Chapter Six – From Palo Alto to Berkeley: Divorce and Recovery (1915-1923)

In 1915 the Panama-Pacific International Exposition (PPIE) became the primary focus of Jennie Cannon's artistic activities. There is no record that she traveled from her Palo Alto home to Carmel or any other destination outside the San Francisco Bay Area. Beginning on January 23rd the Palo Alto Woman's Club sponsored a series of highly popular lectures by Cannon on the "Development of American Art." The intent of these talks was to provide "information which will be of practical use in attending the art exhibits at the coming Exposition." The front-page review of the first lecture in the Palo Alto newspaper noted that all proceeds were to go to the artist's favorite charity, the relief fund for Belgian refugees.[1] Jennie took small select groups on tours to the art galleries at the Exposition and on one occasion met with William Merritt Chase.[2] The complete responsibility for raising her two sons, Milner and George, continued to fall on Jennie's shoulders. William Cannon made only one visit to Palo Alto in late February "spending a few days with his family" before returning to Tucson via Carmel.[3] The abandoned wife obviously realized that her marriage was in trouble, but to what extent she demanded his presence at home is unknown due to the absence of her diaries and the unexplained gap in her correspondence. Increasingly, Jennie looked to her contacts in the Woman's Club for moral support.[4] In May of 1915 she was elected "chairman" of its Art Department and began teaching art classes for a modest fee to members and their families.[5] Aside from her single painting exhibited at the PPIE and at least one other at the Golden Gate Memorial Museum, she held a joint exhibition and sale with Rosa Hooper Lyon in Palo Alto. This three-day show in early December of 1915 would earn her a respectable amount of money and had among its "patronesses" Ada Morse Clark of the Ford Foundation, Mrs. H. R. Fairclough, the wife of a Stanford dean, and Mrs. Gustav Laumeister, whose husband was the renowned architect. High society sponsorship of art exhibits was a guarantee of success.[6] Jennie continued to paint in Palo Alto and along the immediate coast at Half Moon Bay and Montara.

In 1916 Cannon expanded her horizons with six public exhibitions of her paintings. The first in January was at the opening of Oakland's new municipal Art Gallery. Here she displayed her entry from the PPIE of the previous year and sold it before the close of the exhibit. It was the policy of most municipal art galleries at this time to allow artists to sell their works while on display.[7] Either the galleries negotiated a sale with the artist's consent and took a commission or a potential buyer contacted the artist directly at his or her studio. Since it was traditional for artists to attend the opening and closing days of an exhibit that included their work, a buyer could negotiate the purchase at the gallery. Jennie not only contributed to the juried exhibitions of the San Francisco Art Association and the Society of California Artists, but she also entered the highly publicized "jury-free" showing of regional artists at the California Palace of Fine Arts. She was invited in July to contribute to the Oakland Art Gallery's first "all-women's show." In October she held her first solo exhibition in the San Francisco Bay Area at the new Club House of the Palo Alto Woman's Club. At the opening Jennie lectured on regional painting and the importance of art for the development of children. She continued with her responsibilities at the Woman's Club and was reelected as head of its Art Department.[8] She was becoming something of a Palo Alto celebrity and her mere attendance at events was noted in the society pages of the local newspaper.[9]

Jennie's success in public life was threatened by the impending collapse of her marriage. According to documents that were filed with the Superior Court of Santa Clara County, Will

permanently left their Palo Alto home on January 11, 1916.[10] As part of the subsequent "property settlement" of April 15, 1916, which both parties *informally* put in writing, he agreed temporarily to pay his wife fifty dollars a month for support. In the spring she traveled to Carmel "to sketch" and apparently did not meet Will, who had arrived on May 9th for his summer at the Carnegie Laboratory.[11] On or about May 15th Jennie transferred into her husband's name four parcels of Carmel property that were on Casanova Street near Ocean Avenue.[12] The lot that held the Cannons' home was purchased about a year later by the artist Alice Comins.[13] Will, in turn, transferred full title of their Palo Alto home to his wife. Jennie left Carmel by May 18th and chose not to return to her "beloved hamlet" for painting or extended stays until 1920. Will's insistence on publicly socializing in Carmel with his mistress, Ella Shaw Varney, his wife's one-time friend and companion, was painfully humiliating for Jennie. The fact that "Mrs. W. A. Cannon" was listed that summer in the Palo Alto newspaper as the sole official owner of 1727 Waverley Street must have caused tongues to wag.[14] Another blow came in late October when her friend and mentor, William Merritt Chase, died. A month later she attended his special memorial service in San Francisco.[15]

At some point in November or December Will seems to have ended all financial support for his family. Jennie's reaction was swift and defiant. In mid January of 1917 a prominent advertisement appeared in the *Daily Palo Alto Times*:[16]

> Attorney John D. Willard has filed an action in the superior court in behalf of Mrs. Jennie V. Cannon of Palo Alto for divorce from Professor W. A. Cannon of Tucson, Arizona on the grounds of desertion. Professor Cannon is a botanist and Mrs. Cannon an artist. Both are Stanford graduates of fifteen years ago.

This announcement was placed with careful calculation. It did not appear with the "Legal Notices" as a "divorce petition" to alert creditors, but in the "Personals" column. This almost unprecedented act was intended to humiliate Will before his colleagues at Stanford University. It certainly insured that he would never receive a tenured professorship at such a conservative institution. In addition, it gave Jennie some sense of vindication for her exile from Carmel. However, her revenge became a Pyrrhic victory. At this time divorce carried the indelible stigma of failure and impropriety. Jennie immediately resigned from her appointments at the Palo Alto Woman's Club.[17] Her name disappeared from the local art galleries and newspapers as if a light were quickly extinguished. Yet her self-imposed exile was short since the court quickly decided on her behalf. Jennie testified that her husband "willfully and without cause deserted and abandoned" his family and presented documentary evidence.[18] Although Will's attorney contested these allegations, Judge W. A. Beasley found the defendant's answers to the charges "untrue," declared the marriage dissolved on February 6, 1917 and ordered that William Cannon pay Jennie Cannon fifty dollars a month as "permanent alimony." In addition, he was given *financial* responsibility for the "support, education and care" of his two minor children.

Did William Cannon abandon Jennie and pursue the extramarital affair because he felt ignored as his wife pursued a successful career outside the home? Whatever the reason, Will married Ella Shaw Varney, affectionately known as "Eloise," immediately after the divorce was finalized on February 26, 1918. Soon he felt the scorn of his many friends who loved Jennie. He decided not merely to escape from the West Coast, but to leave the continent. He petitioned the State Department through a director of the Carnegie Institution, namely his close friend Daniel T. MacDougal, for a special waiver to conduct "imperative" botanical research with Eloise in Australia.

Travel abroad by Americans was extensively curbed during World War I. MacDougal, who knew of William's emotional state, declared that Mr. Cannon had no responsibilities to "impede his movements."[19] On the eve of his departure from San Francisco (May 15, 1918) Will wrote to MacDougal that his son, Milner, had apparently accepted the fact of his third marriage and that the MacDougals would soon receive the boy's letter. He expected Milner's letter to assuage Jennie's close friend, Louise MacDougal.[20] William and his bride returned to California a year later.[21]

In February of 1917 Jennie's actions were decisive. At the age of forty-eight her eighteen-year marriage had ended in anger and disillusionment. Aside from the issues of Will's prolonged absences and infidelity, there was the nagging fact that he seldom encouraged or praised his wife's artistic efforts. His extreme anti-Semitism angered Jennie who maintained close friendships with many prominent Jewish artists in California and New York.[22] That Jennie chose not to sue over adultery may indicate that she quickly wanted to end the pain and spare her sons further embarrassment. Divorce became her best alternative and the catalyst for a new life. Her decisions at this crucial junction showed tremendous courage. She had no family wealth to secure her future. A logical choice might have been a return to her first profession, an elementary school teacher, but she was determined to pursue her dreams and fashion a profitable career in the highly competitive world of professional painters. Motivated in 1917 by a desire to escape the emotional wreckage of her marriage and more importantly by the need to reinvent herself artistically, Jennie Cannon left California to spend fifteen months in New York City. She placed her eleven-year old son, George, with friends in Palo Alto (possibly the Laumeisters), while her eldest, Milner, was safely ensconced at University housing in Berkeley where he began his freshman year in September of 1916.[23]

Jennie had constantly struggled to find her own artistic persona within the tenets of her most revered teachers, William Merritt Chase and Frank Brangwyn. Chase's praise of her work in 1914 coupled with the warning that she had not quite arrived as a "great artist" only compounded her anxiety. During her stay in New York she actively participated in several memorials to honor her mentor, but she also seized the opportunity to embrace a very controversial Modernism which was quite antithetical to Chase's teachings. She did not fully accept its anarchist philosophy, which made art a confrontational expression of social struggle, but she enthusiastically welcomed the way this new aesthetic transferred art into the realm of purely personal expression. Here there was no slavish emulation of classical or 19th-century ideals. The views of libertarian radicals were not entirely new to Cannon since one of her instructors at Stanford, Bolton Brown, introduced her to the writings of William Morris. What is most revealing in the Cannon file of correspondence at the Tucson Archives are clippings of two articles from the *New York Globe* that were authored by Hutchins Hapgood.[24] In these Robert Henri is praised for his attack on art as "imitative tradition" and for his defense of the individualist as the artistic rebel. Juries and the "official" exhibitions of the art establishment came under his heavy criticism for suppressing artistic freedom and individual creativity. Henri believed artists should "self-organize" and exhibit their work without restriction. In support of these last points Jennie would later proselytize throughout northern California.

The controversies in New York's artistic world did not turn Jennie into the passive philosophical observer; on the contrary, she showed no inhibitions in sampling the offerings. In the early fall of 1917 she joined the notorious People's Art Guild.[25] This organization was founded in 1915 by John Weichsel as a natural outgrowth of communist egalitarianism and the artistic

counterculture it spawned. It was an artist-managed cooperative whose members lived in communes and bypassed "commercial galleries with their exorbitant fees" by exhibiting in the settlement houses of the city's poorer districts.[26] The idea was to make art available to a larger public and slowly cultivate the tastes of the working classes for Modernism and socialist politics. The Guild distributed at cost to its members paint, canvases and frames; in some cases it provided studios.[27] It showcased a number of young radical artists, including a special solo exhibit by John Sloan. We know from the fragmentary exhibition records that Jennie exhibited at least once and was present when the Guild closed its gallery in 1918.[28] Cannon also maintained more traditional liaisons in New York. Women's organizations were especially deserving of support and she exhibited in 1917 and 1918 with the National Association of Women Painters and Sculptors, a group where she had long held membership.[29] From her residence at 438 West 116th Street she perused almost every display of worth or disdain.[30] She frequently visited the Ferrer Center with its exhibitions of works by Robert Henri, Man Ray, George Bellows, Rockwell Kent, John Marin and William Glackens. Away from the constraints of her California artist-friends, Jennie experimented with unorthodox techniques in interpreting oils. From her frequent sketching trips she sent freshly completed paintings, which reportedly possessed a far more open and abstract character, for exhibition and sale at the Forty-Second Annual of the San Francisco Art Association (SFAA). Unfortunately, none of her works from this New York visit have surfaced at present, but if we judge her metamorphosis from the paintings that immediately follow her return to the San Francisco Bay Area, such as her oil entitled *A Street in Chinatown* (Plate 5b),[31] then we can conclude, in the words of William Merritt Chase, that she had "arrived" artistically. According to her granddaughter, this prolonged stay in New York also "radicalized" Jennie personally.[32] Except for weddings and funerals all church attendance ceased, supposedly because her faith in religious institutions had been betrayed by her failed marriage. The artist now refused to wear a corset and simply pulled her hair back into a lopsided bun. She wore simple floppy dresses at home, had the scuffed boots of a workman and, when invited out, nonchalantly arrived in her paint-spattered smock or donned "weird" Mexican shawls with pendulous tassels. Jennie reportedly appeared at the opening of an art exhibition wrapped in a bright Navajo flat weave that was pinned at her shoulders with a turquoise brooch the size of a dinner plate. Her eclectic Bohemian attire was evident as late as 1941 when she posed for a newspaper photographer in a girl's elaborately embroidered Swedish folk dress with a showy satin cape.[33]

It appears that Jennie left New York in May of 1918 and traveled by train to southern California. It is not known whether she stopped in route to visit relatives in Minnesota. Considering her close family attachments, this scenario seems likely. She reached Laguna Beach by June and studied with great interest the first exhibition of local artists on July 27th.[34] She quickly attached herself to its established art colony and infused her new ideas on the rendering of form with the area's glorious light and stunning scenery (Plate 6a). In August of 1918 she participated with thirty-four artists and one hundred and sixteen patrons in establishing the Laguna Beach Art Association.[35] According to its constitution, the object of this organization was "to maintain a permanent gallery, to advance the knowledge of and interest in Art and to create a spirit of cooperation and fellowship between the artist and the public."[36] Jennie eventually paid her dues to become a "life member" and exhibited with the organization for seventeen years.[37] This Association, like the People's Art Guild, entrusted the display and sale of all art to the members

themselves as opposed to the typical arrangement of appointed “academic” committees which were all too frequently subject to political manipulation. Exhibitions in Laguna changed monthly and were chosen by a rotating jury of its members.[38] We know that Jennie returned to Palo Alto by October of 1918 when she staged a solo exhibition of her “new canvases” to benefit “War Relief.”[39] She arrived home not only with a clear conception of how to interpret her world artistically, but also with definite ideas on how to reform the near ossified art establishment of the San Francisco Bay Area. First she had to deal with pressing logistical issues.

During her almost twenty-month absence she had leased her house on Waverley Street in Palo Alto to provide a source of constant income. Evidence indicates that Jennie continued to rent that residence after her return and briefly stayed in the large studio at the back of the property.[40] Palo Alto, she now believed, was far too isolated from the culture and core population of the San Francisco Bay Area. It was also a place where she constantly confronted the painful history of her divorce. In selecting the centrally located city of Berkeley as her new base of operation she quite intentionally avoided the cliquish, male-dominated art enclaves of San Francisco. The fond memories of her 1907 visit to Berkeley’s thriving art colony were an important contributing factor in her choice.[41] Also the peculiar characteristics of this University town suited her new liberated personality. By 1920 Berkeley’s population had ballooned to nearly sixty thousand with a University enrollment of over thirty-seven thousand. Per capita its residents were among the most highly educated in the country. Berkeley also had a very progressive tradition of granting women equal access to education and employment. The University spawned a lively musical, literary and theatrical community. Charles Keeler, the renowned naturalist, writer and vocal proponent of the arts and crafts movement, was elected the “managing director” of the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce, a position he held for seven years; he actively encouraged the municipal sponsorship of the arts. Berkeley was important economically as a terminus for the Pacific railroads and frequent ferry service made trips to San Francisco quite convenient. For Jennie it held the added advantage that her son was attending the University; several of her artist-friends, such as Elizabeth Strong, provided a place to stay while she was house hunting.

In July of 1919 “Mrs. Jennie Cannon” purchased a large hill-side residence on La Vereda Road just northeast of campus for the rather sizable sum of two thousand eight hundred dollars. It was built in 1895 with plans of “recognizable Victorian design” by the renowned architect Bernard Maybeck and offered a fine garden as well as an unusual two-storey veranda that fronted the long street-side axis of the house.[42] The construction of an electric streetcar along nearby Euclid Avenue in 1901 made her home easily accessible to visitors.[43] Although she possessed some money from the pending sale of her residence in Palo Alto, Jennie had no regular source of income outside of the small alimony payment and confronted the uncomfortable fact that banks routinely refused loans to a woman without the co-signature of a husband. She was fortunate to have located the Kingston Investment Company, a financial institution owned and operated entirely by women. Kingston facilitated the loan to purchase 1631 La Vereda on August 29, 1919 at very reasonable terms.[44] With a panoramic view of the San Francisco Bay this house and especially its curious environs suited perfectly her grandiose but still unannounced plans. By 1915 Buena Vista Heights and the upper “Northside” area that included La Vereda were known euphemistically throughout Berkeley as “Nut Hill.”[45] While the “Nut” may have referred to the vegetarian diets of certain inhabitants, it was generally used to label the “strange” social experiments of its residents.

The first started in 1894 when Charles Keeler asked Bernard Maybeck to design “the simple home,” a box-like utilitarian residence that possessed an unpainted interior, exposed beams, stone fireplace and an outer skin of redwood shingles to complement the forested neighborhood. Maybeck, who would later design the Beaux-arts California Palace of Fine Arts for San Francisco’s PPIE, accepted dozens of commissions for these “woody houses” in a town dominated by Victorian architecture. The many proponents of natural urban development in Nut Hill founded the Hillside Club in 1898 to encourage the construction of “artistic” homes on winding streets where private and public gardens intermingled.[46] The intention was to follow the land’s natural contours, protect established trees and conceal houses that maintained commanding views of the San Francisco Bay. The published tracts and proselytizing of the “Nuts” attracted all that was unconventional, including Florence and Treadwell Boynton. From the architectural plans of Maybeck they constructed on a hillside platform a peristyle of thirty-four Corinthian columns known as the Temple of Wings.[47] The interior walls (prior to 1924) consisted of elaborately painted sheets of canvas. Attired in Roman togas the Boyntons fêted guests on vegetarian treats and occasionally were entertained by their close friend, the dancer Isadora Duncan. Their daughter, Sulgwynn, managed a dance studio that employed the techniques of Duncan at this venue for almost fifteen years. Among its illustrious graduates was Martha Graham. Jennie Cannon, whose life was profoundly influenced by William Morris, saw this Bohemian enclave of arts and crafts as a locus of inspiration and the center for a professional career.

What she needed at this time was a reliable income. The peripatetic life of her ex-husband resulted in frequent interruptions with the alimony and child support payments, a burden that she had to assume. Her passion for painting now became the means of survival. Jennie’s first step was to exhibit several of her new Post-Impressionist works at the Schussler Brothers Gallery in San Francisco. Anna Cora Winchell, the conservative art critic for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, offered this short review:[48]

> The name of J. V. Cannon, new to this locality, is attached to two canvases in the Schussler galleries. One is an Eastern landscape, the other a small sketch. Mrs. Cannon paints in the higher keys, evidently seeking to obtain radiance. Her technique is individual and she follows no school, seeming to concentrate upon the outcome than through any special lines of drawing or method.

Apparently, Jennie’s evolving style met with acclaim among buyers with more modern tastes and both works were sold during the exhibition. The Schussler Brothers, who were distinguished purveyors of fine art and framers for the museums of San Francisco, obtained immediately thereafter the rights to sell Cannon’s works for several years.[49] By the mid 1920s she habitually used the Gump’s Gallery in San Francisco and the H. S. Swasey Gallery in Berkeley as her “official dealers.”[50] We have several details about the “business of art” from two surviving pieces of Cannon’s correspondence in the archives of the San Francisco Art Institute.[51] In the exchange of letters during April of 1919 it appears that Jennie sent a large quantity of paintings to the selection jury of the SFAA. From these they were to choose one or two entries for its Forty-Third Annual Exhibition. At Cannon’s request two of her works not selected by the jury were to be shipped by the Association directly to her studio and the remainder were to be dispatched to her “dealer” in San Francisco, the Schussler Brothers. Unfortunately, all were sent to the latter, except for the piece exhibited at the SFAA. Despite receiving what may have been incomplete instructions from the artist, the cooperative SFAA agreed to ship two of the paintings from Schussler’s back to

Cannon's studio. At the Forty-Third Annual her single entry, entitled *[A Street in] Chinatown*, was one of approximately 200 displayed pieces by 91 artists from five western states (Plate 5b).[52] Despite this competition her work was included among the six "finest paintings" that were reproduced in New York's *International Studio* magazine to exemplify the high standards of the exhibition.[53] Thereafter Jennie was asked to exhibit this painting at the Oakland Art Gallery, Gump's and the Del Monte Hotel Art Gallery in Monterey. *The Oakland Tribune's* art critic, who was seldom fond of extolling women artists, cites verbatim the comments from Josephine Blanch, the gallery director at the Del Monte Hotel:[54]

> "A Street in Chinatown," by J. Vennerstrom Cannon, is vibrant with color and direct in handling. Especially fine is the treatment of the broad purple shadows in contrast to the yellow and red of the long lines of buildings in sunlight.

In the spring of 1919 Jennie began what became her penchant for creating controversy when she publicly and rather curtly condemned the selection jury at SFAA Annual for excluding the work of established artists in favor of "new" modern styles. She received a very lengthy rebuttal from Willard Huntington Wright, the caustic film, society, book and music critic for the *San Francisco Bulletin*, under the caption: **S.F. ART ASSOCIATION IS CRITICISED IN ARTICLE FOR ITS MODERNIST TENDENCIES**.[55] Cannon bluntly asked:

> What has become of the works of Arthur and Lucia Mathews, Francis McComas, Isabel Hunter, Mary Curtis Richardson. . . ?
>
> And from the southern part of the State, why are the names of Puthuff, Redmond, Wachtel, Townsley, Mannheim and Wendt missing? Why are several of the art colonies not represented? Why is there nothing by Lundgren, Silva, Parkhurst, Watts and Sammann? Why not the names of Latimer, Sparks, Gray, Lemos, Dickman, Nahl, Judson, Cummings, Mora and Dixon . . . ?

Wright aptly countered that some of the above had not presented work to the jury for consideration (although many had obviously submitted and been rejected) and that it was not the task of the SFAA to compel them to exhibit. By any reckoning Cannon's single work displayed at that Annual, her *Chinatown*, was certainly classed as Modernist; her objections had to do with the exclusion of the old guard who added balance and continuity to the show. She declared that "the speediest antidote for a diseased organization is the creation of a rival organization." Antony Anderson, the erudite art critic for the *Los Angeles Times*, came to her defense in his column and condemned Wright for calling Hanson Puthuff's work inferior, Granville Redmond a decorator of "drawing-rooms of retired Iowans," Elmer Wachtel "a copyist – a sort of exalted illustrator," Jean Mannheim "a facile technician without originality" and William Wendt "an academician of the kind that wins second and third prizes at Chicago exhibitions."[56] No attempt was made to found a "rival organization," but the SFAA Annual the following year displayed many more of the older established painters and W. H. Wright left his employment at the *Bulletin* in October of 1919 after only ten months. Jennie may have had a soprano's voice, but her opinions were heard in baritone. She quietly ended the year with a solo exhibition of her "new paintings" sponsored by her many friends at the Woman's Club of Palo Alto.[57] The proceeds from the sale of her art offered material comfort when it was desperately needed. This solo show was also intended as a very visible sign of their support for a woman who continued to feel a pronounced sense of humiliation over her circumstances. Undoubtedly, many in the Woman's Club knew that William Cannon had an adulterous affair with Jennie's friend. In late July and August of 1920 Jennie made her first known trip in over four years to Carmel in what

amounted to a brief “private visit” to sketch and see Milner in a local play. Her ex-husband and his new wife spent that entire summer at Carmel’s Carnegie Laboratory and Milner shared their residence. Unlike his younger brother, Milner maintained throughout his life a close relationship with his father to the great annoyance of his mother. When both women were in Carmel the local newspaper was tactful enough to refer to Ella Varney, Will’s third wife, as “Mrs. William Cannon” and to the well-known painter as “Mrs. Jennie V. Cannon.”[58] At least the latter had her career.

While Jennie’s profession was widely respected, women artists were handicapped by the covert and all too pervasive discrimination within the local institutions of art. Profound changes in the previous decade had created a very favorable perception of art and artists among the general public of the San Francisco Bay Area. As early as 1910 various “civic committees” released detailed descriptions of the art treasures and ornate pavilions at the forthcoming PPIE. Sensing the growing excitement the editors of several prominent newspapers, who hitherto had commissioned only periodic art reviews, hired permanent “art critics” to write regular columns and Sunday features on the Exposition and its artists. The *San Francisco Examiner* focused considerable attention on the vicissitudes of the art market, exhibits at the local galleries and the personal lives of resident painters.[59] What was not reported was the fact that the vast majority of graduates from the art schools of San Francisco were women and that men constituted a significant majority of the local exhibitors at the PPIE. Many civic-minded private groups, such as the California Club, as well as a number of new private galleries held exhibitions of regional painters to encourage the sale of art to a wider public, but again juries and committees influenced by the SFAA selected primarily male artists.[60] Oakland, the second largest city in northern California, opened its municipal Art Gallery on February 1, 1916 to display traveling exhibitions and showcase the avant-garde work of its local talent, including a significant number of women. However, America’s entry into World War I in April of 1917 brought a pause to this momentum. Fraternal organizations, clubs and women’s societies, which had sponsored the display and sale of works by local artists, now turned their efforts to the sale of war bonds and to the dispatch of “comfort parcels” with food and literature to boost the morale of the troops in the trenches.[61] While exhibits continued at local museums, including frequent displays of war posters, many private galleries were forced to close as the public’s attention was turned elsewhere. The Great Influenza in the fall and winter of 1918 caused attendance at all public institutions to plummet as citizens limited their social contacts and wore requisite facemasks on city streets.[62] An artistic revival began with the return of most American troops from Europe in early 1919 and with the economic recovery driven by the mass production of consumer goods, but in the regional art community female artists continued to face diminishing opportunities. The revered Sketch Club, a San Francisco institution that exclusively promoted, displayed and sold women’s art, opened its membership to men after April of 1906.[63] Under the influence of the male members that Club changed its name to “The San Francisco Society of Artists” in October of 1914 and publicly challenged the entrenched SFAA for control of the artistic community. After a protracted struggle the latter institution persevered and the former along with all remnants of the Sketch Club disappeared.[64] Following a promising start the Gallery for Women Artists at 1509 Gough Street in San Francisco met a slow quiet death.[65] There were other attempts to display exclusively the work of women artists, but all ended as singular events. With the near complete dominance of men in juries at museums and art associations just a token quantity of space was allotted to female artists

regardless of talent. Wealthy and powerful organizations, such as the Bohemian Club, permitted only the display and sale of art by its exclusive *male* membership. In fact, the Bohemian Club, which Eugen Neuhaus declared to be "the rallying center for all the artistic elements of the city," maintained a permanent exhibition of its members' art, sponsored special showings, encouraged the corporate elite to buy these paintings and did not charge the artists a commission on sales.[66] Affiliation with this Club provided such a special cachet that private galleries vied to show its members' work which coincidentally received lavish publicity in the local press.

A handicap faced by all artists was the nature of art criticism in those newspapers. Unlike the *Los Angeles Times*, which hired the articulate New York-trained artist Antony Anderson,[67] the daily journals in the San Francisco Bay Area employed city reporters, poets and "society" columnists to evaluate art. The results were often humorous and on occasion became disgusting displays of bigotry. Laura Bride Powers, who was the society editor at *The Oakland Tribune* in 1913 and was appointed its first regular art critic three years later, provides examples.[68] In July of 1916 Powers grudgingly made a few kind remarks about Oakland's first Exhibition of Women's Art, where E. Charlton Fortune and Jennie Cannon contributed, but added this disclaimer:[69]

> Frankly, the principle of women's exhibitions has never been especially appealing to me. Art consciousness and expression are not sexual qualities, and women's work should take its chances with men's work. Art is art, whether women or men produce it, and the sex of the creator of it has no more to do with it than the color of the artist's hair or his eyes.

The great tragedy is that these ill-informed and misguided opinions were pervasive. L. B. Powers' Sunday review became such a chatty vacuous affair that art was seen as a type of fashion show for interior decorators. Her favored artists, usually the members of the Bohemian Club, became important players in the superficial gossip of the social scene. Her simultaneous "insider" columns on society events were difficult to distinguish from her art reviews.[70] In 1920, *after* Selden Gile and August Gay had received the accolades of the local art community, Powers evaluated "those Gile and Gay things in the current [Oakland] show" with:[71]

> The passion that impels a man to paint in the open – right on the spot – the thing that interests him is the big fact that makes him a likely candidate for a seat among the mighty.

When Michael Williams of the *San Francisco Examiner* critiqued Maynard Dixon's work in October of 1913, he philosophized somewhat bizarrely that:[72]

> Dixon is now doing what he hoped to do. If he is satisfying himself, I don't know. But I hope not. Nothing is more deadly to an artist than the sin of self-satisfaction – except the vice of self-pity which is the absinthe of the soul, deadlier even than the morphine-like spirit of vanity.

Immediately after World War I all but one of the San Francisco newspapers avoided regular art reviews. There were instead periodic announcements and simple anonymous descriptions of major exhibits. On special occasions editors commissioned lengthy reviews by talented observers: E. Ribbink for the *Examiner*, Willard Huntington Wright for the *Bulletin*, and Louise Taber for the *Call*. Only the *San Francisco Chronicle* had a full-time "art critic" with a signed feature column, usually on the "Music and Drama" page. Every Sunday from 1913 thru 1920 Anna Cora Winchell, who was trained in music rather than art, provided evaluations of local showings. Unfortunately, her reviews were very uneven. She tended to flatter her personal favorites among the San Francisco artists with an almost sophomoric zeal and eclectically chose to review the smallest

galleries while completely ignoring the Annual Exhibition of the SFAA. Winchell seldom provided a calendar of forthcoming "art events." From Jennie's perspective the local art world needed reform and especially problematic was her new home in the East Bay.

Berkeley by 1912 no longer supported an identifiable colony of painters and sculptors; there were no municipal venues for the exhibition of art and the University did not have a distinct art gallery for exhibitions until 1935-36.[73] Before its move to Oakland in 1923-24, the local California School of Arts and Crafts (CSAC) occasionally exhibited the work of its students and faculty, often for Christmas sales.[74] The so-called University Association of Fine Arts supported the "seven fine arts" primarily with lectures that were open *only* to members and select guests.[75] Exasperated with the lack of interest in the visual arts *The Berkeley Times* ran an extensive editorial on the problem in early January 1921 under the headline: BERKELEY INDIFFERENT TO THE ARTS.[76] What the city had was a number of very talented resident painters who were motivated primarily by self-interest and viewed San Francisco as their primary venue of opportunity. Among the prominent male artists was U.C. Professor Karl Eugen Neuhaus, who at this time seldom displayed his paintings on the Berkeley campus, but favored the major exhibitions in California, Chicago, Philadelphia and New York.[77] While Neuhaus admittedly derived artistic inspiration from the Berkeley area and lectured publicly on regional art, he made no attempt to organize the local artists. Rather he sought and obtained high-profile appointments, such as a coveted chair on the City of Berkeley's Planning Commission.[78] The respected female painter and teacher at the CSAC, Calthea Vivian, resided at Berkeley's Claremont Hotel, where she infrequently marketed her canvases in its Palm Room, but she made no attempt to include the works of other artists until 1922.[79] While the catastrophe of 1906 had flooded Berkeley with enough motivated artists to galvanize into a colony, the University town in 1920 needed a carefully orchestrated intervention to recreate that art colony in light of the strong competition from San Francisco and Oakland. In a letter dated March 3, 1920 Jennie Cannon wrote to her cousin, Nora Vennerström Hinkston, and declared that: "I want to organize our artists into an association with a gallery of their own."[80] Outside of this bold declaration she offered no specifics.

Events revealed that her plan was systematically carried out. During the first half of 1920 Jennie devoted considerable attention to the conversion of her new home into an impressive studio-complex which remained her fall and winter residence for the next thirty years.[81] She added rooms at the southeast end and subdivided others to create a reception area, viewing galleries and a well-lighted work space. Although Mrs. Cannon was unable to contribute to Berkeley's "display of oil paintings by East Bay Artists" in mid-January at the Hillside Club, her work appeared at seven well-publicized public exhibitions in 1920, including three juried shows in the Oakland Art Gallery and San Francisco exhibits at the Jack London Memorial in the St. Francis Hotel and the "California Artists" in The Print Rooms. At the latter venue two of her paintings were selected to travel with that same exhibit to the Bishop Galleries in Honolulu. In the fall she raised her public profile by offering free lectures on "American Art" at the Palace of Fine Arts to various Berkeley clubs. Jennie's well-publicized triumph that year was her first solo exhibition at a major gallery; during three weeks in December a selection of her oils were critically acclaimed at the Stanford University Art Gallery.[82] In the late summer of 1920 Jennie met with the Managing Editor of the *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, James Wales, and the paper's owner, Charles Dunscomb, to propose that they hire her to write a regular Saturday Evening "feature column" entitled "Art and Artists." At this

time the *Gazette* had only a "Women's Section" with perfunctory notices on "Society" and "Club News" which included gossip on formal teas, bazaars, lectures, church functions, fashions and flower shows. Undoubtedly, she cited the teachings of William Morris to explain that art education and appreciation made the general public more civilized. In addition, there was probably an appeal to regional nationalism with the promise that the local citizens would become more aware of the talents of Berkeley artists and more inclined to visit exhibitions. Jennie's timing could not have been better since Wales and Dunscomb were in the midst of a circulation war with their two local rivals: *The Oakland Tribune* and *The Berkeley Times*. Both of these papers had weekly reviews of the "Arts."[83] To stay competitive and attract new readers the *Gazette* tentatively accepted Cannon's proposal, but initially hired her to write two articles on the blockbuster exhibit of "Old Masters Paintings" at the Palace of Fine Arts. Both essays, which appeared in September and November, enticed the reader with succinct and intelligent explanations of the importance of the European schools represented and finished with an impressive call to purchase the works of local artists who were California's "future Old Masters."[84] She mentioned Douglas Tilden, the famous sculptor and teacher who was recently forced into "commercial work" due to the lack of public support. Her articles proved immensely popular and by December of 1920 Dunscomb had signed Mrs. Cannon to a two-year contract; in 1922, when *The Berkeley Times* declared bankruptcy, Jennie's contract was renewed for two more years. She now had a regular supplemental income, immense personal recognition and the platform to reform the art establishment.

What becomes apparent in her reviews is that Jennie Cannon saw her relationship with her readers as both altruistic and symbiotic in that she and other local artists profited financially from educated citizens who were willing to decorate their homes with contemporary paintings. Her approach was decidedly different than her regional counterparts. During her long periods of residence in the East she was deeply impressed by the quality of the art critics in the *New York Times*. Every Sunday in its Magazine Section accomplished art historians presented articles that clearly defined a period or movement and provided the kind of comprehensive analysis that engaged the educated layman. The *Times* also included the series "Art at Home and Abroad" which had a feature story on a current exhibition, often with photographs that made the seemingly complex accessible. There were also staff reviews of smaller shows, biographies of artists, a calendar of events, and dates for open studios. This paradigm on an abridged scale guided Jennie at the *Gazette*. For the first time in the San Francisco Bay Area an artist provided an insider's perspective on how this exotic sub-culture functioned and explained why the "average citizen" benefited from direct contact with art.[85] Jennie's weekly Art and Artists column contained the subheading "Conducted by J. Vennerström Cannon," as if the eager visitor was about to be guided through an exclusive showing. Her first contribution on February 5, 1921 was actually a call to arms to educate the public on the broader conception of art as the "basic vital principle" that permeates our lives.[86] To lure visitors into a special exhibition of monotypes and silver points by Xavier Martinez she offered an enticing biography and analysis with the sagacious advice that the smart collector should acquire this master now rather than the work of some European artist.[87] In succeeding weeks her remarkable enthusiasm became apparent with stories on the fine collection in Sacramento's Crocker Art Gallery, a recent interpretation of the Pre-Raphaelites, exhibitions at the Oakland and Stanford Art Galleries as well as a penetrating biography on her teacher, Bolton Brown.[88] There was her repeated recommendation that every adult should purchase the paintings

of California artists to improve the quality of life coupled with her constant lament that "Berkeleyans" were so culturally deprived that they had to leave their city to enjoy art galleries elsewhere. Jennie's first salvo in what became her public campaign for a local gallery as well as an organization of artists was fired on April 2, 1921:[89]

> We have not, unfortunately, in Berkeley a home for art. This lack brings to mind the more fortunate condition of our adjoining town, Oakland, which has in its auditorium building a gallery in which to show both works of local and passing artists.

To the average Berkeley resident, who had habitually envisioned his situation as superior to his tawdry neighbor to the south, Jennie's kind words about Oakland's civic pride, local benefactors and cultural attainments were a stinging slap in the face. Jennie envisioned herself as Berkeley's Socratic gadfly. The following Saturday in her blunt editorial harangue against the locals, who were unfavorably compared with their "sophisticated" archenemy Stanford, she decried their failure to fund a World War I "Soldiers Memorial" that would contain a concert hall and art gallery.

Simultaneous with Cannon's reviews on art was the public premier of her own studio-gallery in mid February of 1921. This was the first time in Berkeley since 1910 that any artist had opened a studio with regular business hours. Initially, the public was invited every Wednesday, followed some months later by the addition of Friday afternoon; it was closed from May thru September during her regular migration to Carmel. As with her art reviews, this atelier was copied directly from her experience in New York. She recreated on a smaller scale in her Berkeley home the famous Bohemian studio of William Merritt Chase which attracted curious buyers with its exotic furnishings, cultural events and carefully displayed art. In addition to its risqué location in Nut Hill, which always guaranteed a quantity of the curious, Jennie offered her lush variegated gardens and the spectacular views of the bay. Visitors here were drawn thru interconnected rooms to marvel at her curios from North Africa, Europe and the American Southwest. There was a Coptic flat weave that hung from the bleached skull of a Texas longhorn steer. Guests could relax on harem pillows or chairs inlaid with ivory while scented tea and rosehip candy completed the ambiance. The walls were lined with her own paintings, whose prices were discreetly marked, and with her substantial private collection of contemporary New York and California artists.[90] On the first Saturday evening after the opening there was a widely publicized recital in "her charming new studio" by the Dutch pianist Mrs. T. Jensen who played "several original selections composed by her husband."[91] Over the next decade the studio saw many public receptions, performances (especially for guitar and harp) and poetry readings. Her atelier complex was large enough to accommodate joint exhibitions with local artists. Jennie's widely advertised "openings" for her recently completed art were always well attended.[92] Without the overhead of a downtown gallery patrons discovered that her paintings could be purchased at a favorably negotiated price. Rumors spread that alcoholic beverages, which local laws prohibited, were available at Nut Hill parties.[93] The presence of any spiked punch at Cannon's studio is impossible to confirm, but its availability would have only added to the attendance.

Her art reviews continued unabated. Negative comments on the works of her fellow artists were infrequent, but when they occurred, such as the characterization of Matteo Sandona's submission to the Oakland Art Gallery as "unevenly painted," there was always an explanation.[94] Jennie was an outspoken Modernist and felt no hesitation in branding as plagiarists those artists who still followed the tenets of the French Impressionists:[95]

> These painters won distinction by being themselves. When we produce work similar to theirs we not only injure their work but sacrifice the privilege of leaving the impress of our own personality, not only on our generation but those that follow. In all the world there is no counterpart nor duplicate of ourselves. Our being here is therefore an event.

She said of Frederick Frieseke that he "will not startle anyone with departures into new fields" and advised her stagnant colleagues to attend the Cubist exhibit at the Palace of Fine Arts: "Let every painter who turns out, like peas in a pod, California landscape views – tantalizingly, well behaved – spend an hour in this room and get a fresh viewpoint."[96] Mrs. Cannon did not expect complete originality, but she believed that greatness lies in what an artist invents within the broad principles of any given style. In her columns the College Women's Club of Berkeley, where Jennie was a regular respondent in its "fiction section," and other female organizations habitually received her praise for encouraging the arts.[97] Jennie, who appreciated the value of juried exhibits, supported the occasional "jury-free exhibition" at public art galleries by noting that it provided new artists, and especially women, with the opportunity to measure their creations against the established painters and showed the latter how "hackneyed" their work had become.[98] When confronting the painful fact that the local art market had become stagnant she blamed the: influx of immigrants, emerging and misunderstood radical styles in art, new trends in interior decorating that eschewed pictures, "thoughtless criticism" by artists of each other's work and the lack of publicity for local exhibitions coupled with the regional ignorance in art.[99] During the summer of 1921 she sent from Carmel to the *Gazette* weekly reviews which were full of details on the Peninsula art scene, including the contents of exhibitions and a biography of Thomas Parkhurst.[100] Jennie supported every worthy cause in Berkeley and whenever possible focused as much attention on young local artists (with instructions on how to find their works in the small San Francisco galleries) as on the established figures, such as Isabel Hunter.[101] Her praise of Nicholas Roerich (1874-1947), who was a Russian of Norwegian descent, was unconditional and she repeatedly urged her readers to visit his "unsurpassed" exhibition at the Palace of Fine Arts.[102] Jennie's efforts to raise the artistic consciousness of Berkeley were supplemented by the arrival in the late summer of 1921 of Sydney Lemos, a brilliant art student whom she had met during her last stay in New York. After graduating with a teaching credential in 1912 from the San Francisco Institute of Art, Lemos left for the East Coast to continue his studies with Robert Henri and Frank Vincent DuMond. He became the substitute teacher for the latter and instructed regular classes at the Art Students League and the Chicago Art Institute. To what extent Mrs. Cannon influenced his arrival in Berkeley is unknown. The local press provided a succinct biography of "this recent addition to the local artist colony" and reported that on September 1st "Mr. and Mrs. Lemos opened the 'Studio Tea Room'. . , half a block from the University campus."[103] During regular business hours patrons could enjoy tea and cakes in the "quaint canvas-hung room" and watch the painter at work.

With no less than thirteen public exhibitions of her art, 1921 was by far Jennie's most successful year to date.[104] In addition to her regular participation at the Del Monte Art Gallery, SFAA, Carmel Arts and Crafts Club and several private venues, three shows were especially important for her career: the one-month solo exhibition with sixty of her oils at the Oakland Art Gallery in January, her Carmel show with "over 50 coastal subjects" in July and the second one-man exhibition of her oils at the Stanford University Art Gallery. One reviewer at the latter was especially enamored of her brushwork which produced "vibrating light and color."[105] The only tragedy in 1921 was the death in December of her beloved teacher and friend, C. P. Townsley.[106]

The following year saw twelve public exhibitions of her paintings and was punctuated with several surprises. Jennie's praise of and membership in Berkeley's Twentieth Century Club yielded important dividends with a one-day invitation in January to display seventy-five of her paintings at its Derby Street building; she donated a percentage of the works sold to the Club's charity fund. According to one reviewer, many of these paintings "have been exhibited at the Palace of Fine Arts and other important galleries and all have won honorable mention."[107] The publicity and sales were so positive that she was invited back by the Club to lecture and later in the spring for a three-day solo exhibition. Her high profile continued when her work was selected for Stanford University's Exhibition of California Women Painters which included such notables as Jesse Arms Botke, Mary DeNeale Morgan, Celia Seymour, Calthea Vivian, Isabel Hunter and Alice Chittenden. Her weekly reviews in the *Berkeley Daily Gazette* continued with concise reports on regional exhibits and a call for harmony and cooperation among local artists, citing as a positive example Mr. Helph at his Twin Turrets Studio.[108] Then, without explanation, she made the curious declaration that New York had become "the center" of the art world.[109] On or about February 1, 1922 Mrs. Cannon boarded a train for the Atlantic and in a very modest way made journalistic history. Up to this point reports on the cultural life of the East Coast had been syndicated by New York publishers and generally appeared unedited in the California press. On rare occasions a San Francisco columnist might file a story on the New York art scene while en route to Europe. Jennie persuaded the editor of the *Berkeley Daily Gazette* to allow her to post weekly art reviews "on the other side of the Rockies" for three months. Her stated intent was to dispel the prevailing indifference of Berkeley residents toward the visual arts with her personal reports on the importance of such to the cultural life of their fellow Americans. Her first narrative from Chicago found that the permanent collection of the Art Institute had improved since her last visit, but she bluntly criticized the Annual Exhibition because the all-male jury of art teachers chose their favorite students.[110] In New York she discovered that several California painters, including Armin Hansen, Carl Oscar Borg and William Ritschel, were respected and popular among the art-buying public. With a discerning eye Jennie described the new and challenging work of Gifford Beal and Rose O'Neill and praised artists, such as Randall Davey and Kenneth Hays Miller, who refused to paint for juries in the popular styles, but preserved their independence and self-respect. These observations reveal much about Jennie's personal struggle as an artist. She asked why Berkeley had no museum for contemporary art or "a room filled with the finest of Keiths" and concluded with this curious warning: "Being a woman I wish to have a hand in this matter."[111] She praised the Metropolitan Museum for accommodating children in exhibitions and attended a major art auction where a small oil by William Merritt Chase sold for just fifty dollars.[112] Typically, she concluded that a painting is a wonderful investment. After visiting the new murals in the Boston Library she returned west via New Orleans and San Antonio. The fine museum in the latter was acclaimed as a way of reminding Berkeley that it was still a cultural backwater.[113] Jennie's informative and highly opinionated reports attracted attention and envy back home.

Upon her arrival in late April of 1922 Jennie was impressed by three very dissimilar events: one was mildly annoying, the second a surprise from her eldest son and the third was the subtle but profound movement toward her cherished goal. The first was delivered in *The Oakland Tribune* by the art editor L. B. Powers who undoubtedly found the literary competition from Mrs. Cannon's more innovative and scholarly reviews unpleasant. In February and March during the

absence of the Berkeley artist, the Oakland Art Gallery held a second solo exhibit of her paintings. Powers' review presented a sweetly ambiguous and somewhat discourteous assessment:[114]

> In an inner gallery, Mrs. V. S. [sic] Cannon, now in New York, is represented by a group of paintings that reveal a fine spurt ahead. Her "Chinatown" and a couple of little landscapes near it express a readier obedience of her brush to her intellectual perceptions. A nice fresh quality stamps the little Carmel sketch as well as the little group that flank it.
>
> A determined workman is Mrs. Cannon.
>
> But will work – work alone – ever make an artist?
>
> Never. A painter, yes. But never an artist.
>
> Happily, Mrs. Cannon shows in some of her canvases a feeling for the beautiful in the out-of-doors and a capacity to project her impressions of it with understanding.

This marked the beginning of open hostility on the part of Powers who saw no need for a municipal art gallery in Berkeley when nearby Oakland provided that service. The review of that same exhibition in *The Oakland Post-Enquirer* was markedly different:[115]

> Mrs. Cannon's "Chinatown" is a gay and colorful picture of the interesting Chinatown in San Francisco. It catches the spirit of the city. Her "Sunset" is of a rare beauty and shows that delicacy and feeling for color that characterizes her work.
>
> "The Toilers," by Mrs. Cannon, must be seen from a distance of six to ten feet to be properly appreciated, and then the spirit of the place is caught and the effect of the distance is heightened to such an extent that one feels lost in the maze of blue hills in the background. "Dreams of Italy" is particularly entrancing, in a misty idealistic way.

To the undoubted chagrin of L. B. Powers the majority of Jennie's paintings were sold *during* the exhibit. Shortly thereafter came a surprise in the local press: "Miss Janet Maclay, one of the prettiest and most popular girls in exclusive circles about the bay . . . announced her betrothal to young Milner Vennerstrom Cannon, son of Mrs. Vennerstrom Cannon, the well-known landscape artist of the college town."[116] The bride's mother, Mrs. Mira Abbott Maclay, a figure of commanding respect due to her immense inherited wealth and finishing-school education, was described as "one of the most charming women in society . . . her home in Le Roy Avenue is the setting for some of the smartest parties of the season." Jennie's public reaction was politely cheerful and among friends she probably expressed amazement that the shy clumsy Milner made such a match. However, her reaction in private bordered on outrage because her son had not graduated from the University after seven years of study, had no steady job and was expected to support a wife with exalted expectations.[117] Mrs. Cannon was not unaccustomed to dealing with high society, especially regarding the sale of art, but the scrappy Minnesotan was probably envious of the privileged Maclay family and viewed the alliance as a mixture of oil and water. As the arrangements for the wedding became increasingly ostentatious, she regarded the event as a terrible waste of money and was resolved to thwart those plans.

Her art reviews and calls for a municipal art gallery in Berkeley continued unabated, but her attention was drawn to a continuing exhibit that had opened on January 15, 1922 at the Claremont Hotel.[118] This luxury venue was the Berkeley equivalent to Monterey's Del Monte Hotel and possessed its own streetcar which transported wealthy San Franciscans from the ferry terminal directly to the plush lobby. The Claremont offered panoramic views from its elegant suites, a number of spa amenities, including a Turkish bath, clay tennis courts and several gourmet restaurants. Calthea Vivian, who had periodically rented the Palm Room off the lobby to display her own work at the Hotel, was asked by the proprietors to include with her paintings the canvases of prominent local artists and in essence to become the de facto curator of the Claremont's "Little

Gallery." The Hotel charged no rental fee for the space and collected only a small commission from the sale of each work. Many assumed that the experiment would quickly fail, but Vivian was able to persuade many notables to contribute, including Perham Nahl, Jennie Cannon, William Rice, Isabel Percy-West, William Clapp, Lucy Pierce, Guest Wickson and Cora Boone. When the show prospered and was expanded in March to include Lorenzo Latimer, Laura Adams Armer, Selden Gile, Louis Siegriest, Mary Herrick Ross and Phillips Lewis, Jennie saw an opportunity. At this time Nahl and Cannon approached Vivian about turning the Claremont Gallery into a venue for the exhibitions of a proposed association of Berkeley artists. Unfortunately, Vivian closed the enterprise in May and left for a seven-month summer vacation in France.[119] Jennie was unable to pursue the issue immediately since she had to prepare her own work for general exhibitions in Oakland, Del Monte, San Francisco and Berkeley and especially for a major one-man show of thirty-nine of her oils at the Museum of Fine Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico.[120] In two of the reviews that Cannon wrote for the *Gazette* from Carmel she again chided her local readers for allowing the rival communities of Palo Alto and Oakland to "outstrip" Berkeley as a "cultural center" with their art associations and galleries.[121] When she returned to the University town in September, Jennie approached her good friend, Jessie Fremont Herring, and succeeded in persuading the latter to convert "temporarily" her modest studio-home at 3026 Benvenue Avenue into a second "Little Gallery."[122] By mid fall Herring had reassembled many of the artists from the Claremont experiment and added such notables as Clark Hobart, Ida Maynard Curtis and Lee Randolph.[123] After several months of lobbying and insistent badgering by Cannon, Nahl and several other artists the local Chamber of Commerce opened in November of 1922 the Berkeley Arts and Crafts Shop in a small unoccupied storefront that the Chamber owned.[124] Over the next few years the Shop sponsored dozens of exhibitions and lectures, including several by Cannon, but this venue and Herring's studio were inadequate to meet the needs of the art colony that was beginning to crystallize in Berkeley. In late November or early December of 1922 Jennie attended a meeting "with about a dozen of our best citizens" to discuss the formation of a local art association. Some of the notables in attendance were Profs. Bernard Maybeck, Charles C. Judson and Perham Nahl as well as artists Cora Boone and Jessie Fremont Herring. We know from Jennie's subsequent letter to her cousin Edna that they agreed to study the possibility of forming a "League" of Berkeley artists; Mrs. Cannon was put in charge of publicity and placed on the board of advisors. She soon resigned from the latter due to commitments elsewhere, but continued to post announcements for the League in local newspapers. According to Jennie's letter to Edna, she extracted the promise at the meeting "that every jury will have an equal number of men and women."[125]

After obtaining pro bono advice from an attorney and the commitment of support from over one hundred and thirty Berkeley residents the plans for a formal organization of artists moved ahead. At a convocation in Miss Barnard's Kindergarten School on March 10, 1923 "The California League of Fine Arts" was officially formed and its purpose succinctly stated:[126]

> The object of the League will be to foster the . . . development of painting, sculpture, etching, block printing, to give lectures, to instruct school children in the appreciation of the arts, and to give exhibitions. It is expected eventually to own land and to possess a building, which will house the united arts.

Among the elected officials were Charles C. Judson as chairman pro tem, Bernard Maybeck as president, Perham Nahl as first acting vice president, Cora Williams as first honorary vice president, Rear Admiral Charles Fremont Pond as second honorary vice president and Shirley

Poor as corresponding secretary. Three of the six members seated on the first designated jury of selection were women: Calthea Vivian, Cora Boone and Mary Young-Hunter. Jessie F. Herring was chosen director of the hanging committee which also included Miss Hungerford, Guest Wickson and Phillips Lewis.[127] By the time that the California League opened its First Annual Exhibition on April 2, 1923 it had over two hundred and fifty members.[128] It was decided by a unanimous vote of that organization's officers and board of advisors that the first one-man exhibition in the League's new galleries at 2419 Haste Street should be granted to J. Vennerström Cannon in recognition of her tireless efforts on behalf of the local art community.[129] Her three-week solo show, which was hung and organized "under the auspices of the art section of the College Women's Club," opened on April 11, 1923 with scenes from California, the American Southwest, North Africa and Europe. Of this exhibit Ada H. Davies declared that:[130]

> . . . . whatever the theme, or wherever the locality there is a certain sympathetic power of adaptation on the part of the artist to enter into harmony with her surroundings and to reveal the spirit of her subject.
>
> The subjects are varied, among them Chinatown in the brooding silence of one of those moments when the streets are deserted; another of an old Indian pueblo, with the hint of mystery that always attaches to the homes of these fast-vanishing remains of a splendid early civilization; one of Cypress Point, Carmel, bathed in the golden glow of that lovely color effect that is making studies of Carmel world-renowned; one of Tamalpais from Cragmont Hill, with a close rim of intense purple clouds that gradually melt away into transparent mauve gray; and, finally Cragmont Rock, bathed in the floating mists that bring such an ethereal loveliness to our Berkeley hills at various times of the year. Indeed, the methods of treatment are so unusual and so sympathetic that those interested in art will be well repaid by a visit to the exhibit.

Shortly thereafter Davies declared that another of Cannon's exhibited paintings at the League, *Montara*, was "thought by many to be her masterpiece" and "was the subject of general admiration and distinguished praise . . . thoroughly deserving of the high praise it holds among the representative paintings of California."[131] Another event that attracted notice in the art community during the spring involved the violinist, Mme. Lizetta Kalova, and the famous Russian painter, Ivan Kalmykoff, who jointly established a studio in High Court at the Uplands of Berkeley.[132] Their receptions, which Jennie frequently attended, became elegant society events and Kalmykoff, who had a major one-man show at the Palace of Fine Arts, attracted many buyers for his watercolors. Parallel to Jennie's very public profile was the success of her covert plan to derail Milner's grand wedding. Unlike her extraverted younger son, George, Milner disliked crowds and preferred to work in the garden or quietly read a book in the corner. Jennie meticulously repeated to her nervous son the ever-expanding nuptial arrangements which by early March involved: six separate wedding parties, two bridal showers, well-publicized gowns for the bride and six bridesmaids, an elaborately catered reception for over three hundred and fifty guests, who included the beau monde of Bay Area society, a secret honeymoon planned by the bride's mother, Mrs. Mira Maclay, and, of course, speculation about size and design of the wedding cake. She also informed her son, perhaps incorrectly, that he was required to give public speeches at most of these events. When the terrified Milner informed his fiancée that he refused to participate in this "brilliant affair," they agreed to elope. On March 26th and 27th four Bay Area newspapers announced in bold headlines that the couple had secretly married in a San Francisco civil ceremony without friends or relatives in attendance: "Surprise Wedding," "Plans for June Wedding are Scattered to the March

Winds" and "U.C. Students Run Away – Wed."[133] Until their new home in Berkeley's Cragmont district was completed, which was another gift from the bride's mother, they lived with the latter in her Le Roy Avenue mansion. At this time the Maclays discovered that Jennie had intentionally spooked her son. Henceforth, in dealing with Mrs. Cannon they maintained a polite cold distance which manifested itself in few invitations to visit, even on holidays to see her granddaughter Joan, and in frequent invitations to William Cannon whom Jennie continued to despise. This poison yielded bitter fruit for when Jennie died she disinherited Milner and his entire family; a large cache of Jennie's art was reportedly destroyed by his wife.[134]

The saga of Jennie's involvement in the second Berkeley art colony is continued in Chapter 8. Special emphasis is given to the 1925 reorganization of the League of Fine Arts which abandoned its formal commitment to equal representation for women and expanded its scope to include disciplines beyond art. As a result Jennie withdrew as a "charter subscriber" and refused to exhibit with that organization.[135] A number of female artists in Berkeley followed suit and the League was eventually replaced by a new and far more democratic Berkeley Art Association.

Endnotes – Chapter Six

1 DPT, January 25, 1915, p.1; Appendix 5.
2 *Minutes*, Palo Alto Woman's Club Board Meeting, October 6, 1915.
3 DPT, February 25, 1915, p.8; CPC, March 3, 1915, p.4; MDC, March 4, 1915, p.2.
4 DPT: October 5, 1915, p.4; October 8, 1915, p.1.
5 *Minutes*, Palo Alto Woman's Club Board Meetings: May 25; December 6, 1915.
6 DPT: November 27, 1915, p.5; August 19, 1916, p.1; Appendix 5. Rosa Hooper was a well-educated and highly successful miniature painter who rather scandalously abandoned her husband of nine years to marry the younger William Lyon in 1911(Hughes, p.542). She remained one of Jennie's closest friends.
7 TOT, February 20, 1916, p.48; Appendix 5.
8 *Minutes*, Palo Alto Woman's Club Board Meetings: June 5; August 7; September 20; October 18, 1916; Appendix 5.
9 DPT, September 11, 1916, p.2.
10 *Petition for Order Modifying Decree for Payment of Alimony*, May 26, 1926, Superior Court of the State of California in the County of Santa Clara; Jennie V. Cannon, Plaintiff vs. William A. Cannon, Defendant; Case No.23537 – Dept.3.
11 CPC, May 10, 1916, p.4.
12 CPC, May 17, 1916, p.2.
13 MDC, March 30, 1917, p.2. Will was compelled to stay at Carmel's La Playa Inn while the terms of this sale were negotiated (CPC: March 15 1917, p.2; March 29, 1917, p.3; May 3, 1917, p.4; biography on Comins in Appendix 7).
14 DPT, August 8, 1916, p.3. *The Directory of Palo Alto, Mayfield and Stanford University* in 1916 show only a "Mrs. W. A. Cannon" at 1727 Waverley.
15 LAT, December 9, 1916, p.11.
16 DPT, January 15, 1917, p.5.
17 *Minutes*, Palo Alto Woman's Club Board Meeting, February 21, 1917.
18 *Complaint for Divorce for Desertion*, January 12, 1917; *Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law* and *Interlocutory Decree of Divorce*, Judge W. A. Beasley, February 6, 1917; *Final Judgment of Divorce*, Judge W. A. Beasley, February 26, 1918; Superior Court of the State of California in the County of Santa Clara; Jennie V. Cannon, Plaintiff vs. William A, Cannon, Defendant; Case No. 23537 – Dept. 3.
19 MacDougal, July 13, 1917 Letter from MacDougal to G. Sykes, Box 22, Folder 221, p.1; March 8, 1918 Letter from Cannon to MacDougal, Box 24, Folder 342, p. 1.
20 MacDougal, May 15, 1918 Letter from Cannon to MacDougal, Box 24, Folder 342, p.2. William's actions were ripe with irony. MacDougal, who was having a secret love affair with the writer Mary Austin, might be sympathetic in private, but in his wife's presence he could do no more than condemn his colleague's actions (Chapter 5, note 63). Janice Bowers omits all mention of the divorce and the presence of his third wife in Australia (Bowers, pp.15-17).
21 Prior to his departure William supposedly persuaded Milner to join the U.S. Navy as his patriotic duty. Jennie, as the boy's legal co-guardian, obstructed this plan (MacDougal, August 22, 1918 Letter from Cannon to MacDougal, Box 24, Folder 342, p.2). William Cannon did produce a scholarly publication from his research in Australia (MDC, August 23, 1922, p.4). For the salient facts on William Cannon's life see: *World Who's Who in Science*, ed. Allen Debus, 1st ed., Chicago, 1968, p.296. In 1921 he is still listed as a resident of Tucson, Arizona, but continued in his summer position at the Carnegie Laboratories in Carmel (*American Men of Science, A Biographical Dictionary*, eds. J. McKeen Cattell and Dean R. Brimhall, 3rd ed. New York, 1921, p.112; ibid., 5th ed., New York, 1933, p.175; ibid., 8th ed., New York, 1949, p.378; MDC: June 22, 1922, p.5; August 2, 1922, p.4). In 1925 he was appointed a part-time lecturer at the Botany Department of Stanford University, but he never received a professorship. He lived seasonally in Carmel until his death on January 17, 1958. His obituary names his fourth wife as "Gertrude" (CPC, January 30, 1958, p.5).

[22] A typical example from William Cannon's correspondence reads (MacDougal, May 21, 1908 Letter from Cannon to MacDougal, Box 8, Folder 102, p.1): "I could not get anything out of the Braun concern. The advertising manager, if not a Hebrew, certainly had many Israelitish [sic] traits, we will never get any advertising out of that company."
[23] Letter from Joan Tweit to Robert Edwards dated August 30, 2004. Joan Tweit, Milner's daughter, noted that her father started college at U.C. Berkeley in 1916 "claiming Tucson residency;" he supposedly petitioned for and received resident status in California early in 1917. However, according to the official records, Milner Vennerström Cannon claimed Carmel, California, as his official residence from September 1916 until his graduation in May of 1923 (U.C., *Catalogue*, September 1916, p.80; February 1917, p.90; September 1917, p.76; February 1918, p.86; March 1919, p.84; October 1919, p.91; February 1920, p.105; February 1921, p.111; February 1923, p.138; University of California, *The Sixtieth Commencement, May, 1923*, Berkeley, 1923, p.26). Between September of 1916 and the spring term of 1919 Milner either resided at 2231 or 2228 Dana Street. In the fall of 1919 he moved to 2403 Telegraph Avenue and by February of 1920 he was living with his mother at 1631 La Vereda Avenue. He discontinued his studies in the fall term of 1918. He took a formal leave of absence from the University between October 1920 and December 1922 to pursue employment. He completed the requirement for a Bachelor of Arts degree in "Letters and Sciences" in the spring of 1923, while he was still a resident of La Vereda. No doubt he was motivated by his forthcoming marriage.
[24] Cannon, *Correspondence*: "The Insurgents in Art" of 24 October 1911, p.6 and "Authority in Art" of 28 January 1912, p.10. Both articles post-date her return from Europe and were probably sent to Jennie by Louise MacDougal.
[25] AAA: 14, 1917, p.445; 16, 1919, p.329; 18, 1921, p.373. Cannon's public listing in the *American Art Annual* of her membership in the Guild was an intentionally bold statement.
[26] Gail Stavitsky, "John Weichsel and the People's Art Guild," AAJ 31, 1991, pp.13-15.
[27] AASI, *The Papers of John Weichsel*, microfilm 60-3, frame no. 0027.
[28] AASI, *The Papers of John Weichsel*, microfilm 1079, frame nos. 790-803; microfilm 60-1, frame nos. 529-34, 601-06; microfilm 603, frame no. 0093; Appendix 5.
[29] AASI, Catalogue Collection of American Art, microfilm 917-03, frame nos. 0095, 0138.
[30] AAA 14, 1917, p.445.
[31] Refer to Appendix 6.
[32] This information was obtained during a telephone interview with Joan Tweit, the granddaughter of Jennie V. Cannon.
[33] TPE, September 18, 1941, p.2.
[34] Jessie A. Selkinghaus, "The Laguna Beach Art Colony," *The Touchstone and the American Art Student Magazine*, 8.4 (January), 1921, pp.253f; Dominik, p.10; Solon, pp.49ff.
[35] Dominik, p.10; Hughes, p.190; Jacobsen, p.535; Westphal, *North*, p.19.
[36] Anna A. Hills, "The Laguna Beach Art Association," AMG 10 (October), 1919, p.463.
[37] Appendix 5; AAA: 20, 1923, p.466; 22, 1925, p.434; 24, 1927, p.509; 26, 1929, p.537; 28, 1931, p.476; 30, 1933, p.456; Hunt, p.271; McGlauflin, p.76; Gilbert, p.69; Falk, p.560; Kovinick, p.40. There is some confusion as to when Jennie became a life member; it probably occurred in 1921 (CPC, September 26, 1925, p.8).
[38] Note 34 above & Neeta Marquis, "Laguna: Art Colony of the Southwest," INS 70 (No.276, March), 1920, pp.xxvi-xxvii.
[39] DPT, October 7, 1918, p.1.
[40] According to *The Directory of Palo Alto, Mayfield and Stanford University* from 1917 to 1918 the property was rented to a "Mrs. F. V. T. Lee." Between 1919 and 1922 it was owned by a J. B. and Eva Buchanan.
[41] Refer to Chapter 3, note 115.
[42] BDG, August 20, 1953, p.11.
[43] Cerny, p.201.
[44] DPT, November 12, 1919, p.6. Her property deeds for 1631 La Vereda were recorded by the County of Alameda in October of 1919 (BDG, October 9, 1919, p.8) and are now in the Office of the Alameda County Recorder in Oakland filed in Book 2912, pages 249-253. In all documents Jennie V. Cannon is recorded as "a widow." This may have been a legal subterfuge to obtain a loan. Through the 1920s she frequently listed herself as "widow" in the Directory. Her address in the 1919 *American Art Annual* is simply Hilgard and La Vereda Streets (AAA 16, 1919, p.329).
[45] Wollenberg, pp.76-80.
[46] Charles Keeler, *The Simple Home*, San Francisco, 1904, pp.10ff (reprint Santa Barbara, 1979); George W. James, "Charles Keeler, Scientist and Poet," *National Magazine* 3 (November), 1911, pp.42-51; *Hillside Club Yearbook, 1911-12*, Berkeley, 1912, pp.6ff.
[47] Cerny, pp.202-219; Wollenberg, pp.79-81. The dance classes at the Temple were periodically open for public viewing (SFL, December 5, 1909, p.M-1-5; BDT, October 16, 1920, p.5).
[48] SFC, December 29, 1918, p.6-S.
[49] Refer to note 50 below. The Schussler Brothers Gallery at 285 Geary Street in San Francisco was repeatedly listed in the "Who's Who Among Art Dealers" (e.g., AAA 12, 1915, p.530).
[50] Cannon, *Questionnaire*.
[51] SFAI: Letter from Jennie V. Cannon to Lee Fritz Randolph, "Chairman, Jury of Selection," dated April 4, 1919; his reply to Cannon is dated April 17, 1919.
[52] Refer to Appendix 6.
[53] John Norton, "A Western Exhibition," INS 67.267 (May), 1919, pp.cxxi-cxxvi; Appendix 5.
[54] TOT, October 9, 1921, p.S-8. In her very lengthy review of the Del Monte exhibition Josephine Blanch mentions only two women artists: Jennie V. Cannon and Evelyn McCormick.
[55] Part of Cannon's text and Wright's entire reply are in SFB, May 5, 1919, p.7.
[56] LAT, October 30, 1919, p.3-2.
[57] *Minutes*, Palo Alto Woman's Club Board Meeting, December 4, 1919.

[58] CPC: August 5, 1920, p.1; November 11, 1920, p.1; December 9, 1922, p.10.
[59] One of the early "Sunday features" was published in the fall of 1913 (SFX, October 12, 1913, p.32).
[60] SFX, December 21, 1913, p.30.
[61] The efforts of these organizations, at least in the East Bay, were focused entirely on the war (TCR: March 24, 1917, p.6; May 19, 1917, p.11; June 16, 1917, p.10; September 29, 1917, p.10; October 20, 1917, p.10; November 10, 1917, p.10; December 1, 1917, p.10). Jessie Short-Jackson laments that her first solo exhibition in New York (1917) was cancelled at the H. P. Whitney Gallery when that space was converted into a Red Cross unit (BDG, August 7, 1929, p.19). Her life was so altered by the War that she quit painting (until 1919) and folded bandages for the Red Cross. Anne Bremer and Bertha Lum also donated their time to the war effort (SFC, March 2, 1919, p.E-3).
[62] Alfred W. Crosby, *America's Forgotten Pandemic, The Influenza of 1918*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2003, pp.56, 91-120. In San Francisco all public institutions were closed for three weeks and the requirement on face masks was not lifted until November 21, 1918. In a two-month period over 3,500 San Franciscans died.
[63] BKR, June 5, 1906, p.6.
[64] Refer to Chapter 5, note 135. The victory of the San Francisco Art Association, which had a long history of excluding women from its meetings, was especially unsettling. Historically, many of its male members considered art classes for young ladies to be a mere "finishing school." The Association's first "all women's" show in 1885 was regarded by the press as a social event and most comments were condescending. Emil Carlsen, the Director of the School of Design in San Francisco between 1887 and 1888, declared that women were inferior superficial pupils who lacked self-confidence and were expected to become school teachers or marry (SFX, July 19, 1891, p.14; cf. Hjalmarson, pp.97, 99, 104f, 137). Carlsen believed that they were "indifferent" students who studied art as a "pastime" and achieved only "mediocrity." Arthur Mathews found these remarks odious and published a rebuttal (TWV, July 25, 1891, p.8).
[65] Refer to Chapter 5, note 134. This "permanent Gallery" was established by the Cap and Bell Club at its Conservatory Hall in 1913 (SFX, October 12, 1913, p.30); it closed in 1915 and briefly reopened for one exhibit several years later.
[66] Neuhaus, *Keith*, p.82. Arnold Genthe reaffirmed the numerous advantages the Club had for men (Genthe, pp.59ff; cf. John van der Zee, *The Greatest Men's Party on Earth, Inside the Bohemian Grove*, New York, 1974, pp.16-21, 130f, 148). On two brief occasions in the late 19th century the Club invited a few female artists to exhibit at the normally all-male shows (SFC, December 4, 1898, p.24; SFL, December 5, 1899, p.11; refer to the biography on Maren Froelich in Appendix 7). The experiment was deemed a failure and women were only permitted to view the Club's Annual Exhibitions on three designated days and always in the company of a male member (SFL, November 24, 1901, p.15).
[67] Hughes, p.38.
[68] Edgar M. Kahn, "In Memoriam: Laura Bride Powers," CHS 26.1, 1947, pp.89f. Between October of 1904 and June of 1906 L. B. Powers had been the art critic for the *San Francisco Call*.
[69] TOT, July 16, 1916, p.20. In 1906 Powers proclaimed that women's art was of lesser value because they "have not been long enough competitors in the field of endeavor;" she made no mention of the discrimination by the male-dominated art institutions (SFL, Feb. 18, 1906, p.23). Powers noted: "But through the inexorable laws of evolution, women are reaching the plane of development that God in his wisdom planned for them in his own good time."
[70] TOT, June 20, 1920, p.6-A.
[71] TOT, May 30, 1920, p.3-S.
[72] SFX, October 12, 1913, p.32.
[73] In fact, the official 1923 survey by the local Chamber of Commerce chided the University for not encouraging the exhibition of art (*Business Survey*, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce, Berkeley, 1924, p.27). The origin of the art gallery at U.C. is amusing. Eugen Neuhaus persuaded the Regents of the University to convert a defunct power plant on campus into an exhibition space and used WPA money to decorate the building (Lillian B. Davies, "The Little University Building That Led Three Lives," *Exactly Opposite the Golden Gate, Essays on Berkeley's History, 1845-1945*, ed. Phil McArdle, Berkeley, 1983, pp.214-219). In the early 1920s the University Library and the foyer of Architecture Hall on campus displayed on occasion small traveling exhibits and were temporarily called "galleries" (TCR: February 5, 1921, p.14; February 19, 1921, p.14; BDT, May 7, 1921, p.2; BDG, November 26, 1921, p.6).
[74] BDT: September 11, 1920, p.4; December 4, 1920, p.5. In one case the Junior Red Cross sponsored at CSAC a traveling exhibit of art by Parisian students (BDG, May 30, 1919, p.5).
[75] BDT: September 8, 1920, p.2; September 22, 1920, p.2. This organization was also called the University Fine Arts Society; most of its members lived in San Francisco (TCR, August 28, 1920, p.5; TSL, September 11, 1920, p.3).
[76] BDT, January 3, 1921, p.7).
[77] Refer to the biography on Neuhaus in Appendix 7; cf., SFX, April 5, 1914, p.3; BDG: November 13, 1919, p.5; October 18, 1920, p.5; BDT: October 16, 1920, p.2; February 25, 1921, p.8.
[78] BDT, September 10, 1920, p.1.
[79] Refer to the biography on Vivian in Appendix 14. In the late fall of 1919 and 1921 she opened for public sale her collections "in tempera" and "mural motifs" (BDG: December 22, 1919, p.5; December 17, 1921, p.6.
[80] Letter to Nora Vennerström Hinkston from Jennie V. Cannon dated March 3, 1920. I wish to thank Eleanor Malzahn Jacobsen for permission to cite this letter from her family archives.
[81] According to the U.S. Census of 1920 [ED 192, Sheet 7], she listed her occupation under "Head of Household" as "Landscape Artist." Both of her sons (ages 14 and 20) were in residence and attending school. By the time of the 1930 Census [ED1-313, Sheet 10B] her house was valued at $7,000. From the local Directory (Polk, 1922 p.368; 1925 p.449; 1930 p.366; 1943 p.182) and telephone book (January 1948, p.84) we learn that Jennie resided at this Berkeley address as "a widow." In two SFAA publications (*1935 Catalogue of the First Graphic Arts Exhibition* and *1936 Catalogue of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition*) Cannon listed her residence simply as "Carmel, California."
[82] Appendix 5.

[83] In 1916 *The Oakland Tribune* hired Laura Bride Powers as its art critic. Samuel Hume and Irving Pichel combined art, music and drama for their review in *The Berkeley Times* (BDT, November 20, 1920, p.3; January 15, 1921, p.8). The weekly *Courier* was published by the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce and officially had an "Arts and Crafts" page by an anonymous "Criticus" whose emphasis was music and theatre reviews (TCR, April 7, 1923, pp.5-7).
[84] BDG: September 22, 1920, p.5; November 3, 1920, p.5.
[85] Prior to 1920 a few regional newspapers briefly experimented with an art column written by established artists. In 1906 Will Sparks contributed a number of reviews to the *San Francisco Call* and in 1910 the *Berkeley Daily Gazette* invited Charles M. Crocker to write several critiques (refer to the biographies on Crocker and Sparks in Appendix 7).
[86] BDG, February 5, 1921, p.5.
[87] BDG, February 19, 1921, p.5.
[88] BDG: February 26, 1921, p.6; March 12, 1921, p.6; March 26, 1921, p.6.
[89] BDG, April 2, 1921, p.6.
[90] This information was obtained during a telephone interview with Joan Tweit.
[91] BDT: February 16, 1921, p.2; February 19, 1921, p.2.
[92] E.g.: BDT: February 16, 1921, p.2; February 19, 1921, p.2; April 23, 1921, p.4.
[93] TSL, October 16, 1920, p.1.
[94] BDG, April 16, 1921, p.6.
[95] Ibid.
[96] BDG: April 21, 1921, p.8; February 18, 1922, p.6.
[97] BDG, May 7, 1921, p.6; TCR, October 15, 1921, p.14.
[98] BDG, May 14, 1921, p.6.
[99] BDG, June 4, 1921, p.6; cf. BDG, June 18, 1921, p.6.
[100] BDG: June 25, 1921, p.6; July 2, 1921, p.6; July 9, 1921, p.6; July 16, 1921, p.6.; July 23, 1921, p.6.
[101] BDG: August 6, 1921, p.6; August 13, 1921, p.6; August 20, 1921, p.6; Sept. 10, 1921, p.6; December 24, 1921, p.6.
[102] BDG: September 3, 1921, p.6; September 24, 1921, p.6; October 1, 1921, p.6; October 8, 1921, p.6.
[103] BDT, September 2, 1921, p.6; refer to the biography on Sydney Lemos in Appendix 7.
[104] Appendix 5.
[105] DPA, December 14, 1921, p.4.
[106] LAT, December 3, 1921, pp.2.1, 6.
[107] TCR, January 21, 1922, p.14.
[108] BDG: January 7, 1922, p.6; January 14, 1922, p.6; January 21, 1922, p.5; February 4, 1922, p.6.
[109] BDG, January 28, 1922, p.6.
[110] BDG, February 11, 1922, p.6.
[111] BDG: February 18, 1922, p.5; February 25, 1922, p.5; March 18, 1922, p.6.
[112] BDG: March 4, 1922, p.6; March 11, 1922, p.6.
[113] BDG, March 25, 1922, p.5; April 1, 1922, p.5; April 8, 1922, p.5; April 15, 1922, p.6.
[114] TOT, February 26, 1922, p.7-S.
[115] TPE, February 8, 1922, p.3.
[116] TPE: May 30, 1922, p.18; June 2, 1922, p.18.
[117] During a telephone interview Joan Tweit told this writer of Jennie Cannon's objections to the marriage.
[118] BDG: December 17, 1921, p.6; January 14, 1922, p.6; January 21, 1922, p.5; February 4, 1922, p.6; April 29, 1922, p.6; TOT: January 22, 1922, p.4-S; February 5, 1922, p.S-5; March 26, 1922, p.S-5; April 2, 1922, p.S-7.
[119] The Claremont Hotel art gallery was reopened on December 6, 1925 under the director Harry Noyes Pratt and was committed to selling all displayed work at prices between twenty-five and fifty dollars (TCR, November 28, 1925, p.16).
[120] Appendix 5; BDG, May 27, 1922, p.5.
[121] BDG: July 8, 1922, p.6; July 29, 1922, p.5.
[122] Letter to Edna Vennerström from Jennie V. Cannon, dated December 9, 1922, cited with permission by Joan Tweit.
[123] BDG, December 2, 1922, p.5.
[124] BDG, November 18, 1922, p.5.
[125] Refer to note 122 above.
[126] TCR, March 17, 1923, p.13; cf. BDG, March 24, 1923, p.5.
[127] In 1925, when the League reorganized as the "Berkeley League of Fine Arts," Maybeck remained as president, Eugen Neuhaus became first vice president, William Gaw served as second vice president and Laura Adams Armer, the only woman among the officers, was elected secretary (AAA 22, 1925, p.130).
[128] BDG, April 14, 1923, p.6; refer to Chapter 8 in Volume 2 for the complete history of the League and its exhibitions.
[129] TCR, April 14, 1923, p.12.
[130] BDG, April 17, 1923, p.10.
[131] BDG, June 28, 1923, p.5.
[132] BDG, March 24, 1923, p.5; TCR, April 7, 1923, pp.5, 7.
[133] BDG, March 26, 1923, p.5; TOT, March 26, 1923, p.1-B; SFX, March 27, 1923, p.17; TPE, March 27, 1923, p.5.
[134] The reasons for the elopement and discord that divided the Cannon-Vennerström clans were passed to this writer during a telephone interview with Joan Tweit. The removal of Milner and his daughter as heirs to Jennie's estate is confirmed in her will dated September 6, 1949: *Petition of George H. Cannon for Probate of Last Will and Testament of Jennie V. Cannon*, January 9, 1953; *Decree of Distribution of Estate of Jennie V. Cannon* finalized December 14, 1953; Judge Robert Tullar, Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Pima; Case No.16685.
[135] WTA 1.8, 1926, p.28.