For those of us who have committed ourselves to the teaching and depicting of American history, these are the best and worst of times. On the one hand, we can celebrate an expansion of museums, historic sites, publications, and programs devoted to the telling of our national and local histories. The historic preservation movement has never been stronger. A biography of John Adams has become a phenomenon of bookselling. And even television has been enlivened by the creation of an entire channel devoted to historical subjects. On the other hand, more than one observer has noticed a decline in the teaching of history in our schools and a rising tide of historical illiteracy, as well as a drop in civic participation among the young. For those who believe in the value of history, the present looks very good, but the future much less so.

The National Portrait Gallery is pleased about its initiative to introduce new audiences to the George Washington legacy through the “Lansdowne” tour, among its countless other educational efforts. But we know that there is a great deal more to do. On May 1, I joined a few hundred colleagues at “A White House Forum on American History, Civics, and Service” to explore what we as a nation can do “to renew America’s understanding of itself.”

For those who needed motivation, the results of a recent college history survey revealed that only 34 percent of the respondees knew that George Washington was the commanding general at Yorktown—fewer than the 37 percent who thought Ulysses S. Grant served in that role. NPG Commissioner Roger Mudd, one of the speakers, noted that this lack of knowledge is only part of the problem—the even greater task is to instill in students an ability to analyze and understand the lessons of the past.

The National Portrait Gallery offers this issue of Profile as the latest evidence of its commitment to promoting historical understanding. To coincide with the commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the Lewis and Clark expedition, a number of our staff have, with characteristic style and depth, taken on the meaning of that historic event. I particularly like David Ward’s observation that “it takes a difficult act of the imagination to even begin to grasp the sense of awe and foreboding with which Lewis and Clark . . . faced the task before them,” and also Fred Voss’s cheerful observation on the Louisiana Purchase: “After all, how often does the opportunity to double its size peaceably fall into a nation’s lap?” This is history-telling that is engaging and enlivening. It gives me hope for the future of history.
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Cover: In this bicentennial year of the Louisiana Purchase and the launching of the historic Lewis and Clark expedition to the Pacific Northwest, there is no more apt choice for a Profile cover than this detail of a painting of Thomas Jefferson, the President who spearheaded these events. Evidence suggests that as Lewis and Clark navigated the upper Missouri in the spring of 1805, Jefferson was making time to pose for this portrait by Gilbert Stuart.

Owned jointly by the National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, and Monticello, Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation; gift of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, and the Enid and Crosby Kemper Foundation
Contrary to conventional wisdom, the Louisiana Purchase did not result in the western expedition undertaken by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. Rather, President Thomas Jefferson began planning an expedition up the Missouri River to the Pacific coast in 1802, before the vast trans-Mississippi expanse was obtained from the French. Jefferson’s proposal received authorization from Congress but was put on hold while the administration sought clearance from the European powers. Although the French and British issued passports to the explorers, the Spanish disbelieved Jefferson’s assertion that the journey would be purely scientific and dragged their diplomatic feet. But following the purchase, Spanish opposition and European permission became moot, and the expedition was quickly launched because of Jefferson’s preparatory work. In particular, Jefferson had determined that a western exploration would be headed by his secretary and protégé, Meriwether Lewis (1774–1809), whose scientific, military, and personal attributes the President valued to the highest degree.

As befitted the author of Notes on the State of Virginia, a catalog of the state’s physical, natural, and ethnographic history, Jefferson was impatient to have the continent explored. This desire originated out of his scientific interests, which were based on the Enlightenment’s imperative that the world should be wholly known by man. In writing the expedition’s orders, Jefferson canvassed his scientific friends and colleagues for help in creating guidelines for the kind of observations that were most desired. Other practical help was solicited from those such as Dr. Benjamin Rush, who provided a chest of medicine (including 6,100 doses of various purgatives) and surgical instruments for the trip. Although Jefferson was sincere about the scientific aspect of the expedition, there were, as the Spanish suspected, two official, indeed nationalistic, reasons for sending the mission to the Pacific.

First, the Lewis and Clark expedition was a military mission that would plant the flag in the western territories. It surveyed the terrain into which the United States nation would expand, and although Jefferson’s intentions toward Native Americans were peaceful, the expedition provided an initial assessment of the northwestern tribes. Second, Jefferson was aware of the region’s commercial potential—both its rich natural resources and its potential for farming. He was particularly interested in establishing trading relationships with the Indians. That Jefferson conceived of the expedition as helping to formulate government policy on the development of the West is further shown by his attempts to keep the mission’s purposes and scope secret from the European powers.

Because the area to traverse was huge, Jefferson kept the expedition small and efficient: between fifteen and forty men (the number fluctuated since some were sent home and others were hired along the way), who, as soldiers, were under military discipline. Meriwether Lewis brought on William Clark (1770–1838) to act as co-leader. The expedition trained and made preparations at Saint Louis during the winter of 1803–4, and started up the Missouri on May 14, 1804. The trip to the Pacific took place in two stages. First, the group traveled by water to a site near present-day Bismarck, where they built a fort and spent the winter of 1804–5. The following spring they continued by river and then by horseback across the Continental Divide until they were able to take to the water again in canoes. Throughout this stage they used Indian guides, including Sacajawea, the wife of the expedition’s interpreter. While Sacajawea was helpful, she did not play the role of pathfinder that romantic
mythology has assigned to her.

Lewis and Clark reached the mouth of the Columbia River on November 15, 1805. They wintered there and began their return voyage in March, exploring other major rivers before hitting the Missouri for the final stretch to Saint Louis, arriving on September 23, 1806. Rush’s medical chest and all of those emetics must have sufficed: only one man died (of a burst appendix) on the trip.

The expedition fulfilled the major tasks that Jefferson had set out for it. Lewis and Clark made contact with the major tribes in the area and attempted to reassure them about American attitudes toward them. In particular, Lewis’s speeches to the Indians promised commercial opportunities, while also making it clear that the “Great Father” in Washington was henceforth to govern their ultimate conduct. In addition to gathering Indian artifacts and scientific specimens, the expedition generated a tremendous written record—including Lewis and Clark’s journals, as well as several others kept by members of the expedition—a catalog of the Indian tribes they met, and a rudimentary attempt to map and survey the area along their route. Geographically, the mission dispelled the notion that there was an overland waterway to the Pacific. What also became clear from their travels was the sheer magnitude of the terrain. Although Jefferson and others had heard reports of a western mountain chain, they assumed that it was about the size of the Appalachians. Needless to say, the Americans were staggered when they saw the Rocky Mountains. Similarly, the explorers, familiar with the eastern brown bear, had scoffed at the Indians’ reports of an extremely large and savage bear. This skepticism did not survive the first encounter with a grizzly bear, especially since the expedition’s rifles were not powerful enough to stop the beast. Eventually, they learned to deal with the grizzlies by firing volleys at them, being careful to keep a couple of rifles in reserve in case the enraged animal was not brought down on the first attempt.

The expedition’s encounter with grizzlies raises an intangible, perhaps unanswerable, question about this particular errand into the wilderness. While we can “know” the expedition from its products—the specimens, the reports, the sketches and drawings—as well as from its impact on the subsequent course of American history, it takes a difficult act of the imagination to even begin to grasp the sense of awe and foreboding with which Lewis and Clark and their men faced the task before them when they left Saint Louis behind. If we cannot re-create the explorers’ gasps of astonishment, we can still appreciate the thin line that divided western civilization from wilderness in the first decade of the nineteenth century, when the United States successfully completed the first of its many explorations of the earth and then, in the twentieth century, space.●


A Land Deal We Couldn’t Pass Up

Frederick S. Voss
Senior Historian

Viewed from two centuries of historical perspective, the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 is an event eminently worthy of bicentenary notice. After all, how often does the opportunity to double its size peaceably fall into a nation’s lap? And how likely is the new territory to prove extremely rich in both agricultural and mineral resources? Finally, how much chance is there that the price of this land deal should amount to the bargain-basement rate (even at this time) of roughly 13 1/2 cents an acre?

Good deal or not, it was hardly an agreement that the young American republic had consciously sought or had any reason to hope for. When President Thomas Jefferson dispatched James Monroe to France in 1803 to join American minister Robert Livingston in discussing with Napoleon’s advisers the vast tract of land abutting the United States along the western Mississippi River, his aims were, in fact, quite modest. Spain had just ceded the territory to the French, and it was feared that French rule would go along with the recent Spanish order stopping the free flow of American goods through the territory’s trading hub at New Orleans. That spelled disaster for America’s trans-Appalachian region, whose viability rested heavily on having New Orleans as the dispersal point for its goods. As a result, Jefferson’s main hope for the Monroe-Livingston negotiation was an agreement with the French that either secured permanent shipping rights through New Orleans or provided for outright purchase of an autonomous trading base nearby. Under the mistaken impression that France had also acquired the Floridas from Spain, the two envoys were to raise as well the question of America’s buying that territory.

Livingston and Monroe, however, never had a chance to explore those very circumscribed propositions with the French. Monroe arrived in France on April 10, 1803, and three days later Napoleon’s finance minister, François Barbé-Marbois, initiated a late-evening chat with Livingston, in which he raised the possibility of selling the entire Louisiana Territory for twenty million dollars. As if looking...
a gift horse in the mouth, Liv-
ingston and Monroe held out for a better price, and wisely so. Within three weeks, they were signing agreements to buy the territory for fifteen million dollars. Just how extensive this western expanse was, no one was quite sure, but precise quantification of the acreage seemed irrelevant. As French Foreign Minister Charles Tallyrand observed, perhaps a bit ruefully, the American envoys had made quite a “noble bargain” for themselves.

Before that noble bargain became accomplished fact, however, it had to pass muster at home. Although Jefferson was clearly pleased with the proposed acquisition, he had strong doubts that presidential approval and a congressional endorsement were enough to make it legal. Always taking a dim view of arguments for a strong central government, Jefferson interpreted the federal powers enumerated in the Constitution very narrowly. Since that document failed to mention procedures for extending the country’s boundaries, the only way, in his view, to vest the Louisiana Purchase with a full measure of legitimacy was through constitutional amendment. But even at its most efficient, the amending process would take many months, and in the meantime Napoleon might have second thoughts about selling off his American empire. Ultimately, that possibility was enough to send Jefferson’s legal scruples out the window. Privately observing that “the less we say about constitutional difficulties . . . the better,” he decided that the deal should be allowed to go through without benefit of an amendment.

So it was on December 20, 1803, at ceremonies in New Orleans, that the French officially turned the Louisiana Territory over to two American commissioners, the territory’s first American governor, William C. C. Claiborne, and U.S. Army General James Wilkinson. A duplicitous intriguer, Wilkinson would soon be wound up in Aaron Burr’s alleged conspiracy to subvert the loyalties of some of America’s western wilderness, but on that December day it was all “Hail Columbia” and promises to a not-altogether-happy gathering of Louisiana citizenry that they would soon be enjoying “all the rights, advantages and immuni-
ties of citizens of the United States.” Several weeks after, with his last jot of constitutional inhibitions clearly dissipated, Jefferson jubilantly declared to Congress that “never have mankind contemplated so vast and important an accession of empire by means so pacific and just.”

James Monroe by John Vanderlyn, 1816
On January 18, 1803, President Thomas Jefferson wrote to Congress asking for $2,500 “for the purpose of extending the external commerce of the U.S.” With this request, Jefferson began to realize his dream of organizing a mission to explore the North American continent. To commemorate the bicentennial of the project that we know today as the Lewis and Clark expedition, Monticello has researched and re-created the Indian Hall, the display that Jefferson established in the entrance hall at Monticello to highlight the objects that the explorers sent east. In 2003, the interpretation of Monticello will focus on Jefferson’s role as steward of the expedition.

From the beginning, the encounters between Lewis and Clark’s party and the Indian tribes it met were the most significant aspects of the mission. These were the political, diplomatic, and social interactions through which Jefferson’s goals of expanding trade and coming to know and understand the continent’s inhabitants were to be forged. The presents that Lewis and Clark distributed symbolized the opening of relations between the tribes and the new American republic. The gifts they received in return provided them with examples of Indian art and culture, but Lewis and Clark did not systematically “collect” Native American objects as they did plant and animal specimens. New research suggests that the Indian objects acquired should be understood as results of diplomatic and social exchanges rather than as products of collecting in an anthropological sense. In this way, the objects represent the choices of their makers, not those of explorers unfamiliar with the material culture of Native people.

Before leaving their winter camp near present-day Bismarck, North Dakota, in April 1805, Lewis and Clark prepared a shipment to send President Jefferson. It included Indian objects; animal specimens (a live prairie dog, four magpies, and a grouse); and plant, soil, and mineral samples. Jefferson sent this material to at least three different places: the Peale Museum, the American Philosophical Society, and Monticello. To Monticello he sent elk, deer, antelope, and mountain sheep horns; otter and weasel skins; and Indian pipes, leggings, bows, arrows, pottery, and a painted buffalo robe depicting a battle scene.

The expedition was central to Jefferson’s acquisition of his impor-
tant collection of Native American objects. Jefferson showcased this in his newly completed double-story entrance hall at Monticello, which he called his “Indian Hall.” Placed among his other goods—including European fine art, a model of an Egyptian pyramid, mastodon bones, and maps of the vicinity and the world—the objects from the West contributed to the mélange of material that Jefferson hoped would place himself and Monticello in the context of the larger world.

Despite extensive research, the whereabouts of the majority of Jefferson’s Native American and natural history objects are unknown today. Jefferson gave these collections to the University of Virginia upon his death in 1826. They were first displayed in the university’s Rotunda and later made their way to the Lewis Brooks Hall of Natural Science, a campus museum that opened in 1878. When the museum was converted to classrooms and offices in the late 1940s, the elk antlers that Lewis and Clark sent Jefferson, along with other non–Lewis and Clark components of the collection, were returned to Monticello, but the Indian objects were not accounted for.

Monticello has turned this mystery into an opportunity to involve Native Americans in a contemporary arts project. Indian artists preserving traditional media have been commissioned to create new pieces for the Indian Hall exhibition, based on primary-source documentation of the room and study of surviving historical objects, most notably the important Lewis and Clark collection at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University.

Painted hide robes were traditional garments for the Native men and women of the Great Plains. They also became customary diplomatic gifts and articles of trade. Men’s robes often contained representations of battles in which they had distinguished themselves. The shipment that Meriwether Lewis and William Clark dispatched to Jefferson in 1805 from their first winter camp included a painted battle robe. This robe (now lost), which Jefferson displayed at Monticello, depicted a conflict in which the Mandan and their Hidatsa allies fought the Sioux and Arikara. This re-creation of that robe was made by Dennis Fox, a Mandan-Hidatsa hide painter from New Town, North Dakota.
The Wilder Touch

Nobody’s Perfect: Billy Wilder, a Personal Biography by Charlotte Chandler

Amy Henderson
Historian
In one of his running conversations with author/friend Charlotte Chandler, Billy Wilder explains that “nobody’s perfect” is the line that most sums up his work. There is no comedy, no drama about perfect people.

It was the final line in Wilder’s classic 1959 comedy Some Like It Hot—Joe E. Brown’s laconic response to Jack Lemmon’s declaration, “I’m a MAN!” And clearly it said something about the life of the puckish, witty, and street-smart writer-director whose movie legacy includes Double Indemnity, The Lost Weekend, Sunset Boulevard, Love in the Afternoon, and The Apartment.

Born in present-day Poland, Wilder (1906–2002) left home as an adolescent and got a job as a reporter, breaking into screenwriting in Berlin in the late 1920s while working on that city’s largest tabloid. When Hitler came to power in 1933, Wilder immigrated first to Paris and then to Hollywood, where he bluffied his way into a screenwriter’s job and then—and then!—madly learned to write in English. Luckily, he was a born storyteller with a wonderful ear for American idiom and slang. But in the Hollywood studio system, writers merely provided grist for the screen mill, and Wilder tired of not having control over his own scripts. By 1941 he had badgered his then-employer Paramount about script control so much that, as he said, “they got rid of me by making me a director.” His major picture debut, The Major and the Minor, starring Ginger Rogers and Ray Milland, was a box-office success and launched a writing-directing career that would accumulate six Oscars and an American Film Institute Life Achievement Award.

As a director, Wilder never relinquished control of his scripts on any of his films, and he was rigorous about enforcing letter-perfect readings by all of his actors, including William Holden, Gloria Swanson, Charles Laughton, Marlene Dietrich, Jack Lemmon, and Walter Matthau. Marilyn Monroe presented a unique challenge in the two movies she made with him, The Seven Year Itch and Some Like It Hot. Although he always claimed the screen results were worth it, her erratic behavior was problematic: “Could I set my watch by her?” he once snorted. “I couldn’t even wind my watch by her.”

Charlotte Chandler, whose other books include a biography of Groucho Marx and a collection of conversations with an eclectic group including Mae West, Tennessee Williams, Bette Davis, and Henry Moore, knew Wilder and at the end of his life convinced him to do a series of taped interviews that chronicled his career. Most of the book is a movie-by-movie account in which Chandler poses questions and Wilder gives well-scripted responses. Indeed, his responses are nearly verbatim to those in the 1998 PBS American Masters show on Wilder: it seems director Wilder followed his own finely scripted life story to the letter. Similar responses sprinkle the pages of a recent biography by Ed Sikov (On Sunset Boulevard: The Life and Times of Billy Wilder). Only Cameron Crowe’s 1999 Conversations with Billy Wilder ventures beneath the Wilder veneer with any success, and then possibly only because Wilder himself found it amusing to go “off book.”

Yet the Chandler book remains entertaining. How could it not? Its subject is a character whose credo was “NEVER BORE!”
Franklin’s Many Faces

Brandon Brame Fortune

ASSOCIATE CURATOR OF PAINTING AND SCULPTURE

In 1779, now in his second year as a representative of America’s Revolutionary cause in France, Benjamin Franklin (1706–1790) could not help boasting a little to his daughter of the vogue for his portraits among the French. The production of his likenesses in sculpture, oils, and prints, “of which copies upon copies are spread everywhere,” he reported, “have made your father’s face as well known as that of the moon, so that he durst not do any thing that would oblige him to run away, as his phiz would discover him wherever he should venture to show it.”

Franklin’s wry comment on his celebrity was apt. His extraordinary skill in diplomacy had won much-needed French support for the American cause, and along the way he had become the toast of Paris. To some extent, his popularity stemmed from his fame as the scientist who had unlocked the secrets of electricity, but it was owing as well to his own astute sense of the European audience he was playing to. Two recent studies of Franklin by Bernard Bailyn and Edmund Morgan, distinguished historians of the colonial period, bring us closer to his world, and his role within it, including the uses he made of his visual image.

Bernard Bailyn’s book is a series of essays bound by their emphasis on the broader Atlantic context for the Revolution-ary generation. Bailyn, professor emeritus of history at Harvard, focuses on the provinciality of this generation, and argues that their marginality “profoundly conditioned their lives and . . . stimulated their imaginations, freed them from instinctive respect for traditional establishments, and encouraged them to create a new political world.” One of his essays investigates Franklin’s creative manipulation of his own “provincial” persona through portraiture. For Bailyn, Franklin’s visual image shifted over time to express Enlightenment aspirations and goals, and Franklin actively participated in shaping it, a process best seen during the years in which he moved “into the Parisian core of the enlightened world.” Bailyn’s essay is not the work of an art historian. He relies on an exhaustively researched 1962 study of Franklin’s portraits by Charles Coleman Sellers for documentation. His insights into Franklin’s self-fashioning are instead the product of a career-long engagement with the history of the Revolutionary period and, as such, provide a fascinating view of Franklin’s portraits—from the man of science depicted during his London years by Mason Chamberlin and David Martin, to the *philosophe* in plain clothes and fur hat made famous by Charles Nicolas Cochin and Jean-Baptiste Nini, and the busts made by Jean-Jacques Caffieri and Jean-Antoine Houdon. Bailyn saves his greatest accolades for the portrait painted by Joseph Siffred Duplessis in 1778, a painting that “radiates experience, wisdom, patience, tolerance, and a world-weariness beyond all cleverness and guile.” The version of the portrait by Duplessis owned today by the National Portrait Gallery belonged during Franklin’s lifetime to one of his favorite companions in France, Madame Brillon de Jouy (Anne-Louise d’Hardancourt Brillon de Jouy). Edmund Morgan, who has published a superb short biography of Franklin, describes their relationship in sprightly, insightful prose.
Leading the Race

Susan M. Lee
Management Assistant,
Department of Exhibitions
W.E.B. Du Bois devised a plan for blacks to rise in white America. He proposed the formation of the “Talented Tenth,” an elite group of blacks who would educate and “strengthen the Negro’s character, increase his knowledge and teach him to earn a living.” He asserted that “the Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men.”

Du Bois and His Rivals
by Raymond Wolters
(Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002)

They drank tea, played chess, and exchanged witty and affectionate conversation that was continued through letters, “each claiming an unsurpassable love for the other.” This flirtatious relationship, not quite passionate, but not exactly platonic, was one of many that Franklin sustained in the salons of Paris. As Morgan notes, “They certainly made life in France worth living in a way that nothing else had quite equaled.”

In approximately three hundred pages of easy-to-read type, with well-chosen illustrations, Morgan includes enough of Franklin’s biography and accomplishments to enable us to begin to understand the complexities of the man. As he notes, “it is meant only to say enough about the man to show that he is worth the trouble.”

By making judicious use of this primary material, Morgan reveals Franklin’s charisma, his insatiable curiosity, and his propensity for public service—to his Philadelphia community, to colonial governments, and to the emerging United States.
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Benjamin Franklin by Joseph Siffred Duplessis, c. 1785, gift of the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation

Benjamin Franklin by Edward Savage, after David Martin, 1793

Benjamin Franklin by Jean-Baptiste Nini, 1777

By making judicious use of this primary material, Morgan reveals Franklin’s charisma, his insatiable curiosity, and his propensity for public service—to his Philadelphia community, to colonial governments, and to the emerging United States.

Morgan, professor emeritus of history at Yale University, is one of the foremost historians of colonial American history and culture. He is also chairman of the advisory board of the Franklin Papers project. The introduction that he was asked to write for a new CD-ROM version of the Franklin letters grew into this book. He notes in the preface: “Franklin can reach us in writing that speaks with a clarity given to few in any language at any time, and writing was his favored mode of communication. We can read his mail.”

Franklin can reach us in writing that speaks with a clarity given to few in any language at any time, and writing was his favored mode of communication. We can read his mail. By making judicious use of this primary material, Morgan reveals Franklin’s charisma, his insatiable curiosity, and his propensity for public service—to his Philadelphia community, to colonial governments, and to the emerging United States.

Morgan, professor emeritus of history at Yale University, is one of the foremost historians of colonial American history and culture. He is also chairman of the advisory board of the Franklin Papers project. The introduction that he was asked to write for a new CD-ROM version of the Franklin letters grew into this book. He notes in the preface: “Franklin can reach us in writing that speaks with a clarity given to few in any language at any time, and writing was his favored mode of communication. We can read his mail.”

Franklin can reach us in writing that speaks with a clarity given to few in any language at any time, and writing was his favored mode of communication. We can read his mail. By making judicious use of this primary material, Morgan reveals Franklin’s charisma, his insatiable curiosity, and his propensity for public service—to his Philadelphia community, to colonial governments, and to the emerging United States.
expressed his disdain of the more educated and affluent Du Bois because of “his [light] color, his formal education, his expensive clothes, his imported cigarettes.” While Du Bois focused on education, Garvey encouraged African Americans to capitalize on “big business.” His approach called for African Americans to invest in the Black Star Line, an all-black steamship company that Garvey had established and that he hoped would appeal to the African American working class. Du Bois criticized Garvey’s scheme of African American entrepreneurship in the *Crisis*—the journal of the NAACP—asserting that Garvey was “without doubt, the most dangerous enemy of the ‘Negro’ race in America and in the world.” Garvey responded, “Du Bois and the NAACP will in another hundred years wipe out this ‘Negro’ race and make a new race which will not be ‘Negro’ in any degree.”

At the other end of the ideological spectrum was Walter White, who supported an accelerated program of integration. Before becoming director of the NAACP in 1931, he studied racial discrimination in white neighborhoods, an assignment that came easily because his fair appearance allowed him to blend into the community. Wolters recounts a time when one police force “handed White a revolver, assigned him to an automobile with five other armed men, and authorized him to shoot any ‘Negro’ he thought looked defiant.” Notwithstanding his experience of racial hostility firsthand, White insisted that rapid integration would lead to black advancement in America, a position Du Bois opposed, because it forced African Americans to “escape from their race into the mass of the American people.” Plunging into the mainstream may have succeeded for White, but Du Bois believed it would result in disaster for most African Americans.

Unlike his rivals, Du Bois didn’t intend to separate or artificially integrate African Americans but to find their rightful position in America. In spite of the controversies Du Bois encountered, he persevered with determination, an indomitable spirit, and a stoic, steadfast presence. Wolters carefully limns these traits in Du Bois through specific incidents with his rivals. He depicts Du Bois as the most effective African American leader of the early twentieth century, as a man with convictions—a man who ultimately believed that blacks and whites could achieve racial harmony in America.
NPG on the Road

NATIONAL

Lansdowne
Tour
Seattle, Washington
Seattle Art Museum
Minneapolis, Minnesota
The Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Featuring the famous “Lansdowne” full-length portrait of George Washington by Gilbert Stuart, “George Washington: A National Treasure” is on view in Seattle through July 20, and in Minneapolis from August 1 through November 30. The National Portrait Gallery was able to purchase this major icon of the nation’s first President through the generosity of the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation, which also provided funding for its tour to museums across the country.

Elmhurst, Illinois
Elmhurst Art Museum
To commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of ARTnews magazine, the Gallery has organized the traveling exhibition “Portrait of the Art World: A Century of ARTnews Photographs.” Included are portraits by a broad cross-section of photographers, ranging from Zaida Ben-Yusuf and Alice Boughton to contemporary masters Cindy Sherman, Arnold Newman, and Robert Mapplethorpe. Among the individuals pictured are John Singer Sargent, Pablo Picasso, Georgia O’Keeffe, and Louise Nevelson. The four-city tour is nationally sponsored by AXA Art Insurance Corporation. On view in Elmhurst through July 29, the exhibition travels next to Santa Fe, New Mexico, where it opens at the Museum of Fine Arts on September 19.

In remembrance of John F. Kennedy’s historic visit to Berlin forty years ago, the Deutsches Historisches Museum in Berlin, Germany, has organized “John F. Kennedy,” an exhibition celebrating the life, politics, and legacy of the former President. NPG has contributed seven objects to the exhibition, which is on view from June 24 through October 13, 2003, in the new wing of the museum, designed by I. M. Pei.

See other exhibition-related web pages at www.npg.si.edu.

Democratic Hopefuls by Boris Chaliapin, 1958, gift of Time magazine

Young visitors talk with George Washington re-enactor William Sommerfield after his performance at the Museum and Art Center in Moses Lake, Washington

Photographs by Carol Wyrick
Useful Contacts

The Gallery's mailing address is P.O. Box 37012, MRC 973, Washington, DC 20013–7012.
The main telephone number is (202) 275-1738.

Catalog of American Portraits
Phone: (202) 275-1840
Web: www.npg.si.edu and click on Search
E-mail: NPGWeb@si.edu

Office of Conservation
Conservation consultations are available for the public on
Thursdays from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. by appointment only.
Phone: CindyLou Molnar (301) 238-2006
(for paintings and sculpture)
E-mail: molnarl@npg.si.edu
Phone: Rosemary Fallon (301) 238-2001
(for art on paper)
E-mail: fallonr@npg.si.edu

Library
Phone: (202) 275-1912
Web: www.siris.si.edu (for the library's catalog)
E-mail: lynaghp@si.edu

Office of External Affairs
Phone: (202) 275-1764
E-mail: friendlyp@npg.si.edu

Office of Education
For information about school and community programs, teacher
resources, internships, and upcoming events:
Phone: (202) 275-1811
Web: www.npg.si.edu and click on Events & Programs
E-mail: NPGEducation@si.edu

Office of Photographic Services
Phone: (202) 275-1791
Web: www.npg.si.edu and click on Rights & Reproductions
E-mail: NPGRightsOffice@si.edu

Office of Publications
To order an NPG publication, contact the National Museum of
American History's Shop.
Phone: (202) 357-1527
Web: www.npg.si.edu and click on Publications
E-mail: NPGPublications@si.edu
(for information only)

Upcoming Events

Former commissioner Robert L. McNeil Jr. has endowed an annual symposium on portraiture at
the National Portrait Gallery in honor of pioneer American art historian and fellow commissioner
Edgar Richardson. The first Edgar P. Richardson Symposium on Portraiture will be held on
November 19, 2003. The theme will be self-portraiture; guest speakers will address the broad
issues of self-representation in American art.

Eye Contact: Modern American Portrait Drawings
Final venue: International Gallery, S. Dillon Ripley
Center, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
April 9–July 25, 2004

Portraits of the Presidents
Final venue: International Gallery, S. Dillon Ripley
Center, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
September 24, 2004–January 23, 2005

Women of Our Time:
Twentieth-Century Photographs
Mobile Museum of Art, Alabama
August 8–October 5, 2003

Additional venues include:
Blackhawk Museum, Danville, California
Long Beach Museum of Art, California
North Carolina Museum of History, Raleigh
George Bush Presidential Library & Museum,
College Station, Texas

Portrait of a Nation
Tour Itinerary

For information on available bookings, contact the
Department of Exhibitions and Collections Manage-
ment at (202) 275-1777; fax: (202) 275-1897, or
e-mail NPGExhibitions@si.edu

A Brush with History
Final venue: International Gallery, S. Dillon Ripley
Center, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
November 14, 2003–February 8, 2004

Information
Below are four quotations and four portrait images. Identify the coiners of these words and match them to their likenesses.

1. a. “Excuse my dust.”
   b. “I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard.”

2. c. “So we beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past.”
   d. “The doctor can bury his mistakes but an architect can only advise his client to plant vines.”

Support the National Portrait Gallery!

Director’s Circle
Gifts of $1,000 or more

Membership
Gifts of $100 to $999

For a brochure or more information visit www.npg.si.edu or call (202) 275-1764.