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Midwest Realities: Regional Painting 1920-1950 stands handsomely on its own but was originally conceived to mark some important edges of the broader context for the Southern Ohio Museum's permanent collection of works by one of these painters, Clarence Holbrook Carter.

Carter, who was born in Portsmouth in 1904 and will celebrate his ninetieth birthday with us at the opening of the exhibition, painted the majority of works in our collection during his frequent extended painting sprees in Portsmouth in the 30's and 40's. Even the collection's works painted elsewhere feel like Portsmouth somehow in familiarity of atmosphere and colloquial detail. To join, under one roof, the Carter Collection with representative works by other Midwest Regionalists who were painting at the same time is to create a thrilling opportunity to connect not only our permanent collection but also ourselves to a wider culture, geography and history, and to consider what new critical light we might shed on these older, solid pieces of Midwest American representation as well as what defining light they might shed on our view of ourselves a half century and more after their creation.

We are greatly indebted to David Lusenhop for his devotion to the Midwest Regionalists, his diligent scouring of public and private collections in five states to locate the distinguished works in this exhibition, his generous attention to catalog design and detail, and his patience in all phases of exhibition development. We deeply appreciate the cooperation of the twenty institutions and individuals who have agreed to share their paintings with the Midwest Realities audiences in Portsmouth in 1994 and Springfield in 1995. Obviously, without their enthusiasm for the
project and their confidence in this institution, there could be no project. We also express profound thanks to Liza Johnson whose personal relationship with the Southern Ohio Museum has led to a gratifying professional one. She in turn acknowledges the thoughtful advice and guidance of John Welchman.

Important funding for *Midwest Realities* and its related programming has been generously provided by the Scioto County Area Foundation, the Ohio Arts Council, the Ohio Humanities Council, Bank One Portsmouth, National City Bank, Charter One Bank FSB, Marting's, and the museum’s corporate and individual members.

Sara R. Johnson
*Director of Planning*

---

*Cecil F. Head*

*Evening Light, 1938, oil on board, 29” x 36”*, Lent by Frank and Patte Owings, Indianapolis, Indiana

---

*Situating Midwest Regionalism: Modernization – Modernism – Home*

_Midwest Realities_ reconsiders Regionalist images of the Industrial Midwest, its countryside and small cities, created between the 1920’s and 1940’s. For viewers in Portsmouth and Springfield, these paintings might appear much as they did to the artists who made them: as representations of home. But the works take up the question of “home” in the particular context of modern, pre-World War II America, and the various understandings of place and space negotiated by these images contribute to a contemporary understanding of their cultural moment, for the works in the exhibition speak to several histories: to the sense of dislocation that accompanied industrial modernization, to the Modernist art context with which Regionalism is necessarily in dialogue, and even to the sentimentality about a particular place, “home,” that was somewhat in crisis within the historical circumstances and artistic discourses of the three decades the paintings span.

_Industrial Midwest_ designates Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Illinois as a specific fraction of the heartland, one which is separate from the more exclusively agricultural midwest that borders it to the west. The very notion of an Industrial Midwest highlights the region’s past and present and implicitly notices its original agricultural function and its modification by an emergent industrial one. Based on shipping and railroading, the manufacturing of building materials like steel, and the production of consumer goods, this five-state region experienced large scale industrial growth between 1880 and 1920, the forty years immediately preceding the Regionalist movement. Yet differences
among the particular localities within the region are significant, and their relationships to industrialization are also various. In this show works from the Appalachian corner of Ohio are brought together with images from Detroit and Terre Haute. The stylistic range of the paintings and the cultural dissimilarity of the places they represent might make them unlikely images to be shown together. However, what unites the localities as part of the same region and what brings the content of the images close together, is that they share a demography and geography that continually articulates the relationship between the agrarian heritage of rural communities and the "modernized" industrial pockets within that landscape. These coexisting new and old, urban and rural functions are conditions of modernity which the geography of the Industrial Midwest heightens and to which both Regionalism and Modernism are responding.

The Regionalist paintings in the exhibition were produced in the decade that might be thought of as the golden age of this coexistence, and the dislocations that came with modernization are visible in the lived experiences of the painters. Their biographies and the records of their artistic training reveal family movements from town to town. Some moved to midwestern urban centers like Cleveland and Indianapolis for training in international styles at newly opened art schools; some moved out of the region to American art centers such as New York; still others traveled to Europe to study works of art first hand. The artists' stylistic choices reflect the compression of space and time that such increased travel opportunity brought about. Clara Dieke's faceted Cézannism, John Weiss' darker, more Expressionist images, Lawrence McConaha's Post-Impressionist palette - all drew from continental styles. Their visions of home, refracted through exposure to other places, treat dislocation by moving between the local and a wider totality, between realistic detail and abstracted allegory. This sense of movement can be thought of as a theoretical preoccupation which Regionalism shares with Modernist discourse.

The negotiation between particular detail and abstracted generality was not, of course, invented by the Regionalists. It has been a defining trope in the academic reflection on art at least since Joshua Reynolds offered his forceful characterization of the opposition in his Discourses (1769-79). In the early twentieth century, however, the debate between particularity and universality developed a specific logic. During the 1920's Modernist architecture framed the debate in spatial terms, pitting the new moment of technological utopia against the particularities of place and history. Buildings, histories, memories and details were erased in the name of a transcendent visual Modernism. Much of what passed as "local" was literally bulldozed by the avant garde. Radical dislocation and total newness were valorized as crucial social formations in a progressive movement toward global universalization. In theory, at least, "home" could be understood only in relation to the blueprint of a universal master plan. In the hope of shocking people out of the social complacencies perpetuated in the lingering Victorian maternal sentimentality about home, Le Corbusier described his houses as "machines for living in." For Modernist architects, home and its occupants were characterized as equal, interchangeable parts. As James Holston points out, this is an idea according to which the specific is continually understood in terms of the general, for a specific machine part makes sense only in relation to the totality of the general system.1

In the negotiation of modernized space, as in Regionalism, even the psychology of home was mapped through these models of dislocation. Freud's 1919 theory of the uncanny is translated from the German

unheimliche or, literally, unhomelike, according to which home and the uncanny sense of (un)familiarity that is always a repressed reference to it appears as the opposite of Le Corbusier's optimistic shock of the new. Peculiarity, even particularity, of place is for Freud built out of fetishistic repetition. In these (Modernist) terms, the sentimentality that attaches to a specific place is not a local insistence on socio-cultural particularity but rather the spooky and regressive acknowledgment of a place where, like your mother's birth canal, you've been before.

These negotiations between the specific and the universal are also the concerns of Modernist and Regionalist painting, only here the exchange is operative between the detail of realism and the would-be universal language of abstraction. Georg Lukacs observed that in modernist literature specificity functions allegorically to elucidate the psychology of the individual rather than to suggest information typical or representative of social reality. Likewise it might be said of Modernist painting that "detail becomes an abstract function of the transcendence to which it points." While in these regionalist works detail may function at Modernist in this abstract way, discourses of Modernist painting define themselves against their apparent particularity. Clement Greenberg's review of the American realist Ben Shahn, for example, symptomatically reveals the terms upon which realist detail is rejected:

"This art is not important, is essentially beside the point as far as ambitious present-day painting is concerned, and is much more derivative than it seems at first glance. There is a poverty of culture and resources, a ..... resignation to the minor..." Here Greenberg's discussion of what might be "important" or "ambitious" cannot include so much particularity as Shahn's realist image.

Instead of pointing to the same humanist abstractions as the works that Greenberg is willing to call "ambitious," he concludes that Shahn's insistence on detail resigns him to the "minor" and makes his painting seem "derivative" of past, premodernist embeddedness in place. Greenberg's polemic suggests that realism cannot be understood as part of the project of looking forward to the abstracted allegory of the ostensibly universal "structure of the given world both outside and inside human beings," though certainly he might have identified Regionalism as similarly concerned.

The Regionalist works represented in Midwest Realities function both as rooted, specific manifestations of local knowledge and as Modernist allegories of home. William Kaeser's painting Near Irvington (1934) showing men working in a yard near their house may have been a yard specific to the experience of the artist, or it may remind the local viewer of a particular yard she/he knows. When the quirks and contingencies of local detail resonate as familiar, even as uncanny, to local audiences, the image can evoke a particular kind of specificity that works against the wholesale razing of locality advocated by Le Corbusier.

At the same time the image also functions allegorically to render the Midwestern home in the abstract. While the architecture looks like the Ohio River Valley I know, it might seem equally familiar to someone from Idaho. None of the detail included tells such a particular story that it can only be a certain pair of men working in their particular yard. Instead, Kaeser's abstracted or generic realism encloses an allegorical reference to the way the region negotiates old and new, urban and rural. The visual echo of the new technology of the phone lines in the barbed wire threads of the fencing, for example, reveals that Kaeser has been
careful to tell the broad story of modernization in a way that is abstract enough to convey these general concerns.

Clarence Carter’s painting *Let Us Give Thanks* (1943) exemplifies this allegorization of home. The image shows a family bowing their heads around the supper table. The group is intended to refer to an image of monks at prayer in a Giotto fresco the artist had seen in Europe. Even if we were not aware of this specific allusion, however, such a scene also necessarily carries with it some of the historical weight of symbolism of Leonardo’s painting of the *Last Supper*. Yet while Carter’s painting *Let Us Give Thanks* restages a religious commemoration, the painting is also a quotidian representation of an everyday meal. The family is simultaneously Carter’s own family and an abstracted, representative, symbolic farm family. The Regionalist impulse represented by the image is thus not simply about recording and remembering home, but about using the particulars of home to draw out a broader meaning about social and/or “human” conditions. The image may even function as an ironic social allegory in which the family’s gratitude for the spare offerings on their table acts as a critique of Appalachian rural economics. Perhaps it also functions as a comment on the severity or austerity of “universal” human encounters. In each of these possible interpretations the image puts a specific “home” to work in the service of a more general concept of “homeness,” and it does so in ways that are not necessarily in conflict with some, at least, of the Modernist goals against which Regionalism is so often characterized as a reaction.

In fact, *Let Us Give Thanks* negotiates the specific and the general not only in its running back and forth between realism and allegory, but also in its way of framing the specific home in terms of the totality. We see the family dining on their porch. Eating supper is a common moment from everyday life, but its representation is also a deliberate choice that allows Carter to render the family dinner in visible relation to the landscape in the background. This choice positions the domestic scene within the countryside, the community and, by extension, within a geographic totality that Modernism insistently attempts to identify and understand.

Most of the Regionalist images in the exhibition share this concern. They often depict people occupying a space that brings a domestic environment in relation to the public sphere. Ed Brucker’s image of an alley defined by the backs of people’s houses, or Floyd Hopper’s street scene in which people come together in front of their homes, are of this kind. Even the Regionalist cityscape itself represents home as a public but intimately known (or at least knowable) space. Gerrit Sinclair’s *Milwaukee City Hall* (1930), for example, is a frontal, symmetrical view that assumes the city to be legible and generally understood. It is a representation of the city in the last pre-postmodern moment in which it can still be understood as a totality.

In this view, then, Regionalism stands as the last moment of the twentieth century when an organic world view was still possible, when home still makes sense from the outside in relation to the overweening totality of the city/community. In the postwar period home is more commonly understood from its interior. As evidenced by Andy Warhol’s articulated soup cans or Richard Hamilton’s *What Is It That Makes Today’s Homes So Different, So Appealing?* (1957), domestic space becomes fragmented and atomized. It is seen and realized commodity by commodity. Suburban tracts replace local particularity. The prewar ability to conceive of home as a specific zone of organic connection to a wider community is
manifest in the exhibition by the Regionalist insistence on the comfortable, identifiable spaces and settings that envelop the "home."

These paintings especially deserve reconsideration in the Midwest not just by virtue of the uncanny resonance of their particularity but for the way that they articulate the waning of our ability to inhabit, or at least to imagine, a social totality. While their resurrection here may appear to betoken a nostalgia for the pre-postmodern moment they represent, and while there seems to be little possibility for a return to an era that has definitively passed, there is clearly more than regression and wishful thinking at stake here. The desire to understand a counter-Modernist totality may be wistful, but it also raises the relevant contemporary problem of how we can function as social inhabitants with our increasingly fragmented understanding of place and space. In the context of virtual spaces fed by electronic highways and our increased mobility and resulting dislocation, Midwest Realities gives us access to a strategic moment from the recent past and also gives us some hints on how to negotiate our "homes away from home."

Liza Johnson
Portsmouth and San Diego, 1994
with thanks to John Welchman

Midwest Regional Painting In Context

To arrive at an understanding of and appreciation for the expressions of the Midwest Regional painters of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, one must first and foremost understand the various contextual relationships between the artists and their communities, the communities and the region, the region and the nation and the artists and art history. In so doing, it is possible to assess the relevance and importance of the local and specific artistic gestures made by the American Scene painters of the Midwest within the broader context of American art and American history. Midwest Realities: Regional Painting 1920-1950 begins the process of examining these contexts by placing the work of various Great Lakes artists within the broader framework of a geographic region; the industrial Midwest, where commonalities between people and communities within the region's borders resulted in a unified and coherent body of artwork which provides an eloquent source of information valuable to the examination of America's contributions to history and to art.

Like the nation as a whole, the industrial Midwest experienced immense change between 1920 and 1950. Prosperous communities flourished in the 1920s as industrial and agricultural production peaked. The slaughterhouses of Chicago, the steel mills of Gary, Indiana, and the automobile assembly lines of Detroit thrived in the post World War I economic climate. As the nation prospered and demand for consumer goods increased, the Midwest labor force swelled in the wake of development and production. Advances in manufacturing, transportation and agriculture spurred on growth and provided the promise of an efficient and effective American industrial power whose range of influ-
ence could expand to Europe and beyond. This meant that the Midwest, the heart and backbone of America, as provider of goods for a nation, had now emerged as an indispensable and identifiable region.

It was in this climate of growth and optimism that the Midwest Regional painters came of age. Clarence Carter's early career typifies the experience of a number of Midwest painters. Born in 1904, Carter grew up on the Ohio River in Portsmouth, Ohio, a once thriving industrial community in the northern Appalachian mountain range. After graduation from high school, Carter enrolled in the important and prestigious Cleveland School of Art. It was here that Carter trained under Henry Keller, a Regional Impressionist who, like William Forsyth of Indiana and other regional teachers, had studied in Europe at the end of the 19th century. Keller, Forsyth and other instructors of the realist school, as prototypical Midwest art teachers who espoused an impressionist orientation toward subject matter, encouraged their students like Carter to observe and confront nature in a plein-air tradition which had been prevalent in world art since the 1880s. Here in nature and in the observation of place was to be found, for these instructors, the essence of successful art.

Because of the ever expanding lines of communication in the 1920s between the Midwest, New York and New York and Europe, the young artists of the Midwest, like Carter, became increasingly aware of growing Modernist trends in art which promoted a rejection of realism in favor of a man-made constructivist and abstract language. Carter, like Zoltan Sepeshy in Detroit and Reginald Grooms in Cincinnati, embraced these artistic advances in the name of improving their art, expanding their vision and reformulating their approach to the new modern age.
Carter, as did other artists, even travelled to Europe to pay homage to the "old masters" and to absorb current trends in picture making. Despite the Midwestern attachment to Impressionism, which still dominated the art scene in the Midwest in the 1920s, Modernism as a form and as an idea was creeping into the vocabulary of the Great Lakes artists. The emphasis on decorative patterning, the use of architectonic structure and the manipulation of pure and arbitrary color changed the face of the Midwest Impressionist picture. Rarely, if ever, did the embrace of Modernist language result in a nonobjective or overtly abstract image in Midwest art but clearly, as in August Biehle's early work, the conventions and ideals of Modern art held some meaning for the Midwest Regionalist. Carter's "River Pilot" of 1932, for example, uses decorative patterning and strong horizontal and vertical elements to create a "modern" picture of interacting planes and lines but it never denies its dependence on the subject to provide the ultimate and most powerful reference. This focus upon a new universalism may have continued if it were not for political and economic developments which put the expansive growth of the country and of Modern art on hold for the next ten years in America.

As the economic Depression began in the late 1920s and continued in the 1930s, the Midwest, like America, looked inward out of necessity to take on the economic and social problems which plagued the domestic landscape of the region and the nation. For American society, this meant a re-evaluation and rejection of its participation on the international level and a redefinition of itself in the name of self-affirmation. A new nationalism swept the country as Americans banded together to survive the economic blight. For American art this new focus upon America meant an opportunity to approach the American landscape and people as part of a collective effort to bolster American pride, re-define American art and encourage American self-sufficiency.

Supported by the public and by influential critics of the day like Thomas Craven and Peyton Boswell, American artists set about recording America for both social and artistic reasons. The emergence of the American Scene school of painting was at hand. A realist school whose focus was upon the people and landscape of American life, American Scene painting, as an element of the new American agenda, grew and prospered in the Midwest. Midwest painters, like their better known compatriots Grant Wood and Thomas Hart Benton, set about recording, re-discovering and sometimes glorifying people, places and things American. In the Midwest, however, the realist efforts of artists like Floyd Hopper, Edmund Brucker, Aaron Bohrod and Lawrence McCombs were much less deliberate in their attempts to stylize and mythicize the American landscape. Great Lakes Regionalists did not use the deliberate satire of Grant Wood nor the stereotyping of Benton to re-invent America but simply accelerated their efforts in the realist enterprise that had been flourishing in the industrial Midwest since the turn of the Century. A forthright approach to subject matter empowered the pictures of the Midwest Regionalists with a directness and connectedness which lent honesty to the images. Modernist use of visual elements were used superficially for artistic purposes but rarely was objective depiction compromised in favor of a personally subjective treatment of the scene.

As America emerged from the 1930s, having successfully overcome the economic and social hurdles of the Depression, a new confrontation was approaching. Growing political and social tension in Europe was to eventually lead to a second World War. As America entered the war, the
The American Scene movement reached its peak as nationalism soared. The realities of war, however, would change the direction of American life and American art. As refugees flooded in from Europe and as America increased its military and political presence in Europe, the nation once again, as in World War I, became more internationally oriented. The chaotic and thought-provoking nature of war reminded America that its isolation could not literally or figuratively continue. Artists in the country and of course in the Midwest finally confronted the personal and societal need to express universal meaning and content in their work which would address the new atomic age. The local and specific American landscape which became an important metaphor for American identity in the 1930s could not extend its meaning beyond its place to a new universal world unfamiliar with the mythical American landscape and the American dream. A more overt use of abstraction and an increasing use of very personal and sometimes oblique symbolism began to appear in the Midwest painting of the 1940s. Lewandowski's precisionism was transformed from pictures of American Great Lakes boats into symbols of a new machine age and Carter's earlier straight depictions of Midwestern towns and people developed into eerie and often super-real depictions of abandoned carousels and hooded mannikins representing the isolation and despair of lost American ideals. A shift from the exterior world of local and specific places to the interior world of the human psyche was taking place.

By the 1950s, an abstract language in art had fully engulfed the American artworld. The universalist mentality which had been building in the 1940s finally created an arena in which the local and particular could not be meaningful on the world stage. Searching inside to face the
challenges of expressing the mental world, artists, including those of the Midwest, abandoned the tangible and external which so defined their art through the years of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s.

The artwork presented in Midwest Realities gives us an artistic context for understanding many of the broader historical issues outlined above. As one views the exhibition it is hoped that one can begin to see the works produced in this vital region as the manifestations of much broader historical and cultural issues. Today, as America again attempts to redefine itself in the midst of an everchanging and evermore universal world it is useful to look back to find how American artists once resolved the very questions faced by American society today.

David Lusenhop Jr.
Curator

Works in the Exhibition

Jean Crawford Adams
Federal Building, c. 1930, oil on canvas, 24" x 30". Lent by Robert Henry Adams Fine Art

August Biehle
Berlin Heights, c. 1924, gouache on paper, 13" x 19". Lent by Vixseboxse Art Galleries

David Lusenhop
Night Shift, 1934, gouache on paper, 14" x 20". Lent by Sheld.m Swope Art Museum, Terre Haute, Indiana

Edmund Brucker
Monday Morning, 1945, gouache on board, 20" x 16". Lent by the Inlander Collection, Hamtramck, Michigan

Charles Burchfield
Hill Top at High Noon, 1920, watercolor on paper, 25 1/4" x 18 1/4". Lent by Private Collection

Emerson C. Burkhardt
Larry's Grill, c. 1940, oil on canvas, 22" x 24". Lent by the International School of America

Clarence Carter
Jesus Wept, 1936, watercolor on paper, 14 1/2" x 21 1/2". Lent by Southern Ohio Museum. Purchase: Grant Award from the Scioto County Area Foundation, James and Tabitha Pugh Trust, 92.1.2

Clarence Carter
Ohio River Pilot, 1932, oil on canvas, 35 1/2" x 44 1/2". Lent by Southern Ohio Museum Collection, Gift of Dorothy W. Miller in memory of James B. Miller, 90.2.8

Robert Chadeayne
Cliffside Drive, c. 1937, oil on canvas, 24" x 20". Lent by Columbus Museum of Art, Ohio. Gift of Orlando A. Miller
Frances Chapin
White Tower, 1931, oil on canvas, 31" × 38", Lent by Robert Henry Adams Fine Art

Charles Culver
Michigan Barn, 1943, watercolor on paper, 19" × 25½", Lent by Mark Stuart

Harry Davis
The Pond, Midwinter, 1949, oil on canvas, 40" × 34", Lent by Private Collection, Cincinnati, Ohio

Clara Dieke
Cuernavaca, Mexico, c. 1931, oil on canvas, 20" × 24", Lent by Viscose Art Galleries

David Fredenthal
The Beach, c. 1940, watercolor on paper, 13" × 18½", Lent by Ed Ogal, Paramour Fine Arts

Joseph Freibert
Tenements at Night, 1948, oil on masonite, 20" × 32", Lent by Milwaukee Art Museum, Gift of Dr. and Mrs. Abraham Malamed, M1970.17

Reginald Grooms
Rescue by Boat, 1937, tempera on board, 20" × 24", Lent by Private Collection, Cincinnati, Ohio

Cecil F. Head
Evening Light, 1938, oil on board, 29" × 36", Lent by Frank and Patte Owings, Indianapolis, Indiana

Floyd Hopper
Red Farm, 1937, oil on board, 33" × 44", Lent by Frank and Patte Owings, Indianapolis, Indiana

William F. Kaiser
Near Irvington, 1934, oil on canvas, 33" × 38", Lent by Frank and Patte Owings, Indianapolis, Indiana

Henry Keller
Harvest Time, no date, oil on canvas, 10½" × 10½", Lent by The Cleveland Museum of Art, Anonymous Gift in Memory of Henry G. Keller

Hughie Lee-Smith
Boy with Tire, 1952, oil on plywood panel, 22½" × 32½", Lent by the Detroit Institute of Arts, Gift of Dr. S.B. Milton, Dr. James A. Owen, Dr. B.F. Seibrook, and Dr. A.E. Thomas, Jr.

Edmund Lewandowski
Ore Freighter (Wisconsin Ore Freighter), 1948, oil on canvas, 42" × 30½", Lent by Milwaukee Art Museum, Gift of Gimbel Brothers, M1950.20

Carlos Lopez
Lake Harum Fisherman, 1942, oil on canvas, 21½" × 29½", Lent by the Detroit Institute of Arts, David B. Werbe Memorial Prize, Annual Exhibition for Michigan Artists, 1943

George Jo Men
A Century of Progress, c. 1929, oil on canvas, 28" × 37", Lent by Bob and Ellie Haan

Lawrence McNab
Valley Farm, c. 1933, oil on canvas, 20" × 24", Lent by Private Collection, Cincinnati, Ohio

Constance Coleman Richardson
Parade Hill, South, 1951, oil on masonite, 16" × 30", Lent by the Detroit Institute of Arts, Museum Collection Prize and Palette and Brush Club Purchase Prize, Annual Exhibition for Michigan Artists, 1952
William Sommer
Brandywine Landscape,
c. 1936, watercolor on paper,
35 7/8" x 20 1/4", Lent by
Joseph M. Erdelac

Oakley Richey
Bridge at Night, c. 1930, oil on
canvas, 21 1/4" x 42", Lent by
Richmond Art Museum operated
by Art Association of Richmond

Sarkis Sarkissian
Factory Worker, 1932, oil on
canvas, 32" x 26", Lent by Ned
and Jacqueline Crouch

Zoltan Sepeshy
Marine Still Life, 1946, tempera on
masonite, 30" x 38",
Lent by the Detroit Institute
of Arts, Gift of Dr. and Mrs.
George Kaiman

Gerrit Sinclair
Milwaukee City Hall, 1930, oil
on canvas, 21" x 32", Lent by
Ned and Jacqueline Crouch

Clyde Singer
Communist Rally, Cleveland
Addenda

The August Biehle watercolor, “Berlin Heights,” has been replaced by a Biehle oil painting. Following is the correct checklist information:

*August Biehle*

*Shore at Lake Erie, 1922*

*oil on canvas, 28½” x 20”*

*Lent by Vinehouse Art Gallery*

The Charles Burchfield watercolor, “Hill Top at High Noon,” has been replaced by another Burchfield watercolor. Following is the correct checklist information:

*Charles Burchfield*

*Sunnybrow Row, c. 1942*

*watercolor, 18¾” x 29½”*

*Lent by Rose Hume and Robert Mezo*

Lawrence McConaha’s “Valley Farm” is now lent by the Inlander Collection, Hamtramck, Michigan.

Floyd Hopper’s “Red Farm” is now lent by Bob and Ellie Haan.