1. "PINTOR Y ESCRITOR YO MISMO"

JEAN CHARLOT AS HISTORIAN OF MEXICAN ART

Une des raisons qui les font lire dans toute l'Europe, c'est qu'ils rendent justice à toutes les nations.

'One of the reasons why [French authors] are read throughout Europe is that they do justice to all nations.'

Voltaire: *Essai sur les mœurs et l'Esprit des Nations*.

J'ai rêvé un jour d'un critique amoureux de la peinture, penché avec tendresse sur l'œuvre de ces hommes égaux à lui, déchiffrant avec *respect* l'énigme de leur âme. Drôle de rêve, c'pas?

'One day I dreamed of a critic in love with painting, leaning with tenderness over the work of these men, his equals, deciphering with *respect* the enigma of their soul. Odd dream, no?'

Jean Charlot: "De la Critique et des Peintres" October-December 1922.

Jean Charlot's description of himself, 'I myself, painter and writer,' reveals his dual role in the Mexican Mural Renaissance.[1] As an artist, his work has been recognized as being at the foundation of the movement; a pioneer in style, themes, and media. Similarly, his writings form a basis, considered indispensable, of our understanding the movement.[2] Even more important, Charlot's early writings were a formative influence on the mural movement, shaping its general direction and the self-understanding of the individual artists. This was true of printmaking as well: he "published two celebrated articles that modified the course of the Mexican graphic arts" on José Guadalupe Posada and Manuel Manilla.[3] Charlot's colleagues understood and appreciated his dual role. Xavier Guerrero wrote Charlot on March 3, 1951, thanking him for his book: "está escrito por un pintor que sabe de lo que trata y también el valor de las palabras" 'it is written by a painter who knows both his own craft and also the value of words.'

Charlot arrived in Mexico in 1921 both as a young artist whose work was already attracting attention in France and as a published author and lecturer (Volume 1, John Charlot 2006: chapters 5 and 8). He had been reared surrounded by Mexican artworks and in frequent contact with writers on Mexican culture, like Désiré Charnay. Indeed, Charlot's first historical project on a Mexican subject was started when he was sixteen: a *catalogue raisonné* of the collection of his great-uncle Eugène Goupil, "Notes sur la Collection Aubin–Goupil à la Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris" (1914).[4] Charlot's final project was "José Guadalupe Posada and his successors" (1979). On the last day that he was capable of working, from his wheelchair, he kept his wife Zohmah running through the house to find the right illustrations. She could not understand why he was pushing her so, but the next day, he began the process of dying.[5]

Charlot's seriousness as an author is seen in the care he expended on proper publication. On October 27, 1926, he noted in his diary a problem with *Forma*: "on a mutilé mon article. je ne donne plus rien dans ces conditions" 'my article was mutilated. I will contribute nothing more under these

conditions.' Correct publication was for him a joy: "reçu Forma no 6 avec mon article sur Orozco. grand plaisir" 'received *Forma* number 6 with my article on Orozco. great pleasure' (Diary June 25, 1928).

In this chapter, I will focus on Charlot's methods and tendencies rather than his conclusions and views. I will not provide all the examples I have found and will favor ones from unpublished materials.

Charlot never felt a conflict between his two roles. His portrait drawings of the Mexican artists are as acute as his writings about them: Rivera, the great worker, looks up at his huge walls envisioning the heroic images he will paint on them; Orozco carefully focuses down on the inch his brush touches. But the two roles could compete for his attention. In letters to her friends, Charlot's wife, Zohmah, complained while he was writing *The Mexican Mural Renaissance* (referred to as *MMR*):

> Though Jean will certainly need a free time to do some painting, when and if we can only get this book done. It is surely a lot of work as well as thought and research. I just can't believe that everyone who writes a book puts in the endless trouble on every detail—[6]

Later in the year, Zohmah was happy to write her friend, Prudence Plowe (December 14, 1946): "Jean found time to finish his new painting. The smell of oil paint in the house is wonderful he is usually so occupied with the book." But most often, Charlot's two roles informed each other, with his practical experience as an artist providing a basis for his understanding of others. Visual art was always Charlot's priority, but writing provided an alternative occupation and, because it demanded less intensity, even a relaxation.

The one conflict I have found in his two roles is between his feeling as a practicing artist about another artist and his historian's estimation of that artist. This can be seen in his "Note sur l'Impressionnisme," in all likelihood written before going to Mexico. Charlot refutes the simple idea that Impressionists do not compose, but ends by saying: *Pourtant nous devons haïr l'impress. historiquement* 'Still we must hate Impressionism historically' (ca. 1918–1920). That is, the practicing artist must take a personal, polemical attitude towards his predecessors whereas the historian must be objective. Examples abound of this in the history of all the arts. As an artist, Charlot felt a strong dislike for and opposition to the work of the *Nacionalistas* 'Nationalists' like Roberto Montenegro. Such negative feelings seem to be important for a younger generation establishing its identity and were, I believe, a factor in the choice of themes and styles by Charlot's generation. However, as a historian, Charlot had to evaluate the Nacionalistas in themselves, not in their relation to him and his contemporaries. In sum, Charlot looked at the Nacionalistas from two different perspectives with different results. Charlot was aided in this by his characteristic fairness and desire to write as positively as possible. Charlot also felt affection for people he disagreed with. He ends his discussion of the Nacionalista Adolfo Best Maugard with the remark that his differences from the Charlot's own group "never ruffled the bonds of mutual affection between the muralists and this gentle man" (*MMR* 64).

Charlot's writings on Mexico include a great variety of genres, subjects, and purposes. He wrote poetry and Náhuatl plays, looked at a variety of artistic forms—including dance—and wrote to

appreciate, analyze, record, advise, and promote.[7] He was the art editor of *Mexican Folkways*[8] and, I believe, was active in the publication of *Forma*. As in all Charlot's work and thought, the boundaries are often permeable. For instance, his popular writings could be considered or transformed into scholarly ones; his newspaper article on Carlos Mérida (January 28, 1971) was turned into a journal article, "Carlos Mérida…" (July1971), with the omission of purely local and topical elements, and then used as a major Spanish-language article, "Carlos Mérida, Coloso del Arte Mexicano" (December 5, 1971). Similarly, many of his occasional articles were later republished for their historical or critical value.

Early in Mexico, Charlot was sending reports and photographs of art works to journals in France to promote the new Mexican movement.[9] Apparently the first of these and the only one identified, "La Jeune Peinture Mexicaine" of September 16, 1922, is, as far as I know, the first notice in Europe of the new movement and the first expression of Charlot's own views on the subject. I discuss it below (Appendix II).

Conversely, Charlot's more scholarly writings were often effective as promotion. Charlot's "José Clemente Orozco: Su Obra Monumental" of June 1928 helped that artist with J. M. Puig Casauranc, José Vasconcelos' successor as Minister of Education and possible patron of the muralists (Orozco 1987: 120 f.). Even more important, the article reconverted Walter Pach to Orozco's cause. Pach had been an early admirer of Orozco, but had started to depreciate him in comparison with Diego Rivera. Charlot's article renewed his appreciation.[10] Pach wrote Orozco:

> Le escribo más especialmente para decirle el gran gusto que me han causado sus pinturas y dibujos ilustrados en *Forma* que el buen amigo Charlot acaba de enviarme. Su artículo está admirable; le felicito de tener un critíco de tal entendimiento. Son raros. (Orozco V: 196 f.)
>
> 'I am writing you more especially to tell you of the great pleasure caused by your paintings and drawings illustrated in *Forma* which our good friend Charlot has just sent me. His article is admirable; I congratulate you on having such an understanding critic. They are rare.'

The understanding of the public or even the art world could not be assumed for modern Mexican art. Historical and cultural information needed to be provided as well as general directions towards proper appreciation. The major exhibition of relevant works in New York City, *Mexican Art* (The Art Center, January 19–February 14, 1928), reportedly suffered for these reasons. From Chich'en Itza, Charlot wrote to Edward Weston (n.d., September 1928): "It seems that the Mexican exhibit in New York was a terrible failure, through both lack of organization and lack of comprehension." Charlot would not let these lacks create an obstacle to the appreciation of Orozco's work:

> Charlot was one of the organizers of Orozco's comprehensive retrospective show at the Art Students League in 1929. His painstaking efforts in the arrangement and hanging of the huge collection, his untiring zeal in creating interest in the event and his numerous lectures on the significance of Orozco's art during the exhibition, all

> attested to his generous spirit and to his capacity for loyal camaraderie. (Reed 1960: 70)

Part of Charlot's motivation was also the protectiveness he felt toward artists who were not good self-promoters, for instance Manuel Martínez Pintao:

> un desconocido para casi todos; esto se deberá probablemente a que nadie ha tenido un interés productivo en darlo a conocer. Él, demasiado preocupado por su obra, profesa por la publicidad una indiferencia un poco desdeñosa… Es, pues, de justicia colocarlo en el verdadero lugar que le corresponde y que es de gran importancia. ("Pintao" 1923)
>
> 'an unknown for almost all; this is due probably to the fact that no one has had a productive interest in making him known. He, too preoccupied by his work, professes for publicity an indifference a little disdainful…It is then a matter of justice to assign him the true place that corresponds to him and which is of great importance.'

This effectiveness of Charlot's writings has been noticed in various areas.[11] It could even be used for a joke. Jubilo (1926) describes a family distressed because one of its members, Sebastián, has been reduced to painting the façades and walls of *pulquerías* 'pulque bars' to earn a living. They should take heart:

> Oid lo que dice la sabia y contundente palabra de JEAN CHARLOT, pintor y escultor de renombre, amén de sujeto poco apasionado: "Las pinturas de pulquería y carnicería, pinturas útiles y buenas, son una de las mayores glorias plásticas de México de hoy." Eh? Qué os parece? Regocijaos hombres y mujeres de poca fe, tenéis en vuestra familia, no al despreciable Sebastián, sino al gran Sebastián, a uno de los contribuyentes de las mayores glorias plásticas de México y de hoy.
>
> "Lend your ears to the weight and wisdom of the words of Jean Charlot, known painter and sculptor, and besides a man not given to hasty judgement:
> 'The paintings of pulquerias and butcher-shops, paintings useful and good, are one of the greatest esthetic glories of Mexico and of our time.' Well, what say you now? Rejoice, men and women of little faith, for you have in your family not the despicable Sebastian, but the great Sebastian, one that contributes to the greatest esthetic glory of Mexico and of our time."[12]

Charlot's writings were appreciated by the artists themselves. Carlos Mérida stated "sus escritos eran muy comunes dentro del momento' 'his writings were very common at that time' (January 29, 1971). One reason was that the artists often felt themselves neglected and misunderstood: "the painter himself hardly knew where, if ever, he would gain support and understanding" (1966 Foreword ix). Indeed, their remarks reveal much about Charlot's character and purpose as a writer: Charlot wanted to provide that "support and understanding": "I always try to fortify our pride, I would say, in what is being done in Mexico by going back to sources" (June 9, 1965). Carlos Mérida told me—and repeated in his taped

interview—how amazed the artists were that Charlot could write about them correctly while they were still working; he saw what they were doing and why:

> Juan fue siempre un gran escritor sobre arte. Él tiene una clarividencia extraordinaria para definir, para juzgar y para escribir. Y como yo lo dije antes, Juan era en este "trait", en este camino, en esta condición, uno de los directores del movimiento con más capacidad y con más influencia por el hecho de que era un culto europeo capaz de discernir, de definir, de enseñar, de modelar, de explicar todo lo que nosotros hacíamos y que nosotros conociésemos exactamente por qué y cuándo aquello se hacía. (January 29, 1971)
>
> 'Jean was always a great writer on art. He had an extraordinary clairvoyance for defining, judging, and writing. And as I said before, Juan was in this trait, in this path, in this condition, one of the directors of the movement with more capacity and influence because of the fact that he was a cultivated European capable of discerning, defining, teaching, modeling, explaining all that we others were doing so that we ourselves knew exactly why that was being done and at the very time it was being done.'

Mérida must have been thinking of Charlot's "Carlos Mérida, Maestro Consciente de su Arte," a thorough discussion of that difficult and distinctive artist's goals and means of expression.[13] Mérida responded to an early draft of a section of Charlot's *The Mexican Mural Renaissance, 1920–1925* (*MMR*):

> Recibí los fragmentos de tu nuevo libro; mucho te agradezco la deferencia de hacermelos conocer. Los encuentro muy interesantes no solo por la acuciosidad en el desarrollo histórico de los hechos sino por la originalidad de la exposición de los mismos y la fina, sutil y muy francesa ironía con que los salpicas. Felicitaciones anticipadas; estoy seguro que será un éxito editorial. Gracias muchas, eres muy generoso, al tratar mi intevención en la aventura de la pintura mexicana. Algo tuvimos que ver en ello y alguna vez habría de hacersenos justicia.[14]
>
> 'I received the fragments of your new book; I am very grateful to you for your courtesy in showing them to me. I find them most interesting not only for the acuity in the historical development of the facts but also for the originality of the exposition of the same and the fine, subtle and very French irony with which you salt them. Congratulations in advance; I am sure that it will be a publishing success. Many thanks—you are very generous in the way you treat my intervention in the adventure of Mexican painting. We had something to do with it, and sometime justice must be done us.'

In the younger generation, Alfredo Zalce made the same point in an interview:

> He still gave me good criticisms. When I did my Yucatán portfolio, he did the preface. He did a very good criticism of my work; it was very much in favor of me. I

> don't want to say if it was accurate, because he said such positive things about me. But other people liked it too. Jean understood my work better than I did.[15]

As he started his career, Zalce was an avid reader of Charlot's articles.

> Other artists sounded the same note. Leopoldo Mendez wrote Charlot on August 15, 1968:
>
> Yo aprecio muchíssimo que me consideres un artista mayor y no te digo lo que mi alma siente al leer tus palabras y de Zohmah tambien porque voy a llorar.
>
> 'I am most appreciative that you consider me a major artist, and I do not tell you what my soul feels on reading your words and those of Zohmah also because I am going to cry.'

Alberto Beltrán wrote to Charlot on May 19, 1969:

> Lo que has escrito sobre Méndez me parece muy valioso, no sólo por lo que se refiere a él, sino por tus juicios sobre el papel de aquellos artistas que viven alrededor de las elites.
>
> 'What you have written about Méndez appears very valuable to me, not only for what you say about him, but also for your judgments on the role of those artists who live on the margins of the elites.'

Clarita Guerrero, wife of Xavier, wrote Charlot on November 25, 1971, asking him to write an article on her husband:

> Tú eres el que mejor conoce a Xavier, el que más penetra en su pintura y quien mejor puede escribir sobre ella
>
> 'You are the one who knows Xavier best, the one who penetrated most into his painting and who best can write about it'
>
> escribe ese largo artículo en la manera que tu puedes hacerlo (mejor que nadie).
>
> 'write this long article in the way you can (better than anyone).'

Mérida also requested an article from Charlot:

> I wrote something short for Carlos Merida (he asked me.) to publish here. His last water-colours are finer than anything else he did. (JC to AB "I don't remember if I send you the address of V. Arroyo's little girl")

Tamayo did not like Charlot's art, but appreciated his writing. Thanking Charlot for the article on himself, Tamayo stresses the need for an authentic, non-*charro* image of Mexican art:

> Claro que esto implica una lucha que para ser llevada con éxito, requiere una tenacidad como la mía y una crítica como la tuya.[16]

> 'Clearly this implies a struggle that requires for success a tenacity like mine and a criticism like yours.'

I am reminded of what the artist Fredda Holt once told me after I published an article on her work: "You usually have to wait till you're dead."

Charlot's discovery of unrecognized artists like José Guadalupe Posada and Manuel Manilla and his writing on lesser-known figures, like Pintao, are connected to his human understanding and appreciation of artists. In doing this, Charlot was maintaining the sympathy he had shown in France for neglected figures like Désiré Charnay and Marcel-Lenoir. He stated that he learned from Charnay that people who were in the right could be ignored and even reviled, but this did not make Charlot self-protective or self-promoting. Instead, he dedicated himself to the underdogs. In the 1940s, Charlot was particularly proud as a historian of doing justice to José Vasconcelos, then very much excluded from the picture of the 1920s. Vasconcelos wrote Charlot about the drafts he had been given for comment:

> Su trabajo me parece excelente. Su penetración psicologica es realmente profunda. Gracias por la simpatía con [la que] me juzges[17]
>
> 'Your draft seems excellent to me. Your psychological penetration is really profound. Thank you for the sympathy with which you judge me.'

Charlot's section on Vasconcelos emphasizes the motives for his patronage; Vasconcelos is, therefore, telling Charlot that he had indeed understood him.

Many appreciations can be found also by other nonartists, both published and unpublished.[18] For example, Charlot started as a draughtsman for the Carnegie expedition to Chich'en Itza, but soon "He was found to know much about Maya art that could enlighten archaeologists as to the Mayas"; "the head of the expedition pronounced him the discovery of the season" (*Idols* 305; also McVicker 1999). He became the coauthor of the expedition report and other works on Maya art, and was later credited with contributions to the decipherment of Maya hieroglyphics. An editor at Yale University Press wrote ES [Edwin Stein, Jr.] wrote about *MMR*:

> Having read it and talked over its content with Mr. Kubler, I am convinced of its importance. Charlot went to Mexico as a young man, got to know everyone there in the world of painting, kept careful diaries and records, took part actively in the whole movement, which was one of the most important in modern painting. He is, according to Mr. Kubler, a highly intelligent and verbally articulate man—unusual for a painter; he is, in other words, a kind of Vasari. There is no-one else alive who could write what he has written and this work will always be a primary source—in that sense never out of date. mr. Charlot has waited patiently 11 years for funds to be found. I greatly hope this can be done soon. (July 24, 1959)

Recently a young scholar of Mexican art told me that Charlot was "visionary" in anticipating in his writings the major questions that much later scholars would raise. Another scholar, Lynda Klich, emailed me about her work on the influence of Colonial art on the 1920s movement: "It is remarkable to me that Charlot's

discussion is so essential to understanding the development of muralism, but yet its implications have gone relatively unexplored" (August 4, 2017). Even today, Charlot's writings often set the direction for critical understanding (e.g., 2009 Lola Cueto: 15, 17, 28, 110, 134, 170). Similar appreciations can be found of Charlot's work in the United States.[19]

More negative reactions to Charlot's writings can of course be found. In 1923, Charlot and David Alfaro Siqueiros published five polemical articles under the pseudonym Juan Hernandez Araujo with the general title "El Movimiento Actual de la Pintura en Mexico" (Araujo July 11–August 2, 1923). "Araujo" listed contemporary artists under usually critical rubrics. Reacting immediately, the artists Manuel Rodríguez Lozano and Abraham Ángel protested strongly against the way they had been categorized (1923). More recently, Clemente Orozco V., in his work on his father, the artist José Clemente Orozco, uses Charlot's research appreciatively but disagrees with and criticizes it freely.[20] Charlot has been criticized also for not mentioning the role of the Unión de Damas Católicas Mexicanas in the campaign against Orozco's frescoes and for leaving Leal out of the Araujo articles.[21] The former point would be due to Charlot's Catholicism, and the latter would be the result of his quarrel with Leal, discussed below. Charlot's work could also be ignored. For instance, Mijangos writes that in Mexico only Rivera appreciated Tamayo, apparently unaware of Charlot's writings on that artist (2000: 62).

In contrast to the strong polemics and even personal attacks of much of the contemporary writing—which the Araujo articles can be considered to represent—Charlot's writing is predominantly positive. As he himself stated in a 1971 interview: "I write in the *Star-Bulletin* about things I like because I don't like to say nasty things or even indifferent things." As the Chicano artist, Rupert Garcia wrote to Charlot and his wife Zohmah:

> You're a very kind person and a wonderful artist and art historian. As you may know, your writings are important works for all to read. Your publications on the art history of Mexico are especially significant to us Chicanos. Your generosity and love for good is expressed in all that you have produced for others to read or see. You are an inspiration to me and others. (January 23, 1979)

Indeed, Charlot usually characterized critics and historians as hostile:

> Critics usually love artists when they are dead. They don't know what to do with the live painter. And frictions result.
>
> Somehow the artist does not like the critic because the critic does not like the artist[22]

Charlot's positive spirit was certainly a partial result of his own experience of an artist's sensitivity. Zalce wrote Charlot on October 8, 1971, that he had read a published letter of Orozco's with scornful criticisms of the younger muralists:

> para mí es muy deprimente…Siento vergüenza por haber sido uno de esos pintores de la LEAR a los que Orozco se refiere.

> 'it is very depressing for me…I feel shame for having been one of those painters of the LEAR to whom Orozco refers.'

Charlot's reviews of other artists emphasize, therefore, the positive as well as aspects of their work with which he is in sympathy, for instance, in his writings on Rufino Tamayo, a younger friend who very publicly turned against muralism and towards a more international, elitist style. Charlot appreciated kindness in critics:

> Last year, Carlos Merida wielded his trenchant machete with humaneness, delicately sensing the tie between painting and painter and not especially eager to draw blood, even though it be from a stranger. (March 30, 1966)

Charlot's general policy of not attacking other artists, even when provoked—for instance, not responding to Rivera's view on direct carving, discussed below—is a result of this empathy and also, I believe, because he did not wish to give ammunition to the many enemies of muralism.[23] Even as a historian, Charlot discusses inter-artist disputes only when they had clear historic relevance. His efforts to do historical justice to artists whose attitudes and work were antithetical, like the Nacionalistas, were partly due to his human sympathy, as seen in his remarks on Adolfo Best Maugard, quoted above (*MMR* 64). Charlot's attitude was a conscious criticism of academic art historiography: critics and historians neglected the individual in favor of broader subjects, which resulted in blind spots and distortions.

> [The art critic] whose delight it is to burrow a sniffing way under the surface of an art work and retrieve with canine fidelity what influences, trends, and comparisons hide in there, is stopped still in his tracks by an originality not yet catalogued in history.[24]

Another criticism was of the usual academic's lack of practical experience in art-*making*, a major point for a practicing artist, especially one so attentive to medium as Charlot. Araujo took an extreme position:

> Para escribir sobre ingeniería o medicina hay que ser del oficio. Para ser crítico de pintura, hay que ser pintor… (July 11, 1923)
>
> 'To write about engineering or medicine, one must belong to the profession. To be a critic of painting, one must be a painter…'
>
> no saben que la pintura y la escultura son oficios técnicos que mucho tienen de la albañilería, de la orfebrería y bastante de la mecánica y de la arquitectura, requiriendo, por lo mismo, del conocimiento de las leyes claras y concisas establecidas por la experiencia de muchos PUEBLOS y de muchas EDADES. (July 26, 1923)
>
> 'they do not know that painting and sculpture are technical occupations that share much with bricklaying, goldsmithing, and sufficiently with mechanics and architecture, requiring, therefore, knowledge of the clear and concise laws established by the experience of many PEOPLES and TIMES.'

The language is close to Charlot's at that time:

> S'il a du cœur l'ébéniste te fera-t-il des chaises où l'on ne puisse s'asseoir, ou l'architecte une maison qui doit crouler. Moi de même…[25]
>
> 'If he has a heart, will the carpenter make you chairs you can't sit on, or the architect a house that must collapse. The same for me [the painter]…'

Charlot continued to hold this view. In his 1941 and 1944 Guggenheim applications, he writes: "I understand the problems of the mural painter by personal experience in executing frescos for the Mexican Government" (1942 Appendix I "Plans for Work," below); "I know the problems of the mural painter from the inside, having executed frescos for the Mexican Government as well as in the United States" (1944 ,ix I "Statement of Advanced Work," below). Since technical details of fresco are not discussed in *MMR*, Charlot is referring to the general influence of practical experience on his study: it informs his understanding of the whole. He could thus speak more generally:

> An artist has a sixth sense too. I know when I look at a painting, I can tell things about it that a non-painter can't. Why the artist used that color, why this mound here. These are professional things. A practitioner will know them. (Tabletalk February 15, 1972)

More particularly, Charlot found examples throughout his life of art historians making mistakes because they were ignorant of the craft. One historian calculated the time Goya took to complete his fresco by guessing that he must have spent a day on each face; the historian could simply have identified the daily work sections by finding the joints between the plasterings. Some historians have learned to do so today. Charlot contrasted a critic's lengthy reasoning about an unusual tonality in Poussin paintings with Rivera's simple remark that the artist was using a light instead of a dark background. The nonpractitioner, Charlot felt, cannot reach the practical, artisanal understanding of the painter (Tabletalk May 1978). Charlot was careful, therefore, in his own writings to emphasize the media used and the esthetic effect created by their means, like the muscular and esthetic strength of woodcuts.[26] He provides a history and ethnography of *papeles picados* 'cut papers' as well as an appreciation of their special esthetic possibilities (Charlot October 13–20, 1945; May 9, 1946). Charlot's writing follows in this his recognized interest in exploiting different media as an artist.

The variety of Charlot's subjects attests to the breadth of his interests. Indeed, despite the quantity of his production, he never wrote on several subjects that interested him, like Maya costume,[27] the Casasola photographs, the literary character and quality of *corridos* (the folk ballads that Posada illustrated), or the contemporary poetry movements in which he himself participated. His work on a monograph on Indian dance produced only an article.[28] He wrote on architecture, a major subject of Rivera's, only in relation to murals. He started work on his second projected *catalogue raisonné*, that of Posada's prints and planned one for the illustrations of the union newspaper *El Machete*.[29] Charlot mentioned several times that an analysis of Diego Rivera's style and composition was necessary. He collected Náhuatl texts on the Virgin of Guadalupe in view to their comprehensive publication. Charlot

was less interested in some subjects that were central to other writers, like *la raza cósmica* 'the cosmic race' blended of Hispanic and Indian. Anita Brenner in her *Idols behind Altars* (1970; referred to as *Idols*), discusses *mestizo* 'mixed race' culture at length. Charlot, himself *mestizo*, uses the idea rarely but precisely focused on esthetics; for instance, he describes the tension in Julio de Diego's art between elongated Spanish and squat Indian proportions and their ultimate blending as "a true plastic equivalent of this mestizo race" (May 1940). Charlot felt his own Aztec atavisms and mentioned the complete Indian racial identity of Ramón Cano, Mérida, and Guerrero, but did not use race as a criterion of quality or adequate principle of explanation. He was just as intrigued by the historical paradoxes: the Indian Benito Juarez and the predominantly Indian Porfirio Díaz were great promoters of foreign artists.[30]

Charlot was clearly one writer among many, and his work must ultimately be understood as one voice in a group conversation. For instance, in his 1923 article "Un Escultor: Manuel Martínez Pintao," Charlot included remarks on the differences between direct carving and creating a clay model for a bronze. Diego Rivera echoed the passage in his "Escultura. Talla Directa" of 1927, adding the idea that only direct carving was artistically legitimate and modeling was false (Rivera 1927; 1986: 116 ff.). Charlot drafted a reply to Rivera's article, "Modelado" of 1927, but never published it, probably because of his policy of not criticizing his fellow muralists publicly. Zalce recognized Charlot's practice:

> Jean didn't speak against others. When he had something to say, he did it openly in books. Not Rivera, who made jokes about everybody. Jean made his criticisms in articles. Jean was considered a fair critic, not a member of a party. (July 27–28, 1971)

Similar ideas and expressions can be found among the artists and writers. Both Charlot and Rivera compared Orozco to Léon (*AA* II: 254).[31] They had both read the French author. Did the idea occur to them separately? Did it come up in conversation? Similarly, Charlot said that Rivera found Weston particularly valuable for revealing the value of surface textures; Siqueiros wrote the same point (Weston 1983: 53). I believe many such similarities originated in what Raquel Tibol calls the artists' "Intercambio continuo de ideas" 'Continuous interchange of ideas' (1996: 160). The close publication dates of Charlot's and Rivera's articles on *pulquería* painting suggests that it was a current conversational topic.[32] Other, more extensive similarities suggest the circulation of manuscripts.[33] Similarly, the writers of the time could share mistakes; Charlot misspelled Posada "Posadas" in Araujo and in his first article and was followed by others (e.g., Brenner September 1925: 148). As Charlot remembered: "JC got his information talking to the Arroyos and heard them wrong" (Tabletalk mid-1970s).

Just as in the visual arts, controversies could arise over originality. Orozco accused Rivera of plagiarizing Charlot:

> ¿No te has fijado que ese artículo es vil plagio del que escribiste acerca de Posada? No hay que ser tan candido, Charlot. (Orozco 1971: 32)

> "Didn't you notice that this article is a vile plagiarism of the one you wrote about Posada? Don't be so naïve, Charlot." (Orozco 1974: 26)

As Orozco suggests, Charlot did not defend himself against such attacks. He was, however, protective of his friends (e.g., Glusker 2010: 498; 1998: 72). In a 1928 self-sketch, he remembered his fencing lessons in France: "his pencil becomes a rapier" (Brenner 1928: 65).

Several other artists were also writers, and Rivera and Siqueiros made writing an important part of their careers. Zohmah wrote Marie McCall with her usual bluntness:

> I was thinking how well most of these artists Jean is writing about also write, but how they could really only write about themselves with any conviction.
>
> Siqueiros for instance has written wonderful biographical stories. Rivera writes well but with such wickedness and troublemaking. (September 1, 1946)

A brief comparison of their work with Charlot's, especially as historical sources, helps to distinguish his.

Diego Rivera was a voluminous writer with a broad knowledge of art history, a great eye, and a keen analytical sense. Charlot told me he enjoyed Rivera's conversation because he was the one Mexican artist who did not need to have Charlot's references explained. Siqueiros remembered Rivera's conversation as inspiring (e.g., 1977: 162). Rivera was capable of writing excellent descriptions and analyses with fine arguments for his positions (Rivera 1986: e.g., 159–171, 172–178, 179 ff., 194 ff., 298). He wrote especially well on subjects that did not excite his polemic, like children's drawings (113 ff.). But often his writings assume a polemical tone, with little or no analysis or argument; the only point made is whether Rivera approves or disapproves of the subject, the criterion of which is often how it relates to himself (e.g., 90–94, 230 f.). Moreover, his language is often very general and is left without sufficient definition; for instance, he praises *pulquería* painting for having "una verdadera estética proletaria—pura y verdaderamente proletaria—" 'an authentic proletarian esthetic—pure and authentically proletarian—' without ever describing that esthetic (103). As a result, his articles are often more important for calling attention to subjects than for helping the reader understand them. Charlot called attention to this when Rivera and Frances Toor were taking over Charlot's project for a catalogue raisonné of Posada's work, for which he had already gathered much material:

> Diego es muy inteligente pero no tomara tiempo de buscar material ni hechos y que salga en FW un articulo de el diciendo que Posadas es un enorme artista no quita nada de lo que tenemos y esto siempre saldra en otra y mejor parte. (JC to AB "Recibi tu carta estupida Francis")
>
> Diego is very intelligent, but he will not take the time to search for material, even those already done. And that he puts out in Folkways an article of his saying that Posadas is an enormous artist—that takes nothing away from what we have, and this will always come out in some other and better publication.'

Charlot, in contrast, was capable of praising (e.g., *Idols* 275), but preferred to express his positive views in description and analysis. That Rivera did not produce more of the good writing of which he was capable is regrettable. Charlot appreciated Rivera's contribution, for instance, on *retablos*

or ex-votos: "Diego Rivera was the first to speak respectfully of those little pictures."[34] Similarly, when Harold Leonard asked Charlot about his study of Manuel Martínez Pintao, Charlot replied:

> The first reference to Pintao's work was in an article published by Diego Rivera in 1921. The next, the article I published in 1923 and that you read in "From the Mayans to Disney". Pintao at the time was quite adverse [*sic*] to showing his work. (letter August 18, 1943)

Charlot agreed with Rivera's comments on Weston's photographs: "I repeated Diego's conversation, he [Charlot] often agreeing" (Weston 1961: 147). I myself have found Rivera the most capable critic of the 1920s for understanding what Charlot himself was doing (John Charlot 2001 First Fresco): Rivera did not like Charlot's work and polemicized against it, but he was the person who could best understand it.

Rivera's most serious problem as a literary source is his pathological lying. His editors themselves feel bound to warn their readers that the utmost caution must be exercised in using Rivera's texts for historical purposes.[35] Rivera's fabulizing was recognized by his colleagues.[36] Both Charlot and Siqueiros found their own memories being absorbed into Rivera's developing autobiography.[37] The artists could joke about Rivera's stories. Once during a lunch break from mural painting, Charlot told his colleagues something egregious. They expressed their puzzlement and doubt, but Charlot insisted it was true. When they asked how he could be so sure, he said to general laughter, "Diego me lo dijo" 'Diego told me so.'[38] Charlot wrote Anita Brenner that Rivera had just returned from Chalma, telling his usual tall tales:

> y me dice "Verdad, Juan" y yo contesto "Como no, Diego." y todos se quedan boca abierto. Diego es el payaso del folk-lore. (February 2, 1925)
>
> 'and says to me, "Isn't that true, Jean," and I answer, "Of course, Diego." and everyone is left with their mouths open. Diego is the clown of folklore.'

After regaling me with many of Rivera's tall tales, Clemente Orozco V. remembered an occasion on which Rivera actually spoke the truth. A friend of his immediately objected: "No, Diego, no, tu boca nunca se ha manchado con la verdad" "No, Diego, no. Your mouth has never yet stained itself with truth" (interview June 8, 2004).

Rivera's lying is easy to follow. After Charlot identified Posada, Rivera claimed first that he already knew about him, then that he would pass by his workshop, then that he had met and spoken with him, then that he "pasaba horas en la tienda de Posada" 'spent hours in the workshop of Posada,' and finally that "habíamos tenido la suerte, desde antes de 1910, de haber recibido personalmente las enseñanzas del maestro Posada" 'we had the good fortune, from 1910 on, to have received personally the instruction of the master Posada.'[39] Rivera lacked completely the historian's visceral commitment to fact. Unfortunately, many of Rivera's tales and views have been accepted by historians, distorting significantly the historiography of the movement.

Rivera's writings are, however, an important source for his own thinking, and even his extreme statements express points of historical interest. For instance, he makes the accusation of Charlot that "se

creyó el Greco de México" 'he believed himself the El Greco of Mexico' (Rivera 1986: 53, [1923]; compare 246, 279). El Greco was 'the Greek' immigrant who became in the minds of many the outstanding and typical Spanish painter. Rivera himself had experienced how Picasso and others had become "los más parisienses de la 'Escuela de Paris'" 'the most Parisian of the "School of Paris"' (1986: 246 f.), eclipsing many French artists. Picasso was in fact compared to El Greco at the time (Bissière 1921: 209 f.). Rivera was obviously worried about history repeating itself in Mexico.[40]

Rivera attacked Charlot particularly on his claim, important for the history of the movement, that he completed the first fresco in Mexico since the Colonial epoch (1986: 275 [1942]). Rivera retorted that he had found examples of frescoes from the disputed period, for instance, a mural by Juan Cordero in the Preparatory School and by Petronílo Monroy in a church in Tenancingo. Rivera repeated his claim that Cordero's mural was a fresco in his lecture on the occasion of a major retrospective of that artist in 1945. When Charlot lectured later, he treated the question as purely historical:

> Cuando Diego Rivera habló en el salón de la reciente exposición retrospectiva de Cordero, dijo que el mural de la Preparatoria no era temple, como afirma el catálogo de dicha exposición, sino fresco, pero existen textos contemporáneos, los cuales muestran de modo incontrovertible que se trataba de un temple. ("Juan Cordero, Muralista Mexicano" September 12, 1945)
>
> 'When Diego Rivera spoke in the salon of the recent retrospective of Cordero, he said that the mural of the Preparatory School was not tempera, as the catalog of said exhibition states, but fresco. But there exist contemporary texts which show incontrovertibly that we are dealing with a tempera.'

Finally, Charlot alludes to Rivera's claim of eyewitness authority:

> Por cierto, es muy perdonable el error de Diego, porque él no tenía más de catorce años de edad cuando tiraron el mural, en 1900, y son falibles los conocimientos técnicos de un niño, aun de un niño genial.
>
> 'Certainly, Diego's error is very pardonable, because he was only fourteen years old in 1900 when they knocked down the mural, and the technical knowledge of a child is fallible, even of a child of genius.'

Rivera continued to look for examples and returned vehemently to the attack in 1951. Charlot claimed:

> en una cartela pomposa que su fresco era el primero ejecutado en México después de la época colonial. Esto es una mentira… (1986: 348 f.)
>
> 'in a pompous cartouche that his fresco was the first executed in Mexico since the Colonial epoch. This is a lie…'

Ramón Alva de la Canal started his fresco first, and Monroy painted frescoes in the nineteenth century in Tizayuca and Tenancingo. Hundreds of frescoes were painted in the provinces at that time, and all popular decorators knew the technique.

> Así es que, la afirmación de Charlot constituye no sólo una mentira histórica, sino también una acción de carácter discriminatoria para la pintura mexicana. Cualquiera que sea la estimación o sentimiento profesional que se tenga por el pintor Charlot, hoy plenamente desarrollado, esta falsificación debe ser liquidada oficialmente por la historia del arte mexicano…
>
> 'Thus it is that Charlot's claim constitutes not only a historical lie, but also an action of discriminatory character against Mexican painting. Whatever be the professional estimation or feeling one has for the painter Charlot, today fully developed, this falsification should be officially liquidated by the history of Mexican art…'

Charlot personally checked Rivera's examples or asked friends for help. Pablo O'Higgins wrote Charlot on January 24, 1943:

> Fui a ver a Ramón Alva Guadarrama, y dice que sí es cierto que nació en Tenancingo, pero que no existe un 'fresco' en la iglesia de Tenancingo, ni de él, ni de nadie, que ha de ser un cuentecito de Diego.
>
> 'I went to see Ramón Alva Guadarrama and he says that he certainly was born in Tenancingo, but no "fresco" exists in the church of Tenancingo, neither by him, nor by anybody, and that it must be a little story of Diego's.'

Charlot found no fresco mural between the Colonial period and his own;[41] the most likely possibilities proved to be lime tempera. He wrote up his conclusions in detail but used little in his *MMR* because he felt it sounded defensive (Writings Related to *MMR*: "Appendix I: Fresco Painting in Mexico").

Orozco's writings are of two very different types. His autobiography (1962) is admirably objective if terse. The reader longs for the expansion of his points. Charlot found a curious disconnection between Orozco's flamboyant painting and his low-key prose. He felt that unless the reader knew the artist's achievements from other sources, he would be unable to appreciate the importance of the autobiography. Charlot did trust Orozco's statements of fact, for instance, that he gathered metal shavings produced by Posada's engraving off the atelier floor, a story doubted by some (e.g., Merfish 2013: 52).

In contrast, Orozco's writings on art, especially on his own works, can be puzzling and even misleading.[42] For instance, his programmatic statement on his early mural plans and works champions a generalizing classicism and an estheticist lack of interest in subject matter that is more a polemic against the earlier muralists than a guide to his own production.[43] Orozco seems to extend his characteristic oppositional stance to himself: when he paints in one direction, he uses his writing to vent in the opposite.[44] That is, he writes to restore the equilibrium of his conflicted personality. Scholars have also

questioned the seriousness of certain statements, for instance, that the panels of his *Dive Bomber and Tank* (1940) could be arranged variously.[45] Such writings pose difficult problems for the historian.

Besides his well-known polemical literature, Siqueiros wrote several autobiographical passages, and books have been published of his memoirs as dictated to others. Zohmah Charlot wrote to Prudence Plowe from Mexico City about Siqueiros helping Charlot in his research (March 29, 1946):

> He dug down into his papers to find any records that would interest Jean. He had many stories written, really enough for a book, on remembered experiences. They were beautifully done, and surprising to have him remember things so keenly and with such a lively sense of drama and humor.

While doing research for *MMR*, Charlot translated sections from an autobiographical manuscript of Siqueiros' that has not been published in its entirety.[46] A complete collection of such writings is still to be done and published in a scholarly edition. The available texts display the variability of a storyteller—Charlot considered Siqueiros the greatest he had ever listened to—but none of Rivera's systematic tendentious distortion; rather, Siqueiros is sporadically and inconsistently tendentious. Siqueiros apparently did not consult documents, so his chronology and sequences can be shaky; for instance, he states that Rivera returned to Mexico in 1922 rather than 1921.[47] His later memories sometimes conflict with contemporary evidence; for instance, he writes as if he had to compel Vasconcelos to give him a wall to paint (e.g., 1977: 183), whereas that Minister of Education had almost forced Siqueiros to return from Europe for that very purpose. Siqueiros clearly wanted to portray himself as the rebel against authority. Since his books have been assembled from articles, jottings, and interviews done at different times and in different moods, they can often be used to control each other. For instance, Siqueiros can state that he knew what to do on returning to Mexico (1977: 181 f.; compare 166); in more historical passages, supported by the actual art works produced, he describes his confusion and search for both content and style (e.g., 1977: 186; 1996: 459). A good union man, Siqueiros wants to credit the artist's union, the Sindicato, with a major esthetic influence (1977: 215 f.; 1978[2]: 39 f.); but he cannot find evidence in the work of the "Tres Grandes" and ignores the earlier work of other artists. Indeed, in some of his later writings and interviews, Siqueiros tries to squeeze all the credit for the achievements of the movement into the "Tres Grandes," a very different view from that of the Araujo series, which he co-authored.[48] Thus Siqueiros often writes or speaks from hindsight, projecting later views back into an earlier period. However, Siqueiros' descriptions of the esthetic problems and purposes of the early muralists accord with the early sources and often supplement and illuminate them. I believe he felt those early struggles keenly and remembered them vividly. Moreover, Siqueiros can make an effort to do justice to Rivera, more often his polemical opponent (1978: 45–53).

The writings of the other painters of the movement need to be collected—as have Leal's (1990)—especially the thoughtful and independent works of Carlos Mérida. Most of the artists changed their views over the years, so their individual texts need to be evaluated in the context of their whole career. They will provide an important basis for future scholarly work on the Mexican movement.

One motivation of the literary efforts of the painters was their dissatisfaction with many local art critics of the time; the criticisms made by the artists remained valid for many years afterwards (e.g., Siqueiros 1978: 79 f.). First and foremost, the artists censured the critics' general ignorance of art history and practice, and their dullness of perception and analysis.[49] Critics praise Saturnino Herrán without knowing that he has been influenced by Frank Brangwyn; at the same time, they are ignoring the more Mexican contributions of Orozco and Joaquín Clausell. Charlot's own writing is characterized by his vast knowledge of art history and ability to apply it to the mutual illumination of both subject and comparison. For instance, in his June 9, 1965, lecture "Art and Communication: Posada," he can compare the Mexican artist to Roman and Medieval art, English and Flemish penny sheets, Giotto, Dürer, Rembrandt, Hogarth, Goya, David, Daumier, Manet, Van Gogh, and Picasso's *Guernica*, finding in them commonalities: penny sheets, "we have the devils and the holy personages taking part in the doings of the people"; "I think that the mixture of the two worlds, the other world and this one, is typical of the subject of the pennysheets"; Posada and Giotto, "at the same time so monumental and so story-telling"; and Daumier, "an artist who refused to be artistic, a man who was an artisan in his own idea"; "He is a manual worker, a manual laborer"; Manet's execution of Maximilian, "a picture that should be understood for what it is. It is a manifesto. It is a communication to the people. And Manet is not simply an artful art fellow. He had things to say, and things to say to the nonartists." None of these parallel artists are flat examples, mere supernumeraries; a characteristic of Charlot's writing, a result of his deep knowledge, is that he always communicates the impression that the artist he is using as a comparison is independently interesting and important. Charlot's broad knowledge is apparent also in his archeological writings on the art at Chich'en Itza: Charlot refers to historical reports and to codices—Dresden, Persianus, Tro-Cortesiansus, Vienna, Zouche—to pottery, artifacts, and so on; he also applies his knowledge of liturgical art in order to understand stylistic points.[50] The artist and friend, Ricardo Martínez, spoke to me often of Charlot's unusually broad culture and how important it was in all his work.

Contemporary art movements had to be understood on the basis of art history. Speaking of his work on his *MMR*, Charlot stated:

> También, el libro tiene una parte retrospectiva, donde trato yo de averiguar de dónde surgió esta tradición, para poder probar que no se trata de ningún fenómeno irracional. Aquí es la sección en la cual puedo utilizar mis conocimientos arqueológicos, adquiridos estudiando el arte maya. Después sigo con la época colonial, desde los frescos de Actopan, que son del siglo XVI, hasta las témperas de Juan Cordero en el siglo XIX. (September 14, 1945)

> 'Also, the book has a retrospective part, in which I try to find out from where this tradition emerges, in order to be able to prove that we are not dealing with any irrational phenomenon. Here is the section in which I will be able to use my archeological knowledge, acquired by studying Maya art. Then I continue into the Colonial epoch, from the frescoes of Actopan of the sixteenth century, up to the temperas of Juan Cordero in the nineteenth century.'

Charlot always enjoyed and consulted experts in their fields like A. Hyatt Mayor in prints and Elizabeth Wilder Weisman on Colonial art and architecture.[51]

> Charlot and Siqueiros also criticized local critics for their partisanship:
>
> ocultando las razones estéticas con la camaradería o las enemistades personales…de esa manera sus opiniones necias edifican a sus favoritos de un momento, indiferentemente geniales o mediocres, popularidades de carrizo que atraen sectas de aduladores inocentes, amigos de las publicidades estruendosas…[52]
>
> 'hiding esthetic reasons with personal comradeship or enmities…in this way their foolish opinions build up their momentary favorites, indifferently genial or mediocre, popularities of straw that attract sects of innocent adulators, friends of roaring publicity campaigns…'

Art criticism assumed much of the partisanship of the Mexican journalism of the time. The political rule that only one candidate could be elected was transferred to the field of art, and parties formed around artists with a literature praising one's favorite and depreciating all other artists.[53] Charlot acknowledged the power of journalism in his "De la Critique et des Peintres" of 1922: an angry art viewer says: "Crains ma colère. Mon bureau est celui d'un fort grand journal. Je ferai passer des articles contre toi. Ah !" 'Fear my wrath. I manage a very big newspaper. I'll place articles against you. Hah!'[54] Salvador Novo, for instance, was a veritable mouthpiece for Rivera in the 1920s. This attitude has continued today and was especially strong in my youth, when exclusive loyalty was expected either to Rivera or to Orozco. As late as 1947, Charlot had to ask: "Does it add to Tamayo's respectable stature to belittle what had gone on before him?" (*AA* II: 367). Such an attitude is fatal for the historiography of a group movement. In 1952, Charlot had to criticize Samuel Ramos' book on the watercolors of Rivera as "an amiable paean of praise for the painter" that contributed little to art history: "To make of Rivera the single pivotal factor of Mexican art is to disagree with the facts" (1952: 139; *AA* II: 234).

Charlot's efforts to be objective are easily recognized. In fact, Charlot had a French model of critical objectivity in Maurice Denis, who disagreed with most modern schools but wrote intelligently and insightfully about them.[55] As an artist, Charlot disliked the work of the Nacionalistas like Roberto Montenegro and Best Maugard, but as a historian, he did his best to do them justice in *MMR*. He did not allow his personal difficulties with artists to distort his recognition of their greatness. A clear case of this was Rivera (John Charlot 1997). When Charlot returned to Mexico in 1968 for a retrospective, Rivera's reputation was at a low point, and a number of people tried to elicit negative remarks from Charlot; he invariably replied, "Someday you will all be proud of Diego. He's a great artist."[56] In the mid-1970s (Tabletalk), Charlot also felt that historians had only recently started to give Rivera his due as a Cubist; an attempt had been made to exclude him from the history of that movement when he left for Mexico. An indication of Charlot's reputation for fairness is that Angelina Beloff, Rivera's first wife, gave him that artist's important Italian sketchbook because she knew Charlot could be trusted to preserve and appreciate it (Tabletalk mid-1970s). Indeed, Charlot's article on the sketchbook is a principal contribution to understanding Rivera.[57] Charlot's impartiality extended even to methods: "But if we use now all that

paraphernalia of the Surrealist (however distasteful it is to me personally), we find that we can explain a lot…" (1949 Art and Archaeology: 51).

A basis for Charlot's nonpartisanship was his breadth of interests and sympathies and his refusal to follow the fashions of the moment. For instance, he continually proclaimed the importance of popular imagery, from Daumier to Posada to Disney. He stated that at the end of the nineteenth century, a national Mexican art could be found more in "opposition sheets that featured cartoons which were in themselves a living art more valid than most academic performances of the period" (*San Carlos* 137). Charlot discussed Orozco's cartooning even when that artist was hoping people would forget it.[58] He strongly disagreed with the tendency to depreciate Colonial and nineteenth-century Mexican art. The late nineteenth-century critic Manuel G. Revilla rejected Baroque and primitive Mexican sculpture:

> For him, the lone masterpiece of Mexican sculpture was *el Caballito*, the bronze horse cast by Tolsa around 1800…This new approach is, in its way, as ruthless as the old. Whereas ultra-baroque was the *bête noire* of Revilla, neo-classicism is in its turn ostracized, and Elizabeth Weismann relegates Tolsa's undoubted masterpiece to the limbo of scarcely two lines in a note. (May 1951: 200 f.)

Charlot felt that Colonial and nineteenth-century art had to be recognized as basic to the mural movement, more influential even than Indian.[59] It was also interesting in its own right: "Mexico's academic art was a much more vital product than its European counterpart, due in part to the magic *décalage* in time that qualifies Mexican styles" (*AA* II: 364). Charlot was aware of how provocative positive views of academicism were in the art world. In New York, he shocked many by finding points to appreciate in a demonized academician, William A. Bouguereau (December 1932). In the 1960s, he was similarly offensive when he described abstract art as the academic art of the time: it was the art that was taught in the schools, shown in the museums, and patronized by the moneyed classes and institutions.

Impartiality, objectivity, accuracy, and sympathy were personally important for Charlot, indeed moral imperatives. Charlot felt he had to understand all people justly and help others to do so. He was thus anxious not to appear to belong to a party. When Stefan Baciu emphasized in several publications Charlot's connections to the Estridentistas, Charlot in his interview with me restored balance to the picture by discussing his friendships with the opposing Contemporáneos group (Interview June 12, 1971). The qualities of a good critic were also those of a good human being. Thus, Charlot often used religious language for art, as he did early in his "De la Critique et des Peintres" of 1922, and throughout his later life, for example: "Only in Heaven and in art-making are worth and cost unrelated" (*AA* II: 140). Indeed, the same religious attitude informed both his painting and his criticism: "in art as elsewhere man may lose himself to find himself" (April 1949: 142).

Charlot and others felt that critics and reporters focused too much on the colorful personalities and activities of the artists. The gossip about the Mexican artists was and remains nearly irresistible.[60] In reaction, Charlot tried to make his *MMR* "as uninteresting as possible" (Tabletalk mid-1970s), "not wanting to pull the pants down of my friends." Charlot's nearly exclusive concentration on the art works themselves was appreciated at the time. For instance, Orozco found Charlot's article "sensato y justo sin

salir con anécdotas ni ridiculeces" 'sensible and just without coming out with anecdotes or ridiculous points' (1987: 119). A number of other writers tried later to elicit personal stories from Charlot, but he usually refused. Zohmah Charlot answered Mildred Constantine's request for anecdotes on Tina Modotti, December 7, 1973:

> Jean does not care to speak of personal memories. He has no desire to put down private recollections when he feels the emphasis should be on her art that has permanent value.
>
> I know when he was writing his own book on Mexico, how many times I wished he would include his wonderful reminiscences. However anecdotes have never been included in his writings on his great artist friends.

Although frank about himself in our interviews, Charlot rebuffed me when my questions became too personal about his colleagues. The idea of betraying confidences bothered him. Significantly, neither of my parents were gossipers. I myself appreciated my father's talent for the telling anecdotes in our conversations. For instance, he told me about lunching with Vasconcelos in the mid-1940s. Vasconcelos had been arguing at great length that all the good in Mexican culture came from Spain, when the waiter set down their order on the table. After looking it over, Vasconcelos said, "Waiter, you forgot my *salsita*."

The historiographical problems identified already at the beginning of the movement continued into the next decades until a veritable myth was established and imposed as dogma by the members of the Mexican art establishment. Powerful professors and art administrators imposed the view they had formulated onto younger scholars. Artists like Rufino Tamayo felt excluded: "Yo fui víctima de esta conspiración del silencio y del vacío" 'I was a victim of this conspiracy of silence and exclusion.'[61] Linda Downs' portrayal of Rivera's positive reaction to the United States remains unassimilated (1999). Fortunately, the upcoming generation of Mexican art scholars is criticizing the received view and proposing important new directions in research and understanding (e.g., Eder 2002: 230). The methods of Mexican art history paralleled those of national history: partisan politics extended into historiography, creating a myth that lasted three generations and is only now being challenged (e.g., Garner 2001: viii f., 1–7, 13 ff., 137 f., 196–200, 229, 234). The same myth-making can be found in histories of modern art—depicted as a thin line from Cézanne to Stella—imposed on younger scholars (Guilbaut 1983: 9) and now being challenged by scholars like Kenneth Silver (1989).

Very early, Charlot and others argued against certain ideas that were becoming part of the false picture of the movement. He countered the idea that the new art was "essentiellement politique" 'essentially political' with the example of Carlos Mérida.[62] More generally, Charlot considered his own writing preliminary rather than definitive:

> Cet article est bien plutôt une introduction que j'espère utile à l'étude détaillée de ces mêmes danses, étude que ne manquera pas de faire, espérons-le, quelqu'un de ceux qui s'adonnent au folklore descriptif.[63]

> 'This article is rather an introduction that I hope will be useful for a detailed study of these same dances, a study that will not fail to be done, we hope, by an expert in descriptive folklore.'

This is true most especially of his *MMR*, which he felt would surely be replaced in his lifetime by a definitive scholarly work.[64] In fact, not even a full, scholarly biography is yet available of any artist of the movement.

Rather than hardening his views over the years, Charlot remained open to correction and revision. In the 1920s, Charlot championed the artistic independence of Mexico from Europe. He gradually qualified this view over the years, finding it more theoretical than practical or historical:

> Pero todavía encontramos un no sé qué de heroico en la idea de un arte estrictamente nacional. Tal idea es fecunda en el plano ideal pero no en práctica. La verdad es que se robustece más la obra al quedar expuesta a influencias más diversas. Al Greco se le enraizó lo bizantino (que llamamos español) al estudiar con Tiziano, su sensual opuesto. Y nuestro Diego no nos hubiera salido tan mexicano de no haberse forjado al crisol parisiense.[65]

> 'Nonetheless we find a certain heroic quality in the idea of a strictly national art. This idea is fruitful on the ideal plane but not on the practical. The truth is that the work becomes more robust as it remains exposed to the most diverse influences. The Byzantine (which we call Spanish) rooted itself in El Greco when he studied with Titian, his sensual opposite. And our Diego would not have become so Mexican if he had not been forged in the crucible of Paris.'

Charlot wrote even later: "I now realize that neither one of our mural movements could dissociate itself as thoroughly as it wished from contemporary fashions."[66] Similarly, he later felt that Indian esthetics had influenced the artists less than he and others had thought at the time (Winter 1946: 12; *MMR* 11 ff.). The discovery of new documents could lead to revisions: "Previously-unused documents add to, or modify on minor points, information in that article" (*San Carlos* 93, note 97). Charlot can even admit to an unpublished mistake he made while researching a book (*San Carlos* 114, note 125)!

Charlot clearly had the historian's instinct to recognize historical events, establish facts, and interpret them critically and methodically, as stated in his 1942 and 1944 "Plans for Work" on *MMR* (Appendix I. below). Zohmah Charlot described him at work:

> Just now he is lost in researches. He disappears early to the library and I can entice him home again with meals but otherwise he is compiling notebooks full of dates. He just got interested and won't rest now until he knows all available facts. (To Prudence Plowe, April 9, 1941)

Scholarly history is based on documents, and "This research started as a book of clippings in 1922." From the very beginning of the movement, therefore, Charlot recognized its importance and began to lay the groundwork for studying it by collecting documents.[67] In France, he had already started a clippings

collection of his own work that he continued to the end of his life. Anne Goupil wrote to her son on March 31a, 1928, that she was obtaining a copy of a French article in which Charlot was discussed "pour tes archives." His excitement at the discovery of new materials can be felt in a letter to Brenner:

> Lo mas importante es que descubri dos rollos en el estudio Orozco, uno de todos los proyectos fresco y el otro de dibujos del natural, muchos admirables. Esto haria, bien presentado un conjunto de lo mas serio— ("Como me haces sufrir con tu silencio")
>
> 'Most important is that I discovered two rolls in Orozco's studio, one of all the fresco projects and the other of drawings from nature, many admirable. Well presented, this would make one of the most serious study sets––'

Charlot would continue to gather such materials for institutions like the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Charlot was also keeping a diary, recording particularly start- and end-dates of art projects; a document he was able to consult in his later writings. Indeed, the final *MMR* would be "twofold": the publication of a set of documents ("an examination of source material never translated into English before") and then "The use of these documents as an objective basis of truth to establish the history of the events…" (The publication in *MMR* of the memoirs of Fernando Leal and Ramón Alva de la Canal are remnants of this plan.) Like cataloging, the publication of documents provided the basis necessary for future work by everyone in the field. The search for documents was the reason to return to Mexico and extend his stay there "quedarme cerca de mis fuentes de información" 'to stay near to my sources of information' (1945–1946; also, Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1942 and 1944, below).

Charlot's use of this normal historical method could pass without notice were it not anomalous in the field. With honorable exceptions, Mexican scholars of Charlot's time neglected documentary research, so that his approach was recognized as unusual. As seen above, writing before the publication of Charlot's *MMR*, Siqueiros lamented that there was "nada documental y verdaderamente exacto del período muralista" 'nothing documented and truly exact about the muralist period.'[68] Clemente Orozco V., son of José Clemente Orozco, emphasized repeatedly to me that Charlot was "the only one to do research" in the documents; "it's fabulous" (interview June 8, 2004). Siqueiros, comparing Rivera and Charlot's presentations on Juan Cordero, found the latter "aún más preciso, más documentado" 'still more precise, more documented' (Charlot 1945 Juan Cordero). Weismann writes in her foreword to Charlot's *San Carlos*:

> This little text makes the first attempt to understand that episode, not by preconception or deduction, but by looking at the Academy itself. It is a straightforward, documented report of how things really were then. We are given not merely opinions and criticism, but evidence… (1962: 10)

Charlot always encouraged documentary research, for instance, writing to Clemente Orozco V.: "I am glad that you are looking for genuine sources."[69] Charlot provided information to scholars like Laurence E. Schmeckebier:

> I have known him, of course, since about 1928 when he was working on his history of Mexican painting, one of the first published in English. He came to see me at the time and some of the data I gave him was incorporated in his book.[70]

Indeed, the documents Charlot himself collected have been used regularly by scholars.[71] Fortunately, the emerging generation of scholars is focusing more on archival research and unpublished texts.[72]

Sadly, Charlot's research is now particularly valuable because many of the documents he found and copied have since been lost, due to the notorious porosity of Mexican archives. Olivier Debroise told me that the pay records of the muralists, used in *MMR*, are now missing. Charlot's long lists of documents consulted and the copies he made, organized by him for archiving and preserved in the JCC, have thus become valuable sources in themselves.[73]

Charlot consulted standard archives in the United states (Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1942 and 1944, below) and then experienced the usual difficulties of gaining access in Mexico, as his wife reported:[74]

> Jean can't get at the Ministry files without making endless visits for letters of introduction and then more endless visits to try and catch the people to present them. Public office holders only rush to work for an hour, if that long.

Charlot found most archives neglected and unused:

> Jean is busy reading the files of the San Carlos Academy, dating back several hundred years, piled in dusty heaps on open shelves, he is probably the first person in all that time to read them to be interested in them. He has done enough research for his book for ten books. (Zohmah Charlot to Prudence Plowe October 4, 1946)

Charlot told me that he had found the prize drawings of many generations of students piled on the floor. Nonetheless, he had the excitement of continuous discovery:

> Vasconcelos wrote those people, and I am not saying that just because I read it somewhere, I did look for the original documents and happily enough the files of letters exchanged between Vasconcelos and Rivera, and Vasconcelos and Siqueiros, are in existence, or were in existence before I spoke of them, in the National Archives.[75]

Speaking of *MMR*, Charlot told me "I used only about one-fifth of the documentation in the book" (Tabletalk October 24, 1977). Indeed, Charlot praised Hyatt Mayor for knowing more than he put on paper; one could feel it, Charlot claimed, in what he wrote. Charlot organized his typed notes carefully for archiving and later extracted the relevant materials for his books on San Carlos and on Orozco's letters from New York.[76] He sought new material for those books as well, writing Brenner about the latter project:

> I try to use authentic material rather than reminiscences, letters from my mother, my own diary.

> I have a blank though between December 11 1927 when Orozco leaves Mexico and my own arrival in N.Y. December 16, 1928. Could you help me with your own diary notes about Orozco between those two dates?
>
> …cross my heart I shall make a discreet use of what seems relevant![77]

Charlot's documentary research was very broad. He stated often that newspapers were the best source for dating, then articles, and finally books.[78] That is, the further a writing was in time from the event the more subject it was to error. His respect for journalism may have been a motivation for his lifelong production in that medium. Charlot also collected and studied ephemera, "posters, handbills, manifestos" (Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944, below), and the JCC contains several unique examples of documents that no one else considered worth preserving.

Similarly, Charlot tried unsuccessfully to convince United States museums that they should collect the many mural cartoons that were simply being discarded.[79] Charlot found institutions more interested in prints; the editor of *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* wrote:

> Most of the exhibition—indeed most of the Museum's distinguished collection of Mexican graphic arts—was either given by the painter Jean Charlot or else collected by him in Mexico for the Museum. Mr. Charlot has continued his helpfulness by drawing on his great and sensitive knowledge of Mexican art for this article. (November 1949: 81)

Such activities were effective also in making Mexican art and artists better known. For instance, Charlot donated prints by Emilio Amero to the Metropolitan in order to publicize that artist (Zuñiga 2008: 64 f., 102).

Charlot was also very interested in photographs. Zohmah Charlot wrote to Prudence Plowe that Charlot was going to Coyoacán "to see a woman we used to know and he wanted to see if she had photographs of one of the early muralists whom she had liked" (December 14, 1946). In the 1920s, Charlot worked with Tina Modotti to record the murals of Orozco[80] and, in the 1940s, with another professional photographer to record those of Juan Cordero (1945 Juan Cordero). He found an old news photograph of Orozco and solicited photographs from his colleagues.[81] Again, the JCC contains many rare items. Charlot studied photographs as carefully as texts: "I used a magnifying glass to see what was in the plate" of a dinner with Vasconcelos, Zapata, and Villa so he could add "chicken and asparagus" to his vivid description.[82] Just as Charlot had used Orozco's art works to recreate the mood of the Revolution that artist had experienced, so Charlot could use photographs of the art school at Santa Anita to describe its atmosphere.[83]

Charlot collected information and unpublished writings from his colleagues in the movement, eliciting at the same time their comments.[84] He also received materials from fellow scholars. Weisman sent him an obscure reference for his work on Juan Cordero (September 7, 1947). Charlot was always looking for more documentation, for instance to write on Manuel Manilla:

> yes I could work out a text of sufficient interest with what documents I have at hand, but would like very much indeed to have at least a look at the documentation that Leopoldo Mendez had accumulated. (Charlot to F. Wardlaw October 12, 1971)

Charlot asked several of his colleagues to write their memoirs, thus turning their memories into documents. Charlot published translations of the memoirs he requested by Leal and Alva de la Canal in *MMR*, using them scrupulously, even when they conflicted with his own memories.[85] But he found that most people preferred to talk rather than to write, to be interviewed and let someone else do the organizing and writing. Indeed, most of Siqueiros autobiographical materials and all of the relevant books on Rivera were produced in this way. Emilio Amero thanked Charlot "por las buenas intenciones que te has tomado al pedirme que te mande unas diez paginas sobre mi humilde persona, Dies Paginas!!!!" 'for the good intentions you have had to ask me to send you some ten pages on my humble person, Ten Pages!!!!'; Charlot could write about him better than he could himself (August 3, 1947). Nonetheless, he sent Charlot his important memoir in October (Amero 1947); it was Amero's "most complete known text" (Zuñiga 2008: 18–27). But Charlot did not always succeed in persuading his friends to help, as his wife complained:

> Jean is also writing many articles. I begin to be tired of so much writing. There will be one in a first issue of Magazine of Art and in an English magazine "The Arts". The first on Guerrero he wrote in order to reciprocate for some information he needed for his book, which now Jean's article is at the publishers Guerrero says he hasn't time to give![86]

As a result, Charlot himself had to record the information he was learning orally from others. An early indication of this can be found in the passages of the Araujo article of August 2, 1923, that discuss the Mexican art world just prior to and during the Revolution: the ascendancy of the Academy being undermined by the Impressionism introduced by Dr. Atl in 1908, the impact of the works sent home by Mexican artists living in Paris, the enlistment of the artists as revolutionaries, and the influence of their war experience on their characters and work. Siqueiros was certainly the source of this detailed information—found also in his later writings—and Charlot was receiving an early oral history of the movement, which he would later present, supported with documentary research. In *MMR* (195), he refers to "anecdotes told to me by Siqueiros in 1923." Charlot heard many stories from others as well. Charlot's and Blanchard's "La Jeune Peinture Mexicaine" (September 16, 1922) displays what he knew before his conversations with Siqueiros.

Charlot remembered Siqueiros as the best storyteller he ever met and recorded for *MMR* Siqueiros' famous story of his quarrel with Orozco in the snows of New York city.[87] Oral communications are recorded also in the *MMR* folders, for instance, by Angelina Beloff (on Lhote and Metzinger), Leal, Jorge Enciso, Gabriel Fernández Ledesma, Nacho Asúnsolo, and probably Best Maugard.[88]

The marginal notes made during the conversation with Leal provide a picture of Charlot at work. He is apparently checking his own translation of Leal's "The '1793' of Mexican Painting" (ca. 1934),

writing in the margins as they proceed. They come to the passage on page four of the typescript: "Ramon Alva, Charlot and I initiated then the first trials of fresco painting…" Charlot writes in the margin:

> Says Leal: "And I do him a favor there. I don't remember that he did." I: "I remember some trial by Revueltas." Leal: "That I don't."[89]

On page five, Leal had written: "The first who began painting fresco was Ramon Alva de la Canal," with Charlot following after he saw how quickly one could work in the medium. Charlot notes:

> Says Leal: "Put what you want there. (!) I remember he painted a few days, and then stopped for a long time because he had used the expense money on some other thing." (L.)

Leal earns his exclamation mark by assuming that Charlot will present tendentiously this important historical point. Charlot's "(L.)" reveals how anxious he is to record accurately that Leal himself made the statement.

Charlot's checking of documents against memories was part of his method because he recognized the limitations of a purely documentary approach:

> When documents are the only source of knowledge, one must, at times, be led to false conclusions, or at least to irrelevant ones. In this case, however, it is still possible to cross-check existing texts against live memories. I was a witness to the fever of creation that seized Siqueiros on his return, and that was to eventually stamp many of his personal traits on the Mexican school. In this light, the only Academy document to touch on that period is perhaps disappointing.[90]

The document is a janitor's report on Siqueiros' and Fermín Revueltas' drunken breaking of a glass pane in a studio skylight. The coordination of documents, oral transmission, and personal memories was characteristic of Charlot's work. For instance, to establish the history of Orozco's Revolutionary Series, Charlot used his own memory, asked Anita Brenner to write down hers, consulted her *Idols Behind Altars*, and finally checked everything against Brenner's contemporary diary.[91]

For all his commitment to documents, Charlot had an innate appreciation of purely oral sources, and the information he gathered is generally considered reliable. Zalce wrote to Charlot and his wife (August 17, 1971):

> Muchas gracias Jean por tu escrito. Me dejaste con los ojos cuadrados con tu fantástica memoria, pues citas una conversación que tuvimos hace algo así como 23 años o más, cuando te conté mis recuerdos infantiles de la Revolución.[92]
>
> 'Many thanks, Jean, for your writing. You left me open-eyed with your fantastic memory, since you cite a conversation that we had something like twenty-three years ago or more, when I told you my childhood memories of the Revolution.'

Charlot credited some oral sources more than others. For instance, he never believed Rivera's stories about Posada, but felt Orozco's must be true, because Orozco would never lie.[93]

At times, Charlot may have relied on oral sources to the point of error. For instance, he had an exceptionally close relationship with the Vanegas Arroyo family, the publishers of Posada.[94] In his first interview with a family member, Doña Carmen Rubio de Vanegas Arroyo repeated to him Posada's vivid stories of the floods at León, which he gave as the reason for his coming to Mexico City.[95] Doubts have, however, been raised about the dating, one of several such problems in Posada studies. Oral informants could be insistent. Charlot remembered that when he questioned a Casasola photographer about the accuracy of a date, the man reached indignantly for an imaginary gun at his hip.

Similarly, on good technical evidence, Thomas Gretton has judged Charlot to be in error in claiming that Posada practiced direct engraving on metal plates.[96] A final judgment on this question must take into account that Charlot, in his detailed descriptions of Posada's technique, was relying on interviews with the Vanegas Arroyo family and the memories of Orozco and others.[97] He also sought information wherever he could find it. Virginia Stewart wrote to Charlot: "Regalado's tales about Fabres, Posada, etc. etc. are endless..wish you could hear him…" (March 19, late 1940s). Manuel Rivera Regalado, who had worked for Vanegas Arroyo, expressed his willingness to help Charlot, and they corresponded in the 1950s: "Manuel was kind enough to write for me his memories of both men [Posada and Vanegas Arroyo] and made a sketch of Posada at work that is illustrated in my book *The Mexican Mural Renaissance*."[98] Posada is shown engraving directly on a metal plate or block, and wood and metal shavings are scattered on the floor. A late example of such Posada stories is provided by Alfredo Zalce:

> De Posada, uno de los Vanegas Arroyo nos contó hace mucho tiempo una cosa interesante:—Todas las mañanas, antes de ir a su Taller, Posada recorría las imprentas preguntando si habría algún grabado que hacer. En caso afirmativo de las bolsas de su saco tomaba una placa de metal y buril, y allí mismo, en unos cuantos minutos grababa alguna viñeta or retrato etc. y continuaba su recorrido. ¡Qué bonita manera de llevar su oficio! (Zalce to Charlot, October 24, 1978)
>
> 'About Posada, one of the Vanegas Arroyo family members told us a long time ago something interesting:—Every morning, before going to his print workshop, Posada went around to the shops asking if there was any print to make. When there was, he would take from the pouches of his bag a metal plate and burin, and right there, in a few minutes, engraved some vignette or portrait, etc. and then he would continue his round. What a nice way to do his job!'

Collecting documents and oral reports laid the basis for study. Alberto Beltrán wrote to Charlot on January 19, 1974, asking for information on the printmaker Manuel Manilla:

> Creo que lo que reuniste entonces es muy valioso y debe ser conocido, tanto por tu trabajo y tus consideraciones como por el material en si mismo.
>
> 'I believe that what you collected then is very important and should be known, as much for your work and ideas as for the material in itself.'

From the beginnings of the movement in Mexico, Charlot had not only gathered documents but had begun to make notes on their use (*Notebook C* in *Escritos*). Some uses of documents were straightforward. In his review of Robert Goldwater's *Rufino Tamayo*, Charlot writes: "When the artist, as seems the case here, scruples to recount his past, means may be validly used to fill in, ever so slightly, biographical gaps" (*AA* II 363–368: 364). The method is to use documents:

> The modern artist, too, is leaving factual clues in documents that await future art historians, who will entrust to these more impersonal witnesses the task of assessing the understandable enthusiasm of today's critic, who speaks of a master who is also a living man.

The purpose is to attain a historical understanding of the subject: "By the use of historical method, premature as it were, Tamayo may be specifically linked to the local cultural background…" (365). Charlot uses documents to find an earlier Tamayo artwork than Goldwater had.

Most often, however, documents posed problems that required a critical approach: interpreting them in their historical, cultural, and personal contexts.[99] Charlot was again following normal scholarly methods, but the largely unstudied documents required their creative application. Charlot was particularly intrigued by the problems posed by Mexican Spanish; for instance, "Already in Colonial times, the term 'American' was used as a badge of political nonconformism with Spanish rule on this continent" (*San Carlos* 85 f.). In his review of Alma Reed's *Orozco*, he writes, "In Mexico, even a word can hold complex innuendoes" (Fall 1956: 87). Writing to L. Kemp, an editor of the University of Texas Press, Charlot objected to a translation of an Orozco letter:

> Spanish, p. 95. Letter 24. hago "de tripas corazon".
>
> English, p. 57, translated as "I am keeping a stiff upper lip."
>
> I would prefer something closer to the original, "When the heart fails me, I use guts." (October 26, 1972)

The final translation was, "but I have the guts to cope with it" (Orozco 1974: 62; 1971: 95). Similarly, Charlot's suggested "working in a kewpie factory" was changed to "doll factory" (*MMR* 221, typescript 353). For Charlot, writer and poet, the language of a document was part of its value: "Much material is published here for the first time and it would weaken its value to have it published only in a translation."[100] Charlot particularly appreciated the Mexican Spanish of Orozco[101] and was delighted by Zalce's story that his murals had been criticized for their *muertitos* 'little dead ones' (Zalce to Charlot and wife June 24, 1970). Carlos Mérida was aware of Charlot's sensitivity to language:

> Él aprendió de golpe el español. Tiene una capacidad para los idiomas muy, muy, muy grande y muy afinada. (January 29, 1971)
>
> 'He learned Spanish right away. He had a capacity for languages that was very, very, very great and very refined.'

Language sensitivity was as important in communication as in understanding:

> It is a common experience of students of languages how each language specializes in certain limited areas of interests or of feelings in which it reigns supreme. The man who expresses himself equally well in a number of languages will be tempted to use them each for what it can do best and, as he shifts thoughts, exchanges the one tongue for another as a laborer will pick a particular tool for each given job. When a single language is the only tool, as in our English-speaking universities, there is many an intellectual task at which it is bound to prove awkward. (Charlot 1951 College Art Teaching)

When as a child, I complained about French declensions and conjugations, saying I preferred English. My father said, "At least French is clear."

One of Charlot's main purposes in using documents and oral reports was to establish an accurate chronology, e.g., in "Plans for Work":

> The use of these documents as an objective basis of truth to establish the history of the events…Such a history would emphasize chronology and factual sequence.
>
> … Chronological sequence is stressed to attain a correct estimate of stylistic evolution.
>
> … Documents that permit exact dating [of Montenegro's *The Feast of the Cross*]. (Appendix I 1944, below)

Many sheets of Charlot's *MMR* notes are devoted to arranging sources and events in chronological order, and critical notes like "Schmeckeb. errors" (on Schmeckebier 1939) concentrate on those of chronology.

Such dating was important for the history of the mural movement; for instance, the evaluation of Montenegro's *The Feast of the Cross* depends on its date.[102] The date of Charlot's own first fresco has been the subject of controversy, as seen above. Indeed, faulty dating—and even backdating—has been a primary means of formulating the dogmatic picture of Mexican art. More generally, the later "Tres Grandes" situation of Mexican art was projected back into the early 1920s:

> We witness here the illusion bred by uncertain dating, that the works of a recognized master, aggressively visible now and of vast bulk, must have somehow influenced works less publicized and less exposed, and done by very young men. Checking on dates proves that there was instead a give and take, and that, if Rivera's example was a spur, in exchange some of the essential lines along which the renaissance grew were stated first by the maligned Dieguitos. (Writings Related to *MMR*)

Again, a parallel can be drawn to the dogma of Mexican history: "mythification tends to suffocate, if not entirely obliterate, the historical context" (Garner 2001: 14). Competing chronologies, neglect of chronology, and even anti-chronology continue to plague the field.

Accurate dating was also important for understanding individual artists, and Charlot devoted much research and writing to establishing a proper chronology for Orozco. A major problem was Reed's

claim that Orozco's wash drawing Revolution Series was started in 1913–1917, that is, while the artist was participating in the event. Charlot established that the Series was created in 1926–1928, phrasing his conclusion diplomatically: "Those who know Orozco's lightning way of working believe the purported earlier sketches…to have been rather mental notations" (*AA* II: 287). The correction was valuable because it clarified Orozco's development: "Main interest of this rectification will be to free the master's work from the implausible duality of styles implied…" Moreover, the correction aided in understanding the psychology of the artist: "both the working habits and the mood of the artist"; "Orozco needs to turn his back on the model to see it clearly."[103] Charlot continued to insist on the proper dating of Orozco's work during the editing of that artist's letters from New York.[104] Charlot's work on Orozco's dates was appreciated by his son Clemente:

> As Jean, and perhaps you also, knew, I have been writing a chronology on my father for the past five years, and naturally I am constantly consulting Jean's books. I increasingly appreciate his scholar's research. (Orozco V. to Zohmah Charlot April 12, 1982)

Charlot was an exceptionally close reader, which I first found when he criticized my own articles. He was also a master at teasing the human story out of the most bureaucratic documents (e.g., Summer 1951: 360 f.). Indeed, many art historical subjects can be treated exclusively on a documentary basis, but for the broader topics Charlot addressed and for art criticism, he felt a further capacity was necessary: connoisseurship or taste. Charlot described this capacity in different ways and using different terms; my use of the two above simplifies the discussion for clarity. The whole subject is most controversial, and I will restrict myself to Charlot's own views.

Defined in general terms, Charlot is referring to the appreciation of the individual art work. The viewer should be able to understand what the work is doing or saying, what the artist intended, the message he wished to convey. The viewer should be able to evaluate the work's technique, esthetic quality, and power. He should be able to place the individual work within the artist's total œuvre, art history, and general history, and assess its significance in those contexts. Most important, the viewer should be able to identify and appreciate the unique quality of an art work, what distinguishes it from all others, what makes it new, innovative, and creative. All such general terms need to be specified in the discussion of the work and its artist.

Significantly, such appreciation requires the same skills—the same sensitivity, receptivity, and insight—needed to appreciate a human being. Documentary research and connoisseurship parallel reading about a person and actually meeting him. Does one perceive him merely as he has been reported, or does one form one's own view? Charlot insisted throughout his life on the need for the viewer to look at art: "Even though reconstructing the spirit of a period is important, it is even more important to use our own eyes."[105] To do so requires independent thinking and the courage of one's opinions. Martin Charlot, a son of the artist, once stated that if Charlot had not trusted his own taste and judgment, he would never have discovered Posada; as Charlot wrote: "The output of folk artists is so varied as to be unclassifiable, so cheap as to be despised, so thrust under everyone's eyes as to become invisible" (*AA* II: 124). Most

viewers look at art works through the filters of secondary literature. Instead of seeing a work, they see a label. Charlot protested against the inevitable impoverishment of perception: "Mayan art defies any label" (*AA* II: 54). Any great artist "surpassed in height and depth the critic":

> each generation takes hold of a genius by a single hair, and proclaims that it holds the whole man. Among modern masters, more and more does Cézanne prove his scope as beyond that niche in art history prepared for him by his early apologists, that of a precursor of cubism. (*AA* I: 327)

Lesser artists often attract historians because they are less mysterious: "Dürer is interesting because he's so analyzable. You can see what he's trying to do. So he's a good subject for scholars" (Tabletalk October 1975). Great art ultimately escapes the rational:

> Tal hipnotización plástica del espectador y su transporte hacia un plano a donde ya no le puede servir su juicio crítico natural es el milagro que debe producir toda obra de arte auténtica y es una de las bellezas fundamentales del arte maya. (January 1928)
>
> 'Such a plastic hypnotizing of the spectator and transporting him towards a plane where his natural critical judgment can no longer serve him is the miracle that every work of authentic art should produce and is one of the fundamental beauties of Maya art.'

Though Charlot could adapt general theories (e.g., *AA* II: 66 f.), he felt they could act as blinders. In Yucatan, Charlot was tickled when he showed a scholar a baroque-style temple that had been covered by one of classical style; "No, no," said the scholar, "Classical before baroque." Connoisseurship focuses on human individuals and achieved art works; that is, it reinforced Charlot's historian's tendencies. Art history is full of unexpected surprises, and the art historian must be ready to see them.[106]

The difference between independent seeing and applying labels is obvious when the viewer is faced with something new, that is, with contemporary art. Most people will simply not see it, few will understand it, and deprived of herd judgment, fewer still will support it. The artists of the Mexican Mural Renaissance suffered deeply from the public antagonism to "ces belles choses *uniques au monde dans la période actuelle d'art*" 'these beautiful things, *unique in the world in the contemporary period of art*' (July 1924). The good critic is the one who sees correctly, whose judgments endure: "The touch of true scholarship is to be able to recognize in our day which of the men of the present will be the old masters of the future…this judgment passed on contemporaries is very hard to do right" (September 1947). Charlot admired—and memorialized—critics who were right, like López López and Gabino on Juan Cordero. He himself was proud that his articles of the 1930s on Cubism and Surrealism could be republished in the 1970s without substantive changes.[107] Such critical judgments are easily dismissed as subjective, but correct judgments can indeed be made and ultimately confirmed by posterity, whose judgment, Charlot once said, is infallible.

For Charlot, art is created by artists, and the one cannot be understood without the other: understanding art is deciphering the enigma of the artist's soul. The viewer thus needs to apply the same

sympathy, respect, and love that religion commands for all human relationships. Accordingly, Charlot regularly uses the language of religion and morality for art making and art appreciation. For Charlot, artists were always living human beings: "It is with Posada alive that I am most concerned, and how to outline his sturdy contours before they thin out in a haze of glory" (1964 Posada's Dance of Death: 2). This sense increased as Charlot aged. When in 1976 I noticed differences in my father's latest writings on Posada, he said: "I *identify* with him more" (Tabletalk September 21). Charlot found this quality in older criticism already being challenged in 1937:

> Much fun has been made of the emotional criticism of yore as opposed to such a so-called scientific attitude. Yet the case for the old-fashioned literateur-critic is still valid. He sensed the picture as alive and an autopsy would have seemed to him akin to murder.[108]

Appreciative and grateful statements by artists and Vasconcelos' reference to Charlot's "penetración psicologico," quoted above, reveal how successfully Charlot entered into the thinking of living artists. He in fact planned at one time to describe his own mental processes as he worked.

For Charlot art criticism and history required both documentary research and connoisseurship. Like Siqueiros, he contrasted his own approach to Rivera's on Juan Cordero: Rivera used exclusively his connoisseurship while Charlot joined his to research. Charlot wrote Brenner about Rivera's Posada project:

> Diego es muy inteligente pero no tomara tiempo de buscar material ni hechos y que salga en FW un articulo de el diciendo que Posadas es un enorme artista no quita nada de lo que tenemos… ("Recibi tu carta estupida Francis")
>
> 'Diego is very intelligent but will not take the time to look for material or facts, and that an article of his appears in *Mexican Folkways* saying that Posadas is an enormous artist takes away nothing of what we have…'

For Charlot, scholarship prevented connoisseurship from being amateurish (the bane of much writing on Mexican art), while connoisseurship prevented scholarship from being inhumane. Goldwater used "what knowledge he has of Tamayo's Mexican cultural background, and a firsthand connoisseur's reaction to Tamayo's paintings," but his study needed to be supplemented by the documents Charlot had found (*AA* II: 363). Connoisseurship was necessary for the most basic tasks of art history; for instance, "The safest guide for attribution remains quality" (*San Carlos* 46). But the purpose of writing—criticism or history—could determine the proportion:

> The aim is to reconstruct the milieu that bred the movement, the exciting era attendant on the making of the murals, rather than to procure a final critical estimate of the work as it stands today. (Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944, below)

Charlot once told me that in the early mural movement, some of the artists were good, some were "less good," but they had all lived through a great moment, which bound them together forever. Thus in *MMR*, Charlot focused on the moment. He left unsaid his negative esthetic assessment of the Nacionalistas like

Montenegro and wrote positively about their historical significance. In doing so, he minimized, I believe, the qualitative difference introduced into the movement by the new group of artists who began their activity in late 1921. Siqueiros marked the difference by calling Rivera the "*primer hombre importante de sus fundadores*" 'first important man among [the movement's] founders' (1978: 47).

However, if a choice had to be made between documentary research and connoisseurship, Charlot would pick the latter. In an extreme statement, Charlot prefers to reject the whole research foundation rather than miss the characteristic point, the individual quality, of the art work:

> Qu'on soit savant en histoire de l'art, en connaissances des secrets et des règles du métier, je crois, pour juger, qu'il faut oublier tout cela. La beauté d'une peinture n'est autre chose que l'émotion qu'on en ressent. Or, cette peinture-ci émotionne.[109]
>
> 'That one is knowledgeable in art history, in the secrets and rules of the craft, I think, in order to judge, that it is necessary to forget all that. The beauty of a painting is nothing other than the emotion that one feels from it. And this painting stimulates emotion.'

Charlot's description of art viewing parallels that of art-making: the uncreative artist

> will ease himself by leaning on an academic knowledge of the art styles of the past. All he knows, from Altamira to Miro, will be ingeniously put to work in pictures whose only defect will be a lack of creativeness.
>
> True creation must start from nothing. (*AA* I: 50 f.)

The true viewer must be artistic himself. For both viewer and artist, observation is the beginning and basis of the process. For both, ocular perceptions are then organized by the mind.[110] The viewer must truly enter into the mind of the artist and follow its process. The viewer then adds his own.

Charlot frankly acknowledges the use of his personal taste in particular discussions. His choice of a favorite Mexican print is based not on its artist's fame:

> and the attendant publicity drummed around big names but rather [on] the inner conformity felt before the art work when one is alone with it, and just looking. For the same reason, I would not choose either the biggest print or the loudest, impressive as is the Mexican version of both. (*AA* II: 156)

This point of taste led Charlot to joke about the panels by Rivera, Orozco, and Siqueiros in the Palacio de Bellas Artes: "'*Los tres grandes'* scream at the top of their lungs in a contest to see which can outshout the other" (*AA* II: 391). When Edward Weston asked Charlot to choose photographs for an exhibition, he found:

> Perhaps if I had selected Chicago show, more of the hard, stronger items would have been included. Jean's tendency was to select the more subtle work. (Weston 1966: 278)

Other aspects of Charlot's taste were more unconscious influences, such as his dislike of Neoclassicism. Others were still deeper in his thinking, never being connected explicitly to the Mexican movement. For instance, although I have no hard evidence, I believe my father saw the Mexican Mural Renaissance as nearer to the French than to the Italian. Both France and Mexico had to struggle not only with art problems but with the domineering influence of a near and still active predecessor. Seventeenth-century France faced the Italians and Bernini; twentieth-century Mexico, Paris and Picasso. Charlot never developed this idea, but some of his notorious Mexican nationalism may be based on his admitted French artistic chauvinism.

As a historian and archeologist, Charlot was aware of the distortions produced by subjectivity. In his "Art and Archaeology" (1949), building on the work of Manuel Gamio, he surveys "the different trends" in the understanding of Precolumbian art over the years: "Whatever concept of art was current at the time the object was studied is reflected in its appreciation."[111] Charlot characteristically includes himself among the mistake makers (49). The survey leads Charlot to "ask if certain of those approaches are more valid than others, that is, if we have any key as to how far we miss or how near we miss when we look at pre-Hispanic art" (51). Charlot sees subjectivity as inescapable—"there is a kind of instinct in these things"—but proposes an objective control:

> if we can discover a point of view that accepts and appreciates more of those objects, and rejects fewer of them, that point of view will be closer to the original point of view of the pre-Hispanic artist.

Classicism and realism rejected most Precolumbian art, but with the wider tastes inculcated by modern art, "we will find that we can admire a very great quantity, a very great majority, of Aztec pieces of sculpture."[112] Even more important, the geometric emphasis in modern art, inspired by Cézanne, reveals a fundamental commonality between the Western and the Mexican Indian artist. For instance, that they both use the Golden Section can be seen as a "proof of the universal aesthetic appeal of this venerable proportion" (*AA* II: 53). Charlot is describing here his own approach, but leaves room for others, future and present, particularly the Surrealistic understanding of Precolumbian art, which he personally dislikes.

Charlot's use of connoisseurship is obvious in his writings, and I will suggest its range with a few quotations:

> lo cual explicaría una especie de agresividad militar que, en partes, se impone sobre el espíritu religioso y que es rasgo más propio de la generación de los conquistadores que del siglo XVII. (1945 El San Cristóbal)
> 'which would explain a kind of military aggressivity that, in places, imposes itself on the religious spirit and that is a trace more properly of the generation of conquistadors than of the seventeenth century.'

> Tres estilos distintos se advierten superpuestos en este palimpsesto plástico.
> 'Three distinct styles reveal themselves superposed in this plastic palimpsest.'

> Tal estilo, primitivo si se juzga en términos de un dibujo correcto, se relaciona con el arte de hoy…
> 'Such a style—primitive if judged in terms of correct drawing—is related to the art of today…'
>
> [Identifying changes made during retouching] ese niño tan bonito y tan gentil y a la vez tan incompatible con el plan original.
> 'this baby boy, so gentle and mild and at the same time so incompatible with the original plan.'
>
> a mood dramatic enough to make this drawing a worthy Colonial link between pre-Hispanic renderings of the "slave" theme and modern ones, fraught with social-conscious undercurrents. (*San Carlos* 58)
>
> And yet the craft of an Aztec hand is suggested by the directness of the carving, of a stockiness that bespeaks respect for his material—a local yellow stone…Patiño's technique, unlike his esthetics, still showed some awareness of the pre-Hispanic tradition, of the unclassical—but true—worth of statues kept close to the original boulder shape. (71 f.)

Charlot felt that connoisseurship was equally important for archaeologists, usually "innocent of aesthetic training" (*AA* II: 40), both for the field itself and for the wider assimilation of Indian art into world art history. Mayan art should not be "left wholly to the taste of scientists" but that art should be treated as "a part of our common aesthetic heritage" (*AA* II: 39). He hoped Hawai'i archeologists would not just describe external appearances, but bring out the "juice" of Hawaiian objects (Tabletalk October 24, 1977). He objected to Peter Buck's treating wood and stone objects separately "Because sometimes [the Hawaiians] put the two together." Selected quotations show aspects of Charlot's use of connoisseurship in his own archeological work:

> [Although the figures are carrying weapons,] the whole attitude is more religious than bellicose. Perhaps the spear-thrower is used only as a ceremonial object. (1926 Report: 5)
>
> The different parts of the head are described but without destroying the squarish appearance of the primitive block of stone. (1927 Report: 3)
>
> less close observation of nature…but the freer handling of the natural elements leads to a greater dignity in style. (6)
>
> expressing a more general and religious feeling…
>
> Heads especially are strongly individualistic and are portrayed with a sincerity which makes even the ugliest of them beautiful in features. (6 f.)
>
> Technically it is by far the finest piece of pre-Columbian mural painting which has yet been found, and compares favorably with the best pages of the codices. (9)

> [Some decorated jars are found] en los cuales la pureza de estilo no permite catalogarlos entre los objetos de arte menor, con cualidades más bien decorativas, sino decididamente como arte monumental. (January 1928)
> 'in which the purity of style does not permit their being categorized as objects of minor art, with primarily decorative qualities, but rather decidedly as monumental art.'

> the drawings are too full of life to be second or third-hand copies from monuments… (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 314)

> This method of using a work of art as merely an accumulation of descriptive data fails to reveal or define its most individual feature, which is style. (319)

> the insistence on a squarish outline with extremely short fingers is characteristic of the popular peasantlike tendencies of this particular artist. (324)

> his intelligent feeling for the material used, his peculiarly mathematical emotion, and the tragic core that underlies its "abstract" veneer. (June 1936: 13)

Charlot's connoisseurship also had a more general influence on his work. For instance, its personalist approach is clear in his writings on Mexican folk arts, which had been attracting literary attention for over a hundred years. Charlot's work is distinguished by his effort to identify the individual folk artist and study him as one would a fine artist of the mainstream tradition: "out of this anonymous limbo of folk art have emerged already such artists as Posada, Manila [*sic*], and Estrada…"[113] The emergence of the first two was due to Charlot's efforts. From his life in France, Charlot was accustomed to recognizing folk and popular artists as people, notably, Georgin of the Images d'Épinal and Honoré Daumier.

Charlot had already mentioned Posada in the Araujo articles of 1923, incorporating him as an individual artist into the history of Mexican art. Charlot sketched his intended program more fully in 1926:

> No se podía menospreciar su producción misma, por ser excelente. Entonces se inventó el truco del "arte popular", gracias al cual se podía rendir homenaje a los objetos de arte y seguir despreciando al artista autor de ellos, escondiéndolos, dizque para su provecho, porque sus obras, cesando de ser anónimas, hubieran cesado de ser populares y ya no hubieran interesado a la "élite".
>
> Yo creo que, con alguna buena voluntad, podríamos "despopularizar" una buena parte de las obras plásticas mexicanas y dar, al fin, a sus autores los elogios y el respeto que merecen.[114]
>
> 'The production itself [of the artist] cannot be depreciated, because it is excellent. So the trick of "popular art" was invented, thanks to which one can render honor to the objects of art and continue depreciating the artist who authored them; hiding them

> [the authors], allegedly for their own good, because their works, ceasing to be anonymous, would cease to be of the people and then would no longer have interested the "élite"…
>
> 'I think that with a little good will, we can "depopularize" a good part of the Mexican art works and give, finally, its authors the praise and respect they deserve.'

Once the folk artist had been recognized as a human being, his art could be appreciated for "su calidad humana" 'its human quality.'

Charlot always sensed the artist behind the art work. His wife described their experience in a Mexican market:

> at one stand we found a pin of a couple paddling a canoe. Jean says it was probably made for the private amusement of some craftsman, being so different from the usual silver pieces. He said he had once found a piece of jewelry with a head that might have been drawn by Picasso.[115]

Charlot went to meet folk artists in Mexico just as in France he had visited Épinal and in the United States would make contact with creators of comic strips.

Charlot wanted popular art to be studied with the same rigor as recognized fine art: "Basta verlas como pinturas y no como curiosidades folklóricas" 'They should be looked at as paintings and not as folkloric curiosities' (October 1926 Pinturas). Charlot started listing Manilla's works (1916 Nota sobre Manuel Manilla) and did much work on a *catalogue raisonné* of Posada. He explained their historical and social contexts and analyzed their technique and style. Charlot saw Mexican popular arts as a heritage of Precolumbian art:

> La historia de tal arte deberá reconstituirse, como ya se hizo para la de los frescos griegos, siguiendo las huellas que dejó en el estilo de la pintura menor. (January 1928)
>
> 'The history of such art should be reconstructed, as has been done for Greek frescoes, following the traces that it left in the style of minor painting.'

Comparing the ancient and the modern Maya "gives us a knowledge of and a respect for both" (*AA* II: 38). Indeed, seeing the continuity between them was primarily connoisseurship:

> Pero en donde fracasa el cientista, el artista logra el gol, sin saber cómo y casi sin anhelarlo, sustituyendo con la intuición estética al conocimiento razonable. (January 1946)
> 'But where the scientist fails, the artist reaches the goal, without knowing how and almost without aspiring to, substituting esthetic intuition for rational knowledge.'

Popular artists were not reducible to their contexts, but were artists exploring their media as much as their world; for instance, Posada was:

> an artist whose keen delight in human values never conflicted with an equally intense appreciation of abstract chords—played with endless variations on the single theme of black and white. (1945–1947: 12)

Most important, Charlot described their unique characters in vivid descriptions. To give just one example, Posada's predecessors emphasized consoling miracles:

> Tales relatos no atrajeron mucho a Posada…En cambio, Posada se apoderó de otro género de milagros, algo más inquietantes. Inventa con regocijo mil nahuaques y demonios, los echa despiadadamente encima de algún miserable, alumbra infiernos inauditos para su castigo. (1928 Posada Grabador Mexicano)

> 'Such stories did not much attract Posada…In exchange, Posada seized on another kind of miracles, somewhat more disquieting. He invented with gusto a thousand gods and demons, threw them pitilessly onto some miserable human being, lit unheard of Hells for his punishment.'

The most unusual problem with a person that Charlot faced was the one with himself: Charlot was both critic and artist, reporter and participant, historian and source: "Because I am one of the few survivors of the period of art of the 1920's in Mexico, I do receive many, many queries, plans and demands of help for thesis [*sic*], week after week."[116] Charlot would usually refer people to his books but also provided information that was as yet unrecorded. Curiously, he used himself as a source by publishing his own memoir in *MMR*.

Charlot clearly believed that his multiple roles could be coordinated. In fact, Charlot regularly based his thinking about art on his experience; for instance, he attached art problems to body consciousness (e.g., *AA* II: 66 f.). Charlot felt strongly that nonartists did not understand the artist's experience and, therefore, misunderstood his work:

> Critics, being by trade bookish, have created a fictitious artist in their own image. They jam him full of historical pedigrees, for dates are to be found in books and can be argued or authenticated. They make him also a battleground of styles, for with most of them comparison has taken the place of appreciation. They thus emphasize facts concerning historical tradition, but the laws of material and body, and this all-important holding of the mirror to Nature, are minimized or forgotten. (*AA* I: 65; also 50 ff.)

Charlot's use of his experience as an artist ranged from this basic level to particular details. At Chich'en Itza, he recognizes the orientation of figures towards an altar as characteristic of liturgical art (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 241 f.); he had used the same device in his first mural design, *Processional*, for a parish church in Paris. From his studies at the Beaux-Arts in Paris, he can recognize an odd pose as an academic exercise (*San Carlos* 138). He also describes art works he saw before their destruction (130 note 145). He could understand Orozco's relationship with his mason in terms of his own collaboration (*AA* II: 252). Charlot also applied his particular life experiences. He recognized the use of live glowworm larvae

on a costume in an ancient mural from his witnessing its continued use in the area (Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 289). When Charlot praised Zalce's depictions of Yucatán as accurate, he was doing so as one of the few art critics who knew the region firsthand. He and Guerrero had the same experience of doing their own murals in the little time left to them after assisting Rivera (1972 La Época de Xavier Guerrero). Charlot empathized with artists at points when his personality overlapped theirs: "Merida, as is his habit, did not bother to answer his critics" (July 1971); for Orozco in New York city, "worst of all in his estimation, the taming and tipping of uniformed doormen" (Fall 1956: 85). In his lecture, "Juan Cordero, Muralista Mexicano" (1945), Charlot develops the parallels between the experience of the nineteenth-century muralist and his own and his colleagues' in the twentieth, illuminating both. Charlot's experience was naturally influenced by his personal tendencies. For instance, he emphasized similarities through time and across cultures according to his view that "All great artists think alike."

Charlot focused his *MMR* on the years of which he had personal experience: "Pues la parte central está dedicada al periodo 1920–1925... la época que mejor conozco por haberla vivido personalmente" 'Then the central part is dedicated to the period 1920–1925…the period that I know best because I lived it personally' (September 14, 1945). He considered this personal experience to be an advantage in treating the period:

> My participation in this movement as a mural artist has given me an understanding of it from inside, and my labors in the field of Mexican archaeology have helped me to understand the traditions that lie behind modern Mexican art. (Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1942, below)
>
> The knowledge I have of art and writing does not come from academic study but from actual experience, especially as concerns Mexico. I took a pioneering part in the movement that I propose to write about and have close personal acquaintance both with the facts and with the individuals concerned.
>
> My knowledge of the Mexican art tradition, important for the correct evaluation of its contemporary output, comes from actual participation in archeological expeditions. I know the problems of the mural painter from the inside, having executed frescos for the Mexican Government as well as in the United States. (Appendix I "Statement of Advanced Work" 1944, below)

Charlot told me that if he had extended his study into the years in which he was absent from Mexico City, he could have written only as a historian and would have lost what he could contribute from his personal experience. The mere historian cannot reconstruct fully the feeling of the time and tends to distort it by projecting later developments back into the earlier stages: "the hindsight that is called historical perspective" (*San Carlos* 165). Charlot saw the same stage of recording in a book on United States street murals:

> The story told in these pages is not yet history. It concerns a renaissance in the making and comes close to being a journal jotted as the work proceeds. How then

> could the authors attempt to generalize, to summarize, and even less to moralize, things that, as a rule, we expect from histories of art and funeral orations. (Foreword to Cockroft et al. 1977: xvi)

Charlot was aware of the dangers as well as the advantages of his approach:

> To write about a movement in which the author has taken active part gives a certain vividness to the style, but one must avoid too subjective an approach and personalized estimates of people. In this book all facts are based on source material, contemporary clippings, handbills, and much unpublished material.
>
> Special attention is paid to murals now destroyed and to documents that touch on the "life and times" of the painters. (Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944, below)

Charlot controlled his memories very carefully while writing *The Mexican Mural Renaissance*, anxious to give more weight, I believe, to the documentary. However, when the Yale University Press restarted the book's long delayed publication process, Charlot looked at it with new eyes, and he emphasized the book's personal quality in his blurb (Ca. April 1961):

> This book is different from others that treat of the same subject because its point of view is that of an insider. An art book thus written is bound to include details usually bypassed or relegated to a discreet background. Charlot fortified his memory of the events by patient delvings into private papers and government archives...
>
> Perhaps what gives organic cohesion to this book, that weaves factual research with living memories, is the fact that in his excursion into the near past Charlot was recapturing for himself the flavor of his own youth. Even though he uses strict objective methods, he tells of his researches with the warmth that one reserves for personal memoirs.

Moreover, in his later reviews of other authors, he spoke more freely about the virtues of being a participant-observer-recorder-historian. In Alma Reed's *Orozco*, he found: "these added chapters may be afterthoughts. They lack the authentic fire with which Alma Reed testifies about events in which she was an active participant" (*AA* II: 318). Charlot was moved by the combination of exhaustive documentation —"voluminous and complex data"—and personal experience and feeling in Emily Edwards' *Painted Walls of Mexico*: "vitally involved in the esthetic drama"; "Those who shared this moment cannot forget its mood"; "Memories pull at the leash of scholarly apparatus" (1966 Foreword: ix). In sum, "Achieving their goal of objectivity, the authors add to it a bonus." Charlot could cast himself back into that earlier time without imposing the later layers of historiography. He felt that by doing so, certain facts were more clearly revealed:

> Más bien quiero poner algún orden en nuestros recuerdos comunes, aludiendo a esta época ya histórica, no como historia, sino simplemente como una serie de episodios de nuestra juventud. Apegándose uno a los hechos, sin necesidad de adoptar tono

> profesoral, se puede subrayar el papel único que a Xavier le tocó dentro del renacimiento muralista. (1972 La Época de Xavier Guerrero)
>
> 'I want rather to put some order into our common memories, alluding to this already historic epoch not as history but simply as a series of episodes of our youth. Attaching oneself to the facts, without needing to adopt a professorial tone, one can underline the unique role that fell to Xavier inside the Mural Renaissance.'

Indeed, as the events receded in time, Charlot's appreciation increased of more direct presentation.[117] However, he usually coordinated the two perspectives, for instance, writing that "Those who criticize in retrospect our acceptance of official commissions lack in historical perspective" (1977 Foreword: xvii). On this point, the two perspectives coincide: collaborating with the Obregón government felt right in the early 1920s, and the more problematic situation under succeeding governments should not be projected back into the period.

As a participant in the events, Charlot was able to record elements that would be difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct later, like the close relationship between the artists and their masons. Similarly, he described how much the muralists admired folk artists, which equalized their social intercourse (e.g., *AA* II: 130 f.). In contrast, Charlot found in the United States that the "Social Conscious" artists "talked down" to the people because "they were not considering themselves as part of the people" (June 9, 1965).

Charlot also felt that an impalpable group spirit was at work, moving the artists in directions they were not consciously intending:

> Perhaps the best proof that the painters acted not unlike mediums is the fact that, regardless of their leftist mouthings, they produced such masterpieces of religious art as Orozco's series on the life of Saint Francis, or Revueltas' *Devotion to the Virgin of Guadalupe*, fit expressions of their people. (*AA* II: 148)

Bigger than an individual's "egotistic satisfaction" is:

> the impulse that gave birth to the temples and major sculptures of the Mayas was the collective urge that seizes whole crowds and makes them build as one, be they Athenian Greeks or Gothic Frenchmen.[118]

Orozco was a prime example of the power of such unconscious factors in an artist's work, for instance: "Orozco's positive affirmation of faith is nonetheless impressive for being unconsciously uttered and consciously denied" (November 1947: 263). From a strident championing of an international, perennial, symbological, classicizing art, he moved almost against himself towards the historical, social themes that were providing the most inspiring subjects of the mural movement. In so doing, he created his best work. This late and gradual movement was partially due to Orozco's individual artistic psychology, that is, to his personal need to digest sights and experiences before addressing them. But Charlot felt that larger factors were also at work:

> What happened is that the artists commissioned to paint walls felt how these noble seasoned buildings dictated a task vaster than a display of personality: if their work was to be successful, it should prove to be more, a mouthpiece for collective feelings… (*AA* II: 9)

Group spirit was a response to historical and social need: "the spring that caused those monuments to surge as an answer to the need of the people" (*AA* II: 44). Muralism confronted artists with their artistic heritage in the very walls they were to paint on. Their brushes touched the work of Colonial builders, themselves heirs of a tradition that led the artists back to their Indian roots. Moreover, those buildings were public, making the whole community the intended viewer. That community needed to be addressed in an intelligible language on subjects of interest. All these factors exercised a power over the muralists that was revealed only through the course of the movement. Rivera moved from the symbolizing *Creation* to the ethnographic and historical subjects of the Ministry of Education. On the walls of his little staircase in the Preparatoria, Siqueiros moved from the puzzling symbolic figure on the ceiling to the great *Burial of a Worker*. Charlot himself moved from the unhistorical symbolism of *The Massacre in the Main Temple* to the straightforward depictions of his murals in the Ministry of Education. The Dieguitos—especially Leal, Alva de la Canal, and Revueltas—proved themselves prophets as well as pioneers.

In evaluating Charlot's historiography, an important consideration is his strong memory of how the Mexican Movement *felt* at the time: what the artists *thought* they were doing, how they *spoke* to each other. In hindsight, Charlot could see that their work was less based on Precolumbian art and closer to contemporary European than they had thought in the early 1920s. But that thought was important for their understanding of themselves and their work and part of the group spirit that powered their achievements. Similarly, the movement was experienced at the time as involving a large number of people with a variety of interests and directions; that is, it seemed more like the Araujo articles than the hindsight image of "Los Tres Grandes."

As a result of the factors discussed above, Charlot's *Mexican Mural Renaissance* was novel: scholarship and memory, documentation and experience, were coordinated to produce a more complete and human picture. His wife saw this clearly while he was writing the book:

> Wish you could read Jean's manuscript, it is unique anyway, style, subject and viewpoint. It will be one of those books where people will quote, "It is a well known fact" after reading it, it is so convincingly true and at the same time so original that no one will know.[119]

Moreover, stylistically, Charlot's presentation is closer to eighteenth-century French historiography—subtle, suggestive, humorous, wielding its erudition with a light touch—than to the Anglo-Germanic style normal in art history today.[120] One puzzled young American scholar described it to me as "almost like literature." Siqueiros' description of Charlot's presentation on Cordero—"de manera extraordinariamente amena y con muchos elementos instructivos" 'a manner extraordinarily agreeable and with many instructive elements'—finds echoes in other Mexican writers like Cordero y Salinas: "en su estilo irónico, ameno y simpático" 'in his ironic, agreeable, and sympathetic style.'[121] Charlot

generally uses ordinary language, eschewing technical terms. Siqueiros contrasted Charlot's language —"Nos enseño, así, la verdadera, la exacta—sin exageraciones misteriosas—obra…" 'He shows us in this way the true, the exact work, without mysterious exaggerations'—to Rivera's habitual "nube de humo metaforista" 'cloud of metaphoristical smoke' (1959: 20). Charlot then makes his prose vivid with details—like the chicken and asparagus, mentioned above—and with intriguing turns of phrase. He describes in "today's murals… frescoed brown giants, their fists shaken into geometry" (*AA* II: 4). He depicts the Indian Guerrero "pasando sobre los encalados rojizos y pulidos su mano del mismo color" 'passing over the red, polished wall-wash his hand of the same color' (1972 La Época de Xavier Guerrero). The rhetoric is not empty: the details have been unearthed by long research and the descriptive phrases emerge from intense analysis. Similarly, Charlot's humor has point. His French irony is tickled when he finds the Mexican artists in their premural periods complaining about having to draw models in their ordinary native costumes in 1904 and disparaging Vanegas Arroyo in 1911.[122] They were not acting in accordance with the later myth. Despite all Charlot's unusual ways of presenting his material, the result is clear:

> I read your book that very night and as usual I was very moved by the tremendous clarity of your thought and of your understanding. Everything falls into the right place. It is transparent like "cristal de roca" and so simple. It is very much like Jean Charlot. (Ricardo Martínez to Charlot June 28, 1973)

On the other hand, Charlot's Spanish, like his French, was not simple. In both literatures, his knowledge reached back into the Middle Ages, and he enjoyed reviving expressive words. An example in Spanish is his preference for *humilde* for *humble* over the more contemporary *sencillo*. *Humilde* had and still has negative connotations, but was canonical in older and religious literature. Vasconcelos also used "los humildes" for the poor (1982 volume 2: 89). Charlot was revalorizing vocabulary just as he was visual subjects from Mexican art history. In the United States, he would try the same with the depreciated *chromolithographs*, which he thought was exact.

Several peculiarities of Charlot's presentation may invite misinterpretation. Charlot writes with more precision than most scholars, and the proper weight must be given to his words. For instance, Charlot writes that in the famous 1910 exhibition by Mexican artists, "racial consciousness anticipated the creation of a truly Mexican style" (*AA* II: 260). Charlot disliked the work by Herrán and some others in the show, but is trying to be as positive as he can about them. The words "anticipated" and "truly" show how far he feels he can go. Similarly, Charlot applies the word "innocent" to Orozco: "This superb series closes Orozco's first period. Soon afterwards, his artistic innocence suffered severe jolts" (November 1947: 262). The word recalls the phrase "innocent abroad"; that is, Charlot was implying—what he stated explicitly in conversation—that Orozco was unable to assimilate the new influences he encountered on moving to New York City.[123]

Charlot's most sharply written criticisms were directed against critics, writers, and the occasional non-Mexican artist (e.g., Hoyningen Huene in *AA* II: 71 f.). His affection for his colleagues stimulated an amicable, positive tone, even in important criticisms, for instance, his doubts about the appropriateness of

some of Orozco's Guadalajara frescoes in their setting (*AA* II: 392). This tendency continues into Charlot's historical narration. The pervasive backbiting and intrigue endemic to artistic groups are mentioned in his writings only when they have some impact on events, such as Rivera's pushing Salvador Novo to attack Orozco, which resulted in the mutilation of his frescoes, and even this is reported in veiled terms.[124]

A device Charlot used to soften his criticisms was to phrase them as descriptions. The reader—and indeed the artist discussed—could agree with the description and remain unaware of Charlot's personal negative judgment. His article on Tamayo illustrates this method (*AA* II: 353–362). The reader of Charlot's other writings will be able to detect his reservations:

> picturesque subject matter of tropical Mexico…but used with a tremulous sense of responsibility to the rules of good taste and good painting. (357)
>
> without once falling into photographic vernacular, as he doses with sagacity diverse degrees of abstraction. (361)
>
> Style shifts…[from Mexican nature] to the international style in which the artist is working.
>
> this fresco affects the observer more through the handling of the brush than through its intellectual planning.

Charlot goes beyond description when he denies a point about which, I believe, he was genuinely worried: "Tamayo could have hardened his early success into the mold of a well balanced formula: enough sophistication to intrigue the layman, with enough naiveté to delight sophisticates."[125] Similarly, Charlot can express his hope as an established fact: "Distortions of the human figure are no longer meant for purposes of wit—as plastic puns. They are bona-fide distortions of passion" (358). Indeed, Charlot can become prescriptive rather than descriptive: "This huge mural should put Tamayo's mind at rest as to his ability to produce the kind of full-throated pipe-organ music that he questioned twenty years ago" (364).

This prescriptive tendency of Charlot's criticism is a prominent part of his 1920s polemic. He wrote about the influence of Indian art on the muralists and also took them to the museums to study it. When he wrote *MMR* in the 1940s, he could already judge his earlier ideas from a longer perspective. But the reader must still gauge how much his original, programmatic ideas—especially the opposition to the School of Paris and its current vogue of Neoclassicism—influenced his description of the movement.[126]

Most important in evaluating Charlot's historiography is the recognition that he deemphasized his own role and contribution. Examples are numerous. He describes Rivera as opposing Orozco and the younger artists in general, when in fact, as is clear from Glusker (1998), Rivera targeted Orozco and Charlot in particular. He mentions Novo attacking Orozco, but leaves it to Leal to mention "an inopportune meddler" (*MMR* 172) who caused a breach between himself and Charlot. He mentions Rivera and Siqueiros in the "rediscovery" of Juan Cordero, but not himself (*AA* II: 397). He is silent on all of his educative role—taking artists to the Museum of Archeology, advising them on technique and

composition—about which they themselves speak. He did not describe his stylistic contribution, for instance, in his early woodblocks. He did not write about his role as a writer and had to be interviewed on his relationship with the contemporary Mexican poets. In fact, Charlot wrote much more about others than about himself.[127] His writings are, in consequence, an inadequate guide to his own historical place.

When I was interviewing Charlot in the 1970s, I found that he had simply forgotten about many of the events I was discovering as I was arranging his papers. For instance, he had no memory that he had been the secretary of the Estridentista movement until I found a sheet of its official stationery. Both my parents had forgotten his role in "discovering" Zalce:

> I remember, Jean 'discovered' Zalce! (Emily Edwards to both September 20, 1974)
> Zohmah, you ask about Jean's having discovered Zalce. Jean may have forgotten, but I was there on the roof when he came back from the Students' Exhibit. at the St. Carlos (I *think*); and Jean was all enthusiasm for the lithographs of one of the students. He had gotten a selection of them and showed them to us. The boy's superior work had stood out on the walls. Then he had Zalce and his collection of lithographs to meet Paca [Frances] Toor so that she could promote him. At least, this is the way I remember. (Emily Edwards to both November 5, 1974)

Zalce himself was perpetually grateful (1971). Similarly, in an interview of May 18, 1971, Charlot stated of Goitia:

> He never even visited either the scaffolds of the muralists or the places where the group was. So it's only later on with Anita Brenner and Edward Weston, I think, that I made it a point to go and know Goitia.

Charlot had forgotten that he was the one who brought Goitia to Brenner's attention in a letter to her of May 3, 1925, as seen below. Charlot would regularly recommend worthy artists to valuable contacts.[128]

Charlot would not take any undue credit, an attitude that can be found in his private notes. Among "Schmeckeb. errors," he includes: "I influence DR w squat figures, feet tucked under (cf. Idols) and also Day of Judases. (?) rather Posada." However, Charlot deemphasizes himself so regularly that it must be considered part of his ethic and probably of his personality.

In fact, he goes even further. A characteristic rhetorical device of Charlot's is to use himself as a foolish foil, most often to highlight the virtue of someone else. The difficulty for the reader is to gauge the amount of rhetoric involved as opposed to the historical reality. Sometimes the comparison seems accurate. Charlot describes the skill with which Guerrero applied gold leaf; "When I attempted the same, the leaf just crumbled into uselessness" (*AA* II: 340; 1972 La Época Xavier Guerrero). At other times, the comparison is clearly unhistorical. Praising Carlos Mérida's movement to abstract art, Charlot writes:

> We, who were not brave enough or rash enough to do the same, clinging as we still do to picturesque themes and to realistic vision, do gaze with longing upon Mérida as he opens his path through those rarified regions where appearance gives way to substance. (1937 Foreword)

Although Charlot admired Mérida, he did not characterize his own tendencies or aspirations thus in his historical writing. Similarly, praising Manuel Manilla as a true artist of the people, he refers to himself and his colleagues as "*nosotros*, dilettanti" '*we others*, the dilatants,' which hardly does justice to their commitment to popular art.[129]

Charlot used himself as a foil more significantly when writing about Orozco, who created great art while being less interested than Charlot in theory and problems of composition. Humor enables Charlot to make the point as praise:

> Where the Frenchman's wisdom isolates subject matter from art, and light from form and color… (*AA* II: 253)

> We, post-cubists, are likewise strolling, proud of our metaphysical garments, golden section, fourth dimension, tactile qualities, etc. The critics laud our regalia, the public stands in awe—each stroke of Orozco's brush echoes the child's voice ["He hasn't any clothes on!"] (*AA* II: 237)

Charlot goes so far as to use a criticism Rivera made of Charlot's own way of painting fresco, contrasting Orozco's thick colors with the "delicate washes" of Italian frescoes bleached by centuries to "spinsterish tastes" (November 1947: 259).

Charlot's use of himself as a foil is not merely rhetorical, but symptomatic of his attitude towards himself; it arises from his lifelong self-deprecating humor. To Alberto Beltrán he writes, "recordándome nuestros tiempos en Etnografía, tratando de aprender—en mi caso en vano—el náhuatl" 'remembering our times at the Department of Ethnography, trying to learn Náhuatl—in my case in vain' (April 17, 1969). Charlot in fact learned the language well enough to write puppet plays in it. Underneath the joking was a genuine humility and desire to improve himself. In his "Art and Archaeology," he describes humorously some foolish mistakes made in appreciating Mexican Indian art: "when I speak of my friends as examples, I am not saying anything against them that I would not say about myself too" (1949: 49). This attitude was certainly based on Charlot's Roman Catholicism. In his French *Méditations*, he regularly sets up the highest practical ideals and then criticizes himself for not living up to them.

Moreover, Charlot was always uncomfortable speaking about himself and used humor to cushion his remarks. As a result, his statements about himself are the hardest to gauge historically. For instance, in an article co-written with Anita Brenner, he writes: "Il s'est dépouillé des doctrines professionnelles qui alourdissent son œuvre européen et, au cœur de son travail mexicain bat l'émotion humaine" 'He stripped away the professional doctrines that weighed down his European œuvre, and at the heart of his Mexican work beats human emotion' (Brenner-Charlot 1928: 65). The sentence does express Charlot's feelings during his early period in Mexico, but did he really believe that his European work lacked human emotion? Similarly, when he writes that he immigrated with "Un Mexique de pacotille" 'a sham Mexico' in his head, he is expressing a surprise of discovery that was certainly real, but seriously undervaluing his earlier studies of the country and its culture.[130]

Charlot was a poet and a dramatist and brought some of those talents into his understanding and expression of human events. He also applied his esthetics. He was proud of the academic form and the balance of text and footnotes in his English-language "Juan Cordero, A Nineteenth-Century Mexican Muralist," telling me that the exacting editors of the *Art Bulletin* had been surprised that he had given them nearly irreproachable copy.[131] He was even more clearly the artist as designer of his books—for instance, *Charlot Murals in Georgia* (1945) and *An Artist on Art* (1972)—when allowed by his publishers.[132] The physical object reinforced the linguistic content. Charlot was working truly as "pintor y escritor."

APPENDIX I

WRITINGS RELATED TO *THE MEXICAN MURAL RENAISSANCE, 1920–1925*

From the Applications to the John S. Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for a Grant to Write *The Mexican Mural Renaissance*, 1942 and 1944[133]

From the 1942 Application

Statement of "advanced work etc."

Having taken part in the movement that I propose to write about, I have a close personal acquaintanceship both with the facts and the individuals concerned. And I understand the problems of the mural painter by personal experience in executing frescos for the Mexican Government. Also well acquainted with the literature on the subject, both books and periodicals. I have written numerous articles concerning various angles of the subject and a book that treats of it in part.

Plans For Work

An examination of source material relating to the beginnings of the Mexican modern mural movement; collation, translation, and commentaries.

This work is twofold:

a. The collation and publication of a "corpus" of original documents now disseminated in newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, placards, etc., of the period, and difficult to get at; making them available to a much wider public by translating them from Spanish into English.

b. The use of those documents as a solid basis of truth on which to establish the history of the events that mark the first three years (1921–1924) of the modern Mexican art movement. Such a history would avoid subjective interpretations and unsubstantiated guesswork, emphasize chronological sequence and objective facts.

It would be of practical use for the increasing number of authors who treat of the Mexican modern movement and especially of its beginnings.

The Mexican modern movement, whatever the worth of its actual achievements, has formulated a genuinely American point of view as concerns art, distinct from the point of view that coincided with European trends, especially those of the School of Paris. From a national movement it has become of continental scope; for example, the numerous murals painted in the modern idiom on the walls of publicly owned buildings in the United States would probably never have come to be if the Government had not had

the example and success of the Mexican Government in dealing with artists as a concrete and successful precedent. Thus the knowledge of this movement is of more than academic import.

My participation in this movement as a mural artist has given me an understanding of it from inside, and my labors in the field of Mexican archaeology have helped me to understand the traditions that lie behind modern Mexican art.

Started as a book of clippings in 1922, the number of documents already at hand is approximately two hundred; a number of items will have to be looked for either by this writer or by a proxy in Mexico itself. Much has already been found in the public library in New York and the Congressional Library in Washington, and the translation has been started.

Sheed and Ward, the publishers of my book "From the Mayans to Disney," have first option on the resulting book that, given a general interest in its subject matter, will have, I am sure, no difficulty in getting into print.

As stated before, the work has been already begun, though informally, and would take between one to two years to reach its conclusion.

From the 1944 Application

STATEMENT OF ADVANCED WORK

The knowledge I have of art and writing does not come from academic study but from actual experience, especially as concerns Mexico. I took a pioneering part in the movement that I propose to write about and have close personal acquaintance both with the facts and with the individuals concerned.

My knowledge of the Mexican art tradition, important for the correct evaluation of its contemporary output, comes from actual participation in archeological expeditions. I know the problems of the mural painter from the inside, having executed frescos for the Mexican Government as well as in the United States.

I am well acquainted with the literature on the subject, both books and periodicals, in Spanish, French, and English.

I published over a period of twenty years articles dealing with special phases of Mexican art, and a book in English that deals in part with the subject, and feel well prepared to attempt a total survey.

ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR PERIOD OF FELLOWSHIP

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES:

Approx. 4 months living expenses in Mexico $800

Traveling expenses for myself and family (4) 700

Trips in Mexico:

Mexico City

Orizaba (Orozco mural)

Guadalajara (Carlos Orozco, Clemente Orozco, and Amado de la Cueva murals)

Celaya (mural by Tres Guerras)

Tenanzingo, Puebla, etc. (folk murals)

Epasoyuca, Acolman, etc. (colonial murals).....300

Approx. 8 months of writing either in Mexico or U.S.

Books and other necessary supplies

Books covering Mexican art 1920–25, such as Tablada's "History of Mexican Art" published 1927, Acevedo's "Disertaciones" published 1920, original edition of "Popular Arts" by Atl published 1921, Cubas' "Diccionario Geografico Historico…," etc.

Collection of the art magazine "Azulejos," of the Syndicate newspaper "El Machete." Pertinent numbers of "La Falange," "El Maestro," "El Architecto," and popular magazines "Revista de Revistas" and "El Universal Ilustrado."

…….....300

Collation of letters, diaries covering the period, and copies of legal documents, contracts, etc.

…….…….....50

Expenses on text and illustrations:

Stenographic help 200

Illustrations: photographs to be bought from different sources, newspaper morgues, etc., photographs to be duplicated and restored..……...100

Photographs to be made from original murals not yet reproduced. Photographs of details chosen for their technical or historical interest. Line drawings, diagrams to be

made, and photostats from magazines and newspapers, posters, pamphlets, etc. .
……..…250

TOTAL $2700

This application covers the expense of the trip to Mexico and living expenses there. Also other expenses needed towards the completion of the book. But it does not include living expenses in the United States within the time covered by the grant. Those would be taken care of by my teaching salary and occasional sale of pictures, if any.

Fellowship stipend applied for.....$2500

Signature: Jean Charlot

PLANS FOR WORK[134]

A history of the beginnings of the modern Mexican mural movement including an examination of source material never translated into English before. Special emphasis on the formative years in the work of Orozco, Siqueiros, and Rivera, and on the relationship between government and artists, and a description of the milieu in which they worked.

This work is twofold:

1. The collation and publication of a "corpus" of original documents now disseminated in newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, placards, etc., of the period; making them available to a much wider public for the first time by translating them from Spanish into English.

2. The use of these documents as an objective basis of truth to establish the history of the events that mark the first three years (1921–1924) of the modern Mexican art movement. Such a history would emphasize chronology and factual sequence.

The Mexican modern art movement has formulated a genuinely American point of view as concerns art, distinct from the point of view that reflected European trends, especially those of the School of Paris. From a national movement it has become continental in scope. For example, the numerous murals painted in the modern idiom on the walls of publicly-owned buildings in the United States would probably never have come to be if our government had not had the example and success of the Mexican Government in dealing with artists as a concrete and successful precedent. Thus the knowledge of this movement is of more than academic import.

This research started as a book of clippings in 1922. Additional material came from the New York Public Library, the Congressional Library,[135] and the excellent Bancroft Library in Berkeley, California. It now appears that further items can be found only in Mexico.

If awarded a fellowship I would be able to continue this research in Mexico and take the necessary time for writing, a work carried on up to now under conflicting conditions.

The subject matter of the book is of sufficient public interest to warrant publication by a commercial firm. Sheed and Ward, the publishers of my book *Art from the Mayans to Disney*, would have first option.

"MEXICAN MURALS"

Introduction

To write about a movement in which the author has taken [an] active part gives a certain vividness to the style, but one must avoid too subjective an approach and personalized estimates of people. In this book all facts are based on source material, contemporary clippings, handbills, and much unpublished material. Chronological sequence is stressed to attain a correct estimate of stylistic evolution. The aim is to reconstruct the milieu that bred the movement, the exciting era attendant to the making of the murals, rather than to procure a final critical estimate of the work as it stands today. Special attention is paid to murals now destroyed and to documents that touch on the "life and times" of the painters.

Chap. I

Mexican Indian Mural Tradition

The great murals painted from the IIIrd to the IXth Century by the Mayans of the southern empire, reflected in the painting of figured vases. Frescoes on the walls of temples in North Yucatan, with special reference to the Temple of the Tigers and that of the Warriors, Chichen Itza. Unpublished tracings by the author. Toltec and Aztec remains.

Chap. II

Hispanic Mexican Mural Tradition

Church murals, with special reference to the last of the great religious fresco decorations, that of Tresguerras in Celaya, 1810. Quotes from his unpublished papers kept at San Carlos Academy.

Chap. III

Folk Tradition

Analysis of its influence on the Nationalist movement and on the muralists.

Retablos. Ex-voto painting first despised and then lauded. Quotes from a 1922 appreciation by Diego Rivera.

Graphic Arts. Mainly Posada's work. Source material gathered in 1924 while I was working on a catalogue raisonné of his prints, not yet concluded.

Folk murals. Mainly pulqueria painting as understood and appreciated by pioneer muralists.

Chap. IV

"Deus ex Machina"

A short biography of Vasconcelos, the man responsible for the commissioning of the murals, episodes of his life as revolutionary and political exile. An appraisal of the reasons that led him to sponsor artists on such a scale. His esthetic philosophy expounded in his 1916 *Pythagoras*.

Chap. V

Nationalism

European imported art only one seriously considered under Diaz.

The San Carlos Academy teachings under Fabres, when Orozco and Rivera were art students.

Changes brought by the revolution.

Ramos Martinez. His 1920 reforms in art teaching. The open air school of Coyoacan.

Adolpho Best Maugard. His drawing system of seven elements related to Indian and Folk arts. First show of folk arts held in 1922.

Montenegro. Receives the first mural commission in June 1921. His *Dance of the Hours* and contemporary criticisms.

Chap. VI

Prophets of the Mural Movement

Independent artists. Clausel, Goitia.

Manifestoes forecasting the movement. That of Atl as Director of San Carlos in 1914. Catalogue and one man show of Carlos Merida in 1920.

Manifesto published in Spain in 1921 in *Vida Americana* by Siqueiros.

The San Carlos show of 1921 and artistic trends at the time.

Lozano, an artist dissenting from the muralists.

Chap. VII

The Preparatoria School

History of the first building to be decorated by the group.

The mural of Juan Cordero, 1874.

The revolutionary period.

Vasconcelos as director of the school and his attempted lynching.

Against this background, erection of the first scaffolds, painting of the first murals, public reaction pro and con.

Chap. VIII

Rivera Returns

Flashback to his show of 1911.

His landing in 1921, returning from Europe. His self-appointed task as critic. His trip to Yucatan, an important experience.

His first mural *Creation*, 1922–23. Contemporary description of the work in course.

His workshop with Guerrero, Merida, Charlot, de la Cueva.

Chap. IX

The First Fresco

Charlot and Mexico. Diary entries concerning the fresco, *Massacre of the Templo Mayor*. Its date. Contemporary criticisms. Later history.

Chap. X

Rivera's *Creation*

Rivera's own description of the work written [in] 1922.

His trip to Tehuantepec.

Unveiling of *Creation* in 1923 with a flashback to the opening of the National University in 1910. Banquet given by the Syndicate to Rivera. Place of the work in modern art. Contemporary opinions pro and con.

Chap. XI

Preparatoria Murals, 1923

Alva's Planting of the Cross.

Revueltas' Virgin of Guadalupe.

Leal's Dance at Chalma.

Chap. XII

Orozco's Pre-Mural Period

Artistic beginnings. Posada and the Academy of Fine Arts.

Orozco and the Mexican Revolution. Dating anew the *Mexico in Revolution* series.

His 1916 show. Contemporary criticisms. Tablada's "Orozco the Mexican Goya." Role of Walter Pach and Tablada in helping Orozco to get his first mural commission.

Chap. XIII

Ministry of Education. First Patio

Vasconcelos builds his Ministry. Inauguration speech describing future murals.

First Rivera murals in the first patio are also his first frescoes.

"The secret of the Mexica." Contemporary descriptions and reactions.

Chap. XIV

Ministry of Education. Second Patio

Murals begun by de la Cueva, Guerrero, and Charlot. How the work in course was stopped and the murals partially destroyed. Importance of this work for the formation of the Mexican style.

Chap. XV

Group Shows and Press Campaign, 1923

The 1922 *Art in Action* group show organized by Dr. Atl in Mexico City.

The 1923 group show at the New York Independents, invited by Walter Pach.

First United States' estimates of the movement by Thomas Craven and others. Mexico's dismay at New York's indifference results in adverse press campaign. Tablada defends the painters.

Chap. XVI

Other Murals in San Pedro y Pablo

Vicissitudes of the building through history. Its reconstruction by Vasconcelos.

Murals by Dr. Atl. Contemporary description.

Fresco by Montenegro, *The Feast of the Cross*. Documents that permit exact dating.

Chap. XVII

Arrival of Siqueiros

His artistic beginnings. The students strike at San Carlos Academy in 1913. The open-air group of Santa Anita.

Soldiering in Orizaba, staff attaché to General Dieguez, foe of Villa.

Military attaché at the Paris embassy. Trip to Italy with de la Cueva.

Last Parisian works and first Mexican works. Interest in pulqueria painting.

Frescoes in the Preparatoria. Presidential order suspending the work and its partial destruction.

His esthetic tenets as expressed in the writings of "Engineer Juan Hernandez Arraujo." [*sic*]

Chap. XVIII

Activities of the Syndicate

Foundation of the Syndicate by Siqueiros and others.

Posters, handbills, manifestoes. Publication of *The Machete*.

List of collaborators and digest of contents. A catalogue of its illustrations, woodcuts, etc.

Chap. XIX

Orozco's First Mural

Belated start in a milieu different from that of the earlier muralists.

Unpublished writings in which Orozco expounds his 1923 theories on art and describes in detail future murals.

Contemporary reaction to the murals. Discarded versions; destroyed and modified murals. Attempt at a graphic reconstruction.

Orozco and religious art.

Chap. XX

Direct Action

Political roots of direct action. First incident, the destruction of the dental palace of Dr. Islas. Second incident, the mutilation of the frescoes of Orozco and Siqueiros. The work is stopped as Vasconcelos resigns.

Chap. XXI

Press Campaign 1924

Controversy started by the direct action incident.

Rivera ~~turns against the painters and~~ resigns from the Syndicate.

Chap. XXII

Exit Vasconcelos Enter Puig Casauranc

Dinner given to Vasconcelos before his departure. Chavez incident.

Vasconcelos runs for Governor of his native State, Oaxaca. Press excerpts.

Rivera fresco in the staircase of the Ministry; its mutilation. The new Secretary of Education, Puig Casauranc, endorses Rivera's work.

Chap. XXIII

Characteristics of the Mexican Style

Regardless of differing moods and personalities, the artists of the movement had much in common. An attempt at defining this common denominator, known today as the Mexican style.

Chap. XXIV

Mexican Apport to Modern Art

The painters acknowledged their debt to Europe, to the School of Paris in particular. They in turn proposed new values that transcended the national frontiers. Technical and esthetic forms in the art of today that can be traced to them.

Chap. XXV

~~Mexican Art Today, Its Future~~

Epilogue: The same artists in their present evolution.

Stylistic and iconographic prolongations and departures.

Author's Information Sheet for Purposes of Publicity and Copyright[136]

In Mexico, the revolution started in 1910 stabilized itself into a new order ca. 1920. One of its aftermaths was a rebirth of mural painting, specifically embodied in the craft of true fresco.

While attempting to speak to the people at large with visual displays on public walls, the Mexican muralist found himself in a different situation from that of the easel painter. He felt close to the mural masters of the past, Giotto and Francesca, Raphael and Lebrun [*sic*]. In contrast, he felt apart from his contemporaries of the School of Paris, whose work was cut to fit very different psychological and esthetic specifications.

The Mexican Renaissance is accepted as an historical event. It created a national and racial expression endowed with a style specifically Mexican, regardless of subject-matter. One of the handful of men who evolved the new idiom in the nineteen twenties was Jean Charlot. This book is different from others that treat of the same subject because its point of view is that of an insider. An art book thus written is bound to include details usually bypassed or relegated to a discreet background. Charlot fortified his memory of the events by patient delvings into private papers and government archives, a research made possible by a Guggenheim fellowship that lasted two years.

The opening chapters of the book display, as an indispensable curtain raiser, the story of the centuries-old mural tradition in its pre-Hispanic and colonial phases.

It is in the five years 1920-24 that most of the lineaments of the new mural art were decided upon, and the pioneer mural work of these five years is reviewed extensively. The order in which the artists appear in the text is the same one in which they emerged in their new role as muralists. A few names are already well known to English speaking readers. Others will be new to most, even for men well informed in matters of art.

Perhaps what gives organic cohesion to this book, that weaves factual research with living memories, is the fact that in his excursion into the near past Charlot was recapturing for himself the flavor of his own youth. Even though he uses strict objective methods, he tells of his researches with the warmth that one reserves for personal memoirs.

APPENDIX II

JEAN CHARLOT AND THREE COLLABORATORS

CLAUDE BLANCHARD

"La Jeune Peinture Mexicaine" appeared in *Le Crapouillot*, September 16, 1922, under the name of Claude Blanchard. The article was in fact a "truncated" composition by Charlot himself, as he wrote to Walter Pach on November 5, 1922:

> J'ai reçu un numéro du Crapouillot sur la peinture mexicaine. C'est fait par moi mais l'article a été tronqué. On me demande là-bas les frais de reproductions et les petits camarades ne veulent rien donner. Il me faut donc faire ce sacrifice en l'honneur du curé Hidalgo. (L'article a été écrit au commencement de mon séjour… L'altitude, vous savez.) (Charlot 1922–ca. 1925)
>
> 'I received an issue of *Le Crapouillot* on Mexican painting. It was done by me, but the article was truncated. They ask me there for the costs of the reproductions, and my little comrades don't want to give anything. So it is necessary for me to make this sacrifice in honor of the Curé Hidalgo. (The article was written at the beginning of my stay… The altitude, you know.)'

In 1921, Blanchard had praised Charlot's tempera *L'Amitié* after viewing it at that year's Salon d'Automne and had visited Mexico at an unknown date (February 15, 1922). He was, therefore, a good contact for Charlot in Parisian publishing circles. Charlot discussed the article in an interview with me:

> There was a fellow, he was the son of a Blanchard, Claude Blanchard; he was the son of a fellow who had been one of my teachers of painting. He went to Mexico. He was at the time in the early movie crews and found that he couldn't stay there because there was sort of jealousy for his being a foreigner and so on. So he stayed very few days, but he was connected with *Crapouillot*, with that magazine, and so he asked me to send him photographs and a little text that he would arrange for the magazine, which I did. We were very happy to have that early publicity, and that helped a lot, actually, Ramos Martínez, who was defending himself against still another group of people who were just connected with the *real* academic painting that had been so flourishing in the nineteenth century Mexico. (Interview May 18, 1971)

The content of the article is clearly Charlot's; no one in Europe had his familiarity with the details of the artistic scene at the time or was searching out illustrations of young, still unknown artists. Moreover, the flamboyant, often sarcastic style accords with Charlot's other writings of the time. The opinions and view of the article, discussed below, represent an early stage of Charlot's thinking: "The article was written at the beginning of my stay." Apart from some possible light editing, Blanchard's hand can be perceived in four passages. Some Mexican artists are said to have *come*, *vinrent*, to Europe

(17, right column, paragraph 2). On page 18, paragraph 3, Blanchard seems to have shortened the article by cutting the descriptions of the five artists named, thus breaking the pattern of Charlot's list. Charlot would surely have written on Revueltas, one of whose works is illustrated. The paragraph on Charlot himself is obviously written by Blanchard (18). He has apparently plucked Charlot's name from the longer list of the younger artists, uses a phrase unknown in Charlot's own writings, *la bonne bouche*, and recalls *L'Amitié*. Except for the first sentence, the last paragraph seems to be by Blanchard: the perspective is from Europe, and the conclusion lacks the rhetorical impact with which Charlot ended his articles at the time. The article is thus *tronqué* 'truncated.'[137] Finally, the printed article has many typos resulting from the Parisian editor's unfamiliarity with Spanish and Náhuatl.

The article was originally composed in late 1921 or early 1922: "au commencement de mon séjour" 'at the beginning of my stay.' After a reconnaissance trip to Mexico in early 1921, Charlot and his mother returned to France to arrange their affairs. They then immigrated to Mexico, arriving in Veracruz on November 24, 1921. While Charlot was still back in France, Rivera had returned to Mexico after a long stay in Paris. The article describes this as a recent event: "vient de s'embarquer récemment pour son pays" 'just embarked recently for his homeland' (17). Moreover, Rivera is described through his European work, indicating that he had not yet started his large-scale activity in Mexico; Rivera was given his first wall in December of 1921 and started work probably in early 1922 (*MMR* 135). Siqueiros is unmentioned in the article because he returned to Mexico from Europe only in August 1922. Most important, no mention is made of murals. The modern Mexican movement still consisted largely of easel painting, done by a large number of older and younger painters representing different options. The Blanchard article thus represents Charlot's earliest recorded view of the Mexican art movement and indeed of Mexico itself, preceding the Araujo articles by at least a year.

In the short time Charlot had stayed in Mexico, he had already collected much information on the art scene, organized it into a view, and started writing articles about it for immediate use as publicity and later use as history. We know from his Guggenheim application that he was already collecting the documents that would form the basis for his *Mexican Mural Renaissance*. This was also a financial effort. For instance, professional photographs of art works were expensive, but Charlot was convinced that they were necessary, especially when works were unknown or immoveable like murals. Charlot jokes to Pach about his self-sacrifice, but his religious motivation was powerful throughout his life. Significantly, the "saint" he invokes is the uncanonized, defrocked revolutionary Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. Charlot's religion for the time is revolutionary and anticlerical.

The earliness of the composition accounts, Charlot hints, for some of its light-headed ideas: "L'altitude, vous savez" 'The altitude, you know.' A close reading of the article reveals ideas Charlot discarded and those he continued to develop in his future writings. For instance, he is already displaying his wide inclusiveness. The illustrations include works by Dr. Atl, Rivera, Best Maugard, Ramón Cano, Leal, Díaz de Léon, Mateo Bolagnos [*sic*: Bolaños], Revueltas, and Charlot himself. Seventeen artists were originally mentioned with brief, positive descriptions.[138] The artists span two generations and a variety of styles. The choice is characteristic of Charlot in its broad impartiality—including artists, styles, and genres with which he was not in sympathy—and in its modesty, qualities Charlot displayed as a critic

and historian.[139] Moreover, Charlot's classification of the artists merely by generation reveals that groups gathered around leaders had not yet emerged within the movement itself, a vacuum Rivera, Siqueiros, and Lozano would compete to fill.

Charlot's organization by generation signified for him the artists' place in history. In France in 1916, he had delivered a lecture on his generation with the title "Nous les Jeunes !" 'We the Young!" (1916–1918; *MMR* 75). The title of the 1922 article seems based on this.[140] Charlot's 1924 article "D. Alfaro Siqueiros" will devote much space to explaining the place in history of that artist's generation, which was Charlot's own. In France, Charlot and his contemporary liturgical artists of the Gilde Notre-Dame followed and reacted against the older generation represented by such artists as Maurice Denis and George Desvallières. In Mexico, Charlot identified himself with the younger artists over and against the older ones: Dr. Atl, Best Maugard, Ramos Martínez, Montenegro, and Rivera. His list of the younger artists is a precious record of the composition of the young group at the beginning of the movement. Charlot clearly had strong feelings as well as strong views about the importance of generations. In fact, in the Blanchard article, Charlot has had to impose his organization on his material. Although he recognizes that "Deux générations de peintres collaborèrent à ce bel effort" 'Two generations of painters collaborated in this worthy effort,' he focuses on the younger, placing himself firmly "Parmi les jeunes" 'Among the young' (17), and names the article for them. Charlot's preference for this organization by generation is an argument for the identification of the typologizing lists of the Araujo articles as mainly Siqueiros' work.

Many of Charlot's fundamental ideas—indeed, the general configuration of his later view—can be found already in "La Jeune Peinture Mexicaine." Modern Mexican art is seen as a contribution to "la production artistique contemporaine" 'contemporary artistic production' (16). That is, it has a place in world art, although it has not yet been recognized. Mexico is a great subject for artists, but up to now:

> ce pays de fièvre et de lumière, ne possédait qu'une peinture anémique, retapage éculé d'un néo-classicisme à la Bouguereau, qui subissait à la fin du XIX^{e} siècle l'influence d'un art espagnol d'exportation. L'anecdotisme et la littérature… (16 f.)
>
> 'this land of fever and light possessed only anemic painting, a worn-out retouching of a Bouguereau-like Neoclassicism that submitted at the end of the nineteenth century to the influence of a Spanish art for export. Anecdotalism and literature…'

Charlot will later find better Mexican painters and artists in different media, but his opposition to Neoclassicism and trivializing are already apparent. Moreover, Charlot announces here a principle of the Mexican Mural Renaissance: an adequate, nonderivative, nonimported style must be found for Mexican subject matter.

The poor art Charlot criticized was supported by the Escuela Nacional de Bellas Artes whose "enseignement momifié" 'mummified teaching' suppressed any good tendencies (17). Charlot is agreeing here with his colleagues in the Escuelas de Pintura al Aire Libre, schools that were established in opposition to the academy, but he himself had first-hand experience of the institution. (Later in life, he

will speak more positively about the legacy of Bellas Artes.) Similarly, among the upper middle class, Charlot had seen the art on the walls and the furniture, some designed in France for the Mexican taste, examples of which can still be seen in stately homes and the furniture sections of museums. Charlot's mention of Spanish influence could be based on his own observation and viewing of Spanish works in Mexican collections. This historical background will later be significantly enriched, I have argued above, by his conversations with Siqueiros about the pre-Revolution art students' strike and the semi-independent exhibition of Mexican artists in 1910.

Charlot's solution—which he presents as occurring—is to return to Precolumbian art: "Cependant l'art pré-hispanique servit de point d'appui à quelques artistes" 'However, Prehispanic art served as a base for certain artists' (17). He connects this tendency especially with the younger generation:

> Ces jeunes artistes novateurs étudièrent les vestiges de leur antique grandeur. Ils se remirent à l'école de leurs ancêtres…créateurs d'un style autochtone…
>
> 'These young, innovative artists studied the remains of their ancient greatness. They put themselves back into the school of their ancestors…creators of an indigenous style…'

The theme of a great, ancient Mexican Indian civilization destroyed by Cortes was one Charlot learned from the French *Américanistes* of his youth. Although such thoughts were certainly shared by many, Charlot's mention of the anthropological museum suggests that he is referring here to his own activity and taking his colleagues to study the art works there. The paucity of traces of Prehispanic influences in the art of the time, except in his own paintings, suggests also that he is speaking prescriptively.

However, Charlot's view of Prehispanic art connects it more closely than he will later to ceramic decorative arts, especially of the types like the Petatillo pottery that can be compared to Beardsley.[141] His light-headed, indeed lurid description includes elements that are anachronistic for the Prehispanic period: "sujets apocalyptiques hallucinants…cadavres de femmes et de jeunes taureaux…productions morbides de ces imaginations tourmentées" 'hallucinating, apocalyptic subjects…cadavers of women and young bulls…morbid productions of these tormented imaginations.' At this early point in Mexico, Charlot is more sympathetic to the art of Best Maugard and Montenegro, based as it is on ceramic decorations, as seen in his comments on the two artists. When planning later for murals, the inappropriateness of such a basis will become clear and will be stated polemically. Charlot will also refine his taste in pottery and learn more about the native religious practices of his own day. In his interview with Ron Tyler of July 6, 1978, he stated later that at first he could not differentiate easily between "good" and "lesser" Mexican art because even bad art had *Mexicanidad*.

Charlot mentions two other tendencies:

> Les uns, curieux d'apprendre, vinrent en Europe s'initier aux théories et aux techniques nouvelles pour n'en laisser subsister dans leur art que ce qui pouvait vivre chez eux.

> 'Some, with curiosity to learn, came to Europe to initiate themselves into new theories and techniques, but finally allowed to subsist in their art only that which could live in their home.'

The convolution of this sentence is due to Charlot's desire to make a criticism in a positive way: some members of the older generation went to Europe and saw the new work being done there, but returned and continued to produce old-fashioned art. Araujo will be franker. As opposed to "Pintores con influencias extranjeras" 'Painters with foreign influences,' Rivera, Siqueiros, and Charlot will be described as "Pintores importadores de los últimos movimientos europeos y, por ende, de la buena tradición" 'Painters importers of the latest European movements and, in the end, of the good tradition' (July 11, 1923). Similarly, the artists of the second tendency, landscape painting, have used Impressionism to reveal the beauty of their land but suffer from an ignorance of the later work from Cézanne to Gauguin. Three of the nine illustrations of the article are landscape painting.

A third tendency, apparently just beginning, can be found in Leal's prominently featured *Halte dans la Montagne* (12), also called *The Camp of a Zapatista Colonel*: *"Fernando Leal*, qui est peut-être le plus intéressant pour nous, car il nous raconte la vie des rancheros et des brigands" '*Fernando Leal*, who is perhaps the most interesting for us because he tells us about the life of ranchers and brigands' (18). Charlot writes of these "groupes barbares" 'barbarous groups' before the idealization of Zapata and the Zapatistas as model revolutionaries. But he himself was expressing some of the Mexicans' simmering violence in his woodcuts and saw it carried over into the arts:

> Tous ces jeunes tempéraments sont en train de créer par leurs efforts une peinture mexicaine aussi chaude, aussi rude, aussi vibrante que ce Mexique qui est leur.
>
> 'All these young temperaments are in the process of creating by their efforts a Mexican painting as hot, as rough, as vibrant as the Mexico that is theirs.'

Charlot and others will later make a clearer and stronger connection between the new art and the Revolution.

Unfortunately, Charlot complains, most Mexicans turn away from this forceful art, comfortable with their unthreatening visual sentimentalities. The article apparently ended with a plea for recognition, sympathy, and support for the young artists in their "solitude morale" 'moral solitude.' Charlot's article was designed to help.

DAVID ALFARO SIQUEIROS

In July 11–August 2, 1923, Charlot and Siqueiros published the five "Araujo" articles: "El Movimiento Actual de la Pintura en Mexico." Charlot considered the series important as "the only historical art survey truly contemporaneous with the beginnings of the movement"; Araujo was a "spokesman for the mural group."[142] The series emerged from the long conversations the two artists held while they were rooming together and found that their "points of view merged."[143]

The series articulates this broad agreement, and Charlot continued to adhere to some of its main points in later years: the basic impact of the Mexican Revolution on contemporary art was a "just thesis";[144] and the School of Coyoacán "outlasted its day" with its promotion of Impressionism (*MMR* 52). However, having lived beyond the polemical situation of the Araujo articles, Charlot could also find esthetic and historical virtue in some of the objects of their youthful criticism. The Impressionism of Coyoacán was "neither derivative nor decadent" (*MMR* 52); Araujo's criticisms of A. Ramos Martínez "failed to appreciate the good that Ramos had done" (*MMR* 53); Araujo's (and Rivera's) "ill-humored criticisms" of the earlier decorative style based on folk pottery did not recognize it as "a worthy apotheosis of the nationalist tendencies, of the return to 'Our Own'" (*MMR* 101). Similarly, Charlot confesses that in Araujo's positive appraisal of Charlot himself, "his opinion may have been biased" (*MMR* 185).

The Araujo articles are the result of a true collaboration of like-minded friends. Nonetheless, differences in style and tendencies can be perceived. Both Charlot and Siqueiros were publishing—and Siqueiros had been interviewed—under their own names, so the Araujo articles can be read in the context of their individual work. For instance, Araujo's derivation of Herrán's style from Brangwyn can be seen to be Charlot's view because Siqueiros connected that Mexican predecessor more to German art nouveau (1977: 85, 190; see also 179). Charlot himself connected Araujo's promotion of the master–apprentice relationship and the craftsmanlike approach to art to his 1916 speech "Nous les Jeunes !" Most important, the co-authors differed in their appraisal of the contemporary European Neoclassicism, as argued below.

STYLE

Siqueiros is certainly responsible for the final Spanish language of the articles. Charlot was still composing French drafts that were then translated into Spanish with the help of a native speaker. As a result, the Araujo articles contain many terms that are typically Siqueiros but are not found—or not often found—in Charlot's other Spanish-language articles. For instance, in the phrase "atribuyendo a un individuo la labor de toda una colectividad" 'attributing to an individual the labor of a whole collectivity,' the leftist political term *colectividad* and its variants can be found frequently in Siqueiros' writings, but not in Charlot's.[145] Similarly, Charlot did not correlate artistic schools with political parties; so the phrase "ACADÉMICOS o ANARQUISTAS" 'Academic Individualists or Anarchists' (Araujo July 26, 1923) is in all likelihood Siqueiros. Siqueiros is then responsible for the political terminology. In an excised passage from the typescript of *The Mexican Mural Renaissance*, Charlot referred to "the two-fisted political style of Siqueiros, while the names of the signatories seem chosen by an artist, mostly for euphonic effect" (Writings Related to *MMR*).

On the other hand, Charlot is probably primarily responsible for the religious: e.g., "El Egoísmo Individualista," "ANACORETISMO," and so on (Araujo July 19, 1923). Siqueiros' remembered impression of Charlot is religious: "El catolicón Juan Charlot, con su aire de seminarista" 'The big Catholic Jean Charlot, with his seminarian air' (Scherer García 1996: 80).

Charlot's language tends to be practical and concrete, whereas Siqueiros' tends to the exalted and abstract. For instance in Araujo August 2, 1923, the section on Tórtola Valencia and Anna Pavlova reads like typical Charlot art criticism and can be paralleled in his other writings; the concluding sentence, however, is very much in Siqueiros' style: "Sus resultados no han respondido a la trascendencia de su idea fundamental" 'Its [the Nacionalista group] results have not responded to the transcendence of its fundamental idea.' Having rendered Charlot's views in Spanish, Siqueiros caps them with his own more rhetorical conclusion.

Siqueiros is a prolific coiner of abstractions—"museísmo," "retrospectivismo" (Siqueiros 1978: 59)—and piles them up until they start to fall over themselves, as in "un nuevo humanismo-nuevorrealista" 'a new neorealistic-humanism' (43). When he puts some of his more extravagant coinages in quotation marks, I suspect he is poking fun at himself: "gideismo," "bretonismo" (43), "termometrista" (79).

ORGANIZATION

Siqueiros' language reveals his deductive organization. As opposed to Charlot's more inductive and historical way of thinking, Siqueiros moves from ideas to facts (August 2, 1923):

> Hablaré primero de lo que se relaciona con la equivocación en la idea de belleza local, más bien por conveniencia de redacción que por orden cronológico.
>
> 'I will speak first about that which is related to the equivocation in the idea of local beauty, more for redactional convenience than for chronological order.'

Accordingly, Siqueiros often typologizes, establishing categories with descriptive titles in which he lists the people or items he is discussing;[146] Charlot described types of artists in his own writings, but did not focus on lists. These typological lists, which form much of the Araujo articles, should thus be attributed primarily to Siqueiros, although he and Charlot would have established and filled them out during their conversations together. Such lists contrast with Charlot's more discursive style of essay, a contrast that can be apprehended by contrasting the second Araujo article to the first and third. The first article comprises mainly lists of types of critics and artists, and ends with the promise to specify in the next article "La importancia de las aportaciones individuales dentro de estos grupos" 'The importance of the individual contributions within these groups.' This is done, however, only in the third article. The second article presents itself as "un paréntesis analítico" 'an analytical parenthesis' on the egoism and humility of artists. This is a Charlot theme, prominent already in his earlier French writings against *le culte du moi* 'the me–cult' and not found, as far as I can see, in Siqueiros. Indeed, Raquel Tibol once said to me that Siqueiros did not have an ounce of humility in his whole body. Moreover, the basis of the thinking and the language of the second article is religious rather than political: artistic tendencies are related to Christian morals rather than to political ideologies: e.g., "en el orgullo ególatra o en el narcisismo" 'in egolatrous pride or in narcissism.' I would, therefore, attribute the second Araujo article largely to Charlot, with touches by Siqueiros.[147]

SUBJECTS, THEMES, VIEWS

Charlot and Siqueiros agreed at least on most of the substantive points of Araujo, otherwise they would not have co-authored the series. In both their writings can be found the Araujo belief in the importance of the impact of the Mexican Revolution and of the need to develop a new, appropriate style (August 2, 1923). Both believed in the importance of craft and a background in art history and theory (e.g., Siqueiros 1978: 36 ff.). Nonetheless, Charlot is probably more interested in art history and traditional craft—Siqueiros being more intrigued by craft innovation—and Siqueiros more in "el punto de vista ideológico" 'the ideological point of view.' Both promote teamwork as opposed to individualism, but Siqueiros more from socialist ideals of collectivity and Charlot more from the Medieval idea of guilds and the moral disapproval of egoism. At the time, Charlot wrote more than Siqueiros against the picturesque approaches to Mexican subjects (Araujo August 2, 1923), but Siqueiros certainly would have agreed. The co-authors cannot be separated mechanically or aprioristically: for instance, although I have argued above that Charlot is the likely source of the mention of Brangwyn, Siqueiros was more than capable of such esoteric references (1996: 17), and attributions of responsibility for passages and views must be based on evidence.

Unraveling the co-authors' individual contributions and nuances is now largely impossible, but Charlot himself did feel that he could distinguish Siqueiros' "esthetic tenets as expressed in the writings of 'Engineer Juan Hernandez Arraujo [*sic*]'" (Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944). I will attempt very tentatively to identify the distinguishable contributions of the two coauthors.

Content provides a guide. The mentions of Posada and Pintao (July 11, 1923) are in all likelihood from Charlot. He was studying both, and Siqueiros never showed the same interest in those artists. The condemnation of the Academy of San Carlos (July 26, 1923) seems based on Siqueiros' memories and is expressed throughout in his rhetoric, although the Blanchard article shows that Charlot held similar views before talking with Siqueiros. Siqueiros also mentions an artist, Romano Guillemin, not found in Charlot's writings. Charlot later expressed more respect for the school and always had more appreciation for the traditional academic education. Also, the description of the emotional, character-transforming impact of the Revolution would be based on Siqueiros' own experience.

The major difference between Charlot and Siqueiros is in the evaluation of Neoclassicism and the connection of the Mexican movement to contemporary trends in Europe, more particularly Paris (see my more general discussion in Chapter 4). Earlier, Charlot had justified his and Fernando Leal's new woodcuts by their similarities to contemporary European prints (Vera de Córdova 1922). But at the moment of the Araujo articles, two groups were forming among the muralists. The classicizing group included Ramón Alva de la Canal, Siqueiros, and Orozco—the last two still engaged in their early, classically oriented work. The "addicts of Indianism" included Charlot himself, Rivera working "in his brand-new Indian vein," and probably Leal and Revueltas as well.[148] The Araujo articles are clearly partisans of the former group, and this emphasis comes from Siqueiros, who felt that Picasso's Neoclassicism was in the line of David, Ingres, and Cézanne, that is, in the perennial tradition of authentic Classicism (e.g., Siqueiros 1978: 9 f., 36 f., 60; 1996: 17 f., 201). Araujo will demonstrate that "las manifestaciones pictóricas de México [son] el reflejo natural de las de Europa" 'the pictorial manifestations of Mexico [are] the natural reflection of those of Europe' (July 11, 1923). Thus the

contribution of the new group—Rivera, Siqueiros, and Charlot—is as "Pintores importadores de los últimos movimientos europeos y, por ende, de la buena tradición" 'Painters who are importers of the latest European movements and, in the end, of the good tradition.' Moreover, the connection of the Mexican movement with Europe provides its validation. The third Araujo article consists of four illustrations: an Etruscan painting and one each by Picasso, Siqueiros, and Rivera: "Aspectos Comparativos de la Orientación al Clasicismo de la Moderna Pintura Europea y Mexicana" 'Comparative Aspects of the Orientation to Classicism of Modern European and Mexican Painting' (July 29, 1923). The captions call attention to the similarities of the Mexican work to the Classical and Picasso's. Siqueiros always maintained this position.[149]

Charlot's position differed on two main points. First, he knew that the Mexican artists had been educated in the Classical tradition before the rise of the latest version of European Neoclassicism and had studied authentic Classical works; that is, they were not dependent on the latest trend but got their Classicism direct. Moreover, Charlot regularly emphasized the distinctiveness of Mexican art from European and its foundation in its own long art tradition. Charlot wanted to defend the special character of Mexican art, which would be obscured if it were regarded as a peripheral dependency of the latest Paris fashion.

Emotionally, Charlot reacted very negatively to the contemporary Neoclassical movement of Picasso and others. All reference and frivolity, it lacked for Charlot an essential of true Classicism: serious stylistic search. Charlot is, therefore, yielding the above point to Siqueiros. An important support for this conclusion can be found. Siqueiros' problem was to differentiate himself from the widespread bad "Classical" art both in Europe and Mexico. He did this by using the following language in Araujo: "la estética CLÁSICA o ARQUITECTURAL fue substituida por la FOTOGRÁFICA o ACADÉMICA" 'the CLASSICAL or ARCHITECTURAL esthetic was replaced by the PHOTOGRAPHIC or ACADEMIC' (Araujo July 26, 1923). Charlot's desire to accommodate his friend can be seen in the manuscript of his "D. Alfaro Siqueiros" of February 1924. When describing the bad art against which Rivera's generation revolted, Charlot first wrote "l'art académique. néoclassique" 'academic art. neoclassical'; he then changed this to "l'art d'idéal quasi-photographique" 'art of a quasi-photographic ideal.'

Charlot could go so far to meet Siqueiros because that artist's conception of Neoclassicism contained much that Charlot could accept as Classicism: theoretical foundation, perennial rules, geometric composition, logical proportion, subordination of details to the total effect, appropriateness, and so on.[150] Indeed, many passages in Araujo closely resemble Charlot's early writings, and he certainly contributed to them. In fact, the word *clasicismo* is used in passages that are near to Charlot's thinking. In sum, the two artists basically agreed on Classicism while disagreeing on the value of the latest Neoclassicism.

Siqueiros and Charlot agreed also on broader differences with that Neoclassicism. These are not emphasized in the Araujo articles, but are found in the two artists' other writings. Araujo's statement

—"Tiene además otras razones primordiales de función social y espiritual, de las cuales me ocuparé ampliamente en otra oportunidad" '[Classicism] has other primordial reasons of social and spiritual function, with which I will occupy myself amply on another occasion' (July 26, 1923)—may be Siqueiros growing impatient with Charlot's more technical disquisitions in Araujo. The two artists agreed that any style had to serve a purpose, and Siqueiros criticized European Neoclassicism for its divorce from social concerns, a defect remedied by the Mexican muralists (e.g., 1978: 9 f., 36 f., 44, 60, 62). Charlot himself was convinced that the Mexicans moved beyond the influence of European Neoclassicism in muralism (*MMR* 138). Despite these intellectual commonalities, Charlot's art production of the time was the furthest from Neoclassicism of any of his colleagues, and none of his paintings could have been used to illustrate Siqueiros' point in the third Araujo installment (July 29, 1923).

This difference between the two authors has left traces in the series. For instance, all connections with Europe are not considered good. Montenegro is criticized as "el puente de importación de las manifestaciones 'PLÁSTICO-LITERARIAS' europeas" 'the bridge of importation of the European "PLASTIC-LITERARY" manifestations' (August 2, 1923). Even more generally, the Revolution is claimed to have liberated the Mexican plastic arts "del fetichismo extranjerista, por largo tiempo predominante, orientándolas hacia intenciones nobles de producción racial" 'of the foreignist fetishism, long time predominant, orienting them towards noble intentions of racial production.' An accommodation between the two views is reached by suggesting a joining of "las particularidades raciales" 'racial particularities' with the European *matriz* 'matrix,' without which the painter who wants to "inventar un arte aisladamente autóctono" 'invent an isolated autochthonous art' can achieve only an "obra imperfecta" 'imperfect work.' But an influenced people "con sus aportaciones locales mezcladas a las extrañas, producen momentos pictóricos superiores" 'with its local contributions mixed with the foreign, produces superior pictorial moments.'[151]

I believe that both artists are working towards each other in such statements. The Araujo articles thus represent the Mexican movement as it is still struggling to create its identity and mission. That two of its principal artists could disagree on many points and yet collaborate reveals the positive spirit of the early 1920s, in which the Roman Catholic Charlot was working closely with Marxists. The Araujo articles are also a memorial to the lifelong friendship of Charlot and Siqueiros and of their wonderful conversations.

ANITA BRENNER

When Carlos Mérida visited my parents in early 1971, I remarked on the similarity of *Idols* to my father's views. "It's because Jean wrote it," Mérida replied. When I expressed surprise, Mérida repeated emphatically, "Jean wrote *Idols Behind Altars*." Similarly, when I interviewed Alfredo Zalce on July 27, 1971, and asked about Charlot's relationship with Brenner, he stated:

> Jean helped her make her famous book *Idols*. Everybody knows that the good parts are from Jean. She never wrote anything like that again. She just did newspaper articles, but noting serious. Jean did the illustrations. The capacity of Anita and Jean

> was known; it is not difficult to see what's whose. Also, the orientation and criticism, which Jean gave, is very important. (Zalce 1971)

Similar comments have been made since the publication of *Idols* and indeed about Brenner's earlier writings on Mexican art.[152] In contrast, no one has seen an influence of Brenner on Charlot.

Charlot certainly helped Brenner with *Idols*, and they had already worked together very closely on a number of articles and had planned several projects.[153] Charlot's letters to her record his extensive participation in her work in general. He made detailed suggestions for illustrations, gathered original art works and photographs for her use, and commented on the final layout and presentation of the materials (he also helped her with artworks for exhibitions).[154] A major project was his numerous illustrations for her planned edition of the Náhuatl tales of Luz Jiménez.[155] He also gathered archeological, ethnographic, and historical materials for her, including unpublished texts, and suggested reading. He introduced her to people, as is clearly recorded for Francisco Goitia:

> If it is still time, hablas *de Goytia* [*sic*]. Acabo de descubrirlo y es grande: Misma generation than Diego, & sort of Diego con mucha paz. He lives in Xochimilco quite savage and if somebody comes to see him, he runs away.[156]

> 'If it is still time, discuss Goitia. I have just discovered him and he is great: Same generation as Diego, and sort of a Diego with much peacefulness…'

Brenner later wrote most feelingly about that reclusive and difficult artist. Besides gathering material, Charlot discussed with her the organization of her writing, criticized and corrected points, and expressed his own opinions on individual artists.[157] He advised her on publishing and publicity.

Charlot did not think of Brenner as a mere mouthpiece. In his letters, Charlot is constantly expressing his admiration for her writing as can be seen in a few examples:

> I am always very much ashamed to send you my "writings" because you write so very much better than me. (JC to AB "I did not answer right quick")

> Escribi articulo sobre Orozco para Forma. No vale el tuyo. 'I wrote an article on Orozco for Forma. It's not as good as yours.' ("Ya llegue y empeze")

> He admires "tu perfecta sinceridad y confianza" 'your perfect sincerity and confidence' ("Your drawings from the subway")

When he first knew Brenner, she was a young beginner, but she was growing and improving so rapidly that "you are going to be able to surround me totally, take my measure from up down."[158] Charlot feels he can be objective about her despite his love: "You know I apreciate [*sic*] you at your justo valor [French: *juste valeur* 'just value'] this is to say: Hay equilibrio entre me affeccion y el objeto de la dicha affeccion [There is balance between my affection of and object of said affection]" ("Cuando yo estaba"). He considers her very talented but lacking a broad basis: "Tienes mucho instinto pero te falta cierto grado de cultura general" 'You have much instinct but lack a certain level of general culture,' that is, history, geometry, the exact sciences, and so on (March 29, 1925). Brenner herself clearly recognized this weakness.[159] But again, he

admires her progress: "Deeply impressed by your theory (Relativity instead of evolution.)"[160] In my view, Charlot seems to be saying that he could supply the materials that she could then process in her own way.[161] Indeed, a comparison of passages in his letters to *Idols* shows that Brenner transformed any information he provided. Moreover, he envisions the gradual diminution of his own participation in her work.

Brenner's part in the direct collaboration with Charlot was that of a trusted editor: "I am sorry that you cannot do that revision now, but, my dear, I hope you can do it later on, as nobody else can do it, but you."[162] Charlot was greatly annoyed when someone else was allowed to touch his writing: "Francis [Frances Toor] gave him to 'correct' my article on indian dances and I get a little angry about it" ("Received your letter"). On May 21, 1964, Charlot wrote Brenner that she would be "my most logical translator" of *MMR*.

Any literary collaboration is difficult to define. Brenner wrote in her journal of February 1, 1927: "Funny about our articles in *Forma* No. 2. I used his stuff and he used mine and nobody dreams of such a thing" (Glusker 2010: 311). Just as he gathered material for her, Brenner "Showed Jean my archive" (Glusker 2010: 186). Brenner's daughter and biographer, Susannah Glusker, wrote to me about Brenner's important "Une Renaissance Mexicaine" (February 1928), of which a French manuscript in Charlot's hand was kept in her papers:

> I know for a fact that they worked on the article together. That it was published in various forms, signed by either one or the other because my mother mentions the experience of both working on it, and both signing it.[163]

After the English text was finished, Brenner reported "Jean translating the cockeyed *Ren* article" (Glusker 2010: 39). The English text along with the French translation was sent to the journal, but curiously, Charlot's French translation was taken as the base text and an English translation was made from it and published rather than Brenner's original English. Brenner wrote in her journal of February 27, 1928:

> This morning I received from Paris, sent by Carlos Mérida, a *Renaissance* with my article of two years ago beautifully published. Excellent paper and fine makeup. The most amusing thing: they have taken on an English-French text policy, and they retranslated mine into English, making it very good reading but not mine at all. They did it very well, of course…But I wondered when I had ever written with that particular precise flavor and then I discovered that I hadn't. It does credit to their translators, however, or to Jean's French version. (Glusker 2010: 586)

Charlot wrote Brenner:

> I enjoyed the article very much, the best presented one until now. The english translated from the french would have been better changed for the original text. ("I left Chichen")

Brenner's English is unfortunately not available for comparison.

Similarly, Brenner's "David Alfaro Siqueiros: Un Verdadero Rebelde en Arte" (November–December 1926) is basically a translation of Charlot's manuscript "D. Alfaro Siqueiros" (February 1924) with omissions, rearrangements, and the addition of some material to bring it up to date.[164] Brenner's predictable access to Charlot's manuscripts is demonstrated by her description of his outline method, which was not visible in the final product.[165] Materials from these articles were used in *Idols*. For instance, in Charlot's 1924 article on Siqueiros, he writes: "cette saine discipline que s'imposa le peintre d'être *homme* plutôt qu'être *homme célèbre"* 'this healthy discipline that the painter imposed on himself to be a *man* rather than a *famous man*.' In the 1926 article signed by Brenner, the text is simply translated into Spanish: "la sana disciplina que se impuso el pintor que quiso ser hombre antes que ser hombre ilustre." In *Idols* (266), the passage becomes "a man who chose to be great rather than famous." Glusker describes Brenner "writing about art easily with Charlot's help" and then developing her own expertise (1998: 96). Indeed, Brenner used mentors throughout her life (Glusker 1998: 40, 115, 122). Charlot later illustrated several of Brenner's children's books (Glusker 1998: 213 f.).

> Charlot was aware of his influence on Brenner:
>
> Porque me hablas tan poco de tu trabajo. Sabes como me intereso en el, un poco como si era mio. Porque lo quieres guardar todo para ti? A poco no tenemos todo en comun? ("I left Chichen")
>
> 'Why do you speak so little to me about your work? You know how much I am interested in it, a little as if it were mine. Why do you want to keep it all for yourself? Don't we hold almost everything in common?'

He complains again:

> de tu silencio sobre el libro este, por considerarlo un poco como *nuestro* libro. (no te enojas, verdad.) ("J'ai reçu une jolie lettre de toi")
>
> 'of your silence about this book [Luz Jiménez' folk tales], because I consider it a little as *our* book. (you aren't angry, right.)'

His letters make clear that she was gradually withdrawing in order to establish her own independence. In an angry poem on the ending of their romantic relationship (*Voici fini, Seigneur, l'entracte à mon échelle*, July 23, 1928), he compares himself to Pygmalion.

While they were writing together in the 1920s, Charlot obviously felt their views were compatible. For instance, they appreciated the same painters and the importance of folk art, recognized the capacity of art to evoke emotion, and depreciated the influence of the market on art.[166] However, when Charlot returned to *Idols* much later, he saw differences: "reading Anita's foreword to the new edition of her "Idols behind Altars", I realized how divergent our two approaches and two styles" (Charlot to Frank Wardlaw, June 11, 1971). Brenner herself felt a difference earlier. In *Idols* (304), she mentions Charlot's "neatly scholastic reports of Mexican popular and modern art." This accords with her view of his visual art: "carefully limited æsthetic experiments."[167] Compared to the Mexicans, Charlot seemed inhibited by his European reserve.

Reading *Idols* against the background of Charlot's writings brings such differences to light and makes possible an evaluation of his influence on Brenner's book. This method is limited by its inability to include the many conversations the two had over the years, which Brenner used in her work.[168] Charlot certainly said more than he wrote, for instance, when he showed Brenner around Chich'en Itza during her visit of April 27 to May 8, 1927. Such an oral remark can, I believe, be found in the first two sentences of Brenner's note on Illustration 29, an unattributed drawing by Charlot of a tortillera statuette by a member of the Panduro family. Charlot spoke to me about the work in almost exactly the same words, and I have the sense of him talking about the statuette to Brenner as they were looking at it.[169] Indeed, their mutual friends must have felt Charlot's influence on *Idols* because the book sounded like him.[170] In general, Charlot spoke more boldly than he wrote; Weston reports his comment on looking at an Aztec duck head: "'They were greater than the Egyptians,' was Charlot's comment" (1961: 43). Certainly, the theme of humility was basic to Charlot's writings and is found rarely elsewhere (*Idols*, e.g., 53 f., 110, 116). Brenner was, however, talking with many more people; for instance, she was discovering, photographing, and certainly discussing individual *pulquería* murals with Edward Weston and Tina Modotti. *Idols* memorializes the endless, fascinating conversations of the period.

As a result, when Charlot and Brenner treat the same subjects in a similar way, their convergence is often the result of common experience and widely-held views, for instance, on the emphasis in native art on craft and materials (*Idols* 52). Brenner's discussions of the *petate* 'sitting mat' (*Idols* 27, 123–126) resemble passages in Charlot, but the points are general enough to be common, and Brenner could certainly use her own observation, experience, and response. Charlot wrote on the pervasiveness and continuity of religion in Mexican history, but the point was generally accepted (*Idols*, e.g., 128, 86 f., 144–148, 157). Brenner could draw on her own experience and that of her friends for her discussion of miracles (*Idols* 159 ff.), the Virgin of Guadalupe (*Idols* 149–154 [152, the idea of Tepeyac as the Mexican navel is not found in Charlot]), and the Day of the Dead (*Idols* 21–27; also, 26); "nearly anyone in Mexico can add one episode of an idol behind a cross" (*Idols* 128). When she writes "Religion has always been the dynamo of Mexican art" (*Idols* 244), the word *dynamo* is definitely hers. Their greatest shared experience was of the early years of the movement itself. *Idols* is, therefore, close to the Araujo view of a large and varied group of artists. Thus already in 1929, it differed from the emerging myth of Rivera's dominance and contributed to the widening of the perspective at least to "Los Tres Grandes" (Siqueiros 1978: 47). Reviewers like Carleton Beals complained that *Idols* contained too much Charlot and Goitia and not enough Rivera (Glusker 1998: 106).

Charlot's influence can be identified most securely in passages of technical analysis that are based on or paralleled in his writings. Brenner's analysis of the mural at the Temple of the Tigers, Chich'en Itza (*Idols* 44 f.), is based on Charlot's manuscript "A Note on Maya Esthetic" (1928), found among Brenner's papers. Charlot himself used that material in his "Mayan Art" (1935; *AA* II: 39–45), "A Twelfth-Century Mayan Mural" (1938; *AA* II: 47–57), and in his lecture series *Pictures and Picture-Making* (1938). The illustration of a copy of a detail from the mural is from Charlot as well as the explanatory information in the note (*Idols* 44, 335 f.). Other points in all likelihood from Charlot are the "two ideals of beauty," Maya and Aztec (*Idols* 45), the stylistic distortion of the human body to express a

religious character (*Idols* 39), "another motif, the human hand—an artist's symbol of creative life" (*Idols* 27; Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: 311 ff.), and the characterization of the "haughty mathematician" behind the mask of the god (*Idols* 41). On the other hand, Brenner adds views of others that differ from Charlot's, such as the relation of Toltecs to Aztecs (*Idols* 48 f.), and quotes native literature. Brenner acknowledges her sources in such expressions as "What first looks like faulty architecture is pointed out as planetary geometry" (*Idols* 48).

Brenner uses Charlot for other technical discussions: Posada's technique and Pintao.[171] In general, the more technical the discussion, the more Brenner relies on Charlot's work; this can be seen clearly in her discussion of Carlos Mérida, for which she references his outstanding article.[172] Brenner used other writers as well, for instance, Rivera on ex-votos.[173] She could use also her own independent research along with Charlot's writings, for instance, on *pulquería* painting (*Idols* 171–175), and express her personal appreciation, say, of Mérida's articles on art (*Idols* 234). Charlot was interested in the literature, the *corridos*, that Posada illustrated, but never wrote about them; in contrast, Brenner discusses them at length.[174] Brenner's interest in politics leads her to attribute a definite social thought to Posada (*Idols* 192 ff.), which Charlot never did, and her contrast between Posada and Manuel Manilla is her own (*Idols* 193). In sum, Brenner used Charlot and others as a good reporter would, borrowing information and interpretations from them and adding her own.

Similarly, Brenner accepted the view of Charlot and others that Mexican art history traversed periods—Precolumbian, Colonial, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the modern movement—and that within them could be found "certain dominant themes, certain endlessly repeated forms and values in constantly different relationships" (*Idols* 15). She wrote in her journal of December 5, 1925:

> Worked with Jean on outline for the art book. Makes my mouth water but it is hard to keep to the idea—modern, living, major and result of tradition. Idea: Mexican Renaissance in the sense of constant rebirth. (Glusker 2010: 15; also 16)

Charlot supplied much of the detailed articulation of that view as well as the recognition of Indian art as foundational; for instance, the continuity of burden bearers from Aztec art to contemporary Mexico was important for Charlot's work and may have come from him.[175]

But Charlot was not her only source. Brenner gave major credit to Siqueiros both for the ideas of the movement and for the creation of its style:

> the entire mood of modern artistic Mexico is shot through with the national wishes and abilities crystallized by him. The result of the mural movement is the group product he wanted inspired. The aesthetic is monumental, is racial, is unified with profound ideas, springs out of the subject.[176]

Brenner particularly appreciated Siqueiros' social emphasis in his thinking, painting, and labor activity. Her analysis of Siqueiros' work agrees with Charlot's but also with Siqueiros' own and with the appreciation he was generally accorded. Most important, as can be seen in the chapters "Mexican Messiah" and "The White Redeemers," Brenner characterizes the periods and relates the continuous themes

in her own way, using a wide variety of sources. She connects ideas about the artist to the idea of a Mexican Messiah in an excellent passage (*Idols* 33). Her discussion of the *mestizo* in Mexico seems very much her own as does that of the *vacilada* (*Idols* 180–184), and she discovered her central theme of the three heroisms of thought, emotion, and expression, in the work of an unidentified Mexican poet (*Idols* 28, 315). However much Brenner learned from others, she developed her overall view originally and impressively, as can be seen in her wonderful chapter title, "The Pyramid Planters," which connects the monumental architecture to its agricultural base.

Brenner also had opinions that differed from Charlot's. She was more negative on the Academy of San Carlos than he was (*Idols* 98 f.) and less negative on contemporary Neoclassicism (*Idols* 284). She found in Vasconcelos "only cloudy formulation of his love" for Mexico (*Idols* 7, 1970 introduction), whereas Charlot described his philosophy and planning for the new art. She agreed with most writers in emphasizing the anonymous character of folk art, whereas Charlot was anxious to identify folk artists.[177] Most important, her writing was less academic or "scholastic" than his. Her chronology is generally haphazard, and she does not identify quotations and sources.[178]

Brenner's enthusiasm is directed toward the artists as personalities as much as toward their products, and she wants to present them as living people, using descriptions of their appearance, personality, ways of speaking, and life history, as well as of her own response to them. She approaches them, not as a colleague analyzing their work, but as an art lover meeting the admired artist: "Diego and I quarreled. He wants me to explain the stuff and I'd rather write about the painters and let the work explain itself…I am not a critic" (Glusker 2010: 65). As a result, she is more personal, emotional, and anecdotal than Charlot. While praising *Idols* highly, Siqueiros criticized Brenner's "infantilismo y anecdotismo" 'infantilism and anecdotalism.'[179] However, this contrast between the two writers must not be overdrawn. Charlot does remark on the artists as human beings and Brenner does analyze; her journal notes can be informed and interesting (e.g., Glusker 2010: 110–119). Her intellectual intensity raises her writing well above the soap-opera tone of much recent popular biography of Mexican artists. But Brenner has developed her own emphasis, a development that can be traced in her writings. "A Mexican Renascence" (September 1925) has no anecdotes or encounters with the personalities of the artists, merely a little "color." "Une Renaissance Mexicaine" (February 1928) refers to a multitude of colorful doings but provides only a paragraph of Vasari-like stories. In *Idols* (1929), Brenner comes into her own. Brenner's approach was appreciated by a wide readership:

> Miss Brenner's style, her presentation of her material, banish any possibility of the dryness this book might have suffered in the hands of an academic writer. The volume is replete with legends, stories and incidents which lend to it the glamour of a novel and at the same time gives one a sharp picture of old customs and beliefs of the natives… (P. 1930)

Brenner's prose portraits of Siqueiros, Orozco, Rivera, and others are vivid and have influenced later perceptions of their work: for instance, "All the poise, the social agility, the plausible facade lacking which Orozco suffers, dwell with his supposed adversary Rivera" (*Idols* 278). In developing these

portraits, Brenner drew on her long and close friendships with the artists as well as her focused interviews with them (*Idols* 334, note on Illustration 6). She read Charlot on Orozco, but her description of his personality and subject matter is based on her own history with that Mexican artist (*Idols* 345 f.). In her affectionate chapter on the difficult Goitia, she refers to her many visits to his home.[180] On the other hand, Brenner did not always take notes or check her writing with her subjects. Her account of Charlot's French period seems based on unevenly remembered conversations, and she uses the mistaken title for his first mural, *The Fall of Tenochtitlán*, instead of *The Massacre in the Main Temple* (Idols 309).

Finally, Brenner substantially widened the focus of her discussion to include more history and anthropology, her own field. In these sections, she used a variety of published and oral sources as well as her personal experience, as in the chapter "Travail," on the Mexican Revolution.[181] She followed her own interests, for instance, in Indian *curanderos* 'curers,' and marijuana, not discussed by Charlot except in his letters to her.[182] At Chich'en Itza, she not only viewed the ruins with Charlot but visited on her own the Ligas de Resistencia founded by the socialist governor of Yucatan, Felipe Carillo-Puerto (*Idols* 224 ff.). Years earlier, she had gone on research trips alone as well as with others (e.g., Glusker 2010: 73–91). Her social and political concerns are expressed also in her long section on land rights and her discussion of the political influence of the United States (*Idols* 103–123, 327 ff.). She is generally more interested in the social, historical significance of an art work than in its technical, esthetic virtues (Glusker 1998: 176). She discusses modern Mexican literature and music and brings the history up to the date of her publication.[183] Charlot's realization in 1971 of "how divergent [are] our two approaches and two styles" was due, I believe, to Brenner's extensive use of anthropology and child psychology in her new introduction to *Idols* of 1970.[184] But she had discussed her special interests with him in 1927: "I have declared to both Jean and Lucy my discovery that my book is not art criticism nor history, but really anthropology" (Glusker 2010: 486). Brenner's lack of influence on Charlot can be explained partly by the fact that her independent interests were not shared by him.

The unique aspect of Charlot's collaboration with Brenner was their emotional involvement. Although their work together was usually a steadying influence, several events suggest that it could reflect underlying tensions. When Charlot tells her "he would not have time to do something I asked him to do, but would be glad to help me all he could," Brenner feels "the bond is gone" (Glusker 2010: 188). On his side, "Jean is furious" because she gave "no undue importance" to his desired changes in his first article on Orozco.[185] When Charlot was at Chich'en, Brenner asked him for an article on Maya art. Charlot sent "A Note on Maya Esthetic" (1928) to her and never heard of it again. In a letter during their long breakup—which begins "It would be useless to recriminate"—Charlot nevertheless wrote, "Why was not the Maya Art article published?"[186] Glusker summarized their combination of emotional relation and collaboration in a 1929 poem:

> But you, I'm part of you
> And you're a part of me.
> Before I start to work,
> I need that part. (Glusker 2010: 269)

Despite all the above difficulties, the co-authors were happy with their work. Charlot wrote to Brenner that "Me dio gusto" 'I was pleased' when *The Arts* listed her article, "A Mexican Renascence" (1925), among "articles of more than usual interest" in place of Rivera's (JC to AB "Te mando mi fotografia junto a uno de los menotes que descubri"). Glusker accurately summarizes Brenner's achievement (1998: 98): "Anita presented Mexico…with a personal touch…She combined anecdotes with quotations from historical sources and ballads…" The book remains an indispensable and independent source for modern Mexican art, primarily because of Brenner's passionate and intelligent appreciation of people and events, which she expressed in passages of soaring eloquence. In *Idols*, Brenner reached an intensity beyond her later knowledgeable reporting. *Idols* not only describes, but exemplifies its historic moment of heightened inspiration.

APPENDIX III: EDWARD WESTON AND JEAN CHARLOT'S *THE MEXICAN MURAL RENAISSANCE*

Lew Andrews

A. ON WESTON'S MEXICAN MATERIAL/DAYBOOKS

In the fall of 1942, Jean Charlot began working on a study of mural painting in Mexico in the first half of the 1920s, a study which would culminate many years later in his book, *The Mexican Mural Renaissance* (Charlot 1967). As the project got underway, he contacted Edward Weston, asking to see whatever Mexican material he might still have had, in the hope that it would aid him in his research. Toward the end of the year Weston wrote back to say that he had not been able to find anything:

> Just a word to say that I spent several hours yesterday hunting our loft for mexican data for Jean. No luck. Worse, I know it *is* there. I'm sure that it was brought up from L.A. when Neil [Weston] and I moved. I'm not giving up. I admit the loft is a mess with boxes of Leon's [Leon Wilson] papers and books mixed with ours.[187]

The next day, after more searching in the attic, he wrote again, with better news about the Mexican material:

> Up in the attic again I saw a pink paper sticking out - it was one of the mexican broadsides. I found and will send when next we go in to shop, manifestos, "El Machetes", "Irradiador" and quite a group of photographs of early Charlots. (EW to JC, November 4 [1942], JCC)

Charlot held on to the material for close to a year, but in a letter of September 16, 1943, he indicated that he was returning the Mexican sheets with thanks.[188] And then, in the same letter, he asked if Weston would consider sending him his diary for the Mexican period, so that he could check it against his own or quote from it when appropriate. A few excerpts from Weston's diary had been published in the 1920s, in *Creative Art*, and in *The Carmelite*, but when Charlot made his request, nothing else was accessible.[189] Weston had perhaps already considered publishing a fuller version, but nothing concrete had been done.[190] Charlot's request seems to have started the ball rolling once again (although it would still be many years before the Daybooks were published in full).[191]

Later in the fall of 1943, at least partly in response to Charlot's request, Weston started working on the Daybooks in earnest, as he reported in a postcard: "Surprise! I am working on the Mexican Day Book. If I get it into shape that will go via express without setting afire other innocent packages, I will ship to you; but how soon is the question. You started something, but I'll need some cheering." After signing off, he adds on the side of the card, "May take months!" (EW to JC [postcard], October 5, 1943, JCC). A little more than a month later, he provided an update, reporting that he was still working on the Daybooks, along with an upcoming show at the Museum of Modern Art in New York (EW to JC and ZC (postcard), November 10, 1943, JCC). At the end of the year, Edward reported further: "My day book (Mex.) has been so well edited that it is in fragments or ribbons of paper. It can't go on to you until I find someone to type it" (EW and CW to ZC and JC [postcard], December 16, 1943, JCC).

Shortly afterward, just after New Year's (January 1944), work started up again, and Edward sent a brief note to the Charlots, and added a postscript about the Daybooks: "Day book copy ½ done. Charis [Wilson] hired a painter (*not* a house painter) to do the typing. You know what *that* means!"(EW to JC and ZC, January 3, 1944, JCC). And a week later, Edward sent yet another card: "Be of good cheer – Charis & stenog. working on Day B – twice a wk. It will be your xmas & Birthday present. *When? When? When?*" (EW to JC and ZC [postcard], January 10, 1944, JCC). Although progress was being made, one can detect a note of frustration about how slowly it was going. Charlot responded by letter: he thanked Edward for the progress reports, but expressed concern that in the editing process, valuable information would get lost: "Thanks for your cards telling me of the progress of the 'day book.' Let us hope that the censure will not cut out data that could be of interest to me. I do want to show in the book the part you played and the influence you had in this episode and certainly your own words will be a valuable contribution" (JC to EW [with postscript by ZC], January. 29, 1944, CCP). In the same letter, Charlot added that he was hoping to go to Mexico later in the year to collect more data for the book (Ibid.).

Unfortunately, by the following November (1944), work on the Daybooks had stalled, as Weston reported: "The Mexican Diary is at a standstill on acct no labor to hire. My regrets" (EW to ZC and JC, undated (probably Fall of 1944), JCC). But soon after, Zohmah Charlot arranged for a Los Angeles college student, named Mary Kriger, to work for Edward over the Christmas break. The plan was that she would stay with Weston in Carmel and while there, continue the typing. Weston wrote to Beaumont and Nancy Newhall about the upcoming visit:

> Have not been lonesome so far [Charis was in Washington caring for her mother] – no time; Merle [Armitage] here, and tomorrow Ansel [Adams] arrives with a 'blind date', a girl, friend of Charlot, coming to type my Mex. Diary, stay here over holidays. Who will sleep where, and with whom, while Ansel is here, or after, is in the hands of Pagan Gods.[192]

The blind date in question turned out, of course, to be Mary Kriger, and after she arrived, she reported to the Charlots:

> Dear Charlots: I am at Weston's as you can see from return address. Have been here for over a day now. All we do when we talk at all is talk about you, I hope you are feeling good and self conscious! Mostly talk of time you did something rediculous [*sic*] of course. Also he got out a painting of yours and hung it up, probably so I could tell you that you are still remembered. The painting was up in the attic. *Ha ha*. I have been typing assiduously all afternoon. Jean mentioned throughout MS as 'that nice slim young boy'. Sounds very unlike.[193]

Mary Kriger stayed with Weston about a week, and did only a modest amount of typing, but it was a start. Soon after Edward wrote to Jean to update him on the situation: "I am going through the finished – typing – part of Day Book – only about 5 months done – then ship express to you. Mary K– did about 20 pages. I enjoyed her."[194] A little later he sent a postcard with what must have been

unexpected good news: "Expressing Mex. Day Book (part ready) soon as get transport" (EW to JC and ZC, January 12, 1945, JCC). It had been more than two years since Jean had first asked about the diaries, but at last a portion, at least, was on its way. Two years later, early in 1947, Charlot wrote from Mexico, where he had gone to pursue the book project, and reported that he was working on the final chapter ("Mexico and the United States"), "in which I quote from your beautiful Day Book."[195] Weston must have been pleased to hear, after all the trouble that had been taken over the typing, that his diary was being put to good use.

In the fall of 1950, after he thought his book had been accepted for publication by Stanford University Press (it would eventually be published by Yale University Press), Charlot again asked Edward to send him Mexican documentation; since much of his own Mexican material had been put in storage back in Colorado, he was turning to other sources. Edward had already offered – probably when the Charlots had last visited Carmel, in the summer of 1949 – to give Jean whatever newspapers and broadsides he might still have had, and Jean was taking him up on the offer, hoping that this would help fill in some of the gaps (JC and ZC to EW, October 31, 1950, JCC).

In early December 1950, in response to Jean's request, Edward sent off a package of Mexican material, and followed it up with a letter, in which he explained: "Last week I mailed the newspapers of so many years ago; they include the famous manifesto, the protest by the extranjeros, and several 'El Machetes.' Keep them or turn them over to some historical society, maybe the 'United States National Museum.' They certainly have historical value."[196] Charlot wrote back the next month, and turning to the Mexican material, he quipped: "It seems to me a little mouse got it since I saw it last as there were holes in the newspaper." And then he noted Edward's desire that the material should go to a public institution: "As this is what I want to do with all my Mexican material, we both agree" (JC to EW, January 20, 1951, JCC). This material may be among the many examples now in the Jean Charlot Collection at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

B. ON THE UNPUBLISHED CHAPTER FROM *THE MEXICAN MURAL RENAISSANCE*

In the early part of 1945, Charlot was hard at work on his study of the Mexican mural renaissance; at about this time, he was completing a section on the artistic interconnections between Mexico and the United States which included some discussion of Weston. Charlot had written about Weston before, on more than one occasion, but this was the first statement on Weston he had written in some time; in this case, he focused on Edward's Mexican years and his contribution to the artistic developments of the time. In Charlot's view, Weston played a pivotal role: "It was the good fortune of Mexico," he wrote, "to be visited at a time when the plastic vocabulary of the renaissance [the Mexican mural renaissance] was still tender and amenable to suggestions, by Edward Weston, one of the authentic masters bred in the United States."[197]

When Weston had arrived on the scene in 1923, many Mexican artists were under the spell of European art ("Paris-bred scruples that slowed our effort"), and Weston's direct way of seeing – the objectivity of his photographic vision – led them, Charlot included, away from some of these influences

toward a more representational, and ultimately a more authentic approach, one rooted in their own surroundings and traditions: "He dealt with problems of substance, weight, tactile surfaces and biological thrusts which laid bare the roots of Mexican culture" ("The United States and The Renaissance," p. 559).

At the same time, Mexico had an impact on Weston's photography. Just as Weston helped to redirect Mexican painting, Mexico helped him to clarify his own vision, fully to mature as an artist, and to find his true roots:

> Breughel needed to make the trip to Italy to know that his roots were north. The Americanism of Weston grew its backbone in front of the hieroglyphs of another civilization. Magueyes, palm trees, pyramids, helped him shed, sooner than he would have otherwise, his esthetic adolescence. It was in front of a round smooth palm tree trunk in Cuernavaca that he realized the clean elegance of northern factory chimneys. Teotihuacan, with its steep skyward pyramidal ascent, taught him how to love his own country's skyscrapers. (Ibid., pp. 559-560)

And Charlot concluded his discussion with an incident involving Diego Rivera:

> While Rivera was painting 'The Day of the Dead in the City' in the second court of the Ministry, we talked about Weston. I said that his work was precious for us in that it delineated the limitations of our craft and staked out optical plots forbidden forever to the brush. But Diego, rendering meanwhile a wood texture with the precise skill and speed of a sign painter, countered that in his opinion Weston did blaze a path to a better way of seeing, and, as a corollary, of painting. It is with such humility at heart that Rivera had painted with a brush in one hand and a Weston photograph in the other his self portrait in the staircase of the Ministry. (Ibid., p. 560)

Charlot is referring here to the last panel of the frescoes on the stairway of the Ministry of Education, in which there is a self-portrait of Rivera – as an architect – based on a photograph by Weston: not only did Weston's basic approach have an impact on Mexican artists like Rivera, but specific images became raw material as well (Charlot 1967: 298).

In mid-February (of 1945), Charlot sent a copy this discussion to Weston, and at the end of the month, Weston wrote back to acknowledge it: "Jean, I was deeply moved, and felt quite humble I assure you, when I read your "U.S. and the Renaissance" with my part in same. It gave me something to consider, until now unconsidered, about myself, my work" (EW to JC, February 28, 1945, JCC). By this time Edward had received a good deal of praise, and his historical importance had been well established, but Jean's discussion offered a new perspective, and Edward had good reason to be gratified. Indeed he seems to have passed Charlot's piece along to Nancy Newhall, who quoted from it in her essay in the catalogue for Weston's 1946 exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York (Newhall 1946: 7).

The discussion in question was intended first as an appendix to the main text of Charlot's *The Mexican Mural Renaissance*, and then later as the final chapter. Ultimately, it was dropped, at the suggestion of Yale University Press, when the book was finally published in 1963. It was not considered

suitable as a final chapter; perhaps, too, there were concerns about the length of the book.[198] Charlot later extracted the material on Weston, with the intention of presenting it as a brief, separate article, "Edward and Mexico." A typescript is preserved in the Jean Charlot Collection; the Collection has posted this and related material on its web site.[199]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Peter Bunnell, 1983. Edward Weston on Photography. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc./Peregrine Smith Books.

Jean Charlot, 1967. The Mexican Mural Renaissance: 1920-25. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Nancy Newhall, 1946. The Photographs of Edward Weston. New York: Museum of Modern Art.

Lori Pauli, 1995. "Edward Weston and Christel Gang: Silent Communion." History of Photography 19:3 (Autumn 1995), pp. 263-8.

Edward Weston, 1928. "From My Day Book." Creative Art 3:2 (Aug. 1928), pp. xxix-xxxvi. Reprinted in Bunnell, 1983 (above), pp. 48-52.

Edward Weston, 1929. "Mexican Days." The Carmelite (Aug. 7, 1929), p. 12.

Edward Weston, 1961. The Daybooks of Edward Weston. Ed. Nancy Newhall, 2 vols. Rochester, N.Y.: George Eastman House (1961) and New York: Horizon Press (1966).

Charis Wilson with Wendy Madar, 1998. Through Another Lens: My Life with Edward Weston. New York: North Point Press/Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

[1] Charlot October 1926 Pinturas. Jean Charlot was born in February 8, 1898, in Paris and died in March 20, 1979, in Honolulu, Hawai`i. Biographical information is available on the Web sites of the Jean Charlot Collection and of the Jean Charlot Foundation. The draft first volume of my biography of my father— *Jean Charlot: Life and Work*, Volume 1: *The French Period*, 2006—is posted on the latter site.

Charlot and Anita Brenner have been credited with the first use of the word *Renaissance* for the movement (e.g., Argenteri 2003: 71), but it had been used earlier for the growing activity in the Mexican art scene. "Renacimiento y Nacionalismo" 1923 relates the art resurgence with a general economic and social Renaissance and states that Dr. Atl "ha sugerido" 'has suggested' this earlier. Also Vera de Córdova 1920; Fausto Ramírez 1991: 19 (dates the use of the word to 1907); García de Germenos 1991: 67.

[2] Charlot was early considered an authority. He writes in the mid-1920s to Brenner about Gabriel Garcia Maroto (18891969): "Tambien hay aqui un S[r] Maroto, español critico, preparando libro sobre Pintura Mejicana. Me pidio datos" 'There is also here a Mr. Maroto, Spanish critic, preparing a book on Mexican painting. He asked me for information' ("Hoy te mando el ejemplar de Forma"). This dual role extended into other areas. For instance, in the 1960s, he told me that he was amused when a university administrator said how much they appreciated his productivity as a *writer*. Charlot continues to be recognized as an important writer on the movement, e.g., in an artist's biography:

> The French-born artist became a leading figure in a nation's (Mexico) discovery of itself. No one has better described the ideologic and plastic considerations that entered into the transference of ancient art forms to Mexico's contemporary, dynamic creation that [*sic*: than] Charlot himself. (Arceo 1987: 14)
>
> His years in Mexico resulted in not only a formidable body of art but also an equally formidable body of criticism and scholarship… (Rashkin 2009: 79)

[3] Tibol 1987: 4. See also, e.g., Vidal de Alba 1990, Charlot "colaboró en una serie de publicaciones y se le puede considerar el primer editor artístico" 'collaborated on a series of publications and can be considered the first artistic editor.'

[4] Charlot would maintain a life-long interest in such catalogues, keeping a checklist of his own oil paintings, working with Peter Morse on the catalogue of his prints, and writing his own *catalogue raisonné* of Louis Choris's portraits of Kamehameha (1958). Morse 1976: 324. Charlot's project for a catalogue of the works of José Guadalupe Posada is discussed below.

[5] A month before he died, Charlot was happy with the article as he read it typed clean. He thought the best part—the part he was proudest of—was that on the Vanegas Arroyo *business*. He later said to Evelyn Giddings, "Reading it, no one will be able to tell I wrote it sitting on my fanny."

[6] To Prudence Plowe March 29, 1946:

> Whether it is my low blood pressure or just the altitude I am absolutely lazy these days. It is an awful contrast to Jean who is working from before breakfast until late at night. Besides working on his book he is doing a portfolio of color lithographs on stone, and going several nights a week to take a class in nahuatal [*sic*], the Aztec Indian language, and he really begins to speak it well. Luz' native tongue is nahuatal so they can talk together. I don't even learn Spanish.

To the same, September 21, 1946; October 4, 1946: "However I think he begins to long for a year just to paint in, no teaching, no writing. Wish we had some money so he could." To Marie McCall February 4, 1946: "He has lots of the book done, but is [*sic*: it] is surely a big job. I'll be glad when he is just a painter again."

MMR was first published in 1963. The 1967 edition describes itself as merely "Second printing, February 1967." However, it contains a number of corrections of typographical errors and is used in this book. The Hacker reprint of 1979 describes itself erroneously as based on 1962 [*sic*] first publication; in fact, it reproduces the 1967 edition.

[7] Jorge García Murillo writes in Garduño and Koprivitza 1994: 17, Charlot was "un artista que tiene su lugar en la historia del arte mexicano no sólo como artista plástico sino como el gran promotor que fue del arte de nuestro país" 'an artist who has his place in the history of Mexican art not only as a plastic artist but also as the great promoter that he was of the art of our country.' Reed 1960: 74, Charlot's "effective role of international cultural liaison officer." Lester C. Walker noted the importance of Charlot in bringing Mexican ideas to the United States: "He was an important factor in his movement from one educational institution to another" (Burnett 1979: 2-E).

[8] Reed 1960: 20, as art editor, Charlot "became a leading figure in the nation's discovery of itself"; he showed how ancient Mexican art and folk culture influenced modern Mexican art. Arceo 1987: 14. Zalce 1971:

> **AZ:** I don't know exactly. I have some of his articles that he did for her magazine. I know that they were friends. But I met Frances Toor after Jean left Mexico. I remember many articles, "Pulquerías" especially. Many of those works were really masterpieces, and Jean was the first to call attention to them. He did that also for Posada and Manilla.
>
> Jean's articles were important. People say now he's the one who discovered Posada. After comes Rivera; then all said they knew Posada. Then Orozco. But they didn't say it before.

Vidal de Alba 1990. Albers 1999: 157. Argenteri 2003: 93.

[9] *Idols* 304, Charlot "wrote neatly scholastic reports of Mexican popular and modern art for Parisian revues, and for Mexican." "Art Exhibition under Auspices of Y. W. C. A. Now Open to Public" April 28, 1925, "M. Charlot is the art correspondent in Mexico for 'Crapouillot' and other magazines of France."

[10] Diary August 15, 1928, "bonne lettre d'Orozco me citant lettre de Pach sur mon article" 'good letter from Orozco citing for me the letter of Pach on my article.' Orozco 1987: 123 ff. 129, 132; 125 ("La verdad es que ese artículo me va a servir mucho" 'The truth is that this article is going to help me very much'). Orozco V. 1983: 200. Tibol 1996: 69. See also Reed 1960: 20 ("The most profound interpretation of Orozco's significance was written by Jean Charlot…for Form*a*"); 48 (Charlot's "unfailing sympathy and understanding" for Orozco's work); 59 ("Jean Charlot, the fellow artist perhaps best qualified to appreciate his work and character…").

[11] E.g., Bars 2002: 352 note 96, agrees with Renato González Mello that Charlot might have convinced Orozco of Posada's value; she cites the lack of skeletal imagery in Orozco's work before 1925. Sorell 2002: 283, "In Charlot's name, I extend an invitation to my colleagues to join me and imbibe the cultural feast awaiting them in the streets."

[12] Translation by Jean Charlot, from his research notes. My own translation:

> 'Listen to the learned and forceful statement of JEAN CHARLOT, renowned painter and sculptor, even though about a subject that arouses little enthusiasm: "The paintings of pulque bars and butcher shops, useful and good paintings, are one of the greatest artistic glories of Mexico today." Eh? What do you think? Rejoice men and women of little faith. You have in your family, not the despicable Sebastián, but the great Sebastián, one of the contributors to the greatest artistic glories of Mexico and of today.'

[13] Charlot 1928. Mérida would have seen this in manuscript or in a shorter version published at the time, "Carlos Merida y la pintura" (November 1928).

[14] Letter of December 2, 1943. Similarly Mérida wrote Charlot on July 22, 1963: "me encuentro con tu gratas líneas y el capítulo seis de tu nuevo libro en el cual me incluyes en forma tan notoria y generosa" 'I find myself in your gracious lines and chapter six of your new book in which you include me in such a noteworthy and generous fashion.' Guadarrama Peña 2010: 43, agrees with Charlot against Monsiváis on Mérida's position in the early movement.

In the interview of January 29, 1971, Mérida regretted the lack of a Spanish translation of *MMR*:

> Sobre el libro del *Mexican Mural Renaissance, 1920 al 25*, es una cosa penosa que no se haya aún hecho una traducción adecuada de uno de los libros más concisos y más completos que se hayan escrito sobre el Movimiento Mexicano….Sin embargo la historia que Juan recuenta en su libro es muy interesante en cuanto a que coloca a los pintores que formaron el grupo y que realizaron aquella obra en su justo y definitivo lugar….estamos nosotros muy interesados en que de una u otra forma, ese libro se traduzca al español y se llegue a conocer en México para que se le dé su verdadero lugar, como lo está teniendo ya fuera de México, en los Estados Unidos y en Europa. (January 29, 1971)
>
> 'About the book *Mexican Mural Renaissance, 1920–1925*, it is a painful thing that an adequate translation has not yet been made of one of the most concise and complete books that have been written about the Mexican Movement….Nonetheless, the history that Jean recounts in his book is very interesting inasmuch as it puts the painters who formed the group and who realized that work in its just and definitive place….we would be very interested that in one form or other, this book be translated into Spanish and became known in Mexico so that [the group] be given its true place, which it is already holding outside Mexico in the United States and in Europe.'

[15] Zalce 1971:

> Jean was one of the best critics of art He was a very famous writer. I knew his articles in *Forma*. I read those. So Jean was very important.
>
> …
>
> I remember many articles, "Pulquerías" especially. Many of those works were really masterpieces, and Jean was the first to call attention to them. He did that also for Posada and Manilla.
>
> Jean's articles were important. People say now he's the one who discovered Posada. After comes Rivera; then all said they knew Posada. Then Orozco. But they didn't say it before.

[16] Letter to Charlot, April 23, [1945]. Charlot's article: "Rufino Tamayo" (April 1945).

[17] Vasconcelos to Charlot, July 12, 1945. Charlot remembered Vasconcelos as more guarded in his "Mexican Renaissance":

> Fifteen years ago when he was head of the Library in Mexico City I gave him my manuscript and he read it, and he was rather noncommittal, but he said it could very well have happened so, so that I have in a way his blessings on the subject. (May 11, 1960)

Charlot checked his section on Vasconcelos also with the expert Patrick Romanell, who approved of it and made "a few minor corrections"; Romanell to Charlot, July 18, 1949. Orozco and Leal were also loyal to Vasconcelos: Clemente V. 1983: 107, 110; Leal 1990: 90, 100, 170, 174, 180, 195. Compare Paz 1993: 132 f. On Vasconcelos' titanic achievements in many fields, see Fell 1989, the most scholarly study of the period.

Charlot always felt the artist behind the art. While jurying an exhibition in Honolulu, he wanted to accept a work by a "Sunday painter" in which he felt something special. Charlot's fellow-jurors voted him down, and he learned that the painter died shortly thereafter. Charlot told me that the artist would have been pleased to have his work accepted shortly before he died.

[18] Published: e.g., Reed 1960; 20, 29, 74. Myers 1956: 28 (Charlot "has written a considerable number of significant books and articles on the Mexican movement"). Cordero y Salinas 1959: uses Charlot's writing extensively; 16 ("El celebre e internacional critico del arte…" 'the famous and international art critic'); the author inscribes a copy to Charlot as "culto y apreciable Maestro y Artista" 'cultivated and estimable Master and Artist.' Small 1975: 14 ("definitive studies"). Fell 1989: 404 (the Mexican movement has been studied "de manera magistral, Jean Charlot y Antonio Rodríguez" 'in a magisterial manner'). Paz 1993: 133 (Charlot's theoretical works "played a decisive role at the very beginning of the movement"). The Araujo articles were praised by Dr. Atl; editorial introduction to Lozano and Angel 1923. The letter by Nielsen 1923 is so fulsome as to raise suspicions of being a plant.

Unpublished: e.g., Elizabeth Wilder Weisman to Charlot September 21, 1963, on *MMR*: "it is far and away the most valuable, solid, dependable, important and entertaining book that anyone ever has—or ever will be able—to write on the subject"; "I hope someone will let me review the book, which would not be an act of kindness, but of critical appreciation." Stanton L. Catlin to Jean Charlot, December 20, 1972: "there is a deep and unexpressed feeling of inheritance from you that bespeaks a wish to do you honor that lies very close to the surface of all the growing number of Americanists in this country."

Many such expressions can be found in the correspondence of the Mexican art historian Emily Edwards with Jean and Zohmah Charlot. To Zohmah, February 15, 1948: Charlot's writings and critical comments are valuable for her own work. To Jean, May 9, 1958:

> Would you consider writing the Introduction for the whole tradition of mural art in Mexico?
>
> Shortly after Diego's death, I wrote to Manuel to suggest that we ask you to write the Introduction…They join me in requesting you to write it. To my mind, you are the only one.

Rivera was originally to write the introduction. To Jean, May 20, 1958: "Thank you for your cordial consent to write for us. This makes the book feel alive for me again." To Jean, August 12, 1964: "I am grateful to you for giving Diego priority, and I only miss mention of Orozco's great weight in the mural renaissance." To Jean, May 28, 1965: "I am sorry that Diego is being downgraded. It makes your Foreword of added significance." To Jean and Zohmah on *MMR*, October 18, 1965: "When I get out your book and realize the knowledge and skill that it represents, I wonder that I have had the nerve to attempt even a popular presentation of this fascinating material." To Zohmah, March 7, 1966: "the only criticisms that I will take to heart are those by artists—especially by Jean—so I hope that the proof will be with me. I don't want him to regret writing the Foreword." To Jean and Zohmah, April 14, 1970:

[19] E.g., Lifson 1999:

> Kao believes Shahn's attraction to photography developed naturally out of his painting style. "Jean Charlot talks about how Shahn delights in what is accidental and ungentlemanly about camera work. But he's not talking about Shahn's photographs, he's talking about his paintings. This is before Shahn even picks up a camera!"

[20] Clemente V. 1983: using Charlot's research, e.g., 40, 43, 122, 129, 130 f., 133; disagrees with and criticizes Charlot, 88, 131, 133 ("La versión de Charlot, aunque valiosa, es imprecisa y fragmentaria" 'Charlot's version, though valuable, is imprecise and fragmentary'); 130 (finds Charlot's attitude negative: "Es de hacerse notar en toda esta versión la pésima interpretación que hace Charlot, tanto del carácter autocrítico de Orozco como de su obra" 'Notable in all this version is the most negative interpretation that Charlot makes, as much of the autocritical character of Orozco as of his work'); also 131. Orozco V. sometimes considers Charlot's view the received one that he himself is revising. For instance, on page 128 of his own copy of his 1983 book (of which he generously gave me a photocopy), he has underlined "Oficialmente" 'Officially' in the text and noted in the margin, "Más deberá decir: Según Charlot" 'It should rather say: According to Charlot.'

[21] González Mello 1995: 34. The Damas Católicas incident occurred in 1926, after the cut-off date for *MMR* (Glusker 2010: 147). At the time, Charlot was at Chich'en Itza and returned only later (185). They had, however, been identified as hostile since at least 1924 (Siqueiros 1996: 42). The Damas Católicas are mentioned in a later article Charlot wrote with Brenner (1928: 63). While discussing in *Idols* 308 Charlot's 1924 woodcut, *Rich People in Hell*, Morse 1976: number 56, Brenner commented:

> It was followed not long after by the portrait of a lady in purple with a red wig and a preposterous hat, wearing the medal of a religious organization large and golden upon her bosom. She was the only comment on the troubles of Mother Church that a devout son permitted himself.

Patterson 1964: 276, also criticizes Charlot for not mentioning the Damas Católicas and other Catholics who were against the murals. Mello could make a case with Leal.

[22] Charlot September 1947. See also 1951 College Art Teaching; *AA* I: 50 ff.

[23] Zalce 1971:

> Jean didn't speak against others. When he had something to say, he did it openly in books. Not Rivera, who made jokes about everybody. Jean made his criticisms in articles. Jean was considered a fair critic, not a member of a party.

[24] Charlot November 1947: 259. Compare Brenner [and Charlot] 1928, on Goitia: "Sa technique, née du sujet, fraîche et directe, fut souvent méprisée par les pontifes d'un art orthodoxe" 'His technique, born of the subject, fresh and direct, was often despised by the pontiffs of an orthodox art.'

[25] October-December 1922 Critique. See also 1922 Conseils. Compare Rivera 1924 Guild Spirit: 175.

[26] E.g., 1925 Prologue, 1925 Prólogo. For more general terms, see October-December 1922 Critique; October-December 1922 Conseils.

[27] See my discussion in Chapters 3 and 9 below. Autobiographical notes 1937: "I continue to be an authority on the 14th century costume and habits of the Maya (concerning which I have had one inquiry within the last eight years)…" See, e.g., Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: e.g., 233, 239 f., 242, 253–256. Charlot's letter to Brenner "It would be useless to recriminate" (undated, probably late 1920s) refers to an article that has not been located: "I wanted to know if Morley had received and if received, had read a paper mio (Fashion in dresses as a method of dating monuments) to the Congress."

[28] Charlot August/September 1925. Glusker 2010: 239 (Charlot is "working on a monograph of the dances, so we photographed, took notes, etc. etc.").

[29] Charlot gathered much material for the Posada catalogue, but while he was away in Chich'en Itza, Frances Toor and Diego Rivera published a loose collection of Posada images, which Charlot felt preempted the field. Brenner was helping Charlot on the project (Glusker 2010: 220, 224, 243, 253, 274, 278, 283, 287, 290, 293, 295, 323 (?), 415, 502, 515). On *El Machete*, see Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944 Chap. XVIII). Charlot identified uncredited artists on his copies of the newspaper.

[30] Compare Siqueiros 1977: 210. A paradox within the movement is noted by Charlot:

> The painter of the famous picture, *Zapatistas*, now in the Museum of Modern Art and of the equally formidable *Zapata*—that Alma Reed extolls as the heroic portrait of a hero—contacted his models only as they were brought in daily as prisoners, and shot. (*AA* II: 318)

[31] Charlot Writings Related to MMR: Passages Cut; *AA* II: 254. Orozco V. 1983: 430, called Orozco "El Léon Bloy de la pintura" 'The Léon Bloy of painting.'

[32] Rivera's: June–July 1926 (1986: 100–104). Charlot's: October 1926 Pinturas. Compare Le Clézio 1993: 194 f.

[33] Salatiel Rosales July 30, 1924, (referred to only here) resembles Charlot's "Las Pinturas de la Escuela Nacional Preparatoria" in August 1924. Charlot's diary notes that his article was finished on July 21. Did it circulate in manuscript? See bibliographic note to Charlot August 1924.

[34] Charlot April 1949: 142; *AA* II: 130; *MMR* 33 f. See my discussion in Chapter 3.

[35] Moyssén in Rivera 1986: 11–18. Acevedo, Torres Carmona, and Sánchez Mejorada in Rivera 1999: x.

[36] E.g., Glusker 2010: 15 ("Diego story shaping"); 42, 132 f. *Idols* 278 f. Siqueiros 1977: 154. Scherer 1996: 110, 121 ("Diego era mitómano. Respiraba y mentía" 'Diego was a mythomane. He breathed and lied'). For her book on Rivera, Leah Brenner wanted to check his statements with Charlot (Leah Brenner to Jean Charlot May 21, 1963).

[37] Charlot Tabletalk early 1970s. Siqueiros 1977: 154; 1996: 49. Glusker 2010: 42. Compare Orozco 1962: 118.

[38] Charlot personal communication. Baciu 1982: 13, heard the story from Carlos Mérida and his wife, with the version "Diego lo ha dicho."

[39] Rivera 1986: 122 [1927]; 1999b: 669 [1957]. Charlot can accept that Rivera looked into Posada's shop (*AA* II: 6). Rivera's myth-making on this point is recognized (e.g., Merfish 2013: 50)).

[40] Compare his 1935 polemic against Siqueiros (1999a: 89): Siqueiros returned to Mexico wanting to become "el Mesías renovador de la pintura revolucionaria de México y Jefe Máximo stalinista de la pintura revolucionaria mundial" 'the renovating Messiah of the revolutionary painting of Mexico and the Stalinist Maximal Chief of world revolutionary painting.'

[41] The 1810–1811 fresco secco murals by Francisco Eduardo de Tres Guerras in Celaya may have been the latest ones Charlot found (*MMR* 20 ff.; *AA* II: 162)). I am not aware of later research on this question.

[42] E.g., Tibol 1996. Cervantes and Mackenzie 2010: 548, 554, 558. Lilia Roura Fuentes 2012: 325, 355.

[43] Orozco 1971: 135–139; 1974: 88–91. *MMR* 240, "the written draft [of Orozco's Preparatoria plans) remained mostly ineffectual in practice. It was only two years later, in the House of Tiles, that his original ideal became truly operative."

[44] Compare Siqueiros 1978: 38. Rivera also felt the need to vent, for instance, alternating basically positive depictions of the United States with deeply critical ones when he was working in that country. The Detroit murals achieve an admirable balance.

[45] Oles 2002: 200–203, takes the idea seriously; Anreus 2001: 126, 130, finds the alternative arrangements poor and suggests that Orozco's point was that only one arrangement was possible. Charlot found the idea silly (Tabletalk May 3, 1971).

[46] Such texts are mentioned by Angélica Arenal de Siqueiros (Siqueiros 1977: 8). The Spanish original of one of Charlot's translations can be found on page 211.

[47] Siqueiros 1977: 167. Siqueiros editor, Raquel Tibol, corrects a date, 1996: 399. 1996: 453 ff., is a rare, if not unique, use of documents.

[48] E.g., Siqueiros 1977, 180 ff.; 1978: 31–53; 1996: 459, 468, 502.

[49] Araujo July 11, 1923. Similarly, Charlot explained Herrán's admiration for Ignacio Zuloaga on the fact that he had seen his work only in small reproductions: "I remember Jean said, if Herrán saw one original of Zuloaga, he wouldn't be influenced by him, because they're horrible. He said also that Herrán had better quality than Zuloaga, but admired Zuloaga because he was foreign" (Zalce 1971).

[50] Historical reports: 1926 Report. Compare Fauchereau 2013: 186 f.; artists like Tamayo knew Precolumbian art:

> mais il faut l'acuité critique d'un autre artiste passé par là, Charlot, pour mesurer les différences entre les intérêts archéologiques des muralistes et ceux de Tamayo, et qui expliqueront en partie les divergences de leur art. (186)
>
> 'but it is necessary to see the critical acuteness of another artist who passed that way, Charlot, to measure the differences between the archeological interests of the muralists and those of Tamayo, and which explain in par the divergences of their art.'

Liturgical: Morris, Charlot, and Morris 1931: e.g., 244, 252.

[51] Weisman's long letter to Charlot of February 5, 1947?, on Colonial frescoes, suggests the interest of their conversations.

[52] Araujo July 11, 1923; July 26, 1923. The criticism is found elsewhere, e.g., Maples Arce 1981: 39.

[53] Compare Vasconcelos 1982: 840. Siqueiros 1996: 342.

[54] See also Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944; the description of Chapter XV, reveals the impact of journalistic neglect or adverse criticism on the movement and the historical importance Charlot ascribed to it.

[55] E.g., Altschuler 1994: 18. Objectivity was classically included in the dictates of "noblesse oblige"; e.g., La Bruyère 1975: 243: "L'esprit de parti abaisse les plus grands hommes jusques aux petitesses du peuple" 'Party spirit lowers the biggest men to the pettinesses of the people.'

[56] Zohmah Charlot, personal communication. Confirmed by Martin Charlot, May 25, 1999.

[57] *AA* II: 213–230. E.g., Bargellini 1995: 96, 98 f. Zohmah Charlot to Plowe, December 14, 1946: a Ph.D. candidate from Princeton feels Charlot will give him an objective view of Communism in Mexico: "People who know anything about it won't tell me and those who don't just say abusive things."

[58] Also *Idols* 268 f., 271.

[59] Charlot August 5, 1923; May 1955: 80; *San Carlos* 9; *MMR* 25 ff.

[60] In some cases, personal details have an explanatory force for the historian. Siqueiros wrote frankly about how Revueltas alcoholism reduced his productivity. Charlot mentioned it only in conversation.

[61] Mijangros 2000: 118; also, 62, 119, 128 f. Compare Paz 1993: 132 f., on the exclusion of Charlot and Vasconcelos from the accepted picture because of ideology and politics. Milena Koprivitza, an organizer of the 1994 Charlot retrospective in Mexico, told me her greatest surprise was the unwillingness of Mexican art scholars to make more room in their image of the movement for that artist.

[62] In *Textes Français*, Brenner and Charlot 1928. Since the published article was signed only by Brenner, Charlot himself was used as an example of "la portée universelle de l'élément humain" 'the universal significance of the human element'; that is, the movement was not exclusively nationalistic. Charlot addresses the myth directly in his February 3, 1943.

[63] Charlot July 1925. Also Charlot Fall 1956: 85, "This book contains indispensable source material towards a definitive biography of José Clemente Orozco."

[64] Siqueiros 1978: 80, calls such a work "la primera tarea de todos" 'the first task of all'; at the time he was writing the original article, there was "nada documental y verdaderamente exacto del período muralista" 'nothing documented and truly exact about the muralist period.'

[65] August 1945. In the same year, Charlot could still say (September 14, 1945):

> el continente de América está empezando a tener conciencia de que posee y tiene derecho de poseer una tradición altamente original, dependiente en sus comienzos tal vez, pero totalmente diferente de la tradición europea. Este descubrimiento de su auténtica personalidad…
>
> 'the American continent is starting to become conscious of the fact that it possesses and has the right to possess a highly original tradition, probably in its beginnings dependent on, but totally different from the European tradition. This discovery of its authentic personality…'

Charlot remained of two minds on this issue until late in life.

[66] Charlot 1977 Foreword: xvii; also ix. Charlot had been criticized on this point:

> in spite of his foreign background and training, his attitude to painting outside Mexico is as fiercely chauvinistic as that of any Mexican xenophobe. This is a pity, because although Mexican mural art is largely a thing apart, its true originality will only become evident when eventually it is related to other developments in early twentieth-century art. (Revolution on the Walls 1964)

The author argues that Rivera, Siqueiros, and Atl knew European art, "and their manifestos show that they were deeply excited by the iconoclasm of the Futurists." Charlot knows this, "but he refuses to place them in any kind of historical perspective."

[67] E.g., Rashkin 2009: 59 f., 79. Baciu 1982: 2–5, 29.

[68] Siqueiros 1978: 80; he provides a sketch of some highlights. Also before *MMR*, Siqueiros 1978: 47, wrote of *Idols*, "no obstante su infantilismo y anecdotismo—la única historia veraz" 'despite its infantilism and anecdotalism—the unique reliable history.'

[69] Letter of May 31, 1975; Clemente Orozco had written him asking him for information on May 26, 1975.

[70] Lesley and Hollis 1961. Zohmah Charlot often complained that people with access to Charlot's unpublished writings used them without acknowledgment, using such phrases as "it is well known that..."

[71] E.g., Acevedo 1986: 207, "basada en las un tanto olvidadas fuentes de Charlot" 'based in the somewhat forgotten sources of Charlot.' Tibol 1996: 71 (uses "documento guardado por Jean Charlot" 'document preserved by Jean Charlot'), 86 f., 91 and following, 105.

[72] E.g., Acevedo 1986: 207 f. González Mello 2002.

[73] Working before photocopies, Charlot had to copy materials by hand, including published articles. As I reconstruct the process, his manuscript notes were typed up afterwards, probably by my mother, and then discarded. The process was open to errors of copying and referencing, and a scholarly edition of the relevant documents is much needed.

[74] Zohmah Charlot to Prudence Plowe February 21, 1947. Also January 20, 1946:

> Jean is working very hard on the book. Even so I don't think he will finish in this one year in Mexico. There really is a lot of patience needed in dealing with all his sources and trying to get documents as well as the writing. He is anxious to return here after the summer in Oklahoma.

[75] "Charlot May 11, 1960. In the same talk he mentions finding a letter written by Rivera while he was on his important trip to Italy before returning to Mexico.

[76] Charlot had planned to give his papers to the Archives of American Art, but was offended when he wrote them that he was organizing his materials and a functionary told him not to bother, they had experts for that. "Imagine," Charlot told me, "not wanting to have the organization of the artist himself!" After Charlot decided against donating his papers, Bruce D. Hooten wrote him on July 21, 1965, asking him to reconsider: "Our staff of librarians at the Detroit Headquarters are fully experienced in the arranging of original documents, and it is to their competence that we owe an extensive card catalogue system." On October 29, 1963, W. E. Woolfenden had written encouragingly to Charlot about the possibility of supporting his projected *catalogue raisonné* of his paintings.

[77] Charlot to Brenner October 21, 1971. Also September 24, 1969, and dedication of his *Mowentihke Chalman* (1969). Charlot regularly read Brenner's diary early in their relationship.

[78] Compare O'Malley's comment:

> The principal source for this study has therefore been the periodicals of Mexico City. They may be the only source that permits a systematic study of the public hero cults, and happily they are a very good source. (1986)

Similarly, in the visual arts, Charlot emphasized the neglected nineteenth-century Mexican political cartoons (*AA* II: 151): in a period when European art was in vogue, "cartoonists kept alive the quota of dynamism and unnicety without which Mexican art would quickly wither."

[79] Lesley and Hollis 1961:

> I tried once to boil down to a very simple statement. I said that art in the United States is a question of buying and selling and art in Mexico is a question of making it. And it is very true. I have been astonished. For example, I have been on the advisory board to a museum where it is always the question of buying and selling that comes in. I think there is no secret in saying that was the Museum of Modern Art in New York. And I remember presenting to them a project which was to keep the documentation of the murals that were being done at the time. That was in the 30s—Rivera, Orozco, Siqueiros, and so on, who were doing their large murals. And there was so much being done could be saved: the cartoons on butcher paper, the architectural models with the first sketches. I gave a detailed project in which I suggested a mural department that would keep those different things plus photographs, of course, of the murals in place. There was not much reaction because of the Museum of Modern Art divided its departments into oil painting, water color, drawing, prints and photographs. And my own suggestion would have bypassed all those different departments. Furthermore you can't buy or sell murals. And really that counts very much against mural painting. [edited]

[80] These photographs were also important for the promotion of Orozco's work in the United States. In 1933, Siqueiros wanted photographs of his work for the same reason (1996: 112). Charlot wrote Brenner twice that he needed photographs of his work and an article, most likely for publicity purposes ("Can you send me the best choice"; "I shall be in New York").

[81] *San Carlos* 156. Charlot originally intended to use many illustrations for his *MMR*:

> **Verna:**
> Supongo que el libro llevará ilustraciones.
> **Charlot:**
> Claro que sí... y espero que sean muy numerosas. (September 14, 1945)
> **Verna:**
> I suppose the book will have illustrations.
> **Charlot:**
> Of course…and I hope they will be numerous.

[82] Charlot May 11, 1960; *MMR* 85 f. See also Vasconcelos 1982: 638642.

[83] *MMR* 215 ff. *San Carlos* 161. Mérida to Charlot, December 2 and 3, 1943.

[84] E.g., Mérida to Charlot September 6 and December 3, 1943. Zalce to Charlot October 7, 1975; December 6, 1978. Charlot's *MMR* materials in the JCC contain many copies of documents made at the time: a four page typescript, "Merida," to which Charlot added the note, "His own scrapbook"; "Carlos Orozco clippings. Lent 7–46"; Charlot's translations of autobiographical writings by Siqueiros. Charlot used such materials in many of his writings (e.g., *AA* II: 340 f.).

[85] *MMR* 163–177. The original documents are in the JCC. Charlot was grateful for their work, insuring that they received their copies of *MMR*: "Four copies have to be sent to friends in Mexico who collaborated on the book" (Charlot to Louise F. Bernbaum, July 13, 1963, at the Yale University Press; the archives of the press contain other documents and correspondence on this; see also Charlot to Brenner November 11, 1963). Similarly, he wanted those who helped him to have copies of *San Carlos*, especially Don Lino Picaseño y Cuevas, the librarian at the Academy: "He is the one who introduced me to the collection of student works" (February 27, 1963).

Alva's statement illustrates a problem of collecting such documents. The statement was important for the controversy about the priority of his own or Charlot's fresco. Charlot told me that Alva's first version concluded explicitly that Charlot's was first. However, on the advice of a friend, Alva was vaguer in his final version. I myself find it sufficiently clear.

[86] Zohmah Charlot to Marie McCall September 1, 1946. Also to Prudence Plowe September 1, 1946:

> Jean is doing an article for an English magazine on Orozco and now the Penguin Books want him to do them one for a book. Don't see why he spends so much work making these guys understandable. If it is any consulation [*sic*: consolation], it is a nice article. He did one too on Guerrero whom he wanted to help him with some information for the book, but now the article is to be published and Guerrero says he hasn't time to do the writing for Jean. Nice pals.

The JCC contains Charlot's English translation of some memoirs by Guerrero, but no original Spanish. Whether Charlot was translating a publication or summarizing oral interviews is unclear. The same problem arises with the memoirs of Hermilio Ximénez, Guerrero's worker assistant. Charlot was characteristically interested in the craftsman's point of view.

[87] Documents/Mexican Murals/T. 2, Ch. XVIII O 1: "told by Siq." E.g., Scherer García 1996: 113–118.

[88] Beloff: Documents/Mexican Murals/T. 1, Ch XI. Leal: Documents/Mexican Murals/T. 3. Others: Documents/Mexican Murals/T. 4; Charlot includes many people in a list "as told by"; Enciso's statement: "And in 1910 there was 'Anahuac', a big Indian two meters high. It shocked people accustomed to musqueteers and odalisques." *San Carlos* 107 n. 118, Rivera's memories of a teacher may be based on an oral communication. Brenner recorded Charlot collecting oral information from Indians in Yucatán (Glusker 2010: 397).

[89] Punctuation regularized. Charlot's memory was correct (Zurián 2002: 81). Leal apparently forgot what he himself had written earlier about Revueltas (Leal 1990: 176).

[90] Charlot Summer 1951: 368 f. *AA* II: 332 f. Similarly, he was appreciative but critical of the memories of Doña Carmen Rubio de Vanegas Arroyo (Interview by Ron Tyler, July 6, 1978).

[91] *AA* II: 279 ff. Glusker 2010: 237, a passage used by Charlot. Brenner's letter on the subject, requested by Charlot, is in the JCC. Charlot also consulted the clippings Orozco supplied Brenner for *Idols* (*MMR* 221, note 11). Charlot backed up his own memory with documents as well. He writes Frank Wardlaw about his projected publication of the Orozco letters (June 11, 1971):

> I plan instead a rather full foreword, mostly describing the two worlds the letters imply, the Mexico still in Revolution that Orozco had left and the New-York circles he contacted. Would quote from my diaries, letters, etc.

[92] E.g., López Casillas 2005: 12, "Although there is no documentation to support Charlot's information, the illustrated publications of the period tend to confirm it." The author is discussing dates, including 1882, when Manilla started working for the Vanegas Arroyo shop, and 1892, when he retired; this is the sort of information that Charlot could have learned from the family.

[93] Interview by Ron Tyler, July 6, 1978: "Now, I wouldn't believe anybody else, but Orozco never told a lie…so that has a great weight"; on Rivera, "So since then he tried to hitch himself to the wagon…of the guy who became famous, and the stories got bigger and bigger…"; "So I don't believe a word of it. I don't think he ever met…" Orozco's story is doubted by González Mello 2002: 23 and note 6, page 330.

[94] Charlot to Frank Wardlaw October 12, 1971: "I have known four generations of the Vanegas Arroyos, and consider myself and perhaps I am considered by them, somewhat of an uncle or cousin." Zohmah Charlot to Prudence Plowe December 1945: "Jean had spent a year going through his woodcuts and engravings of Posada, who worked for his father"; "Jean was delighted to draw something for the printing house of Posada."

[95] Charlot Ca. 1923. Also Charlot 1928 Posada Grabador Mexicano; 1945–1947; *AA* II: 169 ("Posada's often-told story"). Compare *Idols* 188.

96 Miliotes 2006: 14–17. For Charlot, this technical question did not necessarily bear on the esthetic impact of a print. He argued that photoengraving should be considered original artwork:

> With the coming of the rotative press, the lithograph goes to metal, a zincograph now, but just as biting, just as fierce and crammed with unwonted art.
>
> Come photo-engraving, the photographic process removes the print from the range of graphic arts, unless, making the same allowance that had to be made in the case of Daumier's late gillotypes, one decides that it is the standard classification that is wrong, for the artist's clawmark is still there" (*AA* II: 139).

Similarly, the TGP "welcomed the introduction of the 'photomechanical process of reproduction,' in hope that it would make the workshop more efficient" (Merfish 2013: 42 f.). In several book illustrations, Charlot used a process one step of which used "a photosensitized offset printing plate"; "The resulting pictures are very difficult to distinguish from original lithographs. Indeed, Charlot felt that his acetate process illustrations were just as 'original' as his artistic prints" (Morse n.d.).

97 1928 Posada Grabador Mexicano; 1964 *Posada's Dance of Death* 1964: 2. Doña Carmen used the word *grabar* 'engrave' in her interview with Charlot, cited above. Compare *Idols* 188 f. The plates examined by Gretton may have been derived from earlier, engraved ones or even photographically from prints. The tiny jerkiness of the line argues for scratching rather than drawing.

98 Charlot to Millard M. Mier, June 4, 1975. Also 1979 José Guadalupe Posada and his successors: 43.

[99] E.g., *San Carlos* 20, 46, 55, 64; Appendix I "Plans for Work" 1944:

> Special emphasis on the formative years in the work of Orozco, Siqueiros, and Rivera, and on the relationship between government and artists, and a description of the milieu in which they worked.

Compare Siqueiros on Charlot's Cordero presentation:

> nos mostró, aunque sin pretenderlo dialécticamente, como la obra de un artista es… una consecuencia natural de la realidad histórica correspondiente.
>
> 'he showed us, although without claiming to dialectically, how the work of the artist is…a natural consequence of the corresponding historical reality.'

Charlot was able to deploy his vast historical knowledge in this task, and the reader is often surprised by unsuspected points, e.g., "San Cristóbal" 1945:

> Otro punto de mucho significativo para América era el hecho de que el Santo hubiese sido servidor del diablo antes de descubrir a Cristo.
>
> 'Another point of much significance for America was the fact that the Saint had been a servant of the devil before discovering Christ.'

Charlot's learning occasionally caused problems with editors. For instance, an American could not identify the French commonplace "l'âne de Buridan" 'the ass of Buridan.'

[100] Charlot to Mayre Wall Eargle March 24, 1961. Similarly, in his *MMR* archives, he has noted in a left margin: "*do not change original in english!*"

[101] Compare Justino Fernandez in Orozco 1955: 11.

[102] *MMR* 104 f. Compare Siqueiros 1977: 180. In Charlot's correspondence with Ross Parmenter on Zelia Nuttall, he defended his memory against doubts: "I am pretty sure of my dates" (letter of April 27, 1974). Parmenter eventually agreed with Charlot.

[103] Charlot November 1947: 261. Also *AA* II: 251; *MMR* 217. Curiously, although González Mello 1995 uses Charlot's writings on several subjects, he seems unaware of Charlot's work on this chronology.

[104] Charlot to Wardlaw June 11, 1971:

> The Mexican edition illustrated too many things posterior to the dating of the letters, with wrong dates for most of the lithos. I would keep all illustrations either anterior or contemporaneous with the text. The material is plentiful.

To Lysander Kemp March 31, 1973: "I am especially concerned about illustrations and their proper dating." To Barbara Speilman February 10, 1974:

> I, however, strongly object to No. 19 The Maguey lithograph. The date is wrong, it is of the 1930's and totally unconnected with the Orozco who wrote me these letters. I think it would be quite unscholarly to include it. It is this very type of thing that I objected [to] so strongly in the Spanish edition of the letters, and it would definitely cheapen the quality of the book.

To the same, February 25, 1974: "Thank you for dropping The Maguey lithograph. It bothered me horribly." See also Fall 1956: 87, incorrect dates on labels of illustrations.

In a recent biography of Xavier Guerrero, Charlot is credited with correcting mistakes made by other writers, Sánchez, Monserrat, and Coronel Rivera 2012: 105.

[105] 1960 Narration in Tahara. The published version differs slightly: "Local beliefs and milieu shed a slanting light on what the artist intended, but a more straightforward witness is the testimonial of our own eyes" (*AA* I: 240).

[106] Some examples are provided in *San Carlos*:

> With hindsight, we may appreciate now how much folk art, art that we treasure by modern standards, was saved from extinction by this stand taken by a plain bureaucrat against the devotees of neo-classical canons. (53)
>
> Surprisingly, it was at last these military men who bent their collective ear to the protracted plight of the school… (68)
>
> Whereas the Habsburg Emperor had respected things Mexican, Indian Díaz looked exclusively toward Europe for culture. (134)
>
> This bad man [Huerta] did more for the good of the Academy than good man Madero ever had. (159)

Charlot was intrigued by the fact that bad popes had been better art patrons than good ones.

[107] Indeed, the only changes Charlot made in republishing his works were in style, in avoiding repetition with other articles, and so on. The most extensive changes are between the first version of Charlot November 1947 and *AA* II: 242–255; Charlot adds to and subtracts from the original and inserts two statements to provide more shape to Orozco's career: "It seemed as if his career as a painter was at an end" (248); "and once again his career as a 'serious' artist seemed at an end" (250).

[108] *AA* I: 52. Charlot singled out Albert C. Barnes' over-scientific criticism of Matisse (*AA* I: 369–373). On the other front, he criticized writers who neglected the physical, technical side of art-making.

[109] Charlot February 1924. Also October-December 1922 Conseils. Compare September 27, 1925: a work should be judged:

> no desde el punto de vista arqueológico, sino desde el estético…más allá de las teorías enfadosas y de las consideraciones técnicas, *la emoción* que se desprende de la misma…
>
> 'not from the archeological point of view, but from the esthetic…beyond annoying theories and technical considerations, the emotion that emerges from it…'

Also *AA* II: 62: having learned all the background information,

> the sensitive reader would do well to wash his mind of all previous connotations and to look again at the plates to receive this time only the artist's message. Despite the diversity of mediums, periods and subjects he will thus familiarize himself with an undercurrent, the spirit of the Maya, that vies in power and in depth with the best of Greece and of China.

On the ultimate irrelevance of technique or process to the final evaluation, compare Charlot's remark on the black velvet painter Leeteeg. In the early 1950s, he was being criticized for using photographs as the basis of his images. Charlot said that the photographs were not the point; the point was that the final works were bad.

Occasions may also arise when the viewer has no background and must rely entirely on his connoisseurship, as Charlot did in his July 23, 1925.

[110] Charlot discusses this process in his *Traité de Peinture* (1921–1922) and uses his findings extensively in analyzing Mérida's nonrepresentational art (1928 Carlos Mérida).

[111] Charlot 1949 Art and Archaeology: 47 ff., quotation from 47. See also Winter 1946: 7–10. Interesting notes on the same subject can be found in the JCC, "JC 1937 Notes on Mayan Art." On Gamio's work and its importance for the Mexican movement, see Eder 1986: 73 ff.

[112] Also, Charlot May 1951: 201: "An appreciation of our own modern art has helped include within the range of our admiration the abstract and primitive factors that are an undoubted part of *mexicanidad*."

[113] *AA* II: 19, contrast 131. Contrast also Rivera 1986: 103, on *pulquería* painting: "la masa proletaria" 'the proletarian mass'; folk artists express "la aspiración colectiva, es decir, que en ese caso se desconoce a sí misma" 'collective aspiration, that is to say, that in this case they don't know themselves.'

[114] November–December 1926 Manilla Grabador. A shorter English version in *AA* II: 157 f.

[115] Zohmah Charlot to Prudence Plowe December 1945. Charlot's respect for popular artists was demonstrated in many ways. For instance, in the typescript of my "Jean Charlot and Local Cultures" 1976, I had written: "terracotta statuette of…tortillas, given to him by Panduro, a folk sculptor from San Pedro Tlaquepaque." Charlot corrected: "tortillas, a gift of Panduro, a master potter from…"

[116] Charlot to Susannah Glusker September 27, 1975. Charlot to Brenner April 1, 1962: "If I live much longer and become the last living specimen of these heroic times, perhaps it [an exhibition] would come to pass." Baciu 1982: 2 ff.

[117] Charlot to Mayre Wall Eargle, March 24, 1961, on the publication of *San Carlos*: "I am quite aware of the imbalance you notice between footnotes and the text proper. At the moment I wrote it, which is already some fifteen years ago, it rather pleased me to give the text such a scholarly flavor." To Wardlaw, June 11, 1971, on Orozco 1974: "…I would prefer a minimum footnotes so as not to invade the very strong atmosphere that the letters generate with scholarly (?) details."

[118] *AA* II: 44; also, 62, "an undercurrent, the spirit of the Maya, that vies in power and in depth with the best of Greece and of China."

[119] Zohmah Charlot to Plowe September 21, 1946[?]. Also to Marie McCall September 1, 1946: "It is an unusual book, but it is such a personal book for Jean that he really must do it just the way he wants." To Plowe October 23, 1946:

> The book is sent to the publishers. Though not completed it is enough done to show. Both to a Spanish and American publisher. It is such an unusual book, not at all in Time magazine style which seems to be the norm now, that I don't know how well it will be liked. It surely has been a tremendous amount of work.

[120] Charlot to Walter Pach March 31, 1923, "certains livres allemands où il faut courir cinquante pages avant de découvrir une idée" 'certain German books in which one needs to run through fifty pages before discovering an idea.'

[121] Siqueiros 1959: 20. Cordero y Salinas 1958: 20. Compare Fauchereau 2013: 187, 189.

[122] *San Carlos* 149 f., 156. *AA* II: 262.

[123] Rub 2002: 18, does not see the implication. Compare the use of the word in 1923 Pintao and in the description of archaeologists as "innocent of aesthetic training" (*AA* II: 40). Charlot felt that Orozco's work suffered from the new influences, whereas Rivera, already seasoned by long exposure to international art, was unchanged stylistically by his residence in the United States. Cervantes and Mackenzie 2010: 454 ff., 549

[124] E.g., *AA* II: 249 f., the connection between Novo's attack and the destruction is not as explicit as it was in Charlot's conversation.

[125] *AA* II: 358. Compare the reassurance expressed: Tamayo's dealer was worried that some of his paintings were too dark to photograph, "thus throwing out of gear the complicated machinery needed to launch and to sell an artist; thus reassuring me as to an integrity unswayed by success" (368).

[126] Charlot's prescriptive tendency can be seen in his 1959 prediction "that there will be a revival of didactic art, sequences tied together by a complex subject matter, unabashedly historical" (*AA* I: 144). Charlot was considering the popularity of Bernard Buffet's poor Joan of Arc series and of a recent work by Larry Rivers, *Washington Crossing the Delaware* (1953), which he admired. Charlot joked that Alfred Barr's prediction of a revival of severe nude painting was followed by Pop Art, but works by Francis Bacon and Willem de Kooning and others accord with Barr's view.

[127] Similarly, when he was art editor for *Mexican Folkways*, Charlot did not use that platform to publicize himself, even leaving his own vignettes anonymous. When Rivera took over the position, he exploited it effectively to reinforce the view he was developing of himself and his own role in the movement. To Rivera's credit, he attached Charlot's name to his vignettes.

[128] Rocío Ramírez November 7, 2002: of a 1935 exhibition at the Julien Levy gallery in New York City, Mercedes Iturbe stated, "Recordó que en aquella ocasión Jean Charlot—quien participó en el movimiento muralista mexicano—recomendó a Julien Levy la obra de Álvarez Bravo" 'I remember that on that occasion Jean Charlot—who participated in the Mexican mural movement—recommended to Julien Levy the work of Alvarez Bravo.'

[129] 1926 Manuel Manilla. In his English version, Charlot does not use the word and emphasizes its less pejorative meaning, "art critics" (*AA* II: 161).

[130] Charlot October 1922; March 1926: 16; *AA* II: 99.

[131] December 1946. At one point certainly, Charlot regretted moving materials from his footnotes to the text of *San Carlos*, telling me he felt it hurt the "balance." Footnotes were part of the genre of academic texts, and Charlot always liked to exploit the special characteristics of the medium he was using.

[132] The artist Zalce admired the format of the latter in his letter to Jean and Zohmah Charlot of December 6, 1972.

[133] Writings Related to MMR: "Short Writings." From the archives of the John S. Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, copies in the JCC. In these and the following writings, I have edited minimally for punctuation and spelling, leaving irregular capitals and not supplying accents.

[134] An unpublished six-page typescript in the Jean Charlot Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai`i, Writings Related to MMR: "Short Writings."

[135] The Library of Congress [ed.].

[136] Ca. April 1961, written for the Yale University Press, Writings Related to MMR: "Short Writings."

[137] Blanchard's "y faire une exposition générale, comme ils en ont je crois l'intention" 'to have a general exhibition here [Europe], as they have the intention, I believe' suggests that Charlot may have promoted the idea.

[138] Page 18, paragraph 3, seems to be Blanchard shortening the article to names without descriptions, as argued above. The drawing by Rivera was later used on the cover of *MMR*.

[139] For genres, see, e.g., *San Carlos* 130 ("masterpieces in the difficult genre of chamber murals").

[140] The title is not, however, unusual. See, e.g., Lemoine July 15 or 16, 1920: "A Propos de 'La Jeune Peinture Française.'"

[141] The references to Egypt and China can be paralleled in some of Charlot's other early writings, but will gradually disappear.

[142] Only survey: *MMR* 203 f. Spokesman: *MMR* 53. Charlot told me several times how important he thought the articles were because they were produced so early in the Movement. See the extended study of Fell 1989: 399 f., 421 f. The use of pseudonyms was a Mexican journalistic practice of the time, e.g., Hall 1981: 207 f. Denis 1912: 11, discussed his own work in an article he signed by another name.

[143] Zohmah Charlot ca. 1980a: "With Siqueiros he collaborated on articles and a cartoon strip." I have found nothing about a cartoon strip. Charlot and Siqueiros continued their conversations into later life whenever afforded the opportunity. My mother remembered Siqueiros often visiting our apartment in Mexico City in the 1940s, asking my father many questions, and listening most attentively to his answers. She wrote in her "DZC Memoirs of Life in Hawai`i" n.d.:

> I could see how Siqueiros and all the other people he knew were the ones who asked his advise [*sic*] in private.
>
> I mention Siqueiros by name as he was so Mexican macho it startled me to see him hanging on Jean's words.

As a child, I myself once watched them talking. Siqueiros was seated in an easy chair and my father was standing at a table by a window, handling coffee cups. Siqueiros would make a strong statement in a somewhat loud, public-speaking voice. My father would then make a shorter reply in a soft, conversational tone, and Siqueiros would sit back and fall silent for a moment. I had the impression that Siqueiros was expressing a strong opinion about something and my father was suggesting other points or angles.

[144] Araujo August 2, 1923; *MMR* 43; also Siqueiros 1978: 32 f.

[145] Araujo July 11, 1923. E.g., Siqueiros 1978: 15, 34, 51, 53. Such Siqueiros' terms abound in the articles, e.g., July 11, 1923, "si la finalidad de la obra es ideológica, psicológica o doctrinaria" 'if the finality of the work is ideological, psychological, or doctrinaire.'

[146] E.g., Siqueiros 1978: 9 f., 57–61, 79 f.; 1996: 293. As with his neologisms, I believe that Siqueiros sometimes produced lists in conscious self-parody, 1996: 107.

[147] The thrust at the Escuela Nacional de Bellas Artes and the parenthetical connection of humility with Neoclassicism—"(especialmente los que no han respondido a los últimos movimientos de vuelta al clasicismo)" '(especially those who have not responded to the latest movements of the return to classicism)'—are in all likelihood from Siqueiros. Another Charlot theme in the article is the Medieval emphasis on apprenticeship.

[148] *MMR* 204. Le Clézio is wrong in his statement about Rivera:

> Même les peintres qui étaient à ses côtés dès le début, Orozco, Siqueiros, Jean Charlot, à présent le critiquent, lui reprochent ses succès, tournent en dérision son parti pris indigéniste. (1993: 95 f.)
> 'Even the painters who were at his side since the beginning—Orozco, Siqueiros, Jean Charlot—now criticize him, reproaching his success, and deriding his indigenist bias.'

[149] Araujo July 26, 1923. Siqueiros 1996: 17 f., 201 f., 304; compare 1978: 15, 21, 36 f., 65. Siqueiros appreciated Rivera's Neoclassicism for its emphasis on the methods of the past, 1977: 185. Siqueiros was at times more negative, 1978: 9 f., 44, 59–62, 69 f.; 1996: 205 f., French Neoclassicism was concerned exclusively with subjectivity and style and did not use that style for the traditional social purposes for which it had been created; 1996: 205 f. Siqueiros could later defend Mexican art against European, especially French influence, writing forcefully against the School of Paris, 1978: 41, 48 f., 53, 59, 62, 79; 1977: 180 ("un México en violenta acción de rebeldía contra la influencia cultural de Europa" 'a Mexico in violent action of rebellion against the cultural influence of Europe'), 183 ("Nuestra cruzada contra la pintura de París" 'Our crusade against the painting of Paris'), 194, 492–496; 1996: 97, 115, 301, 384 f., 447 f. (448, Mexico is the "campo opuesto" 'opposing camp' to Paris), 460. Siqueiros did acknowledge the various influences of Cézanne (1977: 160; 1978: 60), Cubism (1977: 160), Metaphysical art (1978: 37), and Futurism (1977: 165); for the general point, see 1996: 17 f. Moreover, Siqueiros like Rivera argued for "la aportación nacional" 'the national contribution' (Scherer 1996: 126) as well as other new factors (e.g., Siqueiros 1996: 18). In recognizing these elements, Siqueiros comes nearer to Charlot's views.

[150] E.g., Siqueiros 1978: 25; 1977: 166; 1996: especially, 17 ff.

[151] Araujo July 11, 1923. Scherer 1996: 126.

[152] Glusker 1998: 68 f.; compare 106 f. Azuela 2002: 209. Brenner mentions such remarks often in her journals, Glusker 2010: 351; 420 ("Silva told me today that in certain intellectual—high-powered circles it is said that Jean does my writing for me. Also that this is obvious since I don't know anything about painting"); 591 ("Implied that I was the megaphone of other authorities"); compare 524.

[153] Glusker 1998: 46, 54, 71 f., 89. Weston also worked extensively on *Idols* (1961: 162–187, 191).

[154] To give just one example, Charlot's letter "Here is a first idea for ilustrations [*sic*]" provides a detailed list, chapter by chapter, along with comments: "I don't see either how you can arrange it. You would not have the illustrations at hand and they are indespensable (*sic*) to meaning"; "In V we forgot the Tortillera which I find indispensable." Brenner mentions their work on *Idols* in her journals (Glusker 2010: 237, 246, 265, 267, 451, 485, 489, 493, 497, 499, 683; compare 397).

[155] Brenner 1942. E.g., Charlot to Brenner April 8, 1925: "Also to split whatever money would be coming in 3 parts, so as to send some to Luz. I would like also to have a hand in designing the book, having done pretty well with the Amelia del Rio book."

[156] Charlot to Brenner May 3, 1925. Brenner notes in her journal: Charlot "Says Goitia possibly greatest painter living" (Glusker 2010: 10). Charlot put Brenner in touch with other artists as well. In the same letter of May 3, 1925, he writes:

> I send you a second paquete with four illustrations and a photo of a Merida picture. I think you know him. He was working here the first in modernist school, returning from Paris. Diego came about three years after.

[157] Interesting examples can be found throughout Brenner's journal, e.g.: "Jean here most of the day; told Pallares not to come because I wanted to work, but did little else besides getting the problem of the 'Miracle' chapter solved, which was done when Jean talked to me about the idea of the miracle" (Glusker 2010: 451).

[158] JC to AB "Your beautiful poem pleased me." Brenner writes of Charlot's support in her journals (Glusker 2010: e.g., 218, 435, 485, "The 'Posada' chapter seems to have been solved. Jean read it this afternoon and liked it very much").

[159] Glusker 2010: 6 ("I do need to go to school. Short on art history, biology—all kinds of things. Don't want to be a journalist…"; she needs information for "convincing backdrops"—"Have to do as soon as possible an article commissioned for *La Renaissance*…but am too weak to give a damn. I shall talk to Jean—"); 7 ("I need to study much"); 15 ("Reading on modern French painters"); 582 (Carlos Chavez wants her to write about music "as soon as I learned more about analysis").

[160] "A long nice letter." Brenner used Charlot as a sounding board for her theories: "I also told Jean about my 'theory of complements,' and in doing so clarified it for myself" (Glusker 2010: 495).

[161] Brenner was herself gathering materials for Ernest Gruening (Glusker 2010: 352).

[162] JC to AB "Asuntos: The maya drawings." Examples are easily multiplied:

> please remember that *I need you* for the correction of my manuscript. ("If the young man")
>
> I am going to send you some of the manuscript y algo de dinero [and some money], to begin rewriting my book. ("I am going to send you")
>
> I am writing your article on Maya art. I just think you will have to revise it because I am not here in my "english speaking" mood and not much in a mood of writing articles, either. ("I am writing your article")
>
> I send this as it is. Cut, add, reform, do what you want of it. To make a definitive copy would mean two or three days more and I thought you would prefer to have it now…
>
> page one line 17 instead of "taste" I want the word for dogs following a scent : Is it *flair* ?
>
> page 4 : line 4 : chimera ?
>
> put the title you want. ("I send this as it is")

Numerous mentions are found in Brenner's journals:

> helped Jean get his report to Morley into final shape (Glusker 2010: 186)
>
> revising and copying some articles of Jean's (218)
>
> Also translated a Morley article for *Forma* with Jean (493)
>
> I have to help Jean write his Maya stuff, which is two-thirds of the Carnegie book on Chichen (666; also 710 f., 713, 717, 760)

A puzzle is 7, "Dictated several letters to Jean."

[163] Personal communication, November 20, 1996. Brenner noted working on the article without mentioning Charlot (Glusker 2010: 7, 25 f., 37 ff., 64, 219; 38); her expressed "unfamiliarity with [French] audience" suggests the limits of Charlot's help. Glusker 2010: 39 ("Charlot and Brenner coined the phrase "Mexican Renascence" to reflect the idealist spirit of rebirth").

[164] Glusker 2010: 271 (October 8, 1926, "Took notes on Siqueiros from Jean"); 273 (October 11, 1926, "Wrote Siq. article for *Forma*"). Similarly, Brenner's *Idols* chapter on Charlot is taken mostly from his published writings, but she writes of it in her journal as being more original to a degree that I wonder whether a second version was substituted for this first:

> Wrote chapter on Jean, and it came out all right, perhaps a little subjective, but it strikes another note—geometry among the 'guitars and horses and locomotives' which Jean says is much of the rest of the opus. (Glusker 2010: 495; also 493).

In her description of Charlot's work on July 14, 1927, she sounds like Charlot talking (Glusker 2010: 461).

[165] *Idols* 312 (Charlot "is inclined to write letters numbering the paragraphs and heading them with a textual description of the contents…"). The only such letters by Charlot that I have seen are those to Brenner herself. The method is used also in *Notebook A*, in which Charlot wrote the drafts of his first articles in Mexico. Brenner would have seen that notebook. See the introduction and bibliographical notes of *Escritos*.

[166] Pérez Montfort 1994: 140–143, 155 note 4. Glusker 1998: 180 ff.; 182, both wrote on Eilshemius; the comparison of art to a well-made chair (178) is a point made by Charlot, and their ideas of the social function of art and the artist are similar (188).

[167] *Idols* 304; also 309–312. Siqueiros 1996: 206, criticizes School of Paris Neoclassicists for restricting themselves to "limitados problemas."

[168] E.g., Brenner-Charlot 1928: 148, Charlot's oral communication on Posada.

[169] *Idols* facing page 116, note on page 338. I believe the remark on p. 339 is also from Charlot: "Galván holds his brush in the ancient native manner, which is surprisingly like the Chinese way"; also "Chinese influence" in the next note. Charlot had a long-standing interest in Chinese brush technique. Brenner's comparisons to Egypt, China, Greece, and the Italian Renaissance probably owe something to her conversations with Charlot (*Idols* 34, 315).

[170] Brenner has her own eloquence, but a number of phrases in *Idols* recall Charlot's way of speaking and writing: e.g., 25 ("plumper days"); 32 ("so alive that it can go to the extremes of beauty and horror with the same zest"); 92 ("The style, which annoys the critic who would like styles nicely dated, in sequence, according to European sequence…"); 208 ("The doctors, odorous of their make-shift calling…"); 271 ("strutted into the capital playing the fife and drum of an upper dog").

[171] Posada: *Idols* 188 f., 342. Pintao: *Idols* 92–95. Brenner's own interpretation of *Creation* is odd (*Idols* 251).

[172] *Idols* 232 ff., 343. Charlot 1928 Carlos Mérida. The comparison of a well-crafted art work to "a good chair or a good shoe" is from Charlot, probably by way of Araujo (Glusker 1998: 178).

[173] *Idols* 167–170. Rivera 1986: 90–94. I believe her analysis of Rivera's work comes from her conversations with him (*Idols* 285, 289).

[174] *Idols* 175–179, 194–198. E.g., Charlot interprets Posada's plates from the *corridos* they illustrate (1964 Posada's Dance of Death: 3).

[175] *Idols* 118; also 36 f. Compare the point that the Indian sits today as he did before the Conquest (*Idols* 127). Charlot later used the title *The Dark Madonna* for several lithographs.

[176] *Idols* 240–243, 246, 266. Charlot once had a spasm of jealousy about Brenner's closeness to Siqueiros:

> Pero no creo que vengas porque ya tienes mucha consolacion con los estudiantes y Alfaro sobre todo (tu borracheria con el me puso muy furioso y melancolico.) ("A decirte la verdad")
>
> 'But I don't think you are coming because you already have much consolation with the students and Alfaro above all (your drinking bout with him made me furious and melancholy.)'

Brenner wrote that the archeologist, George Vaillant, "Puts a meaning in my things again" (Glusker 2010: 193).

[177] *Idols* 32, 52, 99. Compare 103 ("Presently a weaver, the usual Indian shadow in white…"). Many other opinions differing from Charlot's can be found: e.g., 54, Indians thought of themselves as works of art; 55, Aztecs wanted to possess things for control.

[178] Chronology: *Idols* 7 ("beginning with the Ministry of Education"); 8, the moment in which the open-air schools, the Escuelas de Pintura al Aire Libre, were established; 235–238; 282 f., the chronology of Rivera's work; the placing of her chapter "The Syndicate of Painters and Sculptors." Quotations: e.g., 17, 28, 42 f., 52 ff., 90 f. ("a Mexican art critic"); 116 ("a creole historian"); 132 ("A Texcocan chief"); 143 f., 175, 245. Sources: e.g., 18, 77–81, 88 f., 121, 142 f., 147 f., 160.

[179] Siqueiros 1978: 47. See also 1977: 199, 289 ("la primera crítica de arte de nuestro movimiento, autora de aquel magnífico libro" 'the first art critic of our movement, author of that magnificent book').

[180] *Idols* 288–302. Glusker 2010: 465.

[181] Historical sources: e.g., *Idols* 95–98. Personal experience: e.g., 19; 43 f., her own response to the land at Chich'en; 87, visit to a native chapel and talk with informants; 108, a wedding at Milpa Alta; 139 f.; 147; 181. Talks with informants and scholars: e.g., 140–143, 146 ff.

[182] *Idols* 20 f., 137, 180. Charlot knew about native medicine; 1926 Report: 5 ("An old medicine woman with naked breasts and wrinkled face carries a basket of magic concoction in the same way as do the modern *yerbateras*"). Brenner's subject of Indian writings on proper behavior is also not found in Charlot (53 ff.).

[183] *Idols* 323–326. Charlot recognized her new interests: "I am sure you have changed much, dear, perhaps all those new things you assimilate and that I don't even suspect (music etc.)" (JC to AB "I did not write you for a little while").

[184] Charlot rejected psychological explanations of how Mayas can will themselves to die ("Me da mucha tristeza").

[185] Glusker 2010: 281; also 280. Charlot May 1928. Charlot carefully noted the necessary changes, which have now been posted on the JCF web site.

[186] Diary 1928: August 21 ("écris toute la journée [environ 10 heures] article pour Nation demandé par Anita sur 'Maya Art' 'wrote all day [around ten hours] article for *The Nation* requested by Anita on "Maya Art"'); August 23 ("été cherché l'article" 'went to get the article' [from the typist]); August 24 ("fini corriger l'article et l'envoyé" 'finished correcting the article and sent it'). Other difficulties in their collaboration appear in their correspondence, e.g., Charlot complains that Brenner has not copied an article in time (Diary October 26, 1926).

[187] Edward Weston ("EW") to Jean Charlot ("JC") and Zohmah Charlot ("ZC"), November 3, 1942, the Jean Charlot Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa ("JCC").

[188] ZC (and JC) to EW, September 16, 1943, Center for Creative Photography, University of Arizona at Tucson ("CCP").

[189] Weston 1928: xxix-xxxvi (reprinted in Bunnell 1983: 48-52); idem 1929: 12.

[190] In the 1920s, Cristel Gang typed up portions of the Daybooks after taking dictation from Weston; he later destroyed some of that material. See Pauli 1995: 263-8. According to Wilson 1998: 321, Ramiel McGehee did some of the typing as well.

[191] Weston 1961/1966. For another discussion of how the Daybooks came to be published, see Wilson 1998: 321–323 (there is no mention of Charlot).

[192] EW to Nancy Newhall, January 27, 1945, CCP (Weston/Newhall photocopies, January 1945-December 1945).

[193] Mary Kriger postcard, quoted in ZC to Prudence Plowe, January 18, 1945, JCC. Oddly, this card is dated after Weston's letter to Nancy Newhall, even though it presumably refers to events which had not yet happened when Weston wrote to Newhall.

[194] EW to JC, undated (but must be early 1945). Zohmah later bemoaned the fact that Mary Kriger had only done 20 pages in the week that she was there: "Wish I could figure out a way to get the typing done. If only Mary Kriger had been more useful! 20 pages in a week didn't seem enough to suggest she try again." ZC to EW, August 23, 1945, CCP.

[195] JC and ZC to EW, January 28, 1947, CCP (the first part of the letter is by Jean and Zohmah adds her own comments). Although the chapter in question was not included in The Mexican Mural Renaissance when it was finally published (see below), Charlot does quote from Weston's Daybooks in the final version, in two places. Charlot 1967: 36-7, 298. There are only very slight discrepancies, barely worth mentioning, between what Charlot quotes and what appears in the published version of the Daybooks.

[196] EW to JC and ZC, December 5 (no year, but must be 1950), JCC.

[197] Unpublished chapter, "The United States and The Renaissance," pp. 557, JCC (in "Mexican Mural Renaissance - Chapters Not Used" folder).

[198] David Horne to JC, February 20, 1961, March 3, 1961, and April 11, 1961, JCC; conversation with John P. Charlot, September 2005.

[199] See "Edward and Mexico" in "'Edward and Mexico' unused from MMR" file, JCC; for further discussion, see my study on Weston and Charlot, Andrews 2011.