Chapter Three – Sanctuary: Berkeley's First Art Colony (1906-1911)

If an art colony consists of individuals who have migrated to a specific place in order to live in close association, share common aesthetic interests and receive *institutional* support in a sympathetic community that recognizes the cultural and economic importance of artists,[1] then Berkeley between 1850 and 1905 did not satisfy these requirements. In sharp contrast to the nearby "Sodom of San Francisco," this rural town was incorporated in 1878 with the intent of creating a "sober bayside municipality" for the University of California which officially moved from Oakland to its present campus in 1873.[2] Berkeley's charm and stunning location at the base of the forested coastal hills enticed many artists who needed a convenient weekend escape from their San Francisco associates and "a venue of inspiration" to sketch in unfettered nature.[3] Sightings of mountain lions and deer were frequent. Eventually, the lure of this bucolic haven attracted three major figures from the art world as permanent settlers. The "Dean" among the California painters, William Keith, moved to Berkeley in 1886 and lived near the campus until his death in April of 1911. Despite his spiritual attachment to the local oak trees, Keith commuted for many years on the ferry to his San Francisco studio and sold his paintings there or in that city's galleries. The tightly controlled social life of this rather shy temperamental painter revolved around the literati of the University of California and visiting naturalists, such as John Muir, not his fellow artists.[4] Edwin Deakin, one of the region's most famous and versatile painters, purchased in 1890 a large tract of land along the south Berkeley border and built a Mission-style studio-home on Telegraph Avenue. Although he resided and painted there until his death, Deakin maintained his professional contacts prior to 1906 in San Francisco where he marketed his paintings through various displays, auctions and fairs. After joining the faculty at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art Charles Chapel Judson was appointed in 1901 an Instructor in Drawing at the University of California. Weekly he carried completed paintings from his East Bay residence to sell in San Francisco at the Art Association, Bohemian Club and his "public" studio.

The local Directory of 1892-93 listed only eight resident-artists in Berkeley, including Keith and Deakin, while adjoining Oakland, the state's third largest city, had a total of eighty-six.[5] Many of the "artists" listed in the Oakland classified section were dilettantes who apparently completed some type of art training, but never exhibited publicly. Others specialized in commercial illustration, ceramic painting, wall decoration or portraits, including painted miniatures and photographs. Like Berkeley, Oakland had only a few widely-recognized professional painters who resided within the city and maintained their professional contacts in San Francisco: Carl Dahlgren, Thomas Hill, Christian Jörgensen, Richard Partington and Raymond Dabb Yelland. Surprisingly, Oakland had no centers to retail art nor apparently the quantity of interested clientele to make it profitable. The *Daily Alta California*, a well-respected San Francisco newspaper, offered this blunt assessment: "Oakland . . . . cannot boast of one single private art collection of any magnitude save the one which Mr. Henry D. Bacon so generously deeded to the State and which has been transported to the classic shades of Berkeley."[6] Attempts to establish organizations in support of painters and sculptors quickly failed. In the 1890s the infrequent "art displays" at Oakland's Ebell Club lacked focus and drew amateurs rather than professional artists; the Oakland Sketch Club, which was founded in 1896, staged a few exhibitions and then quickly folded.[7] The exhibits of paintings between 1895 and 1898 at Oakland's annual Industrial Expositions, which on one

occasion had over one-hundred and thirty works by such talents as Isabel Hunter, Charles C. Judson, Mary DeNeale Morgan, Richard Partington and Raymond D. Yelland, never served as a catalyst to establish regular art exhibitions or a local art association.[8] In a half satirical article the *San Francisco Call* devoted an entire page in May of 1903 to the short-lived "Oakland Art Dabblers Association" where Anne Bremer of San Francisco briefly taught "society artists."[9] The benefit exhibitions of the Oakland Art Fund attracted many fine artists for several years, including Mary Brady, Anne Bremer, Giuseppe Cadenasso, John Gamble, James Griffin, William Keith, Charles P. Neilson, Gottardo Piazzoni, Arthur Putnam, Mary Herrick Ross, Theodore Wores and Sydney Yard, but they ended in 1905 when the widely publicized "Plea for a Oakland Art Gallery" fell on deaf ears.[10] This Art Fund, which was broadly established to support music, literature, theatre and all visual arts, had no permanent venue. In 1902 and 1905 its annual exhibit was held at the rooms of the Starr King Fraternity. In 1904 it received limited space in Oakland's First Unitarian Church.[11] About 1904-05 the Home Club of Oakland staged one exhibition that attracted dozens of luminaries, such as Henry Joseph Breuer, Amédée Joullin, Lorenzo Latimer, Julian Rix, Charles Dorman Robinson, Guy Rose and Matteo Sandona, but thereafter it hosted no other art events.[12] In like manner The Oakland Club experimented with, then abandoned displays by local artists.[13] Oakland's Palette, Lyre and Pen Club, which was established in 1905, did exhibit the work of a few professional artists, including Charles P. Neilson, DeNeale Morgan and Xavier Martinez, and even proposed a permanent art gallery, but it ceased to function in late 1906.[14] A similar fate ended the "James D. Hahn Gallery" which was actually a tailor's shop whose proprietor staged ad hoc exhibitions in his store window and preferred to display examples of regional artists from his own collection. Two framing shops in Oakland, Saake's Studio on Telegraph Avenue and Rabjohn's on Fourteenth Street, presented at irregular intervals small exhibitions of area painters.[15] Local Oakland artists, such as the Herrick sisters, held art displays for society matrons, but made no attempt to establish an organization for professionals.[16]

Prior to 1906 the wealthy island community of Alameda made several valiant attempts to sustain an art colony. In October of 1895 J. D. Jewett with the support of Frederick Schafer and R. G. Holdrege established the Alameda Art League and its teaching arm the Art Students League. The twenty-three members were committed to meet three times a week in Jewett's studio on Santa Clara Avenue to sketch "some excellent models" and discuss art.[17] For unspecified reasons the group dissolved shortly thereafter. In April of 1896 the Alameda Art League was "reorganized" with Ralph E. Robinson as president, Charles C. Judson as vice president and Charles P. Neilson as both secretary and treasurer. Neilson taught separate classes in "drawing from the nude" for men and women as well as a "mixed class with drawing from a draped model."[18] The first League exhibition was staged that November at its headquarters in the Central Block and, in addition to its three officers, had several prominent contributors, including Perham Nahl, Isabel Hunter, Lorenzo Latimer and Raymond D. Yelland.[19] The second exhibition of the League was held between April 29th and May 1st of 1897 and drew in addition to the above mentioned artists such luminaries as: Giuseppe Cadenasso, Amédée Joullin, Henry Raschen, Carl von Perbandt, Percy Gray, Arthur Best, John Stanton, Charles Dickman and Henry Joseph Breuer.[20] The League made plans for another large exhibition that fall, but internal conflicts and logistical issues permanently doomed the organization.[21] In the spring of 1899 the "art section" of the Alameda Teacher's Club decided to stage an exhibition of more than three dozen regional artists which comprised most of the names

above and several new faces, including Maynard Dixon, Harry Seawell, DeNeale Morgan, Alice Best and Charles Rollo Peters as well as Alameda residents: Oscar Kunath, Charles P. Neilson, Will Sparks, H. W. Hansen, James M. Griffin, Isabel Hunter and the Nahls.[22] The Teachers' Club held a smaller show of watercolors that December with Hansen, Neilson, Griffin and a new Alameda resident, Francis McComas.[23] Thereafter attempts by the Teachers' Club to display professional artists ended. In March of 1900 Neilson and Robinson founded the Alameda Art Club to carry on the Art League's instruction, but this group also folded within a year.[24] The momentum internally and externally for sustaining an art colony in Alameda never materialized.

Before 1906 the situation was no better in Berkeley where the University of California supplied little support for the visual arts. In the 1870s all freshmen were required to take "freehand drawing," not to encourage a career in art, but to give them the requisite skills for courses in engineering and other applied sciences. In 1881 Henry D. Bacon filled his library on campus with a handsome collection of over sixty European and Hudson River School paintings, which included, in addition to works by Albert Bierstadt and Henry Raschen, a Rembrandt.[25] This became the first "public collection of art" in the East Bay, but soon access to non-University visitors was limited to only a few days each year. By 1906 the "Bacon Gallery" had permanently closed and was turned into a faculty lounge.[26] Only a small part of that collection was accessible in 1911 because the University still lacked an art gallery.[27] In 1885 a Department of Drawing and Mapmaking was organized, again with the idea of encouraging certain practical skills. In the mid 1890s the University created the "Department of Decorative Design and Industrial Art" with a curriculum that resembled an arts and crafts school. It offered a variety of elementary and advanced drawing courses, including "antique, plant analysis and historical ornament," as well as applied art, wood-carving, clay modeling, art furniture, interior decoration and ceramics.[28] The English-born Henry T. Ardley was the designated chairman; Herman Kower was the Assistant Professor of industrial drawing. After the abrupt resignation of Bernard Maybeck from this department the eminent painter Raymond D. Yelland was hired to teach drawing and a "life class from costumed models." For reasons that are presently unclear "a scandal," which may have involved Ardley's life class for graduate students, forced the University to abolish the department in 1899 and compelled the serious art students to study at the California School of Design in San Francisco.[29] Unfortunately, Berkeley's recently formed California Art Club, which was presided over by Ardley, dissolved in the "disgraceful affair." Ardley himself was evidently untainted by these events for he continued with his successful career as an art teacher and lecturer.[30] In 1900 the "Department of Drawing and Engineering Design" was created by the University to teach the most practical courses to engineering students; Kower was its chairman and Maybeck, who taught perspective drawing, left a year later to head the new "Department of Architecture."[31] In 1898 the First Unitarian Church of Berkeley founded the Channing Club "for the benefit of Unitarian students on campus" as both a religious and social organization.[32] On a few occasions the Club exhibited handicrafts, art and photographs of the parishioners. In April of 1899 the University created for the female students a rather anemic "Art Association" that combined music and literature with the occasional "art discussion."[33] Vickery's Gallery of San Francisco was persuaded in 1903 by this Art Association to stage a two-day exhibition of Pacific Coast artists at a local hall, but for unspecified reasons the experiment was never repeated.[34] The equally rare art history lectures at the University were officially open to local residents, but sparsely attended.[35]

This general lack of interest in art at the University was mirrored in the community at large. When the "Ladies of Berkeley" organized in 1900 an "Art Loan Exhibition Society" and made Professor Benjamin Wheeler "honorary president," nothing permanent was accomplished after the inaugural exhibit.[36] The attempt by L. M. Hale to display the works of professional artists at his "handsome art room" in Berkeley also ended after the inaugural exhibition in October of 1901.[37] Between 1902 and 1904 the annual studio exhibitions of California mission paintings in the Berkeley home of Edwin Deakin received little or no notice in the local press.[38] When Berkeley's Hillside Club staged an "important arts and crafts exhibit" in 1904, it consisted exclusively of foreign bric-a-brac collected from the Victorian drawing rooms of its members; likewise a Berkeley weekly lavished attention on a *needlework copy* of Raphael's "Sistine Madonna," while neglecting major exhibitions in San Francisco.[39] Among the citizens of the East Bay there was no consciousness of artists in their immediate communities, but they merely assumed that San Francisco was the cultural epicenter. The resident artists of Berkeley ignored the locals.

Without any civic support, intent or recognition Berkeley had increased its population of legitimate artists and "art photographers" by December of 1905 to include:[40] Laura A. Armer, Henry J. Breuer, Anne Brigman, Jennie W. Brothers, Mabel Burnett, Frederick S. Butler, Frances S. Campbell, Eleanor Carlisle, Louise M. Carpenter, Helen C. Chandler, Sally Daingerfield, Michael J. Doyle, William A. Gaw, Adelaide M. Hanscom, Myrtle Hill, Ellen & Bertha Kleinschmidt, Oscar V. Lange, Edward J. Lough, Florence Lundborg, Ida M. Manchester, Oscar Maurer, Charlotte Morgan, May Morrison, Charles P. Neilson, Katherine W. Newhall, Emily H. Pitchford, George T. Plowman, Arthur Putnam, Eda Saint John Smitten and Maude L. Swan. Most worked independently and exhibited in San Francisco. The majority were single women who chose a Berkeley residence because it was safe, respectable and most importantly, inexpensive. However, when Jennie Cannon visited Berkeley in the fall of 1907, she encountered "artist groups and displays everywhere" and concluded that the University town "surpasses San Francisco as the art capital of the West." Today, if we base our judgment on the quantity as well as the reputation of resident and exhibiting artists, then for a six-year period between 1906 and 1911 Berkeley possessed and encouraged the state's most important artistic community.

This brief but glorious metamorphosis was due to the dramatic shift in population and wealth after the April 1906 earthquake and fire in San Francisco. Immediately following the disaster that city's large art establishment faced several alternatives. A minority of artists continued to live in the ruins or in adjoining towns to the south and reoccupied their San Francisco studios within months. Others took the opportunity to migrate to Europe, the Atlantic seaboard or southern California. By far the largest and most notable assemblage of evacuees traveled just nine miles directly northeast to Berkeley, a respected center for education. The fact that all of the salvaged paintings, sculpture and faculty from the devastated Mark Hopkins Institute of Art had been temporarily relocated to Berkeley, coupled with the persistent rumor that the Institute would permanently move to the U.C. campus, persuaded many artists to migrate.[41] In just three months the rapidity and size of this movement began to alarm San Franciscans. The *San Francisco Morning Call* dispatched to Berkeley a reporter who described in a prominent well-illustrated article on July 15, 1906 the resettlement of two women artists:[42]

> Berkeley has been favored since the earthquake and fire in the accession to the ranks of artists here of San Francisco painters, poets and "Bohemians" in numbers quite

> unprecedented. When the flames swept the town studios [of San Francisco] . . . the hapless painters and their ilk turned almost involuntarily to Berkeley as a place of refuge.
>
> Miss Sue Dangerfield [sic] and Miss Frances Campbell, . . the successful miniature portrait painters of San Francisco, . . have been enabled to form a salon on Bancroft Way, providing for art lovers and art workers a place where "shop talk" can be heard and all the news of the little world of "Bohemia" discussed and enjoyed.
>
> William Keith, . . . has found it practicable to do his work in Berkeley, and so the art colony here has enjoyed the prestige that such an accession to its ranks would naturally bring.

That evening *The Oakland Tribune* produced a variation on this article with photographs of the two attractive female artists mentioned above and declared in its headlines: "Clever Portrait Painters Find a New Home in Town of Berkeley: Brush and Pencil Wielders Add to Colony."[43] Ironically, Daingerfield and Campbell had quietly resided prior to 1906 in Berkeley, but worked so exclusively in San Francisco as to give the impression that they were "city artists."

When a local Berkeley newspaper proudly summarized the *Call* and *Tribune* stories, it proclaimed that "Berkeley probably now shelters more artists, painters and poets, writers and literary men and women than any other community in California, and apparently they all find the atmosphere congenial, for their plans seem to include permanent quarters here."[44] There was a real sense that San Francisco's cultural heritage would be lost unless it was rebuilt in Berkeley. Many artists, including Anne M. Bremer, Louis A. Buchanan, Rose L. Campbell, Charlotte H. Colby, Walter I. Cox, Charles M. Crocker, Sophie V. Culp, Carl C. Dahlgren, Sarah E. Dorr, James M. Griffin, Caroline A. Kennedy, Dyak L. Kooreman, Blanche Letcher, Louise H. Mahoney, Jules R. Mersfelder, Karl Eugen Neuhaus, Marion G. Norton, Harry W. Seawell, Elizabeth B. Strong and Evelyn A. Withrow, were "enabled" to settle because immediately after the earthquake the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce and "sympathetic citizens" made conspicuous efforts to find permanent housing and professional studios for this first wave of "desirable" new residents. Their success at creating a "hospitable sanctuary" quickly became apparent. In a decidedly callous and jingoistic display one of Berkeley's weeklies, *The Courier*, ran this headline in July of 1906:[45]

ART CENTER IS HERE

> No, San Francisco need not fear her southern neighbor [Los Angeles]. Her only dangerous rival is our own city, Berkeley.

That November the *Berkeley Daily Gazette* declared that "every week sees an addition to the rapidly increasing art colony and studios can now be found in almost every block."[46] The anger of the San Francisco press, which often discussed their former artists without any mention of their new Berkeley addresses, was obvious in the reply: "Berkeley is giving itself airs of a metropolis."[47] Although the University town was a modest city by definition, it was small enough that the artists collectively became a distinct and revered influence that changed Berkeley's perception of itself. Unlike many art colonies in the United States, which were populated exclusively by landscape painters, here were also portrait artists, ceramicists, etchers, sculptors and "art" photographers.

Berkeley was one of the few Bay Area settlements that avoided serious damage in the earthquake.[48] In tandem with Oakland it set up temporary encampments and opened private homes as well as public institutions to the many thousands of refugees.[49] When the early headlines declared "San Francisco in Flames – City is Doomed," the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce quickly instituted a "program of aid" that was a thinly veiled attempt to attract displaced businesses with incentives such as low-cost loans and inexpensive land. In published

advertisements from the Berkeley Relief Committee, which sought temporary lodgings for refugees, was the imperative in bold type: **Now is the Time to Attract Desirable Residents to Berkeley**. The city quickly passed a bond measure to build a new wharf to accommodate the largest commercial ships.[50] Between May and September of 1906 almost forty new factories were erected in Berkeley. The Real Estate Board was so successful in marketing residential property to terrified San Franciscans that Berkeley's population between March 1906 and April 1907 grew from thirty-one thousand to forty-three thousand, ensuring its place as the state's fourth (or fifth) largest city.[51] One of the dominant real estate agencies, Mason-McDuffie Company, was accused of buying homes from Berkeley residents at low prices and selling high to needy San Franciscans.[52] For over a year that firm placed full-page advertisements in *Sunset* magazine to proclaim that Berkeley was not only the safe convenient alternative to San Francisco, but was also the region's "new commercial center."[53] The Berkeley Home Building Association promised refugees quick construction of custom homes on any of the thousands of recently surveyed lots.

A momentous step in regional art history occurred in June of 1906 when two local entrepreneurs, the father and son Frederick and Clarence Dakin, announced that their large five-story building under construction in downtown Berkeley would hereafter be known as the "Studio Building" and its top floor would become the area's first free "public art gallery."[54] Frederick H. Dakin, who had changed his name from "Deakin" on or about 1900, acquired a substantial fortune, initially from importing art and "curios" directly from Japan, and then from mining, construction and real estate.[55] Under the tutelage of his famous brother, the artist Edwin Deakin, Frederick amassed a sizable private collection of California art, which grew to enormous proportions when he joined other Berkeleyans, such as Herbert Offield, to purchase paintings from desperate San Franciscans in need of ready cash.[56] Edwin Deakin, who had an enduring interest in architecture and construction, was asked by Frederick to design his penthouse art gallery. In addition to the exhibition space, which was provided with an abundance of diffused light through carefully placed square-headed dormers, the upper floors were divided into twenty large studios, each one to be "occupied by some well-known artist." Deakin also created the entrance mosaic that depicted "an artist's palette with intertwining brushes" and added a spacious lounge with an "entrance to a balcony overlooking the bay and the Golden Gate."[57] According to the publicity, this was the first "professional" building of its type outside of New York and destined to "make Berkeley an art center." Even before its completion San Francisco visitors began clamoring for a similar structure in their own city.[58] The Dakins inaugurated the Studio Building on December 1, 1906 with the largest display of fine arts ever seen in the East Bay: "The exhibition marks an important epoch in the history of the college town – the awakening of the people of a city set in a most ideal, artistic location, to the realization of the beauties about them and of the importance of art."[59] Because of the number of "loaned" paintings, which were primarily from out-of-town artists, was almost equal to the number of works solicited directly from local artists, the press also referred to this show as the "Art Loan Exhibition." Below the gallery of paintings on the fifth floor were displays of "art photos" and crafts; the latter encompassed household articles and imported brasses from Russia. "Society Co-sponsors" for this exhibition included the wife of architect John Galen Howard as well as Mrs. William Keith. The Berkeley photographers Oscar V. Lange, Emily Pitchford and Oscar Maurer had concurrent studio exhibits. All of the profits from these exhibitions were given to the Berkeley Kindergarten Association.

Aside from the physical accommodations provided for artists, another factor that helped to crystallize Berkeley's painters into a colony was the near cult status given to William Keith. His slow apotheosis quickened at the turn of the century with his growing acclaim across the United States and Europe.[60] The exorbitant prices paid for his coveted and occasionally stolen oils only confirmed the belief in his greatness and consequently the naming of a local street in his honor was perfectly natural.[61] Keith's personal wealth became the subject of speculation in the local gossip columns.[62] In 1906 there was a genuine feeling of cultural loss that so many of Keith's paintings had been destroyed in the San Francisco fire. According to *The Wasp*, the only item retrieved from Keith's incinerated studio was a valuable Japanese "gong."[63] However, it was confirmed that Rev. Joseph Worcester managed to collect twenty-nine of the best paintings from that studio prior to its destruction.[64] One Berkeley newspaper reported that the "majority" of Keith's famous landscape paintings had been saved temporarily from the San Francisco fire and transferred to a house near the Presidio for safe keeping; these works supposedly burned in the advancing fire.[65] The story that Keith lost over two thousand works of art in his studio is an obvious exaggeration which was intended to increase the value of existing and new works by the master. San Francisco newspapers were rife with rumors that Keith planned to relocate his "working studio" back to that city, but after the earthquake he painted almost exclusively in his Berkeley home.[66] He publicly promised to create two thousand new paintings. Keith's mass production of "potboilers" after 1906, the concomitant decline in the quality of his work and the proliferation of good forgeries became the focus of serious debates for several decades after his death.[67] The mere rumor that he had completed a major canvas was sufficient justification to publish announcements in the Berkeley press.[68] Likewise, when Keith fell and suffered a disputed "partial paralysis" while walking amid the ruins of San Francisco, his convalescence at his Berkeley home generated front-page bulletins and debate.[69] A San Francisco weekly, which feared further damage to the city's reputation, falsely claimed that this accident was caused by Keith's beloved dogs in Berkeley.[70] His personal philosophy, which was a unique blend of Swedenborgian theology and mysticism, was widely discussed and adopted by many Berkeley painters. In fact, the many followers of the Barbizon school of painting, who were unofficially led by Jules Mersfelder, joined in small expeditions to Keith's reputed haunts. Here in pursuit of their romantic ideals these gilded Bohemians rendered the gnarled oaks in their trademark "low key" tones and composed poetry. A number of prominent painters made short sketching visits to the area, including: Ernest C. Peixotto, Henry Percy Gray, Charles H. Grant, G. Thompson Pritchard, Benjamin C. Brown, Fanny E. Nute and Grace C. Hudson.[71] Five important artists from nearby Oakland – Goddard Gale, Pedro Lemos, Lorenzo P. Latimer, DeNeale Morgan and Sydney Yard – were so conspicuous in Berkeley and the adjoining hills during the spring and fall of 1906 and 1907 that some locals assumed they lived near the campus.[72] So many artists came to the University town to draw inspiration from the proximity of William Keith and his beloved Berkeley hills that it truly should be called the last bastion of the Barbizon school. Painters as diverse as Henry J. Breuer and Evelyn A. Withrow leased rooms in the Studio Building to socialize with the burgeoning art colony and many sought a much coveted audience with Keith himself.[73] However, the more attention that was showered on Keith, the further he withdrew into domestic seclusion. When the San Francisco Art Association hosted an unprecedented exhibition of seventy Keith canvases in conjunction with his 70th birthday – an event patronized by the civic elite of the Bay Area – he refused to attend, but sent his wife

who presented a short letter of "regret" to R. H. Fletcher.[74] Shortly thereafter, when it was announced that a forthcoming art museum in Berkeley would have a "permanent memorial exhibit" of Keith paintings, the great master declined to cooperate with the project. Keith had become as reclusive as Monet and Berkeley was his Giverny.

Desirous for professional contacts and a stimulating congenial home a second wave of influential artists settled in Berkeley between 1907 and 1911. Among these migrants were: Alice M. Best, Mary C. Brady, Althea Chase, Charles J. Dickman, Anna M. Doty, Charles A. Fries, Bertha S. Lee, Jessie Short(-Jackson), Marie A. Ney, Will Sparks, Emily Travis, Jack Wisby and ten of the art instructors at the California School of Arts and Crafts (CSAC).[75] The faculty of the latter included: Ethel F. Anderson, Bertha M. Boye, Elizabeth Ferrea, Xavier Martinez, Frederick H. Meyer, Perham W. Nahl, Isabelle C. Percy(-West), William S. Rice, Mabel V. Shively and Jessie Willard. Four of its teachers, Helen C. Chandler, Ida M. Manchester, James M. Griffin and Blanche Letcher, had lived in Berkeley prior to the opening of the CSAC in 1907.

The CSAC became a cornerstone for the swelling art community. During the early summer of 1906 Frederick Dakin played a pivotal role in its foundation when he offered the president of San Francisco's California Guild of Arts and Crafts, Professor Frederick H. Meyer, three "classrooms" in his soon to be completed Studio Building at an incredibly low rent.[76] In an article published shortly after the earthquake Meyer spoke of the genuine need to establish California's first "practical art school," one that would not only provide each student with extensive training in the aesthetic arts, but also with "certified" and employable skills as practitioners or teachers of design, mechanical drawing and commercial arts and crafts.[77] This was his not-so-subtle slap at the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art which habitually graduated students who found success in the highly volatile art market so elusive that they disappeared. During his five years as an Instructor at the University of California (1902-06) Meyer had grown fond of Berkeley and righteously believed that its forthcoming prohibition on the sale of alcoholic beverages created the most salubrious atmosphere for study.[78] In addition to the town's apparent seismic stability, there was the added attraction that the University and the large art colony would provide a ready supply of potential students which the ruins of San Francisco could not. Meyer accepted Dakin's offer, permanently resigned his University appointment and immediately embarked for Europe to visit his ancestral home in Germany and to study its regional art schools.[79]

On June 24, 1907 Meyer opened his "School of the California Guild of Arts and Crafts" with forty-three students, forty-five dollars in cash and his credit.[80] His wife, Laetitia, functioned as the secretary and advisor. For the first year the school occupied a small portion of the Studio Building at the corner of Shattuck Avenue and Addison Street. Prior to the start of the summer term in 1908 the school moved to the second floor of Woodmen's Hall at 2130 Center Street, directly above Al Ziemer's pool and billiard parlor.[81] By the fall of 1910 some of the school's classes had relocated to a larger complex, the vacant two-story Commercial High School building, which was the former Berkeley High, at 2119 Allston Way.[82] By the summer of 1911 all classes were taught on Allston Way. According to the catalogue of the first academic year, tuition for a full-time student through both terms was seventy dollars and for admission no special qualifications were required "beyond good moral character and such proficiency in the common English branches as the completion of the ordinary grammar school course would imply."[83] Perham W. Nahl, an instructor at U.C. Berkeley's Architecture Department, was persuaded by Meyer to become his "partner" in this

enterprise and head of its new “Art Department.” Meyer conducted his own courses in freehand and instrumental drawing, furniture design, woodcarving and descriptive geometry. He had taught similar classes at the California School of Design and was so highly regarded as a cabinet maker that he was commissioned to make the furniture for Wyntoon, the Phoebe Hearst estate in Siskiyou County, and for the California Building at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition. The third instructor in the summer of 1907, Elizabeth Ferrea, was responsible for the courses in clay and wax modeling. Like Nahl she was born in San Francisco and educated locally at the School of Design where she received honors and came to Meyer’s attention. She taught at Meyer’s school until 1914, but continued to exhibit her sculpture to great acclaim and received international recognition for her bas relief, *The Potato Child*. Diphtheria tragically ended her life in 1925. In the fall of 1907 Meyer hired the Alameda-born Isabelle Percy(-West), the daughter of a wealthy San Francisco architect and another graduate of the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art. Prior to arriving in Berkeley she studied with Arthur W. Dow in New York and Henry B. Snell in England. The talented Percy taught courses in design, drawing and watercolor as well as a class in applied design with Meyer. She was not a co-founder of his school and received a disproportionately small amount of the profit sharing. This may have been one factor that led to her resignation in the fall of 1908, when she resumed post-graduate work at Columbia University and eventually study in Europe. After spending several years in Oakland Percy returned to New York in 1916 and resided with her new husband, George West. Four years later she reappeared at Meyer’s school as the Professor of Costume Design and Composition. Like Nahl she frequently visited the Carmel art colony, where she exhibited her art, but unlike most of her colleagues, Percy-West adopted for her own art the abstract forms of “Modernism” in the 1930s.

Meyer, who initially believed that he needed a nominal institutional affiliation to be successful, stressed in the preamble of the catalogue for the first full academic year – August 1907 to June 1908 – that his school was an *extension* of the California Guild of Arts and Crafts in San Francisco and was established “for instruction in industrial art.”[84] However, his vision for education went far beyond the philosophy of the Guild. He officially organized his classes into the same principal divisions that were traditional at Berlin’s Royal Academy with the distinction between applied arts (practical training for designers) and normal arts (fine arts training for teachers in drawing, painting and manual skills). In addition to the “Diplomas” for the two categories above, the school also offered an “Industrial Certificate” for commercial drawing and modest scholarships. However, Meyer’s intent was to integrate the instruction of applied, fine and industrial arts. As there was significantly more demand for classes in drawing and painting from a student body that increased fivefold in just a few years, he greatly expanded the art curriculum and faculty.[85] The more Meyer denied that his school was a direct challenge to San Francisco’s new Institute of Art, which coincidentally opened about the same time, the more interest the local press took in his comments.[86] According to one Berkeley paper, his classes were largely full of former students from the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art, but Meyer steadfastly denied any intention to recreate the older institution.[87] As early as February of 1907 the San Francisco press accused Meyer of trying to steal the Mark Hopkins’ students: “it is known that he [Meyer] has approached some of the former pupils of the school with questions as to whether they would transfer their allegiance to him in the event of his starting a school of his own. So the [Hopkins] Institute, besides losing most of its teachers, may find itself with a rival to compete with.”[88] In order to quiet dissent from members

of the California Guild in San Francisco over his ambitious plans in the "arts," he renamed his institution the California School of Arts and Crafts (CSAC) in the summer of 1908. To accommodate public school teachers, who were unavailable on the weekdays, night and Saturday classes were scheduled. There was also a "Juvenile Class" on Saturday. As with universities today he knew the value of charismatic "superstars" in drawing new applicants and he managed in the summer of 1909 to hire Xavier Martinez. The frequent and widely publicized exhibitions by both students and faculty on the school premises drew large crowds and became a focus for the artistic community at large.[89] The games and "burlesque" at the school's end-of-term "jinks," which oddly enough paralleled similar practices at the Bohemian Club and the old Mark Hopkins Institute of Art, were widely reported with delight in the Berkeley press.[90] Because of Meyer's official campaign to expand the arts in local public schools and his persistent voluntary efforts to organize local art societies, the CSAC quickly became a beloved institution.

The meager corpus of faculty teaching "drawing" at the University of California played a small but important role in the development of the Berkeley art colony. The University did not have an official "Art Department" until the early 1920s, so instructors were hired, often on a part-time basis, to teach *practical* courses.[91] The "Department of Drawing," which was simply a division of the School of Engineering, hired artists to teach requisite drawing courses to engineering and architecture students. Eugen Neuhaus described his experience in 1908 when he was appointed an instructor to that department which had an engineer as its chairman. His sole class was to teach future architects and engineers how to make accurate drawings from "antique" plaster casts.[92] Charles C. Judson had been appointed to a similar position in 1901 and continued to teach the same courses. Ironically, it was in the summer sessions, "which were self-supporting and not governed strictly by University policy," that artists were engaged to offer "non-traditional subjects."[93] Charles P. Neilson, who taught U.C. courses in the fall term, held immensely successful "water color and landscape classes" in the summer of 1906. In 1907 the students at the Department of Architecture began the annual exhibition of their art, the first display of this type on campus.[94] By 1910 a few "art" courses had been incrementally added to the engineering curriculum and within two years Judson was teaching still-life painting and Neuhaus followed with a course on color theory and advanced design.[95]

The University's rather indifferent approach to art was abruptly shattered when a recently hired drawing instructor in the Department of Architecture, the talented painter Harry W. Seawell, drew everyone's opinion into a firestorm of controversy which spread nationally. The San Francisco-born Seawell had studied at the School of Design and at the Académie Julian in Paris where he also exhibited at the Salon. As the son of an influential superior court judge he had every advantage and could afford to take risks. In the summer of 1906 Seawell proposed to offer an "unorthodox life course" in which he intended to use nude models. The University president, Benjamin Wheeler, confronted this "wickedness" and took the unprecedented step to deny a campus classroom to this new member of the faculty. The first hint of scandal broke on August 3rd, when the venerable William Keith issued one of his extremely rare public statements in favor of nude models.[96] Keith was careful not to criticize publicly the University president, but instead addressed an identical scandal in New York and declared that the "model is essential to real art." Wheeler issued a rebuttal claiming that "it was a private matter with the professor [Seawell] and was not in any way connected with the University."[97] The renowned architect, Bernard Maybeck,

who was a former instructor in drawing, entered the fray and declared that the "University is not the place for an art school and this [Seawell's life class] should be entirely separate from such an institution."[98] The local newspapers delighted in the scandal. Even Will Sparks ridiculed the University's position in the San Francisco press.[99] When New York's venerable Anthony Comstock, who had long waged a campaign against naked models in the East, addressed the "Berkeley debate," two prominent artists in the University town were interviewed in a nationally syndicated article that was published as far away as Alaska:[100]

> Miss F. Soule Campbell, in speaking of the crusade instituted by Anthony Comstock of New York against artists' modes, said: "The idea of suppressing artists' models in the nude is ridiculous . . . it is upon the model in life that the improvement in art at the present day is due. . . . I do not think that models in the nude should be studied indiscriminately, but for artists who have made a thorough study of their work it is absolutely essential to use a life model."
>
> Walter I. Cox, also a well known artist, formerly of San Francisco, and now residing in Berkeley, had the following to say.
>
> "Who is this Comstock? It appear to me that his words are those of a man who is seeking free advertising. To eliminate the models from artists' studios would be a death blow to the perfection of art. There is no bad moral effect from the study of nude models by artists who have the best interest of their work at heart. It is the only correct method of obtaining perfection and realistic art."

Most of Berkeley's burgeoning art colony was outraged and publicly stood behind Seawell. It was not until 1916 that the prudish University allowed nude models in "life classes" on campus. Even then the course was restricted to seniors and graduate students with appropriate majors.[101]

Unaware of Meyer's plans to establish the CSAC, Harry Seawell joined George Plowman, whose impeccable academic credentials included the post of "supervisor of architecture" at the University, and founded an independent art school.[102] At first the two men offered evening "life classes" with nude models at the Golden Sheaf Hall, a private building on Addison Street, in late September of 1906. The overflowing crowds of men and women were taught in separate rooms. The formal opening of the school occurred on January 1, 1907. Classes in various art subjects were well attended by former students of the Mark Hopkins Institute of Art, who were eager to continue their careers.[103] The school's intention to "incorporate" was never realized because of competition from the CSAC. Initially, it was called the Berkeley School of Art, but changed its name in early 1909 to The Associated Studios as part of a restructuring due to financial difficulties. Frances Campbell and Katherine Birdsall became the "directors" of this new art school and moved the headquarters to a building on Hillegass Avenue. At the time of its relocation the curriculum was broadened to include poetry composition, music, languages, the dramatic arts and voice. Perham Nahl and Elizabeth Ferrea continued on the staff, offering Saturday classes respectively in sketching from life and in clay and wax modeling.[104]

Almost simultaneous with the establishment of the CSAC and the Berkeley School of Art was the somewhat painful and prolonged birth of another pivotal institution that eventually became the Berkeley Art Association (BAA). A local newspaper reported that the "first step in a movement to bring together the artistic members of the [Berkeley] community was taken on Saturday night [April 6, 1907] at a meeting held in the Studio building."[105] The fourteen attendees, primarily local artists and art photographers, devised a "tentative program" to address their needs, which included a proposal for monthly exhibits and recitals. Eighteen days later at a second conclave, where

Frederick Meyer and most of the Dakin family were also in attendance, it was decided "to formulate plans for the establishing in this city of a permanent salon to exhibit the work of local artists . . . . the name Studio Club was adopted."[106] The prominent writer Charles Keeler was elected "president" and the painter Louise Carpenter was chosen "corresponding secretary." Other artists or photographers selected as officials included: Emily Pitchford, Frances Campbell, Michael Doyle and Caroline Kennedy. Their ultimate purpose was "to have a sale of local [art] work once a month." It was decided to locate the "salon" in the Studio Building. Meyer was especially enthusiastic because his school (CSAC) was about to open at the same address. However, the scope of The Studio Club was much broader than other organizations of artists and included musicians, writers and actors. There were only twenty-five charter members and further membership was "strictly invitational." Despite the good intentions and favorable press, The Studio Club never held a single exhibit because the managing board failed to rent an appropriate space. The diluted focus of the group and the snobbish control of membership dampened interest within the art colony. Enthusiasm may have also waned due to the well-publicized May 1st opening of the private Piedmont Art Gallery. Located just southeast of Berkeley it became the East Bay's first serious commercial venue for the display and sale of art. This undertaking was largely financed by Frank C. Havens who asked Julia Morgan to design an impressive "Spanish-style" building with ten well-lighted galleries for the display up to three hundred and seventy five paintings. The complex was surrounded by a sculpture garden in Piedmont Springs Park. The Gallery's "appointed curator" was the artist Richard L. Partington.[107] Despite the initial ridicule of its modern statuary, the venue became so popular that Partington insisted on charging an "admission fee" of ten cents.[108] Reputedly, it was the most beautiful complex of its type in the West. The *American Art Annual* added that the Gallery was:[109]

> . . . . the property of the Piedmont Development Company. The pictures have been lent by John Martin, William G. Henshaw, F. M. Smith and Frank C. Havens. One room is devoted to marines and another to studies of women. The paintings are chiefly modern.

The opening was a blockbuster exhibit with works from eight private collections that included California's premier artists and even paintings by Sir Joshua Reynolds. While the Piedmont Art Gallery soon exhibited select current works by the "best local artists," it did not meet the needs of Berkeley's rapidly growing art community.

In September of 1907 the highly successful arts and crafts show of predominately Berkeley artists at the Alameda County Exposition in Oakland's Idora Park again advertised the embarrassing fact that the University town had no regular venue for its own popular colony of artists to display their work.[110] In response, the rather nebulous "Berkeley Arts and Crafts Association" seized the intuitive from The Studio Club and convened at an undisclosed location in early October to elect a slate of officers. With the exception of the treasurer, Eleanor Carlisle, all of the officers were educators and non-artists. This group acceded to the principal demand of the local art colony and "signified their intention of establishing a museum for the exhibition of local work."[111] The declared purpose of the Association was to erect that building within a year and incorporate. The funds would be derived from "holding exhibits" and "the members themselves will make up whatever deficiency there may be." Their museum was to have a size and interior appearance similar to the one in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park. On October 28, 1907 over two hundred and fifty prominent Berkeley residents crowded into the high school auditorium and

formally gave their backing to the Berkeley Art Association (BAA), an organization that was intended to be far more involved than its San Francisco counterpart with promoting all arts in the community. In addition to a museum, it would run its own "Art Institute" and appoint committees to beautify the streets, parks and schools.[112] At this meeting there were some important changes in the roster of previously elected officers. By acclimation Professor E. P. Lewis was replaced as "president" by George A. Baxter, the town's most prominent banker, and three of the ten "director" positions were given to artists: Sally Daingerfield, Louise Carpenter and Frederick Meyer. The latter made sure that craftsmen from "manual training departments" would be included in the BAA's annual exhibitions and lecture series. The BAA held its First Annual Exhibition on December 12th in the "parlors" of the First Congregational Church, displaying about one hundred paintings, including oils, pastels and watercolors, from over fifty prominent California artists."[113] A few loaned "masterpieces" were interspersed among the contemporary works to allow for thoughtful comparisons. At that venue Frederick Meyer designed the display of "crafts" and Oscar Maurer acted as curator for an exhibit of "art" photographs. There was also a musical program and a display of children's art. The event was a resounding success and solidified support for the BAA among the local artists who apparently sold some of their pieces. The ever-enterprising Dakin family simultaneously put up for sale in the Studio Building a large portion of their private art collection.[114] The Dakin sale included jewelry as well as Oriental and California art; the curator was Sally Daingerfield.

Just as the institutional framework of the art colony crystallized in the fall of 1907 Jennie V. Cannon arrived in Berkeley for a visit of at least five weeks. She sent the following letter in 1919 to her cousin, Edna, and included from her 1907 daybook several pages with their copious entries on Berkeley:[115]

> Dear cousin,
>
> You have asked me all over again the reasons why I made Berkeley my home. The artists that I met on my first visit seem to interest you very much.
>
> You know that Milner is a student at the university. My other motivation is the colony of artists I lived with in 1907 - they made this place so special for me and it still is. I am sending along pages from my daybook dated in 1907 to answers your questions – please return them. I hope this satisfies your curiosity. We want you to come for a visit.
>
> Jennie
>
> Daybook Entries of 1907:
>
> (1) Will has continued on to Santa Rosa. Our children [are] safe in Tucson and I am settled in with my dear friend Miss Elizabeth Strong and her sister and children. I do so admire Lizzie's new paintings. They are far more gay and colorful, something very bold. She calls them "experiments" and I hope she continues. This afternoon I walked through the streets downtown. I could not believe my eyes – there were artist groups and displays everywhere – so many fine artists that this place surpasses San Francisco as the art capital of the West.
>
> (2) They have a shiny new studio building for artists that I visited for a second time. Earlier I went to the new arts and crafts school to meet Professor Meyer, Mr. Nahl, and the very smart women instructors. There were many examples of their work on the walls – very impressive indeed. I was introduced to a visitor and friend of Professor Meyer – an art teacher from Stockton, Mr. Rice. He brought some of his photographs and drawings that show much talent. Today I returned to that building to visit the studio of Mr. Breuer and

spoke to the artist and his charming wife. His large paintings took my breath away – majestic mountains and hills in sharp colors. His brush strokes are not smooth, but piled on the canvas in the modern fashion. His older work from 10 years before was just as impressive. These were small oils with romance and gentle keys of color.

(3) I came upon an exhibition by Mr. Mersfelder in a local bookstore. At first I thought his canvases were all black. When I became accustomed to the interior I saw much that was subtle and clever. The artist introduced himself – he is a charming eccentric. He takes his inspiration from Corot and In[n]ess. He prefers not to follow Mr. Keith and his school – they of late are using high keys of color. Mr. Mersfelder paints his forests at twilight always darker than before. This method allows him to find a spiritual world, so he believes. Many followers of Mr. Mersfelder were there. They adore him and recite verses to his paintings and drink small cups of tea. I am sure I smelled whiskey in the teapot. At any moment I expected Byron to appear!

(4) My hike behind the university into the hills was well worth the trouble. Carmel may have the sea, but Berkeley has the magnificent forests of oaks. In every shady spot artists painted in the dark styles of Mr. Mathews or Mr. Mersfelder. I sketched the oaks in the light from open meadows. That visit I finished two sketches. The reaction was polite but most thought my style too Parisian, somehow too bright. That would have amused my teacher Mr. Chase.

(5) During our trip to the university we saw a charity exhibition of water colors and drawings arranged by Mr. Seawell who donated one his studies. There was a tie for first place. One winner was a lovely marine by Mr. Dahlgren – what a fine eye he has for detail and composition and unusual color – the other was by the Art Professor Charles Neilson – an elegant scene of a[n] Oriental street and very clever indeed. He is greatly revered in Berkeley, but is presently out of town. There [was] also fine work by Mrs. Smitten and Mr. Plowman. I was introduced later in the afternoon to Mr. Dahlgren. He is rather modest and very intelligent.

(6) I was taken completely by surprise at the home of Mr. Charles Crocker. He and his lovely wife invite[d] me to tea. The parlor was filled with his display of paintings, all in the dark school that is so popular here. I expected a quiet afternoon of reading when I left Mr. Crocker. Instead I was invited into his studio that had filled with visitors. Never have I seen such a display of art in the West. His paintings here were at a complete variance with those in the parlor – they were shocking and distorted – covered with wild colors. Mr. Crocker saw my surprise and explained that during a recent visit to Chicago he was influenced by French artists, Paul Gauguin and other modern schools. Mr. Crocker is using those methods to examine the soul of natural forms. He wants to show this work in San Francisco or Chicago. One of his companions calls him a psychic Impressionist – whatever that is? To earn money presently Mr. Crocker paints canvases in the style of Corot. When I sat down to study his paintings a piano and string [trio?] performed a very exotic composition that often lacked harmony, but was interesting and suited the surroundings. Several men and women read unusual poems of their own and then Mr. Crocker stepped forward to give his theories on art. I was thrilled. He filled the room with his ideas and the debate was endless. These were university people and agreeable to every experiment.

(7) I saw a mass gathering of so many people that they flooded into the street – they all clamored for an art museum and an institute to promote the arts. This moment warmed my heart.

(8) Mr. Pedro Lemos hired me to paint a dozen illustrations in oil in the style of William Morris to be used by his new company. He is very young and intelligent – and recently married. I invited him and his wife to stay with us in Carmel.

Cannon's eight daybook entries are explained in the following commentaries with corresponding numbers.

(1) We can assume that Jennie arrived in Berkeley during the last week of September in 1907, having traveled from Carmel with her husband who "continued on to Santa Rosa." In correspondence between William Cannon and Daniel MacDougal the former confirms his intention to leave Carmel for Santa Rosa on September 24, 1907 and then return to Tucson by October 3rd to make preparations for his wife's arrival in November.[116] Elizabeth Strong, whose achievements were frequently summarized in the press, was a popular figure. After completing her formal education at San Francisco's School of Design she continued her training in Paris and became a frequent exhibitor at the Salon. During her decade in France between 1880 and 1889 she earned an international reputation for her animal paintings, especially her "portraits" of dogs. Strong eventually returned to San Francisco, but fled the devastating earthquake of 1906 to establish a residence and an "atelier" in the Berkeley highlands northeast of campus. Like the majority of Berkeley artists Elizabeth found her summer inspiration on the Monterey Peninsula where she also instructed students, including her niece. By 1906 she began to experiment with a brighter palette. Jennie undoubtedly met Strong during their Carmel vacations and the two remained life-long friends. Since Elizabeth spent part of the fall of 1907 in Boston, one must assume that her sister, Ninole, hosted Jennie for the remainder of the stay. In 1909, when Strong received a silver medal at the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition in Seattle for her Berkeley landscape *Cragmont Hills*, the local press was justifiably proud. Another of her local studies, *View from Cragmont-Berkeley-1918*, was exhibited at the Oakland Art Gallery (Plate 23).[117] She moved to Carmel in 1923 and continued to reshape her art until her death in 1941.

(2) Jennie's visit with the faculty members at the School of Arts and Crafts in the Studio Building is noteworthy, but she tells us nothing of their displayed art. Of that group the female instructors were probably Elizabeth Ferrea and Isabelle Percy; Perham Nahl was at this time the most widely exhibited artist on the staff. The thirty-seven-year-old Nahl, who came from a family of accomplished German artists, was well versed in all facets of art training, including lithography, etching, drawing and painting. Following his "youthful indiscretion" in New York City, where he was arrested in 1895 for displaying on the public stage completely naked models sprayed only with a bronze pigment, he graduated from the California School of Design with multiple honors in 1905. During a long career marked by many accomplishments certainly his finest hour was at the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition (PPIE) where he not only received the bronze medal for oil painting and the silver for etching, but he also won the first prize for creating the official poster, *The Thirteenth Labor of Hercules*. No other American artist at the Exposition received such diverse recognition. While Nahl's basic approach to art composition is considered "academic" by present standards, his subject matter by any definition is unusual. He strove to engender a broad spectrum of emotions in his "narrative" and introspective paintings. The latter, like the works of Manet, were often characterized by an ambiguous setting or a mysterious glance. His most popular courses were etching and print making, especially the execution of monotypes. Nahl trained two of America's most famous etchers, George Plowman and Gene Kloss. His constant fascination with human nudity led to some of his greatest creations, such as his 1926 etching, *Whispers* (Plate 12b).[118] At the same time Mrs. Cannon's chance meeting and praise of "Mr. [William] Rice" at the School was somewhat prophetic. Frederick Meyer, who had met Rice when

both were students in Philadelphia during the mid 1890s, was probably responsible for getting him a teaching post in Stockton. In 1910 he hired Rice as an instructor at his Berkeley school. Unfortunately, Jennie does not supply details on his photographs and drawings. Rice, a pivotal figure in Berkeley's second art colony, went on to a brilliant career as a teacher and became through decades of exhibitions and awards a highly regarded watercolorist and one of the preeminent color-block print makers in the United States (Plate 18a).[119] Henry Joseph Breuer was highly esteemed in the University town for his love of nature and his rustic personality. Despite his recent elevation to the status as one of San Francisco's most celebrated painters, he and his wife outfitted a one-ton covered wagon as a studio-residence and in 1905 parked it behind Berkeley's Greek Theatre for almost three years. His popularity soared when he donated his valuable painting, *Berkeley Hills*, to the local McKinley Grammar School. His generosity and the students' gratitude were widely discussed in Bay Area newspapers. He also became a pivotal figure in the founding of the Berkeley Art Association. Breuer leased several rooms in the Studio Building for his atelier. Here he regaled the many visitors, especially Berkeley's large population of naturalists, with his adventures in the Sierras and Santa Barbara. His large "modern" paintings, which were influenced by the doctrines of the Impressionists, were not as popular with the local buyers as his earlier canvases such as *Sand Dunes and the Stormy Sea – 1898* (Plate 3a).[120] Cannon evidently found the works from both of his periods worthy of praise. Breuer's oil paintings received the gold medal at the PPIE and were reportedly among the most highly priced canvases in the United States. He maintained a peripatetic life and died in San Francisco in 1932.

(3) Jules Mersfelder, who was born in Stockton and educated in San Francisco, was by far the most popular painter after the reclusive and sainted William Keith. The quantity and tenor of the reports in local publications confirm Cannon's observations and leave the distinct impression that he was a combination of Oscar Wilde and Joaquin Miller. What he certainly had was a mesmerizing personality. In 1895 during one of his stays in San Francisco he so charmed its art community that it staged for his financial benefit a concert that included arias by none other than Giuseppe Cadenasso and dramatic readings by Mersfelder himself. Keith was so jealous of the attention received by the younger Barbizon painter that he attacked Mersfelder in the press for plagiarizing his style. The Stockton artist got his revenge when his painting was chosen for "honors" at Berkeley's 1901 Loan Exhibition. In 1904 he and his wife established in San Francisco one of the most ostentatious studios where the "crème" of Bohemian society gathered. After the complete destruction of all his possessions in April of 1906 he recreated an equally sumptuous atelier in Berkeley and entertained at his famous "teas" the local "clever set" amid the incense and bric-a-brac. He used his studio receptions to attract buyers for his carefully displayed paintings. At one of these functions the impeccably attired Mersfelder staged a concert performance of Camille Saint-Saëns' *Samson et Dalila*. In contrast to these excesses, he led his followers on rigorous hikes through the Berkeley hills where they worshipped nature in their paintings and verse. Unlike the vast majority of regional artists, he was at this time pushing the Barbizon aesthetic into a much darker world in search of spiritual truth (Plate 14b).[121] Jennie probably met him and his followers at Clyde Abbott's Book Store where he briefly maintained a second studio. With the exception of a few short absences Mersfelder resided in Berkeley between 1906 and his death in 1937.

(4) Jennie's hike into the Berkeley hills tells us much about the politics of aesthetics in the art colony. Undoubtedly, she explored one of the large oak groves located about a mile east of

the central campus. Today these are protected in the Strawberry Canyon Preserve. In nearby Hamilton Gulch a number of Keith's favorite haunts are now incorporated into the University's Ecological Study Area. Jennie's mention of Arthur Mathews and Jules Mersfelder is a reference to the Tonalist and Barbizon schools that dominated Berkeley at this time. What is surprising is the local indifference and skepticism toward the techniques of the Impressionists, referred to here as the "Parisian style," which Cannon had already perfected. She discovered in Berkeley that its highly educated community appreciated the art colony collectively and that certain methods of painting and the personal philosophies behind them appealed to specific constituencies.

(5) At present no published account of the "charity exhibition" on the University campus has come to light, but Cannon's mention of several artists is important. The widely-exhibited works of Harry W. Seawell adhered to the academic traditions of the late 19th century (Plate 18b).[122] Carl Christian Dahlgren impressed Cannon with his art and personality. This well-educated Danish immigrant became famous in turn-of-the-century San Francisco as a society portrait artist and was favored by the greatest beauty of the day, Lillie Langtry. He also excelled as an engraver and illustrator. In the latter half of his career he painted far more landscapes. After the earthquake he became Berkeley's polite down-to-earth family man who encouraged all visitors at his studio to take his art lessons. Dahlgren often gave instruction without charge to the neighborhood children and was frequently commissioned to paint local scenes, including one of the Cal football team defeating Stanford University. Cannon discovered that his work was desired for its sharp colorful depictions of local scenes as seen in the Point Reyes' seascape, *Bay of Sir Francis Drake* (Plate 8b).[123] Dahlgren remained a highly regarded figure in the community, although he relocated his studio after several years to Oakland where he died in 1920. Charles Peter Neilson was a Scottish immigrant who achieved such distinction as a professional watercolorist in the highly competitive art community of San Francisco that he was hired to teach at the University of California in 1905. He was a charismatic lecturer and filled auditoriums by making accessible complicated subjects that ranged from art education to the development of Western painting. To the great annoyance of the campus administration he welcomed all visitors into his University classes. His bold studies of San Francisco's Chinatown and the Monterey Peninsula were eagerly collected by connoisseurs of "modern" art (Plate 16a).[124] Problems with Neilson's marriage and his inability to find a satisfactory teaching post compelled him to return to Europe around 1911. Eda St. John Smitten managed to study art and build a career as one of the more talented women painters in northern California despite her marriage and the demands of caring for a family. Her delicate poetic landscapes both in watercolors and in oils were frequently exhibited to enthusiastic reviews; Eda's *Estuary Twilight* is an excellent example of her work (Plate 24a).[125] Smitten's death at the Berkeley home of her son in 1914 was widely mourned. George Plowman's conspicuous presence at the University's charity exhibition is not unexpected. Trained as an artist, engineer and architect he became at a young age John Galen Howard's "superintendent" of architecture on the U.C. Berkeley campus. After initial studies in print making with Perham Nahl he abandoned his career and moved to London where he became the first American student of the renowned etcher, Sir Frank Short. Plowman quickly achieved international fame with his frequent exhibitions on both side of the Atlantic and was awarded the bronze medal in etching at the 1915 PPIE. He published two important monographs on print making and was a respected teacher. His popularity today remains undiminished. The subjects for his etchings spanned both sides of the Atlantic and included

landscapes, monumental architecture and more intimate scenes, such as the *Impasse des Boeufs* from his highly regarded Parisian series (Plate 17b).[126]

(6) Charles M. Crocker was one of the most controversial painters in the history of California art and certainly the most innovative in Berkeley. His Dickensian life began with a log cabin in Illinois and his early departure from grammar school. He reportedly wandered the forests alone reciting the poems of Emerson and Whitman before finding his true calling. After formal studies with Jean Mannheim in Decatur and at the Art Institute of Chicago Crocker and his wife migrated about 1904 to San Francisco where he established a modest career as a Barbizon painter. Several years later with a residence in the University town he publicly maintained a conservative well-attired image and composed articles for the staunchly Republican *Berkeley Daily Gazette*. There were, however, vague comments in other publications regarding the Bohemian events in his atelier. Cannon provides our only detailed account of one of his studio happenings and expresses amazement at his unorthodox paintings, but she offers little concrete information on what was about to explode on the local art scene. In 1908 during Christmas exhibitions at his studio and at Offield's Gallery some of his new art was assessed by untrained but polite Berkeley critics as "impressionistic" and "refreshing." They made no attempt to understand the philosophy expressed in his paintings. As his art evolved from "Psychic-Impressionism" he became the region's earliest exponent of a mystical Post-Impressionism. Crocker boldly published his controversial theories. When he opened a San Francisco studio in 1911 he initially displayed his Barbizon-inspired paintings for ready cash and critical acclaim. Eight years later he found the courage and money to exhibit his most experimental works in San Francisco's Fairmont Hotel to a dismayed public. It is quite possible that one of these displayed works was his *Windswept Landscape: Santa Rosa* (Plate 7).[127] Frustrated with the parochial attitudes of the San Francisco art establishment Crocker moved to Los Angeles where he was adored by critics and the avant-garde, but increasing despised by an older generation of artists who chafed under his criticism. At one point Colin Campbell Cooper penned a vigorous counterattack in the *Los Angeles Times*. In the late 1930s Crocker retreated to Chicago where he died in 1950.

(7-8) The mass meeting that Jennie witnessed was the official formation of the BAA on October 28, 1907. When and how she met Pedro Lemos is unknown, but the two remained friends through the 1940s. With his siblings John and Frank, he ran the Oakland-based Lemos Illustrating Company, also known as the Lemos Brothers, from 1907 thru 1911. When Jennie returned to Berkeley in May of 1909 with the last of the completed illustrations for Lemos, she left us no description of her second visit; only one example of her twelve "illustrations in oil" has presently surfaced (Plate 5a).[128] That summer Lemos and his wife visited the Cannons in Carmel and thus began his long association with that art colony. Jennie was instrumental in persuading him to become the first president of the Carmel Art Association in 1927. Lemos was a widely respected artist, teacher and author. He became one of the region's most recognized proponents of the arts and crafts movement (Plate 13a).[129] In 1917 Pedro resigned his position as director of the San Francisco Institute of Art to head the Stanford University Art Gallery and Museum.

What becomes apparent in the pages of the local publications is that the denizens of Berkeley were captivated with the private lives of their artists. Just as people today fixate on the affairs of the Hollywood stars, so then there was an almost vulgar fascination with this world of urbane eccentrics. One of the most celebrated subjects was a Mexican immigrant of half Indian

ancestry, Xavier Martinez, known locally to his fellow artists as Marty. He followed his successful studies at the California School of Design and École des Beaux Arts in Paris by creating some of San Francisco's most acclaimed Tonalist paintings as well as Fauvist-inspired art and highly modern silverpoints (Plate 14a).[130] His daily life defined the "Bohemian." He routinely caroused with the young intelligentsia, including Jack London, Ambrose Bierce, George Sterling and Gelett Burgess, in such trendy places as Coppa's Restaurant. His move to Piedmont after the 1906 earthquake did not mitigate his libido. Press descriptions of the "aesthetic evenings" included commentaries on the singers, costumes, furnishings, cuisine and guests, especially those with absent wives or husbands. Martinez was the subject of intense speculation regarding his short courtship and marriage to the much younger Elsie Whitaker, whose father supposedly objected to the match at a time when the Oakland newspapers reveled in the details of his own lascivious affairs. After Marty depicted his new wife on a theatrical poster for the University's English Club, it became all the rage on campus to adorn the dormitory walls with purchased or stolen copies of the advertisement. With his appointment to the CSAC he earned the respect of his students and the community. He cut an unusual figure on the streets of Berkeley with his velvet pantaloons, oversized cravat and copious flow of stiff black hair shaded by a wide-brimmed hat.

There were occasions when the behavior of these Bohemians offended public morals. Harry Seawell's efforts to introduce nude models into the University's life class was eventually overlooked, especially in light of his broad support in the art community. However, when he was arraigned in a San Francisco court for committing "a statutory offense" against a female model in his studio, the public was outraged. Charles Dickman, the San Francisco painter and Bohemian Club member, moved his wife and son to a quiet Berkeley neighborhood in 1895 to be near his respected father. Within six years he fled across the bay and forced his abandoned wife to sue for divorce. In the fall of 1907 bold headlines not only proclaimed Dickman's involvement in a divorce suit as the lover of an adulterous wife, but he was also prominently mentioned in the press as a frequent visitor to the home of the poetess Nora May French who had just committed suicide in Carmel. It did not pass unnoticed that same year when Dickman moved with his second wife into his father's Berkeley home. In 1915 he again fled to San Francisco, this time leaving his spouse and young daughter with his parents. His "obscene behavior" was the exception.

For those who eschewed the sensational among the Berkeley art enthusiasts there were many competent painters to patronize. The ever-congenial British-born Edwin Deakin held an annual "open house" to view his paintings and at other times welcomed unexpected visitors, especially those interested in the extensive rose gardens on his estate. He was one of the last survivors of the first great generation of San Francisco painters and his meticulous representational art appealed to many traditionalists. Charles Chapel Judson and Eugen Neuhaus, two young instructors at the University, quietly developed a loyal following of connoisseurs for their Barbizon-Tonalist landscapes, which they sold from studios attached to their homes. The very personable Englishman, Walter Cox, not only had many eager clients in search of portraits, but he was the only artist in Berkeley who specialized in teaching portraiture. Like most of the artists in the colony James Griffin, a respected teacher at the CSAC, held "studio teas" to premiere his latest works and had the added attraction of his lovely daughter, Nan, to act as hostess. Local newspapers vigorously promoted studio events as the opportunity to buy art and rub shoulders with intellectuals.

When called upon the town's people showed great compassion for artists in desperate need. One of the most tragic figures was Dietrich Kooreman. In 1903 he abruptly left an extremely promising career in Europe for San Francisco where he was struck and rendered partially disabled by a streetcar. After the earthquake and fire of 1906 destroyed all his possessions he moved to Berkeley. When his declining health brought him and his family to near starvation, the local press and several churches sold his recent work with displays in store windows and raffles. Although he died penniless in 1912, good Samaritans paid for his funeral.

Any assessment of the relationship between the art colony and the community at large must consider the role of women. Sixty percent of the artist-members of the Berkeley art colony were female and the vast majority of that number were graduates of professional art schools. Their success made them role models. Berkeley's "free-thinking" University women were enamored of the many unmarried "lady artists" who prospered solely by their own talents to achieve an unprecedented level of independence and public respect. Elizabeth Strong, who escaped the poverty of her San Francisco garret to find artistic recognition in Paris and a degree of financial security from the sale of her immensely popular canvases, staged fashionable "salons" at her atelier where scores of young coeds discussed feminist politics as well as art and on occasion joined in chaperoned dances. Both Blanche Letcher and Bertha Boye maintained private studios and were popular instructors at the CSAC where women constituted a majority of the faculty. Letcher was one of the founding artists of San Francisco's Spinner's Club, a cultural center exclusively for women, and Boye was a renowned sculptress who also designed popular posters in support of women's suffrage. Frances Campbell managed an art school and traveled extensively to paint commissioned portraits of America's most influential citizens. Sally Daingerfield was the ultimate entrepreneur with her own commercial art gallery and widely recognized status as a talented organizer of exhibitions. Her Bancroft Way studio drew crowds of artists and students who "talked shop" and exchanged gossip about their little Bohemia. Louise Carpenter combined elegance, infectious charm, keen marketing skills and immense talent to be ranked alongside William Keith and Edwin Deakin. The very popular genre of portrait miniatures had two of its best practitioners in Berkeley, Misses Marian Norton and Rose Campbell. Although Evelyn Withrow, Florence Lundborg, Helen Chandler and Anne Bremer had relatively short stays in Berkeley, they epitomized the unmarried professional painters who were innovators in their field. Isabelle Percy and Louise Mahoney, both CSAC faculty and exhibiting artists, had successfully escaped the constraints and expectations of their affluent high-society families, but carefully cultivated a network of wealthy acquaintances who purchased their paintings at elaborate "teas." Likewise, Bertha and Ellen Kleinschmidt sold their polychrome ceramics and crafts at garden parties in the sumptuous family home where the area's social elite vied for invitations. Like their male counterparts, women artists understood the value of public relations and both Charlotte Colby and Katherine Newhall donated paintings to the local McKinley Grammar School at the same time as Henry Breuer made his magnanimous gesture. Berkeley's most prominent teacher of porcelain decoration was Caroline Kennedy who rented her classrooms at the Studio Building. Popular private classes in drawing and "landscape" were conducted by Althea Chase.

Several married women managed to raise families and simultaneously build a career. Jessie Short(-Jackson) exhibited at numerous venues and held widely publicized receptions at her studio-home to market her watercolors. Eda Smitten's coveted paintings were sold as quickly as

they were finished. Customized, hand-painted porcelain was in demand and a number of women excelled in making ostentatious table settings, including Sarah Dorr and Sophie Culp. "Widow Dorr," who was a recognized expert in tapestry painting, also sold watercolors and oils at her studio receptions. Mrs. Culp was a highly-educated master ceramist known for rose decorations that were favorably compared to those of Franz Bischoff.

Although Berkeley had two recognized male art photographers, Oscar Maurer and Oscar Lange, it was the women who dominated that genre and received national acclaim as innovators in the field. Adelaide Hanscom, Emily Pitchford, Laura Adams Armer and Anne Brigman became almost cult figures in the eyes of their many female followers. The Oregon-born Hanscom excelled as a painter at an early age, but gravitated to a very personal style of portrait photography that received much attention. She was celebrated for her illustrations in the 1905 edition of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyat*; as models for this project Adelaide used several prominent East Bay Bohemians, including Charles Keeler, George Sterling, Gertrude Boyle-Kanno and Joaquin Miller. Near the height of her career she won the top prize for designing the official emblem of Seattle's Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition and exhibited in New York City at the invitation of Alfred Stieglitz. With the tragic loss of her husband in World War I Hanscom suffered a nervous breakdown and a rapid decline. Emily Pitchford was born in Nevada and after a brief stint at the California School of Design she traveled to England for several years to study photography. On her return to Berkeley in 1904 she exhibited widely, helped to organize the local Arts and Crafts Society and taught small classes for University women at her Center-Street portrait studio. In 1910 Emily traveled to South Africa, married William Hussey and returned to Berkeley a decade later to live out her retirement. Although Laura Adams Armer studied for almost seven years at the School of Design and was hailed as one of the region's best poster artists, she decided to open a San Francisco photography studio in 1899. Her portraits, including one of her former teacher Arthur Mathews, received prizes. In 1902 she retired from commercial photography and traveled to the American Southwest with her new husband, Sidney Armer. Four years later she opened a studio in Berkeley, where she offered courses in photography, primarily to U.C. Berkeley students, and exhibited widely to great acclaim. In 1914 she taught photography at the Carmel Arts and Crafts Club. Mrs. Armer never abandoned painting and in 1923, when she devoted the rest of her professional life to the detailed study of the Indians of the Southwest, her photographs were exhibited as often as her paintings. The deeply emotional and mystical qualities of her work attracted an almost cult following among the region's spiritualists through the 1930s. Armer composed and illustrated a series of award-winning publications and created the first motion picture with an all Native American cast. Anne Brigman was born in Hawaii and lived in Oakland, but maintained a teaching studio in Berkeley for her coterie of University coeds. She became a world-class "pictorialist photographer" who specialized in portraits and "symbolic nature studies." Her early success was welcomed by the local press until the fall of 1908 when her photograph entitled *Soul of the Blasted Pine* was removed from Oakland's Idora Park Exposition as being a "vulgar" picture of a female nude. She closed her Berkeley studio when questions were raised about the recruitment of students as "unaffected" nude models. Awards, praise and controversy followed the artist. Brigman became a close associate of Alfred Stieglitz, was elected to the British photographic society "The Linked Ring" and fearlessly published her feminist manifestos which flaunted the separation from her husband and praised women's independence. In this liberated atmosphere Berkeley girls, such as May

Morrison, Mabel Burnett and Myrtle Hill, found the support, opportunities and inspiration to succeed.

If Jennie Cannon was "charmed" by this art colony, the citizenry of Berkeley was mesmerized. A casual glance thru the society pages of the town's daily and weekly journals reveals a constant fascination with the newly transplanted artists. News on the itineraries and durations of their "working vacations" not only supplied insights on their special haunts, but also alerted many local collectors that completed sketches would soon be on display at the studios. Popular escapes for the painters included northern Marin County, the Russian and Sacramento Rivers as well as Lake Tahoe. However, the majority of the artists made the habitual summer retreat to secluded spots in the Carmel-Monterey area. They so popularized that Peninsula that contingents of Berkeleyans, including students and entire families, chartered trains for discount transportation there. East Bay residents occupied a large part of the Del Monte Hotel for what became the ubiquitous "fortnight vacation;" Carmel officially celebrated "University Week" to welcome visiting academics from Palo Alto and Berkeley.[131]

One result of this art mania was that many educated residents, who did not want formal training in art but preferred to study aesthetics, formed numerous "art history" clubs. Perhaps the earliest was the University Women's Art History Circle which provided its members with a regular program of activities that was "partly social and partly instructive."[132] They frequently visited prominent private collections, such as the display of Japanese prints in the home of Oscar Maurer, and invited speakers. Another group, Las Amigas Art Club, had weekly co-educational gatherings in "chaperoned" private homes where members gave papers on select art topics "followed by a dainty menu."[133] After its abortive start in April of 1907 The Studio Club resurrected itself as "the exclusive society of artists" that included literati and actors. They met at irregular intervals for dramatic productions, recitals, readings and lectures on art which were occasionally open to the public.[134] In the spring of 1908 at the Hillside Clubhouse Charles Keeler produced and directed for The Studio Club two plays, *Love or Art* and *The Will o' the Wisp*; in one Anne Brigman played the role of Sybil of Nepenthe and Laura Adams Armer designed the costumes.[135] Among The Studio Club's other members were Emily Pitchford, Evelyn Withrow, Sophie Culp, Elizabeth Strong and the Kleinschmidts. They frequently held meetings in Frances Campbell's rooms at The Associated Studios. The latter organization offered its own program of art lectures and receptions for "Berkeley society."[136] Women's groups in the Twentieth Century Club and the Town & Gown Club followed suit and organized their own "art section" with regular illustrated lectures and "outings" to public exhibitions.[137]

In the middle of all this euphoria and good will toward the resident artists the officers and directors of the BAA held their first "policy meeting" with president George Baxter in the penthouse offices of the Berkeley National Bank on February 14, 1908. The front-page story in the local paper briefly reported that the assembled officials agreed to sponsor a regular series of free art lectures and an exhibition of watercolors in April.[138] Aside from these plans there was no mention of funding for the promised museum. Five weeks later it was reported that the invited artists, including Giuseppe Cadenasso, had all promised to send watercolors or pastels to the April exhibition, but curiously a venue had not been rented.[139] Apparently, no space was made available and the plans for the exhibition as well as the lectures were dropped. Even more ominous was the abrupt resignation that summer of the BAA president George Baxter, the "money man" specifically

chosen for his expertise in fund raising.[140] At this same time the Berkeley artists were sharply divided into two camps over who was responsible for selecting and shipping the California paintings to the 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition in Seattle. One group supported Sally Daingerfield, while another favored Evelyn Withrow.[141] After a number of highly publicized and embarrassing delays a compromise was reached between the two artists, but bitter feelings remained. Within weeks Withrow abruptly left the Berkeley colony, moved back to San Francisco and violated the terms of the agreement by declaring herself solely responsible for choosing and sending the California art to Seattle.

Amid these difficulties the principal of McKinley Grammar School, Charles L. Biedenbach, assumed the presidency of the BAA in late August of 1908. With a combination of charm and assertive persistence he announced within two weeks of assuming his post that the Second Annual Exhibition of the BAA would be held that fall at the same venue as last year's event.[142] He secured commitments to participate from some of California's preeminent artists, including Bremer, Cadenasso, Dickman, Judson, Keith, Latimer, Martinez, DeNeale Morgan, Partington, Piazzoni, Strong, Withrow, Wores and Yard. The fears of the art colony were allayed when the BAA was legally incorporated and the president reaffirmed that the organization would soon establish a permanent art gallery.[143] According to the "Constitution and By-Laws" of the "Art Association of Berkeley, California," that organization was required "to give annual exhibitions of local artists and craftsmen . . . . and to establish and maintain a permanent collection of works of art and to acquire and hold real estate . . . for the purpose of maintaining a permanent art collection." In the official "Aims and Objects" of this Association it was declared that "the essential idea in the establishment of a city art gallery is that every citizen shall have a share in its creation and maintenance" and that such a "building should be erected on public land by popular subscription and its support provided for by a special tax just as the public library is maintained."[144] Unfortunately, such a provision was never inserted in the City Charter. Biedenbach also instituted a monthly BAA lecture series whose topics ranged from prehistoric Greek art to residential and landscape architecture.[145] The Second Annual Exhibition of the BAA was held between November 17th and 20th to great acclaim and with much media attention.[146] According to the official twenty-eight page catalogue, which was printed at The Needham Press and bore on the cover a female head by Donna F. Davis, there were one hundred and twenty exhibits, excluding photographs and "keramics." The press noted that the roster of one hundred distinguished contributors rivaled any exhibition in San Francisco. There was free admission and musical accompaniment; all paintings, except for three watercolors by J. M. W. Turner, were for sale.[147] One Berkeley publication broke ranks and criticized the event:[148]

> The Berkeley Art Association wound up its exhibition in a burst of glory Friday night without accomplishing much except to gain friends. The fact of its being held in a church, and for a short time only, may be somewhat to blame for this. A central location is the place for an exhibit, but with the slim finances of the association the fact that they gave an exhibit at all is greatly to their credit. However, nothing was sold. It may be that the recent financial situation had something to do with this, or perhaps the fact that the exhibit was somewhat of a high society affair may have driven away the people who had money.

The "recent financial situation" refers to a short nation-wide economic downturn, but the tenor of these comments indicates that the BAA was not living up to expectations.

By any reckoning the local art colony had reached its zenith in 1909. That year's annual meeting of the BAA was held on August 30th at the old Commercial High School, a complex that

had just been acquired by Frederick Meyer as the “new campus” for the CSAC.[149] Included in the newly elected slate of five officers were the architect Clarence Dakin (“president”), two teachers, a lawyer and a secretary for a charitable organization. Among the six subsidiary “directors” were only two artists: Charlotte Colby and Eleanor Carlisle. It is likely that the voting attendees sought to avoid the pitfalls of having the endless squabbles and splinter groups that had plagued the artist-managed San Francisco Art Association.[150] The official report of the BAA showed that one hundred and thirty-one new paying members had been added in the last year for a total of three hundred and seventy; the treasury had a small surplus. There was no mention of raising funds to build a museum or gallery, but rather “tentative plans for a permanent art exhibit.” Meyer’s proposal, namely to lease to the BAA at a “reasonable figure” one well-lighted room measuring thirty by fifty feet on his new CSAC campus for meetings and exhibitions, was accepted. An ambitious schedule of exhibitions was immediately approved for 1909-10: September – Japanese prints; October – Third Annual Exhibition of the BAA; November – reproductions of European “master works” in etchings and prints; December – handicrafts; January – “local artists”; February – architecture; March – watercolors and drawings; and April – photography. Each exhibit was to open with a reception and lecture for members only. Thereafter an admission fee of ten cents was charged to non-members. By all accounts the exhibit of Japanese prints was a success, but the space was arguably so limited that only “a small portion of the prints contributed to the exhibit were displayed.”[151]

The growing indignation in the art community with the BAA’s inadequate “rented” facilities and rather broad artistic focus was silenced by a rather amazing declaration. Herbert G. Offield, the “prominent art connoisseur” and proprietor of an art supply business where modest displays of paintings by Crocker, Dahlgren and Mersfelder had been staged, announced in early September of 1909 his intention to build the largest commercial art gallery in the West.[152] Offield was a man of great refinement, a visionary and above all a businessman. He had professional training as an artist and even painted in Yosemite valley.[153] His present store in downtown Berkeley was to be replaced by a three-story “L-shaped” Temple of Fine Arts with six thousand square feet of gallery space and the potential to add more floors. The main façade on Shattuck Avenue was to be a gilded replica of the Temple of Karnak in Egypt. The substantial sum of seventy-five thousand dollars required for construction was to be furnished by Offield himself “and several other well-known [but unspecified] artists.” It was officially noted that the new gallery will “afford the opportunity for the exhibition of work of all artists, local and from abroad.” In addition, Offield would establish a permanent gallery of California artists, including ceramists, sculptors and photographers as well as painters. He also intended to stage special showings twice a year to benefit the local schools and to associate his gallery with a proposed “complete art school” staffed by European instructors. In other words, every stated goal of the BAA at its founding in 1907 was to be achieved not by collective public sponsorship, but by private initiative.

On the weekend of October 9, 1909 a small but dazzling exhibition of the best California artists was held at Berkeley’s Hillside Club under the direction of Frederick Meyer, Bernard Maybeck and Eleanor Carlisle.[154] This display was opened with a well-publicized lecture by Arthur Mathews, the very artist who refused to exhibit in Berkeley lest it outshine San Francisco. Two weeks later the BAA held its Third Annual Exhibition with only thirty artists, a far cry from the two previous Annuals.[155] The reduction was necessitated by the incredibly small venue and

accomplished by a jury that adhered to “stricter rulings” that “materially increased the quality.” Many Berkeley artists were outraged at their exclusion, but could do nothing to change the outcome. The exhibition, which was held for an unprecedented sixteen days, had an exclusive opening night reception and a lecture by Perham Nahl. The disappointment of the art colony continued when the BAA held on November 16th a “loaned” exhibition of “etchings, wood engravings, steel and copper examples of the work of the old masters.”[156] With local artists excluded they could do no more than “find inspiration” from the display and listen to lectures by Frederick Meyer and Albert T. DeRome. The BAA’s December display of “handicrafts” from around the world provided attractive presents for Christmas shoppers, but again offered no public exposure or financial benefits for the art colony.[157]

What first looked like an oversight to the casual observer became a public embarrassment when the BAA announced *without explanation* that the scheduled January exhibit of “local artists” had been replaced with a substitute exhibition of student work from the Art Institute of Chicago.[158] The CSAC actually paid for the Chicago exhibit which was displayed in the rented BAA hall. No documentation has yet come to light regarding this crisis, but certain assumptions can be made. The strictly non-artist hierarchy of the BAA had not only abandoned the original goals of the organization, but also had relegated local artists to a minor participatory role to accommodate the needs of a very diverse membership. From the very beginning the BAA tried to be everything to everyone. Members of the art colony naturally assumed that it would have all the supporting functions of the San Francisco Art Association. The public school teachers saw the Association as an arm of education.[159] The Chamber of Commerce viewed the group as an inexpensive way to encourage business through the beautification of buildings and city streets. At the same time naturalists, who fought to end urban growth, wanted the BAA to “limit the size of advertising signs” and “remove the bill-board nuisance.”[160] The BAA was founded on the assumption that the citizens would gladly fund construction of a museum/exhibition gallery and an art institute. When this failed to materialize, wealthy patrons could not be found as a substitute. Either by individual decision or in secret meetings the members of the Berkeley art colony responded with a boycott of all BAA functions. There was no Fourth Annual Exhibition in the fall of 1910 and the BAA quietly disintegrated.[161] Frederick Meyer tried to fill the void for the general public by instituting that December an enlarged “annual exhibition” of student work at the CSAC.[162] The collective hope of the local art colony for a professional venue of exhibition rested in the new Temple of Fine Arts.

Herbert Offield’s grand gallery was completed ahead of schedule and opened with much fanfare on October 17, 1910. A reviewer for *The Oakland Tribune* declared “that art lovers will throng to the . . . . most perfectly arranged art gallery west of Chicago . . . . for, frankly, there is no place equal to this in any other city of California.”[163] These sentiments were amplified in the Berkeley press where the artist Charles Crocker wrote a lengthy review-article that emphasized the “meritorious and interesting collection of paintings by noted eastern artists.”[164] These included L. Birge Harrison, Maxfield Parrish, H. Winthrop Pierce, Harriet Blackstone and Alfred Juergens. There were also a number of French and European “masterworks,” including canvases by Alfred d’Lemon and the Royal Academy’s George Thompson Pritchard; the latter had just become a recent San Francisco resident. Of the nearly seventy professional artists in the Berkeley colony only three painters, William Keith, Jules Mersfelder and Charles Crocker, were represented in the exhibit. The ensuing anger among the local painters only intensified when one local paper poured

salt on their wounds by speculating that "the gallery will be utilized by the majority of artists about the bay as a meeting place."[165] As if by divine retribution Offield's star attraction, d'Lemon's *The Sisters' Convent at Bruges* – supposedly valued at ten thousand dollars – was stolen two weeks after the opening.[166] In February of 1911 Offield, who was oblivious to the artists' antipathy, staged at San Francisco's Saint Francis Hotel "the finest collection of paintings to be seen this year."[167] The vast majority of the contributing painters, including Childe Hassam, were from the East Coast.

Berkeley artists responded to the community's neglect with defiant action. Many began to permanently leave the colony. As early as 1907-08 a handful of painters had departed for a variety of personal or financial reasons, but between the fall of 1910 and the spring of 1911 a dozen artists of stature abruptly moved elsewhere. The most disastrous was the migration to New York City of Frances S. Campbell who closed her art school, The Associated Studios. At the urging of certain unnamed "local artists" James D. Hahn displayed part of his collection of oils in the foyer of Oakland's Orpheum Theatre where works by colony artists such as Judson, Griffin and Martinez were conspicuous.[168] In an effort to stop the hemorrhaging Oscar Maurer persuaded the Hillside Club to stage a small exhibition in March of 1911 of "the better known artists on the West Coast."[169] Half of the contributors were connected with the Berkeley art colony. This weekend show only drew "several hundred guests" compared to the same event in 1909 that had over two thousand attendees. *The Courier*, Berkeley's prestigious literary weekly, now discontinued without explanation "The Studios" page which routinely carried all the news on the local artists and their exhibitions. Faced with a history of betrayed promises the artistic community endured a final blow on April 13, 1911 when William Keith, the spiritual epicenter of the art colony, died peacefully at home. At his Berkeley funeral in St. Mark's Episcopal Church the coffin was escorted by as many as thirty virgins – "little girls clad in purest white" – but not one of the honorary pallbearers was an artist.[170] Inexplicably, the only artist to attend the funeral was Anne Brigman; Evelyn Withrow delivered a wreath to the Keith home. Within a month there was an exhibition at Offield's with several "memorial paintings" by Keith, but only two other artists from the Berkeley colony, Dahlgren and Crocker, were shown amid a sea of European and East Coast canvases.[171] The local artists, whom the citizenry touted as cultural assets only six years before, had become non-entities.

There are a number of reasons why Berkeley's art colony collapsed. At the top of the list is undoubtedly the failure of the Berkeley Art Association to build a permanent exhibition space and an art institute. With the demise of that organization Frederick Meyer concentrated his efforts on expanding the CSAC, whose prominent faculty, including Xavier Martinez, Eric Spencer Macky and Perham Nahl, attracted pupils from throughout California. By 1914 the CSAC had twice the number of instructors and nearly three times the quantity of students as the San Francisco Institute of Art.[172] However, the cultural revival of San Francisco, especially among the various art associations and clubs, drew Berkeley's professional artists back to the old metropolis where it was significantly easier to sell their paintings. When details were released in 1910 regarding the many expected contributions by California artists to the 1915 PPIE,[173] more artists returned to San Francisco. The death of Keith heralded the end of California's Barbizon movement and many Berkeley painters, who were addicted to this "old fashioned" style of dark representational art, faded into obscurity. The numerous fine ceramists, who specialized in customized hand-painted table porcelain, were made obsolete by the high quality of factory work, especially from Japan. Some of the best miniature painters in north America, including Marian Norton, Rose Campbell, the

Kleinschmidts and Frances Campbell, found that their expensive skills were being replaced by "artistic" portrait photographs. Ironically, it is Berkeley's "art photographers" who are regarded today as pioneers in their field.

What also doomed the art colony was Berkeley itself. For anyone familiar with the history of California in the second half of the 20th century it seems unimaginable that Berkeley at the time of the first art colony was not merely conservative, but in truth had become the reactionary core of a self righteous movement to restore moral decency. The University town, which has a long-standing prohibition on the sale of liquor within one mile of campus to keep temptation from the students, became the first Bay Area municipality to ban the sale of all alcoholic beverages city-wide on January 1, 1907. When this decree was officially incorporated into the city charter two years later, it also forbad the serving of liquor in one's own home. To the great amusement of its neighbors Berkeley passed unprecedented ordinances that prohibited public dancing after midnight and monetary wagers at whist parties in private residences.[174] Thornton Wilder, who attended grammar and high school in the last years of the art colony, created his sanitized community of *Our Town* from his Berkeley experiences. Rev. George Adams of San Francisco's First Congregational Church bluntly declared that "Berkeley was the most moral of bay cities."[175] Since artists tended to be more socially liberal than the general populace, many in the colony chafed under these restrictions. For this reason a number settled in neighboring Oakland, while others found alternative solutions. When Jules Mersfelder was ordered by the landlord of his apartment to cease all social gatherings at 10:00 p.m., the artist leased his own house. The sharp political division of Berkeley along the north-south axis of Grove Street (today M. L. King Jr. Way), which pitted the reformist-minded working classes in the Ocean View district at the west against the more conservative wealthy denizens of east, caused anxiety for the artists who resided primarily in the east. The election of the socialist mayor J. S. Wilson in 1911 had no effect on the collapsing art colony. The final straw for many struggling artists was the local economy which witnessed a rapid increase in the price of real estate, especially rentals. Frederick Meyer was compelled to relocate the CSAC from the pricy Studio Building and the popular painter Carl Dahlgren permanently closed his Berkeley art school to relocate into a cheaper studio in downtown Oakland. After 1910 rentals in San Francisco were far more reasonable than Berkeley.

Between 1912 and the start of the second Berkeley art colony in 1923 the University town's attitude toward art and artists reverted to the benign indifference that had characterized affairs before 1906. The artists who continued as residents or teachers either reoriented their professional activities to venues outside Berkeley or retired from their work. However, art was not completely neglected. The various women's clubs occasionally hosted the "in-house" art lecture as well as the poorly advertised one- or two-day exhibit.[176] For three years between 1912 and 1914 the Hillside Club sponsored a small annual exhibition of California painters.[177] Its 1914 exhibition, which was devoted entirely to women artists, was actually mentioned outside of Berkeley.[178] Unfortunately, the Hillside Club's exhibit a year later consisted of "celebrated" foreign and East Coast artists.[179] The exhibition of California painters was not revived until 1919. By mid 1914 all of the Bay Area was in the grip of "Exposition fever" and lectures on the forthcoming art exhibits at San Francisco's PPIE were popular in the University town.[180] Throughout 1915 Berkeleyans traveled west to marvel at San Francisco's wonders. What followed the Exposition were two extremely important events, one triumphantly meritorious, the other the worst cultural disaster in

the recorded history of the East Bay. Oakland, the once slumbering giant along Berkeley's south border, opened in 1916 a very credible public art gallery which is today the Oakland Museum of California. That institution emphasized the exhibition of local living artists and introduced the public to controversial and stimulating work from around the world. It was the first public gallery in the West to create juries with an equal number of conservative, progressive and radical members to provide artists of every persuasion with the opportunity of exposure.[181] Oakland deservedly basked in the cultural spotlight while Berkeley slept. On the other hand, the exceptionally beautiful Piedmont Art Gallery and Sculpture Garden, the only complex specifically designed as a museum by Julia Morgan, was leveled in 1918 "because of the indifference of the townspeople" to their cultural heritage. One of the many loud protests from Piedmont's neighbors was penned by the art critic Laura Bride Powers in *The Oakland Tribune*:[182]

> The Piedmont Art Gallery – reluctantly I record it – will soon pass into the history of things that were. Development of that part of Piedmont Park upon which the gallery stands has made necessary the esthetic sacrifice. And the spot that many noble works have consecrated will soon be denuded of roof, floor and walls, and be given over to the trampings of men and horses – making way for homes. Always homes, and more homes.
>
> And thus will pass a potent influence in the art of the West – likewise, pardon the digression – one of the best commercial factors on this side of the bay, having been one of the objective points of tourists for many years. It advertised Oakland, it designated Piedmont. And it clung to the memory of the wanderers. . . .
>
> Where the pictures will go is problematical. It is to be hoped that some of the best things would be saved for this side of the bay – that a nucleus could be made for the museum that is to come. . . . To permit the Russian collection – most of it – to go from Oakland, or worse, from California, is a tragedy.
>
> The Havens collection represents retrospective and contemporary art from France, Russia, Holland, Germany, Spain, and much from America, including some excellent examples of California art. . . .

The community of Piedmont approved the subdivision of the Gallery's land and the construction of high-end homes that had far less architectural value than Morgan's masterpiece. Havens' superb assemblage of California and American art as well as his unparalleled collection of Russian masters from the 18th and 19th centuries – six hundred paintings in all – were auctioned in San Francisco. Many of the paintings were sold far below their original purchase price; the bulk of the Russian collection was sent to the East Coast and Europe.[183]

Endnotes – Chapter Three

1 This succinct definition of an "art colony" is derived from my discussion in the Introduction.

2 The colorful history of the town reveals that it was begat through the machinations of petty entrepreneurs, crusty veterans of the California gold rush and righteous Protestant missionaries (George A. Pettitt, *A History of Berkeley*, Berkeley, 1972, pp.11-67; Wollenberg, pp.15-30).

3 Some of the artists who found inspiration in the Berkeley hills prior to 1906 include: Jules Tavernier (SFC, July 20, 1879, p.5), Raymond Dabb Yelland (SFC, May 7, 1891, p.8), John M. Gamble (SFL: April 17, 1894, p.4; August 25, 1896, p.10), Christian Jörgensen (Halteman, p.III.74), Lorenzo P. Latimer (SFL, November 29, 1896, p.17), Harry Seawell (SFL, December 13, 1901, p.9), Maren Froelich (Halteman, p.I.159; SFL, April 14, 1895, p.9), Anna F. Briggs (SFL, March 3, 1898, p.7), Clara McChesney (Halteman, p.II.120) and Mary DeNeale Morgan (Halteman, p.I.231).

4 SFC, May 24, 1903, p.34; BDG, July 25, 1904, p.3. Keith occasionally taught a Friday or Saturday evening class in his Berkeley home for select female pupils (TWP, August 20, 1904, p.46; Cornelius, vol. 1, pp.156f). According to the artist Charles J. Dickman, Keith only participated in one social night at the Bohemian Club because he disliked the antics; he did display his canvases at its annual exhibitions. When he refused to pay the dues, the Club made him an honorary member in exchange for one of his paintings (Cornelius, vol. 1, p.321). Keith kept his public appearances to a minimum. His only advertised lecture on the Berkeley campus was on February 29, 1888. Six years later he addressed the Sorosis Club in San Francisco.

[5] Polk 1892-93, pp.876f.
[6] DAC, May 17, 1885, p.1.
[7] TOT, December 31, 1897, p.8; SFC, April 3, 1898, p.25.
[8] Schwartz, *Northern*, pp.14f; SFL: December 29, 1895, p.26; July 15, 1896, p.13; July 18, 1897, p.15; November 17, 1898, p.11.
[9] SFL, May 17, 1903, p.13.
[10] SFL, March 9, 1905, p.6.
[11] TOT: December 5, 1902, p.4; December 6, 1902, p.6; February 19, 1904, p.9; February 20, 1904, pp.5, 7; BDG: February 15, 1904, p.3; February 24, 1904, p.6; TPE, February 19, 1904, p.5; SFL, March 9, 1905, p.6; Schwartz, *Northern*, p.18.
[12] Schwartz, *Northern*, p.15.
[13] SFL: November 24, 1904, p.6; December 7, 1904, p.6.
[14] TOT: March 25, 1905, p.7; May 30, 1905, p.9; October 18, 1905, p.9; November 11, 1905, p.9; September 6, 1906, p.7; SFL: April 30, 1905, p.36; June 26, 1905, p.4; October 18, 1905, p.6; July 2, 1906, p.4.
[15] SFL: November 24, 1904, p.6; December 7, 1904, p.6; December 23, 1904, p.6; TCR, December 22, 1906, p.13.
[16] TOT, February 27, 1904, p.7.
[17] ADA, October 10, 1895, p.1; cf. ADA, October 11, 1894, p.1.
[18] ADA, August 5, 1896, p.1.
[19] ADA: November 13, 1896, p.4; November 16, 1896, p.1; November 20, 1896, p.1; November 19, 1896, p.1; SFL, November 20, 1896, p.11.
[20] ADA: April 21, 1897, p.1; April 28, 1897, p.1; April 29, 1897, p.1.
[21] ADA, October 2, 1897, p.1.
[22] ADA: April 29, 1899, p.1; May 9, 1899, p.1; May 17, 1899, p.1; May 18, 1899, p.1; May 19, 1899, p.1.
[23] ADA, December 6, 1899, p.1.
[24] ADA: March 1, 1900, p.1; November 1, 1900, p.1.
[25] Schwartz, *Northern*, p.13.
[26] BKR, August 16, 1906, p.3.
[27] BDG, November 28, 1911, p.4.
[28] U.C., *Courses*: 1896-97, pp.35f; 1897-98, pp.44-47; 1899-1900, pp.60-63; AAA 1, 1898, pp.92f; see also C. C. Foley in Baird, pp.29f.
[29] Berkeley's Department of Decorative Design and Industrial Art still functioned in July of 1899 because it co-sponsored with Stanford University an exhibition of art in Los Angeles; refer to Appendix 5 and note 91 below.
[30] ADA: May 20, 1905, p.1; May 24, 1905, p.4; cf. Hughes, p.44.
[31] U.C., *Courses*, 1900-01, p.114.
[32] BDG: April 13, 1901, p.1 November 16, 1909, p.5; *1920, Blue and Gold, Yearbook of the University of California*, Berkeley, 1919, p.153.
[33] BDG: January 18, 1901, p.6; August 26, 1901, p.3; October 9, 1901, p.2; October 30, 1901, p.2; William C. Jones, *Illustrated History of the University of California*, San Francisco, 1901, p.396; *1906, Blue and Gold, Yearbook of the University of California*, Berkeley, 1905, p.216.
[34] BDG, February 2, 1903, p.2.
[35] BKR: February 20, 1902, p.2; March 28, 1906, p.6.
[36] SFL, October 20, 1900, p.11; MHR, December, 1900, p.28.
[37] BDG, October 16, 1901, p.3.
[38] BDG, June 26, 1902, p.8.
[39] BDG, May 31, 1904, p.1; TCR, January 27, 1906, p.3.
[40] Biographies for all of the artists listed here are in Appendix 7.
[41] BKR, May 1, 1906, p.1; BDG: May 21, 1906, p.1; September 4, 1906, p.8; TCR, August 25, 1906, p.6; cf. SFC, May 13, 1906, p.23. Over a hundred paintings were stored in the University's faculty lounge, immediately adjacent to the office of the U.C. president.
[42] SFL, July 15, 1906, p.32.
[43] TOT, July 15, 1906, p.23.
[44] BKR, July 16, 1906, p.6; cf. BDG, July 16, 1906, p.5.
[45] TCR, July 28, 1906, p.6.
[46] BDG, November 9, 1906, p.5.
[47] TWP, December 14, 1907, p.15; cf. SFC, June 20, 1907, p.5.
[48] Richard Schwartz, *Earthquake Exodus, 1906*, Berkeley, 2005, pp.47ff. Apparently, many of the town's exterior chimneys were cracked or dislodged as was the roof of one public school. The U.C. campus was left relatively unharmed.
[49] BKR, April 18, 1906, p.1; BDG, April 23, 1906, pp.9-12.
[50] BDG: April 30, 1906, p.1; May 1, 1906, p.1.
[51] BKR: July 23, 1906, p.6; May 11, 1907, p.1; May 23, 1907, p.1; BDG: March 3, 1906, p.1; May 8, 1906, p.7; July 6, 1906, p.8; TCR: May 5, 1906, p.1; June 23, 1906, p.2; June 30, 1906, p.3; BKI: September 28, 1907, p.8; December 5, 1907, p.1; Wollenberg, p.47.
[52] TCR, April 28, 1906, p.1.
[53] SNT: 18, 1906, pp.70-79; 18, 1907, p.273.
[54] BKR, June 22, 1906, p.1.

[55] BKR, February 8, 1906, p.1. According to the Berkeley Directories, "Frederick H. Deakin," Edwin Deakin's youngest brother, arrived in Berkeley about 1895 with his wife and two sons, Frederick H. III and Clarence C. Their home at 2321 Vine Street was in North Berkeley at the opposite end of the city from the rest of the Deakin family dwellings (Polk: 1896, p.571; 1897, p.625; 1898, p.577; 1900, p.592; 1902, p.546; 1906, p.659; 1907, p.1563; 1908, p.1265). Frederick legally changed his last name to "Dakin" which was the spelling of his ancestral surname prior to 1820. Clarence C. Dakin studied engineering and was a licensed architect (Polk 1910 p.1318).

[56] On one occasion they employed the artist Charles P. Neilson who "secured hundreds of the best pictures" for their clients (BDG, May 12, 1906, p.5).

[57] In 1905 Frederick Dakin began construction of this five-story masonry building at the present corner of Shattuck Avenue and Addison Street (BDG, September 26, 1905, p.1). It was intended to be the headquarters for the Dakin Company and the tallest building in downtown Berkeley, just one block from campus and adjacent to the Southern Pacific Railroad station; the architect of record was probably Clarence Dakin. In the summer of 1906 the Dakins decided to capitalize on the art colony that was in desperate need of studio space and hence the redesign of the upper floors (BKR, June 22, 1906, p.1; BDG, October 20, 1906, p.5). On the exterior the Studio Building is characterized by a mansard roof of red tiles and rounded bay windows below the gallery level. Immediately after its restoration in 1978 it was declared a Berkeley landmark. While Edwin Deakin's mosaic was carefully preserved, his fifth-floor art gallery was long ago subdivided into offices.

[58] SFL, August 5, 1906, p.27; TCR, October 22, 1906, p.14; SFC, December 1, 1906, p.4. Berkeley's Studio Building was the inspiration for an identically named San Francisco edifice on Presidio Avenue that briefly housed artists' studios and the Julie Heyneman Gallery between 1907 and 1909 (SFL: September 13, 1908, p.28; September 6, 1908, p.22; TCW, May 28, 1909, p.431). A second San Francisco "studio building" was built later on Bush Street (SFL, April 18, 1909, p.31; TCR, May 29, 1909, p.14; SFC, June 27, 1909, p.26). Prior to the 1906 earthquake a standard apartment house at 609 Sacramento Street in San Francisco was sometimes called a "studio building" because certain artist-tenants, such as Maren Froelich, worked there (TAT, May 9, 1898, p.14; SFC, May 11, 1906, p.10; Crocker: 1902, p.1716; 1903-04, p.1760; 1905, p.1775).

[59] TCR, December 8, 1906, p.13; cf., Appendix 1, No.1; SFL, December 1, 1906, p.5; SFC, December 1, 1906, p.4; TOT, December 2, 1906, p.16; Schwartz, *Northern*, p.19. See also Appendix 1, No.1.

[60] TWP: January 23, 1904, p.89; April 2, 1904, p.371; BDG: April 25, 1905, p.5; March 12, 1906, p.6; BKR, March 12, 1906, p.7; SFL: July 9, 1905, p.19; August 5, 1906, p.27; October 28, 1907, p.7; TCR, July 6, 1907, p.13; BKI: May 10, 1907, p.3; May 18, 1908, p.5. The Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D. C., gave Keith's paintings a "place of honor" and New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired a number of pieces (SFC, May 22, 1905, p.7; BDG: May 26, 1905, p.6; October 14, 1905, p.14; November 26, 1906, p.5).

[61] TWP, May 7, 1904, p.516; TCR, October 19, 1907, p.5. By November of 1906 his paintings were again selling for the habitual high prices at the Vickery, Atkins & Torrey Gallery in San Francisco (TCR, November 3, 1906, p.13; TWP, November 24, 1906, p.145; cf. TCR, September 11, 1909, p.14).

[62] BKR, March 17, 1906, p.7; cf. BKR: March 25, 1907, p.1; October 21, 1908, p.2; BDG, September 11, 1906, p.1. When Keith's estate was assessed after his death, his net worth was listed at over a quarter of a million dollars, a staggering sum in 1911. Almost all of this amount was in cash, stocks and bonds. His entire corpus of paintings was valued at less than thirty-eight thousand dollars (SFL, July 30, 1911, p.23).

[63] TWP, July 14, 1906, p.10.

[64] SFC, May 14, 1906, p.10.

[65] BDG, May 9, 1906, p.3.

[66] Refer to the biography on Keith in Appendix 7 as well as: BDG: July 16, 1906, p.5; April 13, 1911, p.1; TCR, September 1, 1906, p.6; SFL: September 2, 1906, p.27; September 9, 1906, p.27; TWP, October 20, 1906, p.44; BKR: May 6, 1907, p.3; February 8, 1909, p.6; BKI, April 12, 1911, p.1.

[67] LAT, July 14, 1929, p.3-18.

[68] TCR: November 24, 1906, p.13; December 1, 1906, p.13; October 5, 1907, p.16; April 8, 1908, p.10; April 25, 1908, p.14.

[69] BKR, September 10, 1906, pp.1, 8; BDG, September 11, 1906, p.1; cf., TCR, October 22, 1906, p.14; BDG: September 24, 1909, p.5; March 3, 1911, p.5. When Keith returned ill from the Grand Canyon, it was the subject of community concern (BDG, July 11, 1904, p.3).

[70] TWP, October 20, 1906, p.44.

[71] For specific references on visiting painters the reader may wish to consult the following: Ernest C. Peixotto (SFL, June 24, 1907, p.7; BDG, June 24, 1907, p.5; TCR, June 29, 1907, p.13; BKI, October 3, 1907, p.5); Henry Percy Gray (Schwartz, *Northern*, 65); Charles H. Grant (BDG, November 20, 1907, p.2); George T. Pritchard (BDG, May 7, 1909, p.5); Benjamin C. Brown (SFL, September 25, 1910, p.34); Fanny E. Nute (BDG, December 6, 1910, p.5); Grace C. Hudson (BDG, March 10, 1911, p.5). Painters came from as far away as New York to vie for the privilege of painting Keith's portrait or to find inspiration in the Berkeley oaks (BDG, June 15, 1910, p.5; BKI, July 4, 1910, p.1).

[72] BKR, June 6, 1906, p.6 and the biographies in Appendix 7. Lorenzo Latimer made several lengthy trips to Berkeley for sketching, exhibitions and social contacts. I would like to thank Alfred C. Harrison, Jr. for sending me a selection of San Francisco newspaper clippings (1906-12) on Latimer. For further information on this artist see Harrison's *L. P. Latimer: California Watercolor Painter*, The North Point Gallery, San Francisco, 2005 and the biography in Appendix 14 of my publication.

[73] Although Breuer publicly extolled Keith's masterly skills, he reportedly was not welcomed at his residence. Keith had earlier barred Breuer from his San Francisco studio because of the latter's vulgar bragging about the high prices he received for his paintings. Keith was apparently jealous (Cornelius, vol. 1, pp.495, 589).

[74] BKR: November 4, 1908, p.5; November 20, 1908, p.1; BDG: November 20, 1908, p.6; November 30, 1908, p.6; TSL, November 21, 1908, p.3; SFL, November 20, 1908, p.7; cf. *San Francisco Evening Globe*, June 26, 1909, p.29. Mrs. Keith, who was trained as an attorney, was very prominent in Berkeley politics and actively supported the suffragettes as president of the Berkeley Political Equality League as well as the Humane Society (BKR: July 25, 1906, p.6; January 15, 1909, p.6; June 23, 1909, p.1; September 2, 1909, p.1; September 15, 1909, p.4; TOT, December 20, 1906, p.1; BKI: September 4, 1907, p.1; December 1, 1908, p.5; August 25, 1910, p.1; BDG: December 1, 1908, p.1; August 30, 1909, p.1; TCR, January 29, 1910, P.8).

[75] I only include those faculty members of the CSAC who were professional artists and exhibited in Berkeley between the summer of 1907 and the spring of 1911. I have intentionally excluded the teachers of "crafts" and applied mathematics: Rosa G. Taussig and Anne H. Johnson (instructors in bookbinding), Mrs. Rufus P. Jennings (instructor in metal work and jewelry) and Otto A. Schumann (instructor in geometry and mechanical drawing). Also excluded is Clara M. Hetschel, who taught only for six weeks in the summer of 1909.

[76] According to Meyer, as Dakin saw the school's enrollment rise he "raised the rent several times," which forced the school to relocate (Frederick H. Meyer, "Why an Art School?", reproduced in *Remembering Dr. Meyer*, CCAC Alumni Society, Oakland, 1961, pp.8f).

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.; BDG, December 11, 1906, p.1.

[79] SFL, August 5, 1906, p.27; BDG: August 6, 1906, p.4; August 24, 1906, p.4; TCR, August 18, 1906, p.4; cf. Dhaemers, pp.37f and Isabelle Percy's "Early History of the CSAC" (presently unpublished in the Archives of the California College of the Arts, Oakland).

[80] Photographs of the school buildings, faculty and classes as well as a brief history of the institution can be found in Edwards, pp.6-19; cf. Trapp, pp.143, 152, 154f, 268f.

[81] TCR, March 28, 1908, p.10; ATC 9, 1921-22, p.6: BDG, November 5, 1952, p.27.

[82] This space was leased by Meyer in the summer of 1909 (cf., Dhaemers, p.2; note 149 below; Polk 1912, p.60). Although the curriculum increasingly emphasized the "interpretive arts," by 1920 many of the school's graduates were still considered "commercial artists" (TSL, September 18, 1920, p.3). In May of 1922 the Berkeley Board of Education was in need of office space and on the expiration of Meyer's lease took over that part of the CSAC campus which was occupied by the metal and woodworking shops. Meyer decided at that time to construct a new campus in north Oakland at 5212 Broadway Boulevard on the former estate of James Treadwell (BDG, November 6, 1952, 13). On November 2, 1922 the school incorporated (CSAC, 1923-24; Letter of August 3, 1928 sent to A. T. DeRome by Meyer, Archives of the California College of the Arts, Oakland). The last classes in Berkeley were held in 1924-25. The School was renamed the California College of Arts and Crafts (CCAC) in 1936 (TAT: April 17, 1936, p.17; August 14, 1936, p.11). A second campus in San Francisco was opened in 1996. The school's name was changed for the fourth time in 2003 to the California College of the Arts (CCA).

[83] CSAC, 1907-08, p.4.

[84] SFL, June 24, 1907, p.7. In 1907 the faculty of Meyer's Berkeley school taught extension courses in San Francisco for the Guild (SFL, October 28, 1907, p.7). The Guild was actually part of a larger historical process that ultimately traced its antecedents to 19th-century Europe, William Morris and an arts and crafts movement that revived the design and hand fabrication of decorative and functional objects in opposition to industrial mass production. Its first titular appearance on the Pacific was in the fall of 1894 when a small all-male clique of highly successful San Franciscans founded the Society and Guild of Arts and Crafts (SFX, October 6, 1894, p.14; October 26, 1894, p.12). Its "exclusive" membership was limited to sixty professionals who were drawn from architects, writers, musicians, painters, sculptors and persons of "allied handicrafts." Initially, the latter category had only a single representative, an "illustrator." After the success of its first apparently "open" exhibition of printing (SFC, January 19, 1896, p.7; January 20, 1896, p.7; January 21, 1896, p.9), the older established artists (primarily painters) so dominated subsequent shows that it was difficult to distinguish them from the local Art Association (SFL, May 10, 1896, p.7; TWV, May 23, 1896, p.9). Devoid of any philosophical underpinnings and unable to find either adequate finances or competent management, the elitist Society and Guild of Arts and Crafts began to dissolve in a frenzy of ill-feeling (TWV, August 17, 1895, p.10). The California Guild of Arts and Crafts was established in August of 1903 by Douglas Van Denburgh and "confined itself strictly to applied arts" (MHR, Christmas, 1903, p.32; SNT 13.2, 1904, p.140). It was organized in San Francisco with a clear sense of purpose that was quoted years later in the CSAC catalogue (CSAC,1907-08, p.2): "to encourage and bring into closer communication the craftsmen of the State; also to provide means for bringing their work to the attention of the public, and through exhibitions, lectures and instruction to raise the standard of arts and crafts work and cultivate the public taste." To accomplish this annual exhibitions were given, courses of lectures were held, and in 1906 a library was started. The California Guild survived into the second decade of the 20th century.

[85] BDG: August 5, 1908, p.8; August 22, 1910, p.3; BKI, August 20, 1910, p.1; TCR: January 2, 1909, p.14; August 27, 1910, p.14; Dhaemers, pp.15ff. Eventually, Meyer created separate professional schools within the CSAC for Fine Arts, Applied Arts and Art Education.

[86] BKR: April 15, 1907, p.4; June 24, 1907, p.4; TCR: May 4, 1907, p.13; June 29, 1907, p.13; BDG, June 24, 1907, p.3.

[87] BDG, June 29, 1907, p.5.

[88] SFL, February 11, 1907, p.7.

[89] Appendix 1, No.9D; BKI: December 3, 1907, p.5; December 17, 1907, p.5; December 21, 1907, p.5; January 8, 1910, p.1; February 18, 1910, p.4; July 21, 1910, p.1; July 29, 1910, p.1; TOT: May 31, 1908, p.31; June 6, 1909, p.31; August 1, 1909, p.22; August 17, 1912, p.12; TCR: June 6, 1908, p.14; January 9, 1910, p.14; BKR, May 22, 1909, p.4; BDG: May 21, 1909, p.3; May 25, 1909, p.8; December 5, 1910, p.1; December 6, 1910, p.5; Whitaker, p.105.

[90] BDG: November 20, 1907, p.2; December 10, 1907, p.3; December 17, 1908, p.5; December 18, 1908, p.2; May 15, 1909, p.8; TCR: November 30, 1907, p.16; December 21, 1907, p.16; November 21, 1908, p.14; BKI: December 19, 1907, p.7; December 20, 1907, p.8; October 30, 1908, p.5; December 12, 1908, p.5; BKR: December 16, 1908, p.8; May 15, 1909, p.1; cf., SFC: December 22, 1895, p.28; December 23, 1900, p.9.

[91] According to Eugen Neuhaus there was an Art Department "before the advent of President Wheeler," but little was known of its history (Refer to notes 28 and 29 above; cf. Neuhaus, *Self-Portrait*, p.179). From the short *Autobiography* of Frederick Meyer we learn that he was hired in 1902 to teach Descriptive Geometry in the "Drawing Department" because the "Art Department had been temporarily closed" due to an undisclosed "scandal" (Frederick Meyer, *Autobiography*, [unpublished, partially handwritten draft], p.3, deposited in the Archives of the California College of the Arts, Oakland). In 1906-07 M. Earl Cummings was borrowed from the California School of Design to act as a part-time instructor in sculpture at the University. The very slow evolution of Berkeley's Art Department continued in 1914 when the name was changed from the "Department of Drawing" to the "Department of Drawing and Art." Between 1920 and 1922 there was the addition of six faculty members who taught art exclusively. Finally, in 1922-23 the "Department of Art" officially became independent of the "College of Engineering" and had Eugen Neuhaus as its chairman (Neuhaus, *Reminiscences*, p.38; U.C., *Courses*, 1914-15, p.83; 1920-21, p.62; 1921-22, p.63; 1923-24, p.46). Neuhaus was chairman from the fall of 1922 through the spring of 1925. Because no one wanted to succeed him as chair, a Latin Professor, Oliver Washburn, held that post for eleven years between 1925 and 1935, at which time the Dean of the Architecture School briefly assumed the position (Neuhaus, *Reminiscences*, p.21). From late 1935 to 1952 Stephen Pepper, a member of the Philosophy Department, served as chairman of the Art Department (C. C. Foley in Baird, p.32).

[92] Neuhaus, *Self-Portrait*, pp.90, 92; Neuhaus, *Reminiscences*, pp.6-21.

[93] Neuhaus, *Self-Portrait*, p.98.

[94] TCR, January 25, 1908, p.16; TDC: January 17, 1908, p.4; January 28, 1908, p.1.

[95] U.C., *Courses*, 1912-13, p.68; 1913-14, pp.77-79.

[96] BKR, August 4, 1906, p.2.

[97] BDG, September 4, 1906, p.8.

[98] Ibid.; U.C., *Catalogue*, 1898, p.9; 1899, p.7; February, 1903, p.10.

[99] SFL, September 9, 1906, p.27.

[100] *Fairbanks Evening Star*, August 30, 1906, p.3.

[101] TCR, January 1, 1916, p.12.

[102] BKR, September 4, 1906, p.8; BDG, September 22, 1906, p.1; TCR, September 22, 1906, p.10; Polk, 1907, p.1594.

[103] BKR, October 6, 1906, p.3; TCR, October 6, 1906, p.11.

[104] BDG: August 19, 1909, p.5; October 20, 1909, p.5; June 3, 1910, p.5; TCR: August 14, 1909, p.14; January 22, 1910, p.7. Nahl publicly complained that he could not find proper female models for his "life classes" at the CSAC or The Associated Studios because the professional "life painters" never coalesced into a single city after the 1906 earthquake (TCR, November 23, 1907, p.16).

[105] BDG, April 8, 1907, p.3; cf. TOT, April 9, 1907, p.15; TCR, April 20, 1907, p.13.

[106] BDG, April 26, 1907, p.1; TCR: April 27, 1907, p.13; May 4, 1907, p.13.

[107] BDG: March 31, 1906, p.6; May 1, 1907, p.12; May 3, 1907, p.5; July 15, 1907, p.5; March 4, 1908, p.5; BKI, May 1, 1907, p.6; BKR, May 2, 1907, p.8; TAT, June 1, 1907, p.719; TCR: May 11, 1907, p.13; March 28, 1908, p.10. For colorful anecdotes on the Havens family see Whitaker, pp.30ff, 155ff.

[108] TCR, June 15, 1907, p.5.

[109] AAA: 11, 1914, p.49; 12, 1915, p.54.

[110] The exhibition of paintings at Idora Park was organized by Berkeley artist Sally Daingerfield (TCR: August 31, 1907, p.14; September 28, 1907, p.14; BDG: September 2, 1907, p.5; September 23, 1907, p.5).

[111] BKI, October 8, 1907, p.2; BDG, October 10, 1907, p.3; TCR, October 12, 1907, p.16.

[112] BDG, October 29, 1907, p.1; cf. BDG: October 26, 1907, p.1; October 28, 1907, p.9; November 2, 1907, p.5; SFL, October 29, 1907, p.11; TCR: November 2, 1907, p.16; August 26, 1908, p.5; August 31, 1908, p.5.

[113] Appendix 1, No.2; BDG: December 13, 1907, p.9; December 16, 1907, p.3; December 17, 1907, p.5; TCR: November 23, 1907, p.16; November 30, 1907, p.16; December 7, 1907, p.16.

[114] BKI, December 2, 1907, p.5; TCR: December 7, 1907, p.16; December 14, 1907, p.16.

[115] This letter to Cousin Edna, who was an aspiring artist with a natural interest in the Berkeley art colony, is dated "December, 1919." I would like to thank Eleanor Malzahn Jacobsen for unrestricted access to her Vennerström family correspondence and specifically for permission to cite this material. Unfortunately, when the pages of the 1907 daybook were glued into the large family album, the margins with the specific dates for each entry were trimmed and discarded. It was impossible to make a photocopy from the fragile album, but I was given unhurried access to produce a careful transcription. At present the remainder of the 1907 daybook has not been located. The citations in Jennie's diaries are normally short notes of daily affairs, while her daybook entries are often long, reflective passages on special events. The format of her daybooks varies. For example, her entries on Egypt, which are quoted in Chapter 4, constitute a special section at the end of her bound diary, while her 1907 comments on Berkeley are written on ledger-size detached sheets with the faint traces of horizontal lines. In my transcription of the daybook in Chapter 3 numbers are introduced at the beginning of each paragraph to facilitate the organization of the commentaries.

[116] MacDougall, Letters dated 30 August 1907 and 17 September 1907.

[117] Refer to Appendices 6 and 7.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid.
[120] Ibid.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Ibid.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Among the summer visitors from Berkeley to the Carmel-Monterey area were such artists as: Laura Adams Armer, Anne Bremer, Anne Brigman, Frances Campbell, Louise Carpenter, Charles Crocker, Sally Daingerfield, Charles Dickman, William Gaw, James Griffin, Charles Judson, William Keith, the Kleinschmidts, Xavier Martinez, Charlotte Morgan, Charles Neilson, Eugen Neuhaus, Katherine Newhall, Isabelle Percy(-West), Emily Pitchford, Harry Seawell, Jessie Short(-Jackson) and Elizabeth Strong. The U.C. Students were so ubiquitous in Carmel that the sororities held "annual" house parties at the seaside hamlet (SFL, December 25, 1909, p.15). For "University Week" in Carmel see TOT, March 7, 1926, p.S-8.
[132] *1908*, *Blue and Gold*, Yearbook of the University of California, Berkeley, 1907, p.197; *1909*, *Blue and Gold*, Yearbook of the University of California, Berkeley, 1908, p.147; TDC: October 3, 1907, p.4; October 15, 1907, p.2; TCR, November 28, 1908, p.8; BDG: December 5, 1908, p.5; December 26, 1908, p.8; BKR: November 5, 1908, p.5; November 23, 1908, p.5.
[133] BKR: October 26, 1908, p.5; November 4, 1908, p.5; November 12, 1908, p.5.
[134] BKI, May 6, 1908, p.5; BKR: October 7, 1908, p.5; October 20, 1908, p.5; December 1, 1908, p.5; BDG: October 4, 1909, p.5; October 5, 1909, p.5; TCR, January 9, 1909, p.14.
[135] TOT, March 30, 1908, p.4.
[136] BDG, August 19, 1909, p.5.
[137] BDG: November 22, 1909, p.5; November 23, 1909, p.5; November 9, 1910, p.5; BKI, March 21, 1911, p.1.
[138] BDG, February 17, 1908, p.1.
[139] TCR, March 28, 1908, p.10.
[140] At the time of Baxter's election one Berkeley publication went so far as to declare that "success . . . is assured" for the Berkeley Art Association (TCR, November 30, 1907, p.6). Precisely why Baxter failed to secure even a modest amount of financial and moral support is unknown.
[141] Refer to the biography of Evelyn Withrow in Appendix 7.
[142] TCR: August 29, 1908, p.14; September 10, 1908, p.14; BDG, September 15, 1908, p.3.
[143] BKR, October 3, 1908, p.1. By December of 1908 the debate regarding the gallery focused on whether it should be located on the University campus or in town and which "interested capitalists" would become financial sponsors (TCR: December 26, 1908, p.14; February 20, 1909, p.14).
[144] BAA2, pp.5f, 21.
[145] BKR: January 22, 1909, p.5; January 26, 1909, p.5; February 19, 1909, p.3; September 20, 1909, p.1; BKI, October 20, 1908, p.7; TCR: January 23, 1909, p.14; February 20, 1909, p.14; May 1, 1909, p.14.
[146] Appendix 1, No.3; BKR, November 16, 1908, p.5.
[147] BKR, November 18, 1908, p.8.
[148] TCR, November 28, 1908, p.14.
[149] BDG: August 27, 1909, p.1; August 31, 1909, p.1; September 1, 1909, p.1; TCR: August 28, 1909, p.14; September 4, 1909, p.14; September 11, 1909, p.14; BKR, September 1, 1909, pp.1f.
[150] Hjalmarson, p.104.
[151] TCR: September 18, 1909, p.14; September 25, 1909, p.14; BDG: September 20, 1909, p.5; September 21, 1909, p.1; BKR: September 21, 1909, p.4; September 29, 1909, p.1.
[152] BDG: September 7, 1909, p.1; August 12, 1910, p.5; TCR: September 11, 1909, p.14; February 19, 1910, p.12; SFL, October 23, 1909, p.15. Most art galleries in the San Francisco Bay Area began as "picture framers" and suppliers of artists' materials. After purchasing the Berkeley framing shop of J. T. Tracy, Offield opened his own art supply business at 2036 Shattuck Avenue in August of 1901 (BDG, August 12, 1901, p.7; Polk: 1902, p.612; 1906, p.775; 1910, p.1108). He also sold gramophones. The growth of his "art gallery" coincided with the rise of the Berkeley art colony (TCR, November 10, 1906, p.13; BDG: December 18, 1906, p.6; August 9, 1907, p.10). He began displaying and selling the work of some local artists and "French masterpieces" at his annual Christmas exhibition and in periodic shows. It was only in January of 1909 that he kept his small gallery open year round (TCR: January 2, 1909, p.14; January 16, 1909, p.14).
[153] BDG, November 16, 1901, p.7.
[154] Appendix 1, No.4.
[155] Appendix 1, No.5.
[156] BDG: November 15, 1909, p.1; November 17, 1909, p.1; November 20, 1909, p.5; TCR, November 20, 1909, p.14.
[157] BDG: December 14, 1909, p.1; December 17, 1909, p.3; TCR, December 11, 1909, p.14.
[158] TCR, January 15, 1910, p.14; BKI, January 15, 1910, p.1.
[159] BKI, October 8, 1907, p.2; December 11, 1907, p.5; January 27, 1910, p.1.

[160] TCR, November 9, 1907, p.5.
[161] The BAA board of directors attempted to consolidate exhibitions, but even this attempt failed (BKI: January 27, 1910, p.1; April 14, 1910, p.1).
[162] BDG: December 5, 1910, p.1; December 6, 1910, p.5; December 10, 1910, p.4; TCR, December 17, 1910, p.14.
[163] TOT, October 15, 1910, p.8; cf. Appendix 1, No.6.
[164] BDG, October 28, 1910, pp.9, 12.
[165] BDG, October 15, 1910, p.8.
[166] BDG, October 31, 1910, p.1. Offield's "Temple" continued in business for a number of years, but sold fewer paintings while expanding the "crafts" section (i.e., pottery, copper ware and leather) and the framing business (TCR, March 4, 1916, p.31).
[167] SFL, February 26, 1911, p.31.
[168] BDG, November 25, 1910, p.5; TCR, November 26, 1910, p.6.
[169] BDG, March 14, 1911, p.1; cf. Appendix 1, No.7.
[170] BKI: April 12, 1911, p.1; April 13, 1911, p.1; April 14, 1911, p.1; April 15, 1911, p.1; BDG: April 13, 1911, p.1; April 15, 1911, p.1; SFL, April 16, 1911, p.59; TCR, April 29, 1911, pp.3f; Cornelius, vol. 1, pp.532ff.
[171] Appendix 1, No.8.
[172] Cf., AAA 11, 1914, p.354; CSAC, 1914-15, pp2ff.
[173] TCR, September 24, 1910, p.14.
[174] TCR, September 21, 1907, pp.4f; cf. SFL, December 5, 1906, p.4. As expected, the San Francisco newspapers were satirically hostile and carried amusing stories on how Berkeleyans were smuggling liquor in the suitcases.
[175] BDG, October 1, 1907, p.7.
[176] TCR: October 5, 1912, p.8; May 3, 1913, p.6; November 1, 1913, p.15; November 22, 1913, p.14; April 4, 1914, p.15; October 31, 1914, p.12; November 7, 1914, pp.10f.
[177] TCR: April 6, 1912, p.7; March 1, 1913, p.14; March 15, 1913, p.14; March 7, 1914, p.13; March 14, 1914, p.5; March 21, 1914, p.15; BDG: March 13, 1914, p.8; March 17, 1914, p.3; March 10, 1915, p.1; March 16, 1915, p.4.
[178] SFC, March 8, 1914, p.21.
[179] SFC, March 14, 1915, p.24.
[180] TCR: August 29, 1914, p.12; December 19, 1914, p.11; January 23, 1915, p.10; February 6, 1915, p.10; February 27, 1915, p.12; March 6, 1915, p.9; April 10, 1915, pp.4f. In 1916 the University discovered that its summer art courses were overflowing due to the interest generated by the Exposition (TCR, May 13, 1916, p.13).
[181] TOT, May 7, 1923, p.4.
[182] TOT, December 24, 1917, p.24.
[183] *Catalogue*, *Frank C. Havens' World Famed Collection of Valuable Paintings by Great Ancient and Modern Masters*, *Public Exhibition and Auction*, October 23, 1917; TOT: October 14, 1917, p.20; October 28, 1917, p.20. In her jingoistic survey of the "Piedmont art colony" Ann Swift makes no mention of this Gallery or its fate (Swift, pp.5ff).