” *Improving College and University Teaching* 28, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 12–18.

Rosand, David. “Obituary: Meyer Schapiro (1904–1996).” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57, no. 3 (July 1996): 547–49.

______. “Meyer Schapiro (23 September 1904–3 March 1996).” *Proceedings of the*

American Philosophical Society 142, no. 3 (September 1998): 494–98.

______. “Schapiro, Meyer.” In *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly. *Oxford Art Online*. Accessed April 20, 2010. http://www.oxfordartonline.com.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/subscriber/article/opr/t234/e0458?goto=schapiromeyer&type=biography&pos=2.

Rose, Barbara. *American Art since 1900*. Rev. and expanded ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975.

Rucker, Robert Hamilton “Japanese Sword Furniture.” *Parnassus* 7, no. 7 (December 1935): 21-23.

Rusk, William Sener. “Letter to the Editor,” *College Art Journal* 2, no. 1 (November 1942): 24-26.

Russell, H. Diane, and Richard Spear. “On the ‘State of Research’ Series.” *Art Bulletin* 70, no. 1 (March 1988): 138.

Russell, John. “Meyer Schapiro, 91, Historian and Teacher Who Wove Art and Life, Is Dead.” *New York Times*, March 4, 1996.

Russell, John Malcolm. “The Iconography of the Friedsam Annunciation.” *Art Bulletin* 60, no. 1 (March 1978): 24-27.

Sandler, Irving. “Modernism, Revisonism, Pluralism, and Post-modernism.” *Art Journal* 40, nos. 1 / 2 (Autumn-Winter 1980): 345-47.

Sandler, Lucy Freeman, et al. *CAA Newsletter*, Winter 1982, 1-8.

Sargent, Walter. “The Value of Art Education in Colleges.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 4 (September 1918): 83-88.

“Schapiro, Meyer [Meir until 1907].” In *Dictionary of Art Historians.* Accessed July 15, 2010. http://www.dictinoaryofarthistorians.org /schapierom.htm.

Schapiro, Meyer. Letter to the editor. *Parnassus* 12, no. 1 (November 1940): 2.

______. “New Documents on St.-Gilles.” *Art Bulletin* 17, no. 4 (December 1935): 415–31.

______. Review of *Babel’s Tower: The Dilemma of the Modern Museum* by Francis H. Taylor. *Art Bulletin* 27, no. 4 (December 1945): 272-76.

______. “Review of C. R. Morey, *Early Christian Art: An Outline of the Evolution of Style and Iconography in Sculpture and Painting from Antiquity to the Eighth Century*.” *Review of Religion* 9 (1944): 165–86.

______. “The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac: Part 1 (I).” *Art Bulletin* 13, no. 3 (September 1931): 249–351.

______. "The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac: Part 1 (2)." *Art Bulletin* 13, no. 4 (December 1931): 464–531.

______. *Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac.* New York: College Art Association, n.d.

______. *The Romanesque Sculpture of Moissac.* New York: George Braziller, 1985.

______. *Selected Papers I: Romanesque Art.* New York: George Braziller, 1977.

______. *Selected Papers II: Modern Art: 19th and 20th Centuries.* New York: George Braziller, 1978.

______. *Selected Papers III: Late Antique, Early Christian, and Medieval Art.* New York: George Braziller, 1979.

______. *Selected Papers IV: Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist, and Society.* New York: George Braziller, 1994.

Schapiro, Meyer, and Lillian Milgram Schapiro with David Craven. "A Series of Interviews (July 15, 1992–January 22, 1995)." *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 31 (Spring 1997): 159-68.

Schatz, David. *Peer Review: A Critical Inquiry.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004.

Schmidt, Otto. "A. Kingsley Porter, *Romanesque Sculpture of the Pilgrimage Roads*." *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* (1927): 266–69.

Schmit, Theodor. "The Study of Art in the U.S.S.R. (1917-1928)." *Parnassus* 1, no. 1 (January 1929): 7-10.

Schor, Mira, et al. "Contemporary Feminism: Art Practice, Theory, and Activism—An Intergenerational Perspective." *Art Journal* 58, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 8-29.

Schwabsky, Barry. "Resistance: Meyer Schapiro's Theory and Philosophy of Art." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 1-5.

Scott, Jeannette. "What Instruction in Art Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?" *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 18-19.

Seidel, Linda. "Arthur Kingsley Porter: Life, Legend, and Legacy." In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 97-110.

Shapley, Fern Rusk, and Clarence Kennedy. "Brunelleschi in Competition with Ghiberti." *Art Bulletin* 5, no. 2 (December 1922): 31–34.

Sherman, Claire Richter. "The Department of Art, Wellesley College, and the History of Art and Classical Archaeology, Bryn Mawr College, 1875-1914." In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 151-60.

Sienkewicz, Julia A. “Uniting the Arts and the Academy: A History of the CAA Annual Conference.” In Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*.

Silver, Larry. “The State of Research in Northern European Art of the Renaissance Era.” *Art Bulletin* 68, no. 4 (December 1986): 518-35.

Singerman, Howard. *Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Sloan, Joseph C. “The Scholar and the Artist.” *Art Journal* 23, no. 1 (Autumn 1963): 16-19.

Smith, E. B. “Appendix II: Study of the History of Art,” In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 12-36.

Smith, Holmes. “The College Art Association of America.” *School and Society* 4, no. 87 (August 26, 1916): 334-37.

______. “The Future of the University Round Table.” In *Proceedings of Meetings,* 143-46.

______. “The Problems of the College Art Association.” *Bulletin of the College Art Association* 1, no. 1 (January 1913): 6-10.

Smyth, Craig Hugh. “Charles Rufus Morey (1877–1955).” In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History*, 111–22.

______. “Introduction to Part 1.” In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 5-6.

______. “Walter W. S. Cook.” *Art Journal* 22, no. 3 (Spring 1963): 167.

Smyth, Craig Hugh, and Peter M. Lukehart, *The Early Years of Art History in the United States: Notes and Essays on Departments, Teaching, and Scholars.* Princeton, N.J.: Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, 1993.

Society of Architectural Historians. “History: The Society of Architectural Historians—Seven Decades of Scholarship.” Accessed May 22, 2010. http://www.sah.org /index.php?submenu=About&src=gendocs&ref=SAHHistory&category=About.

Society of Contemporary Art Historians. “Welcome to the Society of Contemporary Art Historians.” Accessed June 12, 2010. http://www.scahweb.org.

Sorensen, Lee, ed. Dictionary of Art Historians. http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org.

Spear, Richard. “Editorial Ruminations,” *Art Bulletin* 76, no. 2 (June 1994): 206-7.

______. “From the Editor.” *Art Bulletin* 68, no. 1 (March 1986): 6.

Steppat, Leo. “Can Creative Art Be Taught in College?” *College Art Journal* 10, no. 4 (Summer 1951): 385-88.

Strickland, Karilyn B. “Art Department.” In *An Administrative History of Vassar College 1861-2003.* Edited by Ronald D. Patkus and Elizabeth A. Daniels, 12. Poughkeepsie, N.Y.: Vassar College, 2004.

Stuhlfauth, Georg. “Literatur.” *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 52, nos. 1–2 (1931): 164-65.

Taylor, Curtis R. “The Old-Boy Network and the Young-Gun Effect.” *International Economic Review* 41, no. 4 (November 2000): 871–91.

Tierney, Cristin. “A Stimulating Prospect: CAA’s Traveling Exhibition Program, 1929–1937.” In Ball, *The Eye, the Hand, the Mind*.

Tomkins, Calvin. *Duchamp: A Biography.* New York: Henry Holt, 1996.

Tselos, Dimitri. “Too Many Societies?” *College Art Journal* 6, no. 4 (Summer 1947): 303-5.

University of Virginia. “Thomas Jefferson’s Academic Village.” Accessed January 12, 2010. http://www.virginia.edu/academicalvillage/.

U.S. Copyright Office. “Fair Use.” Revised September 2010. Accessed September 28, 2010. http://www.copyright.gov/fls/fl102.html.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Wallach, Alan. “Meyer Schapiro’s Essay on Style: Falling into the Void.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 11-15.

Waltham, Mary. “The Future of Scholarly Journals Publishing among Social Science and Humanities Associations: Report on a Study Funded by a Planning Grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.” February 18, 2009.

Watkin, David. *The Rise of Architectural History.* London: Architectural Press; Westfield, N.J.: Eastview Editions, 1980.

Watson, Forbes. “Art and the Government in 1934.” *Parnassus* 6, no. 8 (January 1935): 12-16.

Wehle, Harry B., and Margaretta M. Salinger, *A Catalogue of Early Flemish, Dutch, and German Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1947. An exhibition catalogue.

Weisberg, Ruth. “Art Journal at Fifty,” *Art Journal* 50, no. 4 (Winter 1991): 7.

Weller, Allen Stuart. “John Pickard, Walter Miller, the College Art Association, and the University of Missouri.” In *100 Years of Teaching Art History and Archaeology: University of Missouri, 1892-1992,* 6-37. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology, 1992.

Weller, Allen S., et al. “The Ph.D. for the Creative Artist.” *College Art Journal* 19, no. 4 (Summer 1960): 343-52.

Wendland, Ulrike. *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil: Leben und Werk der unter dem Nationalsozialismus verfolgten und vertriebenen Wissenschaftler*. 2 vols. Munich: K. G. Saur, 1999.

Werckmeister, O. K. “Meyer Schapiro, *Romanesque Art*” (book review). *Art Quarterly*, n.s. 2, no. 2 (Spring 1979): 211–18.

[Western Drawing and Manual Training Association]. *Proceedings of Meetings: Western Drawing and Manual Training Association.* Peoria, Ill.: J. W. Franks and Sons, 1915.

Williams, John. “Meyer Schapiro in Silos, Pursuing an Iconography of Style.” *Art Bulletin* 85, no. 3 (September 2003): 442–68.

Wilson, H. L. “The Proposed Non-technical Magazine.” *Bulletin of the Archaeological Institute of America* 4, no. 1 (March 1913): 7.

Wolff, Justin. "The Politics of American Modernism." In *Art in America: 300 Years of Innovation.* Edited by Susan Davidson, 192-209. New York: Guggenheim Museum, 2007. An exhibition catalogue.

Wood, Christopher S. “Art History’s Normative Renaissance.” In *The Italian Renaissance in the Twentieth Century,* 65-92. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2002.

Woodward, Ellsworth. “What Instruction in Art Should the College A. B. Course Offer to the Future Artist?” *Bulletin of the College Art Association of America* 1, no. 2 (January 1917): 19-20.

Woodward, Henry. “Annals of the College Music Society,” College Music Society. Accessed July 31, 2010. http://www.music.org.

Zanten, David van. “Formulating Art History at Princeton and the ‘Humanistic Laboratory.” In Smyth and Lukehart, *Early Years of Art History,* 175-82.

Zerner, Henri. “Editor’s Statement: The Crisis in the Discipline.” *Art Journal* 42, no. 4 (Winter 1982): 279.

Zuntz. “Eine Vorstufe der ‘Madonna Lactans.’” *Berliner Museen* 50, no. 2 (1929): 32-35.