

Chapter Five – The Turning Point: William Merritt Chase and Carmel (1914)

The complicated and at times searing events that Jennie Cannon either initiated or witnessed in 1914 can best be understood with introductory remarks on the two protagonists: William Merritt Chase and the “gentry” of Carmel. The affairs of that summer led to the retirement of the former and ended the retirement of the latter.

In 1914 no North American artist was more accomplished or flamboyant than William Merritt Chase.¹ He was born on November 1, 1849 in Williamsburg, Indiana. Chase left Indianapolis twenty years later on the advice of his first art teacher, Barton S. Hays, to study at New York’s National Academy of Design. Thereafter, he briefly settled into a marginal career as a still-life painter in St. Louis. With the help of a generous private grant he began his European studies in 1872 at München’s Royal Academy under Alexander von Wagner and later with Karl von Piloty. In Bavaria he established a number of close friendships, especially with the group of artists under the spell of Frank Duveneck. He developed a deep empathy for German academic traditions and learned that the most successful artist was the one who captivated the public with his personality as well as his skills. Upon his return to New York in 1878 Chase assumed a teaching post at the Art Students League where he quickly became a revered figure and began the process of building his grand persona. He miraculously acquired the highly coveted Tenth-Street studio of Albert Bierstadt and decked out the interior with Persian carpets, potted ferns, Venetian tapestries, Egyptian urns, stuffed flamingoes, Japanese parasols, swords, drums and the most exotic objets d’art. A tall Negro servant, attired like a Nubian grandee in a red fez, admitted the ever-curious rich who purchased landscapes and still lifes during recitals or poetry readings. Chase amassed a collection of great contemporary painters which he interspersed among his own recently completed canvases. As his popularity grew the fashionable vied for invitations to pose for his much admired portraits done in a bravura style with a somber palette. As a result of subsequent trips to Europe in the early 1880s he eventually adopted a lighter tonal range and experimented, much like the French Impressionists, with the subtleties of reflected light. Outside his studio at public events Chase was fastidiously attired in spats, creased trousers and an impeccably tailored cutaway jacket with the ubiquitous lapel carnation. A bright scarf, which was cinched by a bejeweled ring, was tucked into his satin vest. His beribboned pince-nez hovered between a silk top hat and a propeller mustache. On Fifth Avenue his conspicuous profile was preceded by a brace of Russian wolf hounds on gold leashes. This ostentatious spectacle combined with his immense talent and a personality that was reported to be generous, charming, gregarious, forcefully assertive and conceited naturally brought him the intended fame. He became the essence of the Gilded Age.

The exploits of this dapper figure were routinely reported in the press. In 1880 he was elected President of the Society of American Artists, a position that he would hold at intervals for over ten years. He became a co-founder of the Society of American Painters in Pastel. Accounts of his “art expeditions” with the Tile Club provided amusing tittle-tattle. In 1886 he married the socially prominent Alice Gerson and had the first of many successful one-man exhibitions. The following year he began teaching at the Brooklyn Art Association. The summer school of art that he founded at Shinnecock near Southampton was a resounding success from 1891 to 1902. He established in 1896 the Chase School of Art which was renamed two years later the New York School of Art. He taught there until 1907 when he returned to the Art Students League. His

popular summer classes based in Europe (1903-1913) had alternating venues in Haarlem, London, Madrid, Florence, Bruges and Venice. Counted among his most successful pupils were: Edward Hopper, George Bellows, Rockwell Kent, Georgia O’Keeffe, Gifford Beal, Charles Demuth and Joseph Stella. He was showered with academic and public honors, including his election in 1890 to the rank of Academician at the National Academy of Design and later his inclusion on the death of John Twachtman into *The Ten*, a very select society of East Coast Impressionists. Those attending his regular free lectures were regaled by the booming voice, gesticulating arms and well-timed rhetorical cadence that made fathomable the great artistic movements of the West. For a wider audience he published these lectures and reviewed art exhibitions in the local newspapers.

To date no art historian has asked why this sophisticated charismatic teacher decided to leave the refinement and comfort of Europe and New York in 1914 to open his renowned summer school far from his base of support in an obscure untested hamlet on the Pacific. A convenient answer is that he was charmed and persuaded by his former student, Jennie Cannon, and business manager, C. P. Townsley. However, behind Chase’s substantial façade of seemingly unassailable success were serious problems that undoubtedly provided additional inducements. Foremost among these were the vicious machinations of the highly competitive art world. Witty and substantive attacks by Chase on American avant-garde artists engendered so much anger that the progressives sought revenge. In 1910 John Sloan and Robert Henri intentionally excluded him from the Exhibition of Independents. For purely political reasons Chase was banned from New York’s celebrated and widely attended 1913 Armory Show which included such conservative Tonalist painters as Harold Davis.² A rumor in the spring of 1912 that was officially confirmed by January of 1913 – one month *before* Chase authorized Townsley to accept formally the invitation to teach in Carmel – revealed that Chase was not among the select American artists to have a private gallery at San Francisco’s 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition (PPIE). His omission was devastating personally and politically. Carmel, which lies about one hundred miles to the south of that metropolis, would offer the discreet proximity for the famous artist to lobby in private the Exhibition Committee. Jennie Cannon relates that this is exactly what happened:³

Mr. Chase’s presence in the West worked out advantageously for him. For political reasons his name had been omitted when the individual rooms had been assigned to twelve leading American painters in the Panama Pacific International Exposition (1915). A well-known successful teacher, excellent painter, and man of affairs, his name should have been first on the list. This error was corrected; those who attended that fair will remember the very interesting Chase room which contained several of his best-known canvasses. Mr. Chase was granted complete freedom in the selection of material for the ceiling, wall covering, and floor. Municipal courtesies were extended to him, befitting a citizen of his rank and fame.

He chose Carmel over potential sites in southern California for easy access to San Francisco where “once on the ground, Chase was too large a man to be thus ignored.”⁴

Closely entwined with the 1915 Exposition was the issue of Chase’s health. Beginning with his school days in Germany, where the heavy consumption of beer and schnapps led to many drunken nights, he became so increasingly dependent on alcohol that even his wife supplied him in Venice with a special “Scotch whiskey . . . to ease his pain.”⁵ Chase died on October 25, 1916 from cirrhosis of the liver, a condition that he had known of for some time.⁶ In 1913 he realized that San Francisco would be the largest world-wide Exposition since the Chicago fair of 1893 and the last big artistic plum of his career. His prominence there would be vital to his legacy.

Equally important was the issue of money. Chase suffered from chronic indebtedness because he provided lavishly for his large and adored family, purchased expensive art and antiques on impulse and maintained a polished aura wherever he lived and traveled.⁷ The wide-ranging and early publicity for his Carmel Summer School, as well as slight discounts for early registration, brought the total enrollment by the spring of 1914 to about one hundred, a quantity that was unprecedented for his summer classes. This combined with the perks provided by Frank Devendorf made the expedition to the Pacific quite attractive for Chase.

Because of its recent founding, Carmel had no hereditary class of “old money.” Rather its “gentry” consisted of the small group of year-round residents who owned their modest homes and maintained a very peculiar “us versus them” mentality. They were united in their tolerance – and a few would even say enjoyment – of the admittedly cold, blustery and damp Carmel winters. Artists and literati, who formed the spiritual core of the gentry, viewed themselves as the unofficial protectors of the community ethos – an unwritten liberal code that encouraged creativity in all forms. It was generally accepted that Carmelites had the collective duty to provide public forums for musical and theatrical productions, dramatic readings and exhibitions of arts and crafts. If a byproduct of this creative process was unorthodox behavior, including the abundant consumption of wine and opium as well as liaisons with errant spouses or members of the same sex, then the gentry turned the proverbial blind eye. As an unincorporated town the permanent residents lacked the institutions to govern themselves publicly and so became accustomed to reach a consensus on issues by retiring behind closed doors. This practice led to habitual secrecy, enforced loyalty and an uncommon self-reliance that had the most unfortunate consequences in 1914. On every inconsequential issue they tended to protect their own. The most desirable qualities of Carmel – the relative isolation, unblemished beauty and aggregation of so many intelligent minds – also created a collective tension that seemed to demand a dramatic response to every simple problem. After several visits to the seaside hamlet the noted writer, Van Wyck Brooks, observed in his highly entertaining autobiography that “Carmel was a wildwood with an operatic setting where life itself also seemed half operatic and where curious dreams were taking place in the bungalows and cabins, smothered in blooming vines, on the sylvan slopes.” After further observations he proclaimed: “What was it in the Carmel atmosphere that so conduced violence? . . . nihilism too was endemic in Carmel, like suicide and murder and along with the Mediterranean beauty of the scene; and it seemed the right place for Henry Miller to say that ‘it doesn’t matter a damn whether the world is going to the dogs or not’.”⁸ Preservation of the dramatic unspoiled scenery and rustic quietude was vital for artistic inspiration and required constant opposition to all forms of development, even to Devendorf’s most benign schemes. Surprisingly, the gentry encouraged summer tourists to occupy the local hotel rooms and the “tent city” because their temporary presence generated the bulk of the income on which many of the non-transients lived. Likewise, the “seasonal residents” from May thru September were vital to the local economy, but excluded from the inner circles of power even though many owned Carmel property. Visiting reporters were encouraged to rhapsodize on the Bohemian life at Carmel’s Elysian shores, but they were seldom given details of private lives. The first breach in this carefully manicured façade occurred on November 13, 1907 when the poetess Nora May French, who was widely known for her nymphomania, committed a painfully gruesome suicide in the home of George Sterling. Too many sordid details were anonymously revealed to the press which offered the identities of her many

recent married callers, including the well-respected artists Charles Dickman and Charles Rollo Peters, and fanned rumors of several impending suicides in the hamlet.⁹ The gentry's chagrin eventually faded, but everyone was mindful of the effects of bad publicity on the town's image.

All of the denizens of this scenic hamlet were justifiably proud that their community was a cultural center. The 1911 brochure from the Carmel Development Company boasted that over one half of the residents had "work connected with the aesthetic arts."¹⁰ Although most in the first wave of the George Sterling literati had migrated elsewhere by 1914,¹¹ the newer "creative types" were far more involved with the two major artistic pursuits, recitals and plays. The resident musical star, Frederick Preston Search, a respected cellist in San Francisco circles, was accorded near adoration in the Monterey area.¹² Frank Powers, the town's co-developer, was an avid supporter of the dramatic arts. Carmel's Forest Theatre, which was founded in 1910, staged primarily all-volunteer productions under the guidance of retired professionals.¹³ Among the writers the MacGowan sisters and Mary H. Austin received the most attention.¹⁴ Alice MacGowan and her sister Grace were widely celebrated for their "potboilers" and historical romances, which are ignored today or remembered as the compressed plots in numerous silent films.¹⁵ Mary Austin was a name that Chase recognized as both a successful novelist and playwright as well as the appointed head of East Coast publicity for San Francisco's PPIE.¹⁶ Her reappearance in Carmel to produce one of her own plays in 1914 may have created an additional incentive for Chase to travel west. Jennie Cannon's intent, as outlined in the preceding chapter, was nothing less than the establishment of the study and practice of art as the third pillar of Carmel's culture.

When Devendorf supported her proposal to open a world-class art school and as a byproduct to create a larger colony of professional artists, in part by usurping the prerogatives of the locally run Arts and Crafts Club, there was serious opposition. Several months prior to the start of the Chase Summer School Mary E. Hand, DeNeale Morgan and Helena W. Smith, the three elected officers of the Club and respected members of the Carmel gentry, removed the veil of secrecy from their negotiations and sent a devastating telegram to C. P. Townsley. Jennie's diary entry for February 11, 1914 provides a terse summary:¹⁷

I had to write six letters about Chase matters. The Carmel A[rts] and C[rafts] [Club], after we [Devendorf and I] had offered two studios to Mr. Chase, telegraphed Mr. Townsley [on] what commission they will pay for the use of studios! A very curious thing to do. I expect [the] Chase matter to fall thru at this rate.

Jennie understood the level of Chase's indebtedness. She knew that he would be unwilling to sacrifice any of his earnings to pay rent and that it was impossible at this late date to raise the registration fees. We can guess at the motivation of the Club's hierarchy. Helena Smith and DeNeale Morgan were unable to teach their normal summer classes in art because of the presence of the Chase School and consequently part of the rental fee for the studios was intended as financial compensation.¹⁸ Jennie's letters to Powers and Devendorf, as well as her "considerable correspondence" with the Club yielded the following compromise.¹⁹ The Club would desist from making any financial demands of Chase on the condition that his Summer School was publicly acknowledged in the press as being initiated by and under the patronage of Carmel's Arts and Crafts Club. Within days the *San Francisco Examiner* published a very flattering front-page article on Chase which concluded with: "The Carmel Arts and Crafts Club, of which Mary E. Hand is president, has been chiefly instrumental in securing the Chase summer school for California,

mainly through the efforts of Mrs. Jennie V. Cannon, the landscape painter."²⁰ A few months later the *San Jose Mercury Herald* carried a prominent story that declared the Chase Summer School to be the work of the Carmel Club with no mention of Jennie Cannon.²¹ Michael Williams, who had just published a short piece on the attractions for painters in the Monterey Peninsula without any mention of the Club, was asked by Jennie "to write an article for publication on the Arts and Crafts Club of Carmel."²² She was doing everything to placate the dragon.

Not all the news was bad. Two of the nation's most important metropolitan newspapers confirmed the recent ascendance of Carmel in the art world.²³ As part of a long preface to the announcement of the forthcoming Chase Summer School, the *New York Times* declared that Carmel was a place of unparalleled artistic inspiration and "the center of art life and interest" in the region. Over a dozen of its resident artists, including William Ritschel, Shirley Williamson, William Silva, Arthur Vachell, J. E. Walker, Goddard Gale, Detlef Sammann, DeNeale Morgan, Josephine Culbertson, Ida Johnson and Helena Wood Smith, were singled out for excellence. Further proof of the hamlet's importance came from southern California when the *Los Angeles Times* published the itinerary of Everett Maxwell, the curator of the Fine Arts Gallery in Exposition Park:

Maxwell left for San Francisco, Sacramento, Carmel and Seattle, a few days ago, to be gone a month. He is on the search for good pictures. In San Francisco he will inspect the pictures sent in for the coming Panama Exposition in 1915. He will pick out 150 of the best of these, and in June, 1914, they will be exhibited in his fine arts gallery

He will also gather up the best of these he can find in Seattle and Sacramento, and he will visit the colony of painters in Carmel with predatory intent, returning with his booty and exhibiting it in April.

In the eyes of this influential curator Carmel had become one of the Pacific's top four art venues outside of southern California. Neither *Times* in New York or Los Angeles mentioned Monterey.

During the first four months of 1914 Jennie was also preoccupied with settling her family into the new home on Waverley Street in Palo Alto, participating in her husband's social life as a visiting instructor at Stanford and coping with her own deteriorating health.²⁴ With the mounting demands on Mrs. Cannon as both artist and wife tensions slowly reached the breaking point:²⁵

I shall be at home to friends on Saturday afternoon so I will not miss people all together, when I take up my sketching once more. I must get ready for Mr. Chase. . . . I have been able to sketch twice this past week. It is difficult for a woman with a family to pursue a calling aside from her family affairs. Sometimes I think I will not try because it seems so difficult to find time – one has always too little strength.

Jennie found temporary relief in outings to San Francisco where she viewed exhibitions by Childe Hassam and Frank DuMond and attended lectures at the Sketch Club which she recently joined.²⁶ She refined her skills in making picture frames and hosted a reception for a local painter of miniatures, Rosa Hooper Lyons.²⁷ Her friendship with Ms. Lyons would prove of immense value in the near future. Jennie's four-year battle with her lungs, which always manifested itself with a difficulty in breathing and extreme fatigue, was finally diagnosed as diplococcus.²⁸ On April 27th she had surgery on her "left breast" in Palo Alto's Peninsula Hospital. Will visited her bedside the following day and read passages from *Huckleberry Finn*.²⁹

Her recovery was rapid and by May 11th she boarded a train for the short trip to Carmel. Jennie's first days were spent with a relaxed schedule of painting from her own yard, chatting with Will about the Choral Society practice in the Arts and Crafts Club, and worrying that her son, Milner, was spending his birthday alone in Palo Alto. She expected him to join the family at the

end of his high school term and took some consolation that he was enjoying one of her practical presents, a “complete history of the Inyo Free State.” Jennie also savored special private events, such as the May 21st recital by Messrs. Cadman and Search in the Brooks-Van Horn home where only a carefully selected “audience of musicians, artists and writers” was invited.³⁰ Whenever she found time, she escaped in her reading. What tired her were the visits by chatty Carmelites who spoke of nothing but the hamlet’s “humiliating scandal.”

On May 9th Carmel’s serene façade was shattered by the three-inch-high tidal-wave headline on the front page of the *San Francisco Call*: **PLOT TO POISON ALICE M’GOWAN.**³¹ Jennie and the other seasonal residents knew nothing of the long-brewing crime until its startling publication. Next to a huge profile photograph of the authoress was a narrative that described how the chili sauce, mayonnaise and candy in her cooler had been spiked in early April with enough strychnine “to kill the entire literary colony.” Her Japanese cook, Aki, almost died from tasting one tainted marshmallow. Because she expectorated her first taste of the chili sauce, MacGowan was unharmed. Immediately thereafter “some of the leading lights in the versatile community have received threatening letters” which cautioned “Look out or you’ll be poisoned.” Considering Carmel’s rather lurid attachment to toxins – the poetess Nora May French and Mrs. George Sterling both used cyanide to end their bouts of depression – Carmel’s gentry decided among themselves to maintain secrecy and hire private “Mundell Detectives” who found not a single clue after four weeks of investigation.

Outside of the Monterey Peninsula there was a genuine feeling of anger that such an important crime had gone unsolved and that its story had been snuffed out by local censors. The *San Francisco Examiner* carried this May 10th headline: **DREAD HAUNTS CARMEL COLONY.**³² Here the tenor of report was far more blunt:

Grim, black fear has folded its raven wings and settled down on Carmel-by-the-Sea. For weeks the artists, poets, writers, dramatists and musicians colonized there have lived in dread and trembling, apprehensive of some dire calamity. . . . Coming as it did on the heels of a series of depredations, it was feared that to give the attempt publicity would mean a wholesale exodus from Carmel.

An unnamed investigative reporter discovered evidence that throughout March and early April of 1914 there were nine major Carmel burglaries, including the theft of \$2,000.00 in diamonds and “a large sum of money” from the home of MacGowan. No one had been arrested, in fact most of the robberies were never reported to the Monterey authorities. Local writers, such as Jimmy Hopper and Harry Leon Wilson, became ad hoc detectives, but to no avail. Amateurish attempts to blame Mrs. Greeley, a respected resident and a prominent volunteer in many theatre productions, not only failed in court, but created deep divisions in the ranks of the gentry.³³ News of these crimes spread throughout the West, and appeared in the *New York Times* under the caption: **POISON FOR ALICE MCGOWAN.**³⁴ Chase obviously knew of these events before his arrival and acted with appropriate caution when in July he sent his wife from Carmel after only one week’s stay.

Motivated by evident chagrin and disgust Carmel’s gentry persuaded the local Monterey newspaper, which had been conspicuously silent up to this point, to publish a rebuttal “for truth.”³⁵ This article revealed much about the gentry’s suspicion of outsiders and especially the police; the big “city papers” were accused of “gross exaggeration” in claiming that all of Carmel was terrified:

As a matter of fact, only six or seven people in Carmel knew of the matter until mention was made in the city papers, and these had mutually agreed to say nothing

whatsoever about it. . . . After the discovery [of the poison] was made it was kept as quiet as possible. Miss McGowan [sic] turned the case over to her brother-in-law, Mr. Leon Wilson As far as could be learned yesterday, nothing was being done to apprehend the culprit, merely a waiting policy being pursued in the hope that 'time will tell all things.'

Jennie's single diary entry on Alice MacGowan adds another facet to the complicated mystery:³⁶

On the way I met Alice MacGowan. There have been several attempts to take her life, a strange thing for she is popular with everybody.

No published source had ever reported more than one attempt on MacGowan's life. Jennie's knowledge of multiple endeavors to kill the writer gives some indication of how insular and protective Carmel had become. In just three months the gentry would approach a far more serious crime with the same naïve self-reliance, but this time the consequences were fatal.

The status of the Chase School was not affected by these events. After his arrival in late April, C. P. Townsley preferred to focus attention on administrative work and the May 4th opening of the studios. He gave preliminary instruction to early arrivals.³⁷ Jennie visited one of his plein air classes near Mr. Vachell's house on Camino Real. Unfortunately, the wind came up and ruined a glorious day.³⁸ According to her diaries, the late spring of 1914 was especially foggy, damp, "raw and cold."³⁹ When the weather permitted, the Cannons and Townsleys planned beach outings.⁴⁰

Aside from her mandatory rounds through the social circles of Carmel's gentry, Jennie continued to develop a close rapport with the established artists in summer residence, especially William Ritschel. The latter and C. P. Townsley spent the evening of May 27th at the Cannons' home for "a jolly time talking art and artists . . . and heard some funny stories on Chase and his colored servant, who, having been long in the family, really felt he had done some of his paintings."⁴¹ Will and Jennie drove the "very rough road" to Ritschel's house for reciprocal visits where they spent long evenings and admired his "fine" paintings. Jennie predicted that "he will make a great name for himself with his work on the ocean."⁴² Mary Curtis Richardson, the influential San Francisco artist who was in Carmel for two months of "outdoor portrait painting," showed off an array of sketches, about which Jennie had some private reservations.⁴³ The respectable sales of Jennie's paintings locally combined with her growing reputation in the art world reaped an important dividend. On June 16th she was notified of her election to the Society of Monterey Artists, a recently formed and very short-lived organization. She was given a one-month notice to contribute paintings to their forthcoming exhibition at the swank Del Monte Hotel.⁴⁴

Carmel was enjoying a bountiful harvest of tourists. In addition to the summer migrants who occupied the "tent city," all four hotels were filled to capacity and a special twice daily coach from the Hotel Del Monte was chartered to bring the beau monde to observe the great New York artist and his students in action. One newspaper report, which no doubt gladdened the calculating hearts of Devendorf and Powers, claimed that Carmel's Hotel Monte Verde had become "the center of considerable real estate activity as guests have purchased lots almost immediately." To compound the excitement Xavier Martinez arrived with his summer painting class from Berkeley's California School of Arts and Crafts and Ralph Johonnot opened his School of Design and Crafts.⁴⁵ The confluence of so many artists and students at one location in the West was unprecedented.

The only problem was that Chase had not arrived on the preannounced date of June 27th. Jennie simply noted in her diary without explanation that Mr. and Mrs. Chase appeared in Carmel on July 3rd at 1:26 p.m. They were taken immediately to one of the best homes, Rice Cottage, which Jennie and Mrs. Townsley had decorated with flowers. Mrs. Cannon was philosophical:⁴⁶

The great event is about to come off after two years of expectation. This is a great thing for the West. It is going to put me on my feet, I believe. . . . It remains to be seen whether he will like the West. If not, he will never come again. Mrs. Chase returns home after a few days. None of their children have come with them.

On the Fourth of July the Townsleys, their relatives and the Cannons had dinner at the beach and that night they attended Carmel's elaborate costume drama the "Sons of Spain," an historical saga of Spanish colonialism.⁴⁷ In attendance Jennie spotted the Chases who were now fêted and adored by the gentry. One week later Mrs. Chase would accompany her husband on his first trip to San Francisco. Thereafter she left for New York.⁴⁸ Chase's Monday morning "studio criticisms" were summarized by DeNeale Morgan:⁴⁹

These Monday morning criticisms lasted from three to four hours, and he kept the intense interest of every student every moment of that time. On these days (each Monday morning during the three-month session) all the work done by the pupils during the previous week, aside from the regular criticism days was put up on the large board for criticism, not one canvas was ever left without comment, except where it was not claimed by a pupil present, in which case Mr. Chase would remark pleasantly, "If it's not worth claiming, it's not worth the time for criticism," and so he would pass on to the next.

Three things Mr. Chase always tried to impress on his pupils:

First: "In your efforts seek Truth."

Second: "Interesting treatment" which he analyzed. "Always have your canvas *interesting in the make* from the start so that anyone seeing it would like to possess it."

Third: "Quality."

. . . . Five pictures were painted by Mr. Chase before the assembled class – two portraits, two still-lives subjects, and one landscape – and these were given as prizes to the most deserving students of the class at the close of term.

Morgan went on to note that Chase would "never endure . . . indifference or laziness on the part of a pupil toward his or her work, he insisted upon improvement and progress continually." Apparently, her teacher visited Morgan's studio and offered "helpful" suggestions.

Jennie's diary for July tells us much about Chase's specific movements in Carmel.⁵⁰ The outdoor classes always consisted of exercises in landscape or models in costume, while the studio work focused on still lifes and portraits. She marveled at his ability to criticize so many canvases with such enthusiasm and personal attention: "he is very conscientious for a great master. . . . He seems wound up to run forever." The outdoor class of Tuesday, July 7th, was held on Mrs. Frank Powers' property, a massive beautifully situated lot near the Carmel Gate to Pebble Beach.⁵¹ Here each student stood for the criticism and followed Chase to the next easel so that by the end of the critique he was surrounded by a huge crowd. This is the only class that Mrs. Chase attended. Over tea in Mrs. Powers' house Jennie found the master's wife "charming" and sincerely added "I could easily love her." Before all the students and the rather large audience of visitors at his second Monday criticism on July 13th "Chase painted a portrait of a child, explaining and illustrating as he worked" and then announced that he was "at work upon a portrait of Senator Clark for which he is to be paid \$15,000.00."⁵² Obviously, Chase was hoping for more commissions among the visitors. On the afternoon of July 31st he returned with his class to Mrs. Powers' property where he painted as a demonstration his only known landscape of Carmel.⁵³ Immediately thereafter Chase took tea with Jennie at the rented cottage of her friends, the artists Isabelle Percy and Betty de Jong.⁵⁴ Both showed off their recent work and Chase was "so kind to all who paint. He regards art and artists as something to be revered."

Chase's congeniality and apparent good humor actually concealed his deep discomfort with Carmel. On either July 13th or 14th he abandoned Rice Cottage and took "an apartment" at the Del Monte Hotel in Monterey. Since Devendorf would never pay for accommodations outside Carmel, Chase had to subsidize this expensive housing. The local Monterey newspaper simply noted that by Wednesday, July 15th, the great artist was ensconced in the Del Monte for the entire summer.⁵⁵ A few days later he served as the sole judge for the Summer Exhibition at the Society of Monterey Artists where he awarded prizes to E. Charlton Fortune, Clark Hobart and Isabelle Percy. It was also disclosed that he "has taken a studio in Monterey and has already planned much work in the picturesque old town." This was Monterey's not so diplomatic slap at upstart Carmel.

Still the question remains as to why the cash-strapped Chase would leave his free comfortable accommodations in Carmel and assume the burdensome expense as well as the inconvenience of a commute? Fortunately, Jennie Cannon provides some answers. As she and Chase walked alone to her house one evening he:⁵⁶

. . . . related some unpleasant experiences he had with a student in the afternoon. I realize how entirely he is wrapped up in art and art students. This is his life. He is happy in the thought that he is much needed. He does not like . . . Carmel – that I can perceive though he does not say so. He has not lived much with nature.

After Shinnecock all of his summer courses had been centered in the metropolitan areas of Europe, a far cry from austere Carmel with its damp foggy days. What Chase resented about this hamlet was the dearth of such civilized amenities as fashionable promenades, discreet club rooms and well-appointed salons. Carmel was the perfect inspirational escape for a painter, but Chase did not want a retreat. Although Rice Cottage had more space than a Del Monte suite, in the latter Chase could be far more inconspicuous in his personal habits, especially playing billiards and drinking with new friends, such as the young artist Myron Oliver. Here too was the privacy to seek portrait commissions among the hotel's affluent guests. At the Del Monte Chase could properly receive the steady stream of admiring notables from San Francisco and comfortably attend the parties given in his honor.⁵⁷ Carmel painters, such as Jennie Cannon and DeNeale Morgan, were invited to these receptions which were carefully controlled by resident artists in Monterey.⁵⁸

Carmel was life in a small fish bowl with no escape from the aspiring gentry and the ubiquitous adoring pupils. They scrutinized his every movement like the priestess poking the spewing entrails of an oracular sacrifice. Chase had grown extremely apprehensive around disgruntled students, especially those married women he brought to tears with his blunt criticism. Years earlier he had been severely mugged by the husband of an irate pupil.⁵⁹ Cannon also revealed that Chase felt a "keen disappointment" that the vast majority of his Carmel students were "beginners" and that he failed to "draw the advanced artists as he had in all his European tours." The incomplete list of enrolled students in 1914 contains only a few East Coast painters of modest reputation; the attending Pacific Coast artists were either neophytes or about to establish solid credentials.⁶⁰ Included in the latter group are E. Charlton Fortune, Jennie Cannon, DeNeale Morgan and Donna Schuster. According to Cannon, the professional "western artists, especially about San Francisco, were pro Whistler and anti Chase in their training and sympathy." In other words they favored the darker traditional aesthetic over the Impressionist-inspired palette. The outbreak of World War I during Chase's visit and the near hysterical anti-German sentiment in Carmel obviously irritated the New York artist, who held a special fondness for Germany

throughout his life, and provided further incentive to stay in Monterey.⁶¹ Chase sensed that something was terribly wrong in Carmel's insular society – that incongruity between the well-cultivated façade and the suppressed seething emotions below.

Despite his new residence Chase continued to attend Carmel social functions, albeit on a very selective basis, and occasionally stayed overnight at the local Pine Inn when it was too late for a return to Monterey.⁶² The July 25th opening of Mary Austin's overwrought Indian melodrama "The Arrow-Maker" was attended by Jennie Cannon, who found the production "dreary," and by Chase, who evidently agreed.⁶³ Both artists were probably eager to see the costumes and scenery that were "designed" by one of Carmel's leading painters, William Silva. Afterward Mary Austin told Chase that she had posed for famous artists in the Latin Quarter of Paris and that two of those portraits were selected for the Salon. Chase responded by inviting her to sit for a portrait during his class, but he told his students prior to her arrival that "getting into the Salon was the easiest thing there was to do, no restrictions at all."⁶⁴ Chase obviously attended the posh August 3rd reception hosted by Mrs. Frank Powers in his honor, an event that was also intended to showcase her own sister, Mrs. E. Thompson Seton, an amateur painter and writer.⁶⁵ The approximately one hundred and twenty guests were drawn from the educated elite, students of Chase and established painters in Carmel and Monterey. Chase evidently preferred more informal settings, such as Jennie Cannon's "picnic dinners" where he chatted at leisure with DeNeale Morgan, Jane Powers, the Silvas and Townsleys.⁶⁶ Of one such event Jennie relates:⁶⁷

Mr. Chase told stories all the while and did most of the talking. He really is the most charming, interesting personality I have ever known. In the afternoon he made pastels for us by putting a teaspoon full of gum Arabic into half a glass of water – making a paste of it and while using gay colors to make shades.

Chase clearly enjoyed Mrs. Cannon and her friends. Such outings provided a painless way to maintain a requisite but limited social visibility in Carmel.

While Chase was tactfully trying to avoid Carmel whenever possible, the Townsleys were attempting to ingratiate themselves among the gentry and Jennie frequently came to their assistance. On one occasion she hosted for young Lois Townsley a "musical reception" which included Frederick Preston Search and his accompanist, Robert Lippett. After tea at the Cannons they adjourned to the Townsleys' home where Lois impressed the assembled guests with a virtuoso performance on the piano.⁶⁸ By September of 1915 Lois had replaced Mr. Lippett as Search's accompanist.⁶⁹ C. P. Townsley, however, was far more concerned with his own career once Chase had told him in mid-July that he would neither return to Carmel nor hold summer classes again. Townsley did receive Chase's blessing to continue the Carmel Summer School of Art under his own leadership and he left for Pasadena to obtain Mannheim's approval to administer his Carmel program through the Stickney Memorial School where he was now employed. This scheme was approved enthusiastically and it was agreed that Townsley would employ one Carmel artist as his administrative assistant. When Townsley returned to Carmel in late July he hired DeNeale Morgan for that post.⁷⁰ The only other painter who had taught at the Arts and Crafts Club in 1913 was Helena Wood Smith and she was evidently deemed less talented than Morgan.

While Chase's absence from the list of attendees at Carmel's grand production of "Montezuma" was conspicuous,⁷¹ his presence at such plebian events as the Salinas Rodeo drew this verdict from the press:⁷²

Chase was an enthusiastic spectator The spirit and color of the old days of vaqueros and festival were of great interest to this artist whose life has been spent largely in the east and in Europe.

What especially fascinated the locals about the Chase school was the element of competition among the students. According to the Monterey press, the forthcoming award for the “best queer” aroused “great interest” among the visitors at his studio. The newspaper went on to explain:⁷³

A “queer” is a sketch made of a subject not chosen for its beauty but for the opportunity it offers the student to learn how to paint and a subject which will sweep out conceptions of what makes a pretty picture. Mr. Chase’s oftenest repeated advice being “It doesn’t matter what you paint, but how you paint.”

On August 12th the newspaper carried a special article on the awarding of the first prize for the “August Queers” to Miss Agnes Musser’s “excellent treatment of a bird cage hung against a picket fence” and the second prize to Miss Ellen Kellogg’s “sketch of . . . the ends of two tables set with bread and butter . . . ready for a meal.”⁷⁴ Each winner received a demonstration piece that Chase had painted in an earlier session. It appears that only a dozen paintings were submitted for competition from the entire class. On the same day that this article appeared a Chase student vanished with no warning or trace.

On Friday morning, August 14th, Carmel was basking in the glory of its cultural novelty and its best tourist season ever. The *Monterey Daily Cypress* announced for the benefit of the curious that “Mr. Chase will accompany the class and will criticise and instruct both morning and afternoon” at Point Lobos, immediately south of Carmel.⁷⁵ On the front page of that same paper was the alarming headline that resurrected memories of Carmel’s disastrous spring: **CARMEL WOMAN DISAPPEARS FROM SIGHT, WELL KNOWN ARTIST THOUGHT TO BE VICTIM OF FOUL PLAY.** The thirty-six-year-old artist, Helena Wood Smith, had disappeared from her Carmel home on Wednesday last and had not been seen that day at the Chase Summer School. George Kodani, a Japanese art photographer, who admitted to visiting his long-time friend Helena that afternoon, had been released by police for lack of evidence after he “was closely questioned.” Kodani did confess that he had been trying to leave Carmel for days on his brother’s orders, but lacked sufficient funds. It was reported that immediately after his release he allegedly telephoned a woman in Monterey’s “red light district” and demanded \$25.00 on pain of death. That Friday the entire male population of Carmel and troops from the Presidio began a systematic search of the woods and shore for Smith, but to no avail. The metropolitan newspapers, which were intentionally kept in the dark about Carmel’s earlier crimes, immediately dispatched reporters to ferret out the truth. That evening the *San Francisco Bulletin* published a plagiarized version of the Monterey newspaper article as if to whet their readers’ appetite for an impending disaster.⁷⁶

On Saturday, August 15th, both the *Monterey Daily Cypress* and *San Francisco Bulletin* carried very slanted stories on how Kodani had allegedly tried to forge Miss Smith’s handwriting and cash one of her checks.⁷⁷ In addition, the *Cypress* reported on the “disappearance” of Kodani and the reward for finding Smith. The near identical accounts in the *San Francisco Chronicle* and *The Oakland Tribune* had the addendum that “Miss Smith is of a nervous disposition and has been ill for some time.”⁷⁸ The Carmel gentry was not pleased with this exposé on Smith’s mental health, a condition which they blamed on her recent inability to find employment as an art teacher. The fact that Chase held his August 14th class, while the rest of Carmel was out searching for one of his own students, aroused so much ill feeling that Townsley’s scheduled class of “sketching at Point

Lobos” on August 16th was cancelled.⁷⁹ Many among the Carmel gentry publicly asked why Chase was not more protective of his pupils. A few people believed that Smith was hiding merely to draw attention to herself. Chase commented obliquely on the growing hostility toward him in a letter to his wife. He refers to his August 19th lecture on Whistler at the Arts and Crafts Club:⁸⁰

Tonight I am to give my class [with Mary Austin as model] and [to] the Carmel high-brows my talk on Whistler. I wish you were here to give me your sympathetic support.

This lecture, which had been scheduled in early August, drew many professional artists, including Armin Hansen and Rowena Meeks Abdy.⁸¹ One result of the simmering fear in this community was the abrupt departure of a number of Chase’s female students and a decline in attendance at the outdoor sessions.⁸² DeNeale Morgan avoided all classes for several weeks. According to one newspaper, the students in the Summer School assumed that Miss Smith disappeared while sketching alone in the woods.⁸³ Jennie summed up the situation on August 20th:⁸⁴

I am tired out, so I am not painting. This week the uncanny disaster to Miss Smith has used the students up very much so that many are not working at all. Considering that I have my housework too, I have held out quite as well as could be expected.

As the tragic events unfolded both Chase and Townsley watched helplessly as the Carmel gentry self destructed.

Between August 14th and the 22nd there were countless futile search parties and even a “posse” along with hundreds of rumors and useless leads.⁸⁵ What rapidly emerged in Carmel and the press were two camps with very conflicting views on Miss Smith’s disappearance. The most vocal faction of the Carmel gentry believed she had been murdered by the crude duplicitous “Jap” (Kodani) who was still waiting to strike the white women of Carmel. Not only did they succeed in fanning racial hatred throughout northern California,⁸⁶ but in the ensuing hysteria they also convinced a sizable group that the “Monterey authorities” responsible for law enforcement were incompetent because they had released Kodani prematurely. The two prominent leaders of this faction were Mary Austin and DeNeale Morgan. The latter was especially efficient in manipulating the press and supplied newspapers, such as *The Oakland Tribune*, with information that erroneously linked Kodani to the MacGowan poisoning and the three unsolved Kendall murders of 1910.⁸⁷ At one of Carmel’s numerous mass meetings Austin and Morgan submitted a somewhat inflammatory “open letter” on which they were able to obtain the signatures of approximately one hundred and fifty women, both residents and visitors. The complete text of this document was published in the *Monterey Daily Cypress*:⁸⁸

“Carmel City, August 17. To whom this may come, greetings: In view of the recent attempted poisoning of one woman and the disappearance of another under circumstances strongly indicative of foul play, we, the undersigned women of Carmel, citizens and taxpayers and summer residents, hereby protest against the methods of those officials who have to do with the detection and punishment of crime, particularly the sheriff and district attorney. We feel that the manner in which these cases have been handled to date endangers the safety of all citizens, and particularly of unprotected women.”

The editorial response entitled an “An Unjust Criticism” appeared in the same issue of the Monterey paper in which the above letter was published:⁸⁹

. . . . In fairness to those officials, the people of this community should withhold judgment until it is shown that a crime has been committed. . . . a man is innocent until proven guilty. . . . there was nothing to hold the Japanese [Kodani] on and the officers would have overstepped themselves if they had held him. Even now, should he be caught

and brought back to Monterey County, he would have to be released upon habeas corpus proceedings. . . . In this letter reference is made to an attempted poisoning of a resident of Carmel [Alice MacGowan] several months ago. . . . When the district attorney and sheriff of this county were finally notified [one month later] every scrap of evidence had been destroyed and those connected with the matter were reluctant to give any information, as they were in the present disappearance when first approached.

Based on crude estimates only about twenty percent of Carmel's entire adult population of women, both summer and permanent residents, signed this "open letter."⁹⁰

Kodani became an easy target simply because he was Japanese. For decades that group had suffered overt discrimination which came to a head in 1905 when both houses of the California legislature unanimously passed a resolution demanding that the Federal government prohibit all Japanese immigration into the state.⁹¹ In the town of Carmel, where the few resident Japanese functioned as cooks and gardeners, many resented the Kodani family who had settled on the Monterey Peninsula in the late 19th century and opened the very successful Point Lobos Canning Company. The Kodani clan was prosperous and their children well-educated.⁹² However, other Carmelites were more open-minded and in 1913 welcomed at the Forest Theatre a production by the Japanese-American playwright, Takeshi Kanno, who performed with his Caucasian wife, Gertrude Boyle, the famous Oakland sculptress.⁹³

A second faction in Carmel vehemently opposed the views of Morgan and Austin and supplied their own damaging information to a willing metropolitan newspaper. The pages of the *San Francisco Call* fashioned a decidedly different view of Kodani and gave credence to yet another theory expressed "by many prominent members of the Carmel colony" that Miss Smith was kidnapped and still alive.⁹⁴ Aside from repeating the widely publicized reports, the *Call* described Kodani as a brilliant "photographer of esthetic tastes and culture" and the priest of a mystic cult. The photo of the suspect shows a well-groomed and fashionably attired man who is playing affectionately with his pet collie.⁹⁵ The *Call* not only discovered that he was a welcome and frequent visitor in the "exclusive homes of Carmel," but also that he was carrying on amorous affairs with "many beautiful society women" locally *and* in the San Francisco Bay Area. Carmel bubbled with scandalous excitement when the paper published the complete texts of Kodani's "sensational" and highly literate love letters with their attached poems; the family names of the female recipients were carefully omitted.⁹⁶

What permanently shattered any appearance of unity among the gentry was the *Call's* "exclusive" article written by one of Carmel's most respected resident-writers, Grace MacGowan Cooke, the sister of Alice MacGowan.⁹⁷ After she hypothesized that Miss Smith was killed with cyanide, Cooke accused the citizens of her town, the Monterey authorities and the Carmel Development Company with intentionally obstructing justice and concealing the "nucleus of criminal action" there. This conspiracy of silence was compounded when the Monterey press refused to investigate her claims. The next morning the *Monterey Daily Cypress* crowned its editorial of rebuttal with the heading "Yellow Journalism" and castigated the *Call* for publishing the ravings of "hysterical and impulsive aesthetes."⁹⁸ In Carmel there were persistent stories, which were publicly confirmed in the press and during Kodani's trial, that Miss Smith was having a protracted affair with the Japanese photographer. His refusal to marry her out of state, due to California's 1907 law against miscegenation between Japanese and Caucasians,⁹⁹ as well as his threat to run away with another woman, led to several violent arguments. The press pointedly

asked why her many Carmel friends failed to intervene directly or contact the appropriate authorities in Monterey when they feared for her safety?

On Sunday, August 23rd, one day after Kodani was apprehended, the partially decomposed body of Helena Wood Smith was found in a shallow sandy grave. The official coroner's jury, which included the Cannons' close friend Daniel MacDougal, determined that she had been strangled and that none of her jewelry had been removed. After making a series of false statements Kodani confessed to this "crime of passion" and to the killing of her dog which he feared would lead searchers to the body. At another hastily assembled public meeting in Carmel there were demands to expedite justice and hang the obvious murderer. Many feared that the violator of their artistic utopia might again escape. Sodate Carmel had suddenly become carnivorous. Monterey authorities, who had informants at the meeting, quickly dispatched Kodani under heavy guard to the County Prison in Salinas, thereby foiling the rumored "lynching mob" that was gathering in Carmel. Authorities also worried that Kodani would commit suicide. Despite the raging battles of World War I and the death of Pope Pius X, the California press allocated prominent space for the continuing drama in Carmel.¹⁰⁰ The last known photograph of Miss Smith, which also depicted William Merritt Chase criticizing one of her paintings, became a popular illustration.¹⁰¹ As stories of the liaison between Kodani and Smith surfaced, the anger of the more bigoted gentry grew exponentially. Morgan and Austin drafted a "set of resolutions" to "protest false statements," namely that Miss Smith, whose "character was above reproach," had been intimate with a "Jap murderer." Out of an adult summer population of about fifteen hundred in Carmel they were able to obtain only seventeen signatures and of these only two were students of Chase, Josephine Blanch and Hannah Thompson. A second petition, which severely criticized the Monterey Sheriff and District Attorney for releasing Kodani's "conflicting confessions" that "besmirched" the victim and Carmel, garnered more signatures. Among the artists only Eva Belle Adams, DeNeale Morgan, Josephine Culbertson, Louise MacDougal and Josephine Blanch signed this second document; the names of other Carmel painters, including Jennie Cannon, were conspicuously absent. Ironically, Miss Smith's brother, who was himself a newspaper reporter, claimed that the authorities had acted properly.¹⁰²

Fanning the flames was the respected Oakland painter Goddard Gale, who was Morgan's close friend and a "prominent member of the artist colony in Carmel." Several days *before* Kodani was arraigned in court Gale bluntly stated in a slanderous article published by the *Oakland Enquirer* that the "illiterate . . . and dishonest Jap" had murdered the "lovable" artist.¹⁰³ In another attempt to influence potential jurors Mary E. Hand and DeNeale Morgan, in their *official* capacity as president and secretary of the Carmel Arts and Crafts Club, drafted, signed and circulated in September of 1914 a letter which proposed to "clear a blameless woman's memory from the baseless aspersions of her murderer."¹⁰⁴ Their rendition of the facts "confirmed" that Miss Smith's acquaintance with Kodani was slight. It soon became clear that the vast majority of Carmelites knew of Miss Smith's private life with the Japanese photographer, were deeply saddened by her tragic death and wanted to put the whole affair behind them. Most, but not all, did just that.

During these frenetic events in August and September William Merritt Chase, Jennie Cannon and the remaining summer students took a decidedly Buddhist approach. After August 20th there is not a single mention in Cannon's diary of the Smith tragedy, but instead there are reports on studios and "jolly" social events. On August 24th, the first Monday criticism after Smith's

body was discovered, Chase did not speak, but in the afternoon he painted an aquatic still life that was to become a prize for the September 14th student competition. Regarding this subject, Jennie marveled: "They [the fishes] really trickled from the ends of his fingers."¹⁰⁵ The next day Chase spoke in the studio, which was engaged in a portrait exercise, and Cannon noted:¹⁰⁶

Mr. Chase said . . . not to paint one's friends. If one did, he should not give them away. A given thing was not appreciated in any case. He is right.

He gets up fresh every morning [with] a new viewpoint. The day is before him. He has burned bridges behind him. He looks large, but is small. Whether it is his proportion or his spirit makes him seem larger, I cannot say.

The following Saturday, August 29th, she was invited to the Townsleys where Chase and some of his former students, who called themselves the "Venice crowd," had "such fun telling stories" and listening to Lois' piano recital.¹⁰⁷ Jennie was completely fatigued after his Monday criticism two days later. The great painter was especially ebullient after September 4th, when the Fine Arts Department announced that he had been assigned a "private" gallery at San Francisco's PPIE.¹⁰⁸ On September 12th Jennie still had not found the subject for her "queer" in the second competition despite the advisory from her teacher that "beautiful things be all about one." That same afternoon the Chase class visited the studio-residence of William Ritschel near Point Lobos to view his seascapes that were soon to be sent to New York for winter exhibitions. Jennie's close friend, Ada Morse Clark, was a guest of the Ritschels at this time.¹⁰⁹ Two days later Chase lectured on Piloty and awarded the first prize for queers to John Butler and the second prize to Louise Crow. Jennie believed that these awards were well-deserved, unlike those in the first competition.¹¹⁰

Because of her long association with Chase, Mrs. Cannon also had private meetings with the New York painter in his Monterey studio. On September 9th she saw his "very fine . . . studies of fishes – rock cods, etc. . . . Also a study of geraniums arranged . . . on a shawl white in color."¹¹¹ In her diary she included very crude sketches of two Chase paintings: a study of arranged geraniums in a tall conventional vase and a rock cod still life with a container at the right. The latter corresponds to the *Fish Still Life* in the Chase catalogue raisonné.¹¹² Chase developed a somewhat odd reputation along the docks of Monterey for sketching fish that were still breathing.¹¹³ On another visit to his studio, when many of his students were present, DeNeale Morgan described how Chase "pulled off" several monotypes which eager pupils drew lots for.¹¹⁴ At the session on September 15th Chase spoke to Cannon:¹¹⁵

He told me this morning that he had been to look at my Marine again and that it was splendid [Plate 4b; Appendix 6]. He said it was the kind of thing I could sign and send to an exhibition. [Chase] said I had not arrived yet, but that it was good. When I said that my work was uneven. He said everybody is, who is worthwhile. The students were delighted to hear him say this.

The next day William Ritschel came to see Jennie's same Marine:¹¹⁶

He said it was quite an achievement . . . the best I had done. Well that is only one [painting], now I must go to work. It means much to have two such views as Mr. Chase and Mr. Ritschel speak well of one's work.

Jennie was frequently present for the Chase-Ritschel meetings. At one such gathering she included in her diary:¹¹⁷

I went with Dr. and Mrs. MacDougal to the Ritschels. Mr. Chase came down also. Mr. R[itschel] was charming. [He] has the simplicity of a child. As a medium he uses flax

oil, which is clarified linseed oil. Keeps canvases from cracking. He rolls his large canvases. Mr. Chase uses the same varnish.

Jennie was invited to these meetings because she had reached that degree of competency to be regarded as a peer. Her artistic prowess was confirmed when Rabjohn & Morcom, one of the most prominent private galleries in San Francisco, added Jennie's oil paintings to its 1914 Fall Exhibition of "Carmel and Southern California Artists" which included works by William Adam, C. P. Townsley, J. Edward Walker, Benjamin Brown, Granville Redmond and Maurice Braun.¹¹⁸ This was the first time that Carmel artists had been singled out as a distinct entity in a San Francisco gallery.

On September 18th Chase gave his farewell talk to the class and Jennie found it "impossible to keep from crying a part of the time." His charisma affected everyone and he was quite simply "a wonderful personality."¹¹⁹ DeNeale Morgan quoted his last words to the class: "I wish to express to you, my students, what a real pleasure you have been to me, out here in California, I have enjoyed being with you, teaching you what I could, and trust you will feel that you have gained something in your work."¹²⁰ Jennie departed Carmel late that afternoon and reached her home in Palo Alto, where Will and the boys were waiting.¹²¹ Two days later Townsley and his entire family left for their new home in Pasadena.¹²² Just prior to his departure, Chase was given a "stag-dinner" at the Del Monte Hotel and numerous laudatory speeches.¹²³ He was physically and emotionally drained by his experience in Carmel. In 1915 he briefly returned to San Francisco to supervise his gallery at the PPIE, but made no attempt to return to the Monterey Peninsula.

During Kodani's trial in October of 1914 DeNeale Morgan gave evidence that she had seized – without obtaining permission from the investigating police – a pair of broken spectacles from Smith's home and had her Oakland optometrist confirm that they belonged to the deceased. Morgan wanted to show that the murder was premeditated, occurred in the artist's bungalow and was not the result of a spontaneous tryst on the beach. However, this tampered evidence and her theories proved to be useless.¹²⁴ Kodani's confessions and the trial itself were marred by procedural errors that today call into question the legitimacy of the proceedings.¹²⁵ The presiding judge rudely castigated the divided jury which settled on life imprisonment instead of the death penalty.¹²⁶ Apparently, there was sufficient evidence to rule out premeditation and to confirm that Smith and Kodani were lovers. Miss Morgan was not prosecuted for removing and tampering with evidence in a capital case. The blatant racism in the press and among many of the Carmel gentry in 1914 was and remains unforgivable. Unfortunately, both Frank Powers and James Franklin Devendorf were absent from Carmel for most of that summer.¹²⁷ Their presence and sound judgment would have done much to mitigate the hysteria. Equally unforgivable was the deliberate isolation of the Japanese community in Carmel in the months following. The boycott of all Japanese products and labor was so effective that by March of 1915 the *Carmel Pine Cone* announced in the manner of a weather report: "Carmel's Japanese colony is considerably diminished, owing to the recent departure of a large number, who will make their homes at or near Castroville."¹²⁸ That August the *Pine Cone* published on its front page a poetic letter from Kodani in which he offered his deepest regrets over the killing of his beloved friend and admitted that his only solace was in operating the prison's photo gallery.¹²⁹ This letter, which was excerpted from the *Salinas Journal*, was accompanied by a Carmel editorial declaring that his punishment did not fit the crime and that he would have hung but for the duplicity of one pacifist juror. In the spring of 1924 the Monterey County District Attorney "vigorously protested against the granting of a parole

or pardon” for Kodani and the State Prison Board acted in accordance with that request.¹³⁰ When Kodani died of pneumonia at Folsom Prison in September of 1930, the *Pine Cone* called him “Carmel’s famous criminal,” summarized his capture and noted that he was repeatedly denied parole by those “who felt that justice had been lax in the sentencing of this murderer.”¹³¹

Jennie greeted the fall of 1914 with new vigor and an unwavering determination to succeed as a professional artist. The second half of September was occupied with “motherly duties” and “settling the house.” There were visits to her home by numerous artists, including C. P. Townsley and two of the winners of the Chase prizes in Carmel, Elena Kellogg and John Butler.¹³² After only one week at home Will left on a prolonged trip to Carmel and Tucson. One of his tasks was to plan an expedition in the Arizona desert with Daniel MacDougal and the artist William Silva.¹³³ While some of Jennie’s free time in October was spent designing the garden, most of her efforts were devoted to the chaotic art scene in San Francisco. The promising experiment with a permanent Gallery of Women Artists ended after one brief and successful exhibition which probably included Cannon’s work. Unfortunately, political bickering among its many officers led to the Gallery’s demise.¹³⁴ The long-established San Francisco Art Association suffered an internal revolt over control of the organization by many of its “working artists.” According to Michael Williams’ article in the *San Francisco Examiner*, the city’s most prominent artists defected to the Sketch Club which changed its name to the “San Francisco Society of Artists” and reorganized its by-laws “to put artistic merit in a primary place in considering pictures for exhibition.”¹³⁵ Obviously, the issue of impartiality in jury selections was the major concern. As an active member of the Sketch Club Jennie stood on the side of the rebels, but she was not in a leadership position. Unfortunately, this new Society of Artists did not long survive. Jennie’s immediate concern was to produce two oil paintings for submission to the Exhibition Committee of the PPIE. Typically, she had doubts about the merits of her work, but the Committee decided to exhibit one of the submissions in an auxiliary show.¹³⁶ She was also invited by the Woman’s Club of Palo Alto to give a series of lectures on the art at the PPIE.¹³⁷

A stream of visitors enlightened Jennie on the current “art scene” in Carmel. The best informed was Ada Morse Clark who had just spent many weeks with the Ritschels. It seems that a minor scandal involved Annie Traquair Lang, the East Coast painter who studied with Chase in New York, Philadelphia and Carmel. She was accused of painting a very unconventional portrait of William Ritschel with Mrs. Jane Powers in the latter’s garden.¹³⁸ Jennie also records one of Ada Clark’s rather gossipy stories about the Ritschels’ maid:¹³⁹

We listened to tales about William Ritschel with whom Mrs. Clark has been staying. Sara, a colored woman, rules the house as a saint. She says that at night all the doors were opened thru the house and Sara would sing melodies. This after all lights were out. [She] calls Mr. Ritschel, *Bro Ritschel*.

Jennie found other diversions in reading a biography of Charlotte Bronte and driving the Maxwell “into town” for concerts, theatre and occasional church attendance. She lunched with faculty wives and close friends, including Louise MacDougal, accepted a commission for a painting and even went out dancing with a female friend.¹⁴⁰ She showed no hesitation in leaving her sons alone for a few days to make them “self-reliant” and reluctantly tolerated her husband’s prolonged absences with a certain stoicism. However, when Will returned on Thanksgiving after ten weeks away and then quickly abandoned his family for most of December, Jennie commented at Christmas: “I much

regret the boys must be away from him so much . . . rather lonesome to have Will gone.”¹⁴¹ That Will was not there to see his own sons become men and help with all the typical adolescent problems was a source of constant anxiety for Jennie. At this time she still had no inkling of Will’s protracted affair with Ella Shaw Varney. Surprisingly, Jennie was still busy with correspondence regarding the petty logistics of the Chase Summer School.

Years later, when Jennie Cannon carefully evaluated the importance of his visit, she concluded that “William Merritt Chase was an excellent teacher and an interesting personality, but fundamentally speaking, his visit did not change the art contours of the West.”¹⁴² With the exception of Carmel she believed that most of the artists of *northern* California abruptly made the leap from the somber Barbizon and Tonalist aesthetics to the Modernist movements without embracing a transitional Impressionism as their counterparts had done in the southern half of the state. As discussed in Chapter 7 Chase had a profound impact on the development of Carmel as an art colony. On a more personal level his teachings led to significant changes in the style and palette of his students. DeNeale Morgan abandoned her Tonalist tendencies to favor bright contrasting colors. E. Charlton Fortune was prior to 1914 a painter “primarily of portraits and figure studies,” but after Chase’s summer class “she began to work in the colorful, high-key manner that distinguishes her art.”¹⁴³ Many of the painters associated with the Carmel colony embraced facets of the Impressionist aesthetic for part of their careers before developing their unique Post-Impressionist styles. It is clear that the Chase Summer School brought the last wave of Impressionism at a time when it had nearly disappeared in France, its point of origin, and was declining on the East Coast of the United States.¹⁴⁴ Despite its tardiness Carmel’s regional school created some of the most highly original work in the genre.

It is unfortunate that much of the historiography on the 1914 Chase Summer School has distorted the events. No one has discussed the tragic murder of one of his students and the hysteria that engulfed the Peninsula. Instead this is replaced with the gentle Bohemian image of inspired artists at their seaside arcadia. In Eunice Gray’s account of Carmel’s Arts and Crafts Club she reminisced on the great summer school and dismissed Jennie Cannon’s role as a mere agent of the Club.¹⁴⁵ In 1926, when the State of California published in five volumes its official history, Rockwell Hunt concluded the list of Cannon’s artistic accomplishments with:¹⁴⁶

She thought of and helped to make possible financially the Out of Door School, conducted by William Merritt Chase, at Carmel . . . That move worked out advantageously for Mr. Chase, as well as the artists of the western coast.

Despite this attempt to correct the historical record, a decade later Gene Hailey said of E. Charlton Fortune: “In 1914 Miss Fortune suggested that her old friend, William Merritt Chase . . . come to Carmel and teach rather than go to Italy as he had planned.”¹⁴⁷ This statement displays a profound misunderstanding of the history, logistics, motives and timing of Chase’s visit as outlined in this chapter. It is remotely possible that Fortune wrote to Chase in 1914 to welcome his impending arrival, but there are *absolutely no references* in her carefully catalogued correspondence and autobiographical essay to indicate that she had any involvement in bringing the New York painter to Carmel.¹⁴⁸ Hailey’s story undoubtedly annoyed many who knew these events firsthand. Not long thereafter the editor of the *Carmel Pine Cone* invited Jennie to recount the “facts” of why and how Chase came to Carmel. In her article she credits Devendorf, herself and Townsley with creating the Chase Summer School.¹⁴⁹

Beginning in the mid 1980s, long after all the protagonists had died, writers were so eager to produce coffee table books on Carmel artists that they failed to conduct even the most rudimentary research on their subjects. They simply assumed that one of two prominent artists on the Monterey peninsula was responsible for Chase's visit. Unlike Jennie Cannon, both had been permanent residents. E. Charlton Fortune became the most popular candidate despite the lack of even circumstantial evidence.¹⁵⁰ The great doyen of the Art and Crafts Club, DeNeale Morgan, is also credited with the same act.¹⁵¹ This association was made despite the fact that Morgan never left California to study with Chase, never contacted Chase or his manager, and never claimed credit in her lifetime. In fact, when Morgan wrote "a memoir" for the William Merritt Chase Memorial Service of 1916 in her capacity as "art chairman" of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, she made *absolutely no mention* of contacting Chase prior to his arrival in Carmel.¹⁵² One historian has tried to solve this dilemma by asserting without any evidence that Fortune and Morgan were jointly responsible.¹⁵³ The issue has reached such a ridiculous level that in order to enhance an early artist's reputation for a forthcoming exhibit and sale it has almost become de rigueur to mention discreetly in the catalogue – and of course without a footnote – that: "He persuaded Chase to come in 1914."¹⁵⁴

Endnotes – Chapter Five

- ¹ I make no attempt to supply new material on Chase's life prior to 1912, but provide only a brief summary from two competent sources: Pisano, *Chase*, pp.13-111, 121-27, 135-54, 163-83; and Bryant, pp.1-310.
- ² Pisano, *Chase*, p.181; Bryant, pp.213-17.
- ³ Cannon, *Drama*, p.105. This story is confirmed by Chase's close friend, Gustav Kobbe, whose prominent article entitled "Whole Gallery for Chase" appeared in the Sunday *New York Herald* (*NYH*, June 27, 1915, p.6). Newspapers in California carried the bulletin that Chase was *first* assigned his "exclusive" gallery at the PPIE in early September of 1914 (*SFC*, September 6, 1914, p.54; *MDC*, September 9, 1914, p.3; cf., Bryant, pp.230f and Roof, p.252).
- ⁴ *CPC*, January 10, 1930, p.9.
- ⁵ Bryant, p.208; cf. Bryant, pp. 24, 47, 76, 124.
- ⁶ Bryant, pp.253f. In the spring of 1914 Chase made a brief trip to London, ostensibly to visit artist-friends. It is possible that he was also examined by Harley Street doctors who confirmed the opinions of his New York specialists on the gravity of his condition. Bryant's supposition that Chase may have accepted the Carmel position in 1914 because of the rumored threat of war in Europe and his fear of a long ocean voyage is disproved by Chase himself (cf., Bryant, p. 250; Howell, p.110). Chase officially accepted the Carmel appointment in February of 1913, long before any specific threat of hostilities in Europe. Equally erroneous is Bryant's contention that E. Charlton Fortune "led" the "vigorous art colony" in Carmel. Fortune lived in Monterey during the summer months only and in 1914 visited Carmel to attend Chase's classes (Refer to biography on Fortune in Appendix 7 and notes 150 and 153 below).
- ⁷ Bryant, pp.135-38, 208, 250; Roof, p.251; Pisano, *Summer*, p.12.
- ⁸ Van Wyck Brooks, *An Autobiography*, New York, 1965, pp.194, 199.
- ⁹ *TOT*, November 15, 1907, p.4; cf. Chapter 2, note 152.
- ¹⁰ Hale, p.22; Temple, pp.85-106.
- ¹¹ Elsie Whitaker Martinez describes the literati of Carmel as being very transitory (Whitaker, pp.160ff).
- ¹² Mr. Search was frequently accompanied by the pianist Robert Rolland Lippett (*MDC*: July 31, 1914, p.1; August 16, 1914, p.4; August 18, 1914, p.3; September 3, 1915, p.1). Search's fashionable "private" beach parties as well as his participation in local dances and musical events were extensively covered in the local society pages (*MDC*: July 21, 1914, p.3; July 29, 1914, p.3; August 11, 1914, p.3; August 12, 1914, p.4; September 19, 1914; cf., Cannon, *Diaries*: August 24; September 7, 1914; Hale, p.45).
- ¹³ Michael Williams, "The Forest Theatre at Carmel," *SNT* 29.3, 1912, pp.319-325. The political in-fighting of Carmel's theatrical personalities provided amusing anecdotes for the San Francisco press (*SFX*: April 27, 1913, p.45; May 25, 1913, p.46; June 29, 1913, p.44). The published reviews of the plays, often written by Frank Powers, were designed ultimately to encourage tourism (*SFX*: July 27, 1913, p.71; August 17, 1913, p.35). In the early years these productions proved to be very profitable (cf., Hale, pp.44-46; *MDC*, July 1, 1914, p.4; *SJM*: June 4, 1914, p.3; June 19, 1914, p.15; June 20, 1914, p.11).
- ¹⁴ *MDC*: May 13, 1914, p.1; July 15, 1914, p.3; July 17, 1914, p.4; July 21, 1914, p.2.
- ¹⁵ Connie Wright, "Those MacGowan Sisters," *Carmel Residents Association Newsletter*, May, 2002, pp.9-11.
- ¹⁶ Augusta Fink, *I-Mary, A Biography of Mary Austin*, Tucson, 1983, p.171. Chase met with Mary Austin at several Carmel "teas" and privately in his studio where he finished her portrait. Her "pushiness and claims to extra-sensory perceptions" apparently did not alienate the New York artist (cf., Walker, pp.24ff; *The Chronology of American*

- Literature*, ed. Daniel S. Burt, New York, 2004, pp.308, 311, 323-26, 345, 368; *Western Trails, A Collection of Short Stories by Mary Austin*, ed. Melody Graulich, Las Vegas, 1987, pp.4-19).
- ¹⁷ Cannon, *Diaries*, February 11, 1914; cf. Cannon, *Drama*, pp.105f.
- ¹⁸ A list of the 1914 Arts and Crafts Club courses reveals that painting was not offered because of the Chase Summer School (SJM, June 28, 1914, p.11). The official brochure of the 1914 Summer School Program of the Arts and Crafts Club is glued into the Club's *Scrapbook* at the History Room Archives of the Harrison Memorial Library, Carmel. The brochure, which was published in the spring, shows that Mary Hand and Mary DeNeale Morgan were reelected to their previous positions as president and secretary. Helena W. Smith was replaced by Mrs. Sydney Yard as the Club's director. The 1914 summer classes of the Club opened on July 6th and closed on August 14th. As in the previous year Josephine Culbertson taught pottery and Ida Johnson instructed the class in china painting and porcelain design. Two notable additions to the summer staff were Anita L. Murray, the Seaside-Pacific Grove painter who taught French, and Laura Adams Armer, the renowned Berkeley artist who taught advanced photography. The Club's Annual Exhibition of Paintings, which was incorrectly labeled as the "7th Annual," was to be held in July and August. At present no list of exhibitors has been located.
- ¹⁹ CPC, January 10, 1930, p.9.
- ²⁰ SFX, February 24, 1914, p.1. Michael Williams authored this piece as well as an earlier "art note" that announced for the second time the coming of Chase to Carmel (SFX, February 1, 1914, p.25). However unjust this compromise may appear, Jennie Cannon showed no hesitation in sharing honors with the Arts and Crafts Club. The important point was to establish the Chase School in the West. The last published announcement that failed to credit the Arts and Crafts Club with bringing Chase to Carmel appeared in the *Monterey Daily Cypress* (MDC, February 25, 1914, p.1). What Cannon could not control was the steady flow of "unauthorized" articles that gave her exclusive credit for Chase. For example, she was given prominent billing in a notice that appeared in the *San Francisco Call* (SFL, March 22, 1914, p.13; this article is also pasted in the Arts and Crafts Club *Scrapbook*): "The establishment of the school is the direct result of Mrs. Jennie V. Cannon's continued efforts Herself a painter of no mean ability, she pointed out to Chase the glories of California and the beauties of Carmel." In 1930, a few years after the Arts and Crafts Club had officially dissolved, Cannon publicly declared in the *Carmel Pine Cone* that: "The Arts and Crafts did not seek Chase" (CPC, January 10, 1930, p.9).
- ²¹ SJM, May 2, 1914, p.5.
- ²² MDC, February 10, 1914, p.1. Williams seems to have divided his time between Carmel and San Francisco (MDC, September 26, 1914, p.4; Cannon, *Diaries*, March 8, 1914). The Cannons frequently socialized with Michael and Peggy Williams (Cannon, *Diaries*: June 4-5, 15-16, August 18, 23, 1914 and especially Chapter 4, note 126).
- ²³ NYT, February 1, 1914, p.M-15; LAT, March 8, 1914, p.3-5. Michael Williams, who also wrote art reviews for the *San Francisco Examiner*, echoed the sentiments of the *New York Times* (SFX, February 8, 1914, p.35).
- ²⁴ The local Directory lists W. A. Cannon as a "professor at Stanford" and Mrs. W. A. Cannon as a "housewife." Both officially resided at 1727 Waverley Street in Palo Alto (*The Directory of Palo Alto, Mayfield and Stanford University for 1914-15*, Palo Alto, 1914, p.34).
- ²⁵ Cannon, *Diaries*: February 7, March 19, 1914.
- ²⁶ Ibid.: March 6, 12, 1914.
- ²⁷ Ibid.: March 30, April 24, 1914.
- ²⁸ Ibid.: February 8, 15, March 13, 15, 18, 30, 1914.
- ²⁹ Ibid.: April 27-28, 1914.
- ³⁰ Ibid.: May 11-21, June 27-30, 1914.
- ³¹ SFL, May 9, 1914, pp.1, 3.
- ³² SFX, May 10, 1914, pp.1, 60. *The Oakland Tribune* claimed that the poisoning "rendered the literati wild with fear" and its staff writer delighted in ridiculing George Sterling and Perry Newberry as "poetic astrologer-detectives" (TOT, May 10, 1914, p.17).
- ³³ MDC, March 21, 1914, p.6.
- ³⁴ NYT, May 10, 1914, p.3.1; LAT, May 10, 1914, p.1-4.
- ³⁵ MDC, May 13, 1914, p.1. Five months later Alice MacGowan would accuse the gentry of Carmel, the local press and the Monterey authorities of conspiring to suppress the investigation of her poisoning (SFL, August 19, 1914, p.14; MDC, August 20, 1914, p.2). Later a grand jury investigation into the poisoning found no evidence of a cover-up (MDC, October 2, 1914, p.1).
- ³⁶ Cannon, *Diaries*, May 26, 1914. The fact that Jennie saw Alice MacGowan in Carmel on May 26th refutes the published report that she had fled her home (TOT, May 12, 1914, p.9).
- ³⁷ SFC, June 28, 1914, p.30.
- ³⁸ Cannon, *Diaries*, May 22, 1914.
- ³⁹ Ibid.: May 22; June 6, 15-16, 1914. Throughout the summer Jennie mentions that "the weather stays foggy all the while – six sunny days out of six weeks" (ibid., July 5, 14, 1914).
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., June 21, 1914. Mrs. Townsley, accompanied by the couple's "two talented young daughters," arrived from New York about June 10th (SJM, June 7, 1914, p.15). William Cannon maintained a decidedly low profile throughout the summer. His only complaint dealt with the paucity of carpenters (MacDougal, May 14, 1914 Letter from Cannon to MacDougal, Box 16, Folder 228, p.1). His one scheduled lecture in Carmel appears to have been cancelled (MDC, August 8, 1914, p.3).
- ⁴¹ Cannon, *Diaries*, May 27, 1914.
- ⁴² Ibid., June 17, 1914.
- ⁴³ Ibid., June 21, 1914; MDC, August 4, 1914, p.3.

- ⁴⁴ Appendix 5; Cannon, *Diaries*: June 16, July 1, 1914; cf. MDC, July 19, 1914, p.1. The Society of Monterey Artists, which was founded about 1913, received little recognition outside of Monterey. On one occasion its members discussed the possibility with Everett Maxwell of exhibiting at the new municipal art gallery in Los Angeles, but the organization apparently folded before an exhibition was assembled (MDC, March 17, 1914, p.1; SFC, March 29, 1914, p.19). To the great annoyance of the *Monterey Daily Cypress*, the *American Art Annual* refused to recognize the city of Monterey as an "art center" (MDC, March 20, 1914, p.3).
- ⁴⁵ MDC, July 26, 1914, p.4; AAA 11, 1914, p.353; biography on Martinez in Appendix 7. In the *American Art Annual* the class taught by Martinez and Johonnot was officially listed alongside the Chase Summer School.
- ⁴⁶ Cannon, *Diaries*, July 2-3, 1914; cf., SJM: June 28, 1914, p.11; July 10, 1914, p.11; Bryant, p.251. There is no documentary evidence that Chase stayed with Jean Mannheim prior to his arrival in Carmel (Reitzell, p.70). Chase and his wife traveled via St. Louis and Salt Lake to see the PPIE officials in San Francisco before going to Carmel.
- ⁴⁷ Cannon, *Diaries*, July 4, 1914; cf., MDC: July 1, 1914, p.4; July 7, 1914, pp.1, 4.
- ⁴⁸ Cannon, *Diaries*, July 11, 1914.
- ⁴⁹ TWP, December 30, 1916, pp.10f.
- ⁵⁰ Cannon, *Diaries*: July 6-10, 13-31, 1914. For the similarities to Chase's Shinnecock Summer School see: Appendix 3; Ronald G. Pisano, *William Merritt Chase*, New York, 1979, p.60; Pisano, *Chase*, pp.121ff.
- ⁵¹ The Powers' house (near North San Antonio) had convenient access to the Seventeen Mile Drive and the Del Monte Forest with sweeping views to the north and west (Clark, pp.75, 133, 387, 522; Hale, p.12; Spangenberg, p.48).
- ⁵² The portrait of the child does not appear in the Chase catalogue raisonné and its location is presently unknown. At this time William A. Clark, a United States Senator from Montana and a newly appointed trustee of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, was a guest at the Del Monte Hotel which provided a convenient place for his sittings with Chase (MDC, July 16, 1914, p.3; cf., CPC, April 14, 1915, p.2). The Chase catalogue provides a color reproduction of this portrait, but erroneously dates it to 1915 (Ronald G. Pisano et al., *William Merritt Chase: Portraits in Oil*, vol. 2, *The Complete Catalogue of Known and Documented Works by William Merritt Chase [1849-1916]*, New Haven, 2006, OP.564, p.266).
- ⁵³ This painting, titled *A Northern California Coastal Landscape – 1914*, was sold at Butterfields in December of 2001 and was reproduced in color for the auction catalogue (B & B, December 12, 2001, No. 5206). The Chase catalogue raisonné has a smaller color reproduction of this work with the title *Coastal Landscape, California (Carmel-by-the-Sea)* (Ronald G. Pisano et al., *William Merritt Chase: Landscapes in Oil*, vol. 3, *The Complete Catalogue of Known and Documented Works by William Merritt Chase [1849-1916]*, New Haven, 2009, L.327, p.155). This oil on canvas, which may have been the "demonstration piece" given to Louise Crow as a "student prize," was painted from the field directly west of Mrs. Powers' home in an area that is presently at the northern extremity of Carmel Beach City Park (Clark, p.74). It depicts the unencumbered view directly north. In the background stands Arrowhead Point where the Pebble Beach Golf Course is located today (Clark, pp.20f). Outside of Carmel and probably near Point Lobos Chase painted another coastal scene: *California Coast Landscape* (Pisano et al., vol. 3, L.331, p.156f). Chase also painted three landscapes in Monterey, all showing the distinctive telegraph/telephone poles (Pisano et al., vol. 3, L.328, L.329, L.330, pp.155f; cf., Gerdt and South, pp.160, 166; Pisano, *Summer*, pp.16, 141).
- ⁵⁴ A few weeks earlier Chase awarded the third prize at the Summer Exhibition of the Society of Monterey Artists to Isabelle Percy for her pastel study entitled "Sweet Pea Garden" (MDC, July 19, 1914, p.1; cf., Cannon, *Diaries*, July 26, 31, 1914 and the biography on Percy-West in Appendix 7). Percy evidently gave several "teas" for Chase. On one occasion in the presence of Mrs. Chase Francis McComas, the famous watercolorist, and his wife "assisted" Percy with the arrangements (TOT, August 11, 1914, p.16; TAT, August 15, 1914, p.110).
- ⁵⁵ MDC, July 19, 1914, p.1; July 23, 1914, p.4. Katherine Roof makes no mention of Rice Cottage, but implies that Chase located himself at once in the Del Monte and quickly found a "small studio" in Monterey (Roof, p.247). Evidence indicates that he and Mrs. Chase first visited the Del Monte resort on July 9th (TOT, July 10, 1914, p.15).
- ⁵⁶ Cannon, *Diaries*, July 28, 1914.
- ⁵⁷ TOT, July 21, 1914, p.12.
- ⁵⁸ TOT: July 25, 1914, pp.7f; July 28, 1914, p.15. Ironically, at one of these receptions Chase gave an "informal talk" that was a "discourse on the high ideals in art, versus the commercial interest to which so many artists surrender."
- ⁵⁹ Bryant, pp.175f, 208.
- ⁶⁰ Appendix 3; CPC, January 10, 1930, p.9.
- ⁶¹ Even Jennie Cannon declared: "I shall never more travel in Germany. I despise them now." She was heartbroken by the capture and destruction of so many of her beloved Belgium towns (Cannon, *Diaries*: August 2-3, 18; September 10; October 9, 14, 1914).
- ⁶² MDC, July 21, 1914, p.3.
- ⁶³ After visiting the "Feast of Lanterns" in Pacific Grove, the Cannons attended the evening performance of *The Arrow-Maker* (Cannon, *Diaries*, July 25, 1914; MDC, July 21, 1914, p.2; July 23, 1914, p.3; July 26, 1914, p.4). The two other plays that summer were *A Mission Story* and *Montezuma* (SFX, June 6, 1914, p.6). The Cannons' close friend, Dr. Daniel MacDougal of the Carnegie Institute, shouldered most of the costs for Austin's production because he had started (or was about to begin) a very secret and enduring love affair with that writer. His own artist-wife, Louise, was revolted by his constant demands for sex and found consolation in her daughter, Alice, and female friends, especially Jennie Cannon (Augusta Fink, *I-Mary, A Biography of Mary Austin*, Tucson, 1983, pp.170, 182, 192, 195, 206-13; cf. Esther L. Stineman, *Mary Austin, Song of a Maverick*, New Haven, 1989, pp.124-26, 132).
- ⁶⁴ Cannon, *Diaries*, August 19, 1914. Chase's portrait of Mary Austin is not mentioned again by Cannon, but it may be the "very picturesque subject" that he describes in a September letter to his wife (Roof, pp.248-50). Austin's portrait does not appear in the Chase catalogue raisonné. The kimono portrait of C. P. Townsley's daughter, which Chase called *The Flame*, was enthusiastically received (Pisano et al., vol. 2, as cited above in note 52, OP.562, p.265).

- ⁶⁵ Cannon, *Diaries*, August 4, 1914; MDC: July 31, 1914, p.4; August 6, 1914, p.4; August 8, 1914, p.3.
- ⁶⁶ MDC, August 14, 1914, p.3.
- ⁶⁷ Cannon, *Diaries*, August 10, 1914. Jennie spent part of Sunday, August 9th, with Chase in Monterey. Her diary entry consists of one of his "humorous stories" about his own inability to distinguish his "first pair of twin" by their names. That day he repeated his famous maxim: "Burn your bridges behind you. The day is before you."
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, July 12, 1914.
- ⁶⁹ MDC, September 3, 1915, p.1.
- ⁷⁰ MDC, July 31, 1914, p.4.
- ⁷¹ MDC: August 1, 1914, p.4; August 2, 1914, pp.1,3; CSM, August 1, 1914, p.22.
- ⁷² MDC, August 4, 1914, p.3; cf. Roof, p.247. The young artist, who attended the rodeo with Chase, was Myron Oliver.
- ⁷³ MDC, August 8, 1914, p.3. Euphemia Charlton Fortune's definition of "queers" is far more gritty: "*Queers* were limited in subject matter to old brooms, telegraph poles, sinks and garbage cans, some of the most ambitious going so far as to add dead cats and chickens to their compositions and always using tones and planes of bluish gray and umber" (E. Charlton Fortune, *Scrapbook*, Manuscript Archives of California Art, The Oakland Museum of California, p.7).
- ⁷⁴ MDC, August 12, 1914, p.2; Cannon, *Diaries*, August 10, 1914.
- ⁷⁵ MDC, August 14, 1914, p.3.
- ⁷⁶ SFB, August 14, 1914, p.4.
- ⁷⁷ SFB, August 15, 1914, p.3; MDC, August 15, pp.1, 4. The *San Francisco Chronicle* and the *San Francisco Call* carried restrained summaries of the events (SFC, August 15, 1914, p.9; SFL, August 15, 1914, p.1). The *San Francisco Examiner* added the curious point that Kodani asked for permission to join the search party on August 14th and this was apparently denied (SFX, August 15, 1914, p.1).
- ⁷⁸ SFC, August 15, 1914, p.9; TOT, August 15, 1914, p.8.
- ⁷⁹ MDC, August 16, 1914, p.4. Townsley's outdoor class was rescheduled with a live model in the garden of Mrs. Frank Powers (MDC, August 20, 1914, p.4).
- ⁸⁰ There is some confusion as to whether the Whistler lecture was given on the 19th, 20th or 21st of August (Cf., Roof, p.248; Cannon, *Diaries*, August 19, 1914; MDC, August 20, 1914, p.4).
- ⁸¹ MDC: August 8, 1914, p.3; August 21, 1914, p.4.
- ⁸² Two students are mentioned as leaving shortly before August 20th (MDC, August 20, 1914, p.4). The Monterey newspaper only records departures when the Carmel hotels submit the information, which is infrequently provided.
- ⁸³ MDC, August 16, 1914, p.4.
- ⁸⁴ Cannon, *Diaries*, August 20, 1914.
- ⁸⁵ MDC: August 16, 1914, pp.1, 4; August 18, 1914, p.4; August 22, 1914, p.1; SFX: August 17, 1914, p.12; August 18, 1914, p.4; August 19, 1914, p.4; August 20, 1914, p.8; SFB: August 18, 1914, p.5; August 19, p.4; SFC: August 18, 1914, p.5; TOT: August 19, 1914, p.4; August 20, 1914, p.13; August 21, 1914, p.4; SDI: August 14, 1914, pp.1, 5; August 15, 1914, p.1; August 17, 1914, p.5; August 18, 1914, pp.1,8; August 21, 1914, pp.1, 5; August 22, 1914, p.1; SJM: August 18, 1914, p.4; August 24, 1914, pp.1-3; SCN: August 19, 1914, p.1; August 22, 1914, p.3.
- ⁸⁶ The most vociferous newspaper was undoubtedly the *Oakland Enquirer*. The racist editorials in that publication elicited an outcry from the normally restrained Japanese community on the Monterey Peninsula (MDC, August 28, 1914, p.2; cf., MDC: September 1, 1914, p.3; September 4, 1914, p.1). Another highly inflammatory editorial appeared in *The Oakland Tribune* which characterized the "East" as evil (TOT, August 30, 1914, p.11).
- ⁸⁷ TOT, August 18, 1914, p.20.
- ⁸⁸ Conflicting press reports indicated that there were between one hundred and one hundred and sixty signatures (MDC, August 19, 1914, pp.2, 4; cf., TOT: August 18, 1914, p.20; August 19, 1914, p.9; SFX, August 18, 1914, p.4).
- ⁸⁹ MDC, August 19, 1914, p.2.
- ⁹⁰ According to Grace MacGowan Cooke, the winter population of Carmel adults is less than five hundred; that number triples in the summer to fifteen hundred (SFL, August 19, 1914, p.14). Assuming that women are at least half the population, then one hundred and fifty is twenty percent.
- ⁹¹ BDG, March 3, 1905, p.1.
- ⁹² The East Bay press repeatedly made disparaging comments about Kodani's family (TOT, August 30, 1914, p.11; cf., Hale, pp.155f; Monica Hudson and Suzanne Wood, *Images of America, Point Lobos*, Chicago, 2004, pp.7ff).
- ⁹³ This couple was married out of state to avoid the laws against miscegenation. Unfortunately, the marriage ended in a very messy separation which the *Carmel Pine Cone* conspicuously placed on its front page (CPC, October 6, 1915, p.1; cf., BDG, March 13, 1915, p.2; OVM 67.5, 1916, p.365).
- ⁹⁴ SFL, August 22, 1914, p.3.
- ⁹⁵ SFL, August 17, 1914, p.12; August 18, 1914, p.9.
- ⁹⁶ SFL, August 20, 1914, p.9; cf. TOT, August 21, 1914, p.4.
- ⁹⁷ SFL, August 19, 1914, p.14; cf. TOT, August 21, 1914, p.4.
- ⁹⁸ MDC, August 20, 1914, p.2.
- ⁹⁹ NYT, August 25, 1914, p.16; SFL, August 24, 1914, p.1.
- ¹⁰⁰ SFL: August 24, 1914, pp.1-2; August 25, 1914, p.5; August 27, 1914, p.8; August 31, 1914, p.5; September 4, 1914, p.10; October 19, 1914, p.2; October 21, 1914, p.14; October 22, 1914, p.9; October 24, 1914, p.2; TPE: August 22, 1914, p.3; August 24, 1914, p.12; August 26, 1914, p.5; August 28, 1914, p.20; October 22, 1914, p.3; MDC: August 25, 1914, pp.1, 4; August 26, 1914, p.4; August 27, 1914, p.1; August 29, 1914, pp.1, 4; August 30, 1914, pp.1-2; September 2, 1914, p.1; September 6, 1914, p.4; September 11, 1914, pp.2-3; September 15, 1914, p.1; September 22, 1914, p.1; September 29, 1914, p.1; October 6, 1914, p.1; October 18, 1914, p.1; October 20, 1914, p.1; October 22, 1914, p.1; October 23, 1914, p.1; October 24, 1914, p.1; October 25, 1914, p.1; SFX: August 23, 1914, p.1, 48;

August 24, 1914, pp.1, 5; August 25, 1914, pp.1, 6; August 26, 1914, p.5; August 27, 1914, p.5; August 28, 1914, p.11; SFB: August 24, 1914, p.1; August 25, 1914, p.9; August 27, 1914, p.8; October 24, 1914, p.16; SFC: August 23, 1914, p.31; August 24, 1914, pp.1, 5; August 25, 1914, pp.1, 5; August 26, 1914, p.15; August 27, 1914, p.11; August 28, 1914, p.8; September 1, 1914, p.5; October 24, 1914, p.16; October 25, 1914, p.1; TOT: August 23, 1914, p.20; August 24, 1914, p.9f; August 25, 1914, p.11; August 26, 1914, p.5; August 27, 1914, p.12; August 31, 1914, p.1; September 4, 1914, p.11; September 16, 1914, p.18; October 24, 1914, p.1; October 25, 1914, p.37; SDI: August 24, 1914, pp.1, 4, 8; August 25, 1914, p.1; August 28, 1914, p.8; September 3, 1914, p.1; LAT: August 24, 1914, p.1-3; August 25, 1914, p.1-3; September 1, 1914, p.1-4; SJM: August 28, 1914, p.13; September 1, 1914, p.12; SCN: August 24, 1914, p.8; August 25, 1914, p.8; TDR: October 23, 1914, p.1; October 23, 1914, p.1; *Napa Daily Journal*, August 25, 1914, p.1.

¹⁰¹ This photo in the *San Francisco Examiner* consumed about one-fourth of the entire page (SFX, August 24, 1914, p.5).

¹⁰² TOT, August 27, 1914, p.12; MDC, September 12, 1914, p.3.

¹⁰³ TPE, August 28, 1914, p.20.

¹⁰⁴ Miraculously, a carbon copy of this letter survives in the *Scrapbook of the Carmel Arts and Crafts Club* at the History Room Archives of the Harrison Memorial Library, Carmel.

¹⁰⁵ Cannon, *Diaries*, August 24, 1914.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, August 25, 1914; cf. Lauderbach, p.434. Despite this admonition, Chase frequently gifted his paintings. He did so with his portrait of C. P. Townsley. A black and white reproduction of this "oil sketch" is in David Edstrom's "A Friendly Suggestion about Art Schools," *California Southland*, 3.18, 1921, p.8. Since Townsley refers to his portrait by Chase in August of 1911, the date of 1914 assigned to the painting in the catalogue raisonné is obviously in error (Cf., note 101 in Chapter 4 and Pisano et al., vol. 2, as cited above in note 52, OP.551, p.260). Chase also gifted a "demonstration portrait" of his Monterey student and companion, Myron A. Oliver, to the subject (refer to note 72 above and to the biography on Oliver in Appendix 7). Color reproductions of this piece have appeared in an auction catalogue of Butterfield & Butterfield and in the Chase catalogue raisonné (B & B, June 15, 1995, No. 4204; Pisano et al., vol. 2, as cited above in note 52, OP. 560, p.264).

¹⁰⁷ Cannon, *Diaries*, August 29, 1914.

¹⁰⁸ SFC: September 6, 1914, p.54; September 13, 1914, p.28; MDC, September 9, 1914, p.3; note 3 above.

¹⁰⁹ Cannon, *Diaries*, September 12, 1914; MDC: September 13, 1914, p.3; October 6, 1914, p.2.

¹¹⁰ Cannon, *Diaries*, September 14, 1914.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, September 9, 1914. Jennie refers to several fish studies which may or may not include the fish still life that Chase executed on August 24th.

¹¹² Ronald G. Pisano et al., *William Merritt Chase: Still Lifes, Interiors, Figures, Copies of Old Masters, and Drawings*, vol. 4, *The Complete Catalogue of Known and Documented Work by William Merritt Chase (1849-1916)*, New Haven, 2010, SL.158, pp.68f. The Pisano catalogue also has a 1914 *Still Life with Fish and Brown Vase* that Chase probably painted in Monterey (*ibid.*, SL.159, p.69).

¹¹³ TOT, September 30, 1914, p.11. Chase also found his marine subjects at the local fish mongers and even painted the interior of one with the proprietor at work (Pisano et al., vol. 4, as cited above in note 112, I.54, p.121).

¹¹⁴ TWP, December 30, 1916, p.10. Ronald Pisano and his team have tentatively identified a number of the Chase monotypes that may date from his Carmel visit (Ronald G. Pisano et al., *William Merritt Chase: The Paintings in Pastel, Monotypes, Painted Tiles and Ceramic Plates, Watercolors, and Prints*, vol. 1, *The Complete Catalogue of Known and Documented Work by William Merritt Chase [1849-1916]*, New Haven, 2006, M.3-M.30, pp.49, 51-55, 59f).

¹¹⁵ Cannon, *Diaries*, September 15, 1914.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, September 16, 1914.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, September 13, 1914. In her diary Jennie also included rough sketches of three paintings by Ritschel (cf. Lauderbach, p.433).

¹¹⁸ SFC: September 6, 1914, p.17; September 13, 1914, p.28; September 27, 1914, p.19.

¹¹⁹ Cannon, *Diaries*, September 18, 1914.

¹²⁰ TWP, December 30, 1916, pp.10f.

¹²¹ Cannon, *Diaries*, September 18-19, 1914; MDC, September 22, 1914, p.1.

¹²² MDC, September 20, 1914, p.2.

¹²³ Roof, p.250.

¹²⁴ MDC, September 4, 1914, p.1; TDR, October 22, 1914, p.1. The biographies on Morgan written by Carmelites make no mention of her involvement in the Smith murder investigation (e.g., Donovan, p.77; Hale, pp.40f).

¹²⁵ *The Salinas Daily Index* had by far the most extensive coverage of the Kodani trial as well as the probate proceedings for the will of Helena Wood Smith (SDI: September 4, 1914, p.8; September 8, 1914, p.1; September 10, 1914, p.5; September 11, 1914, p.6; September 14, 1914, p.1; September 21, 1914, p.1; September 22, 1914, p.4; September 24, 1914, p.8; October 6, 1914, p.1; October 19, 1914, p.4; October 20, 1914, p.1; October 21, 1914, p.1; October 22, 1914, pp. 1, 4-5; October 23, 1914, pp.1, 8; October 24, 1914, p.1; October 26, 1914, p.1; October 28, 1914, p.1).

¹²⁶ MDC, October 28, 1914, p.1; SDI, October 27, 1914, pp.1, 8.

¹²⁷ In early August Frank Devendorf rushed off to rescue his wife and two of his daughters who were trapped in Brussels at the outbreak of World War I (TOT, August 11, 1914, p.4). Although Mrs. Powers was prominent in Carmel throughout the summer of 1914, her husband was frequently absent due to business commitments.

¹²⁸ CPC, March 31, 1915, p.4.

¹²⁹ CPC, August 25, 1915, p.1.

¹³⁰ CPC, June 21, 1924, p.4.

¹³¹ CPC, September 19, 1930, p.1.

- ¹³²Cannon, *Diaries*, September 19-22, 1914.
- ¹³³*Ibid.*, September 23-24, 1914. During her two-day visit to Carmel and Monterey in the late fall of 1914, Jennie examined Silva's desert studies before their exhibition in Los Angeles (*ibid.*, November 30 – December 1, 1914).
- ¹³⁴SFX: October 2, 1914, p.9; October 4, 1914, p.51. More than one hundred paintings were on display, but no complete list of contributors has yet been discovered.
- ¹³⁵SFX, October 6, 1914, p.7; SFC, October 11, 1914, p.26.
- ¹³⁶Cannon, *Diaries*: December 1, 8, 10, 22, 1914; cf., TOI, February 20, 1916, p.48; Jacobsen, p.535; Falk, p.560; Hughes, p.190.
- ¹³⁷Cannon, *Diaries*, November 9, 1914.
- ¹³⁸*Ibid.*, October 17-18, 1914. Annie T. Lang, who died in 1918, was a gifted artist and a favorite student of William Merritt Chase (Pisano et al., vol. 2, as cited above in note 52, OP.531, p.251). According to one report, her signature has been removed from paintings that have recently been reattributed to William Merritt Chase (Falk, p.1941).
- ¹³⁹Cannon, *Diaries*, October 17-18, 1914.
- ¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*, November 12-13, 1914.
- ¹⁴¹*Ibid.*, December 23-25, 1914.
- ¹⁴²CPC, January 10, 1930, p.9.
- ¹⁴³William Gerdtts in Jean Stern et al., *Masters of Light, Plein Air Painting in California 1890-1930*, Irvine, 2002, p. 60; cf., Barbara J. Klein, "The Carmel Monterey Peninsula Art Colony: A History," ART, 8.4 (September/October), 1996, p.113; Penny Perlmutter, "E. Charlton Fortune," in Howell, pp.24-27. The extent to which Fortune was influenced by the iconoclastic Albert Sterner and Frank DuMond during her tenure at the Art Students League is open to debate (Susan Landauer, "Searching for Selfhood: Women Artists of Northern California," in Trenton, p.19).
- ¹⁴⁴Terry St. John, "California Impressionism After 1915," in Jones, *Impressionism*, pp.16-18.
- ¹⁴⁵Regarding all aspects of the Chase visit, Eunice Gray specifically mentions Cannon only once: "with the help of Mrs. J. V. Cannon, . . . a correspondence was entered into with Mr. C. P. Townsley" (Gray, p.120). Miss Gray was a socially prominent member of the Carmel gentry, an amateur artist, journalist, poet and playwright. She even built her own home (MDC: August 2, 1914, p.1; August 14, 1914, p.3; March 9, 1917, p.3; CPC: November 1, 1916, p.1; September 30, 1938, p.7; E. T. Gray, "The Barnacle," *The Craftsman*, 22.6, 1912, pp.669-71).
- ¹⁴⁶Hunt, p.271.
- ¹⁴⁷Hailey, vol.12, p.60.
- ¹⁴⁸According to one of her biographers, Penny Perlmutter, Fortune's contact with Chase *prior* to the start of the 1914 Summer School was limited to a few months in 1910, when she was at the Art Students League in New York City (Howell, pp.26-27, 110; cf. Brennan, pp.12f). I suggest that Fortune had little time to study with Chase because she maintained her own portrait studio in 1910, the same year she traveled to Scotland. When she *officially* listed her New York art instructors in the *American Art Annual*, she makes no mention of Chase (AAA 12, 1915, p.374; cf. Fortune's biography in Appendix 7).
- ¹⁴⁹CPC, April 26, 1940, p.12.
- ¹⁵⁰How Fortune came to be credited in recent literature with bringing Chase to Carmel is actually a comedy of academic errors. In 1986 Raymond Wilson stated that "Chase . . . taught a class at Monterey in the summer of 1914 at which Fortune may have been present" (Westphal, *North*, p.14). Four years later in the first lengthy biography on Fortune Robert Brennan noted that Fortune "took credit – rather obliquely and without explanation" for Chase's presence in Carmel, but his co-author, Merle Schipper said that Chase was "probably persuaded by Fortune." Brennan and Schipper cite as their *sole justification* the quotation above from Raymond Wilson (Brennan, pp.15, 33, 52 note 9). This attempt to inflate Fortune's political importance has had an unfortunate ripple effect. In his justifiably acclaimed essay on Impressionism in California, Will South states that "Fortune claimed credit for Chase's presence in Carmel" and he cites as his source the above quoted passages from Brennan and Schipper (Gerdtts and South, pp.57, 76 note 81). Now that this association is engraved in stone writers no longer bother to cite a justification for Fortune's involvement, but simply assume such (cf., "William Merritt Chase, A Northern California Coastal Landscape, 1914," *Butterfields Auction Catalogue*, B & B, December 12, 2001, No. 5206, p.102; Janet Blake's biography of Fortune in D. Solon et al., *In and Out of California*, Laguna Beach, 2002, p.120; J. Stern et al., *Masters of Light*, Irvine, 2002, p.104; Gilliam, p.147). The most recent "chronology" on Fortune is more cautious and states that she only encouraged her "former teacher, William Merritt Chase to teach . . . on the Monterey peninsula" (Howell, p.110).
- ¹⁵¹Donovan, p.77; W. South et al., *Guy Rose, American Impressionist*, Oakland Museum, 1995, p.66. Apparently, the first to credit Morgan with bringing Chase to Carmel was Thelma B. Miller who penned a rather fanciful biography of Mary DeNeale in 1935 (CPC, March 8, 1935, p.2).
- ¹⁵²TWP, December 30, 1916, pp.10f.
- ¹⁵³Janet (Dominik) Blake in her biographies of Fortune and Morgan declared of the former that "it was at her urging that William Merritt Chase was invited to teach at the Carmel Summer School," but added the clarification that "at the urging of E. Charlton Fortune, Morgan invited William Merritt Chase to teach" (Westphal, *North*, pp.70, 122, 195 note 4, 196 note 5). Blake cites as her only source Terry St. John's "California Impressionism after 1915" (Jones, *Impressionism*, pp.17, 22 note 16). Unfortunately, St. John provides not a shred of evidence to support this association. Dominik repeats the same assertion in another biography (J. Stern et al., *Selections from the Irvine Museum*, Irvine, 1992, p.108; cf., William Gerdtts in Howell, pp.16, 121 note 3).
- ¹⁵⁴The most egregious example is the completely unjustified involvement of George D. Otis (*The Golden Gate Collection of Paintings by George Demont Otis, 1879-1962*, Exhibition Catalogue, October 12 – November 26, 1977, San Francisco, 1977, p.2).