We won't win any points for originality by making our fall issue of Profile mostly about the American presidency. But in this case, that's a good thing. Appropriately in an election year, our society as a whole—and particularly those institutions devoted to education—should be focusing on an office that continues to grow in importance for our nation and for the world. We need to know as much as possible about what to expect from the individual who will occupy the Oval Office, and also how those expectations have changed over the years.

I have written elsewhere in this issue about America's Presidents, but here I'd like to make a special point about the visual record of the presidency that is the Portrait Gallery's contribution to our national understanding. The Portrait Gallery has about 1,200 images that refer to the American presidency, and these paintings, sculptures, prints, drawings, and photographs are at the heart of our collection. In our Hall of Presidents, we literally look these Presidents in the eye and take their measure at moments when they had the greatest effect on our life as a people.

But the Portrait Gallery’s curators and historians have also taken care to assemble images that make us aware of not only the process through which we choose Presidents—campaigns and elections—but also the process through which we evaluate them once in office. A President’s formal portrait tells us a great deal about the symbolic place the office holds, as well as something of the individual’s look and personality. Yet the representation of the political process is what really provides a picture of who we are as a democratic people: energetic, rambunctious, idealistic, suspicious, disappointed on occasion, but in the end hopeful, always hopeful, about the next candidate, the next election, the next change. These are the images provided us by the print-makers, the photographers, the caricaturists, the poster-makers, the masters of opinion and opinion-making. And this is why to the roll call of honor of the formal portraitists of the presidency—such as Gilbert Stuart, G.P.A. Healy, and Douglas Chandor—we add the vital, biting visual wit of Thomas Nast, Herblock, Edward Sorel, and Oliphant.

The American presidency, like the nation it embodies, is both ideal and all too human. It is the artists who constantly remind us of this duality, and for that the National Portrait Gallery salutes them in this presidential season.

Marc Walker
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At the start of the presidential race in 1952, pundits gave the soft-spoken man with a mild southern drawl and coonskin cap little chance to win for the Democrats in the New Hampshire primary. Estes Kefauver, the junior senator from Tennessee, had become a household name the previous year during the televised hearings of his special committee investigating organized crime. But Kefauver had entered the presidential primaries with no professional organization and little money. And if President Truman decided to again seek the Democratic nomination, it was assumed to be his for the asking. Nonetheless, Kefauver beat Truman decisively and won all twelve delegates. To New Hampshire voters, Kefauver was the anti-politician, coming out of the Tennessee hills and prevailing over the state Democratic machine in his 1948 run for the Senate. When accused by the machine leader, Memphis mayor Edward H. Crump, of being a radical and as deceptive as a pet raccoon, Kefauver replied, “I might be a pet ‘coon, but I ain’t Boss Crump’s pet ‘coon.” The coonskin cap with which Kefauver appeared on the Time cover of March 24, 1952, would become a fixture. In New Hampshire, Kefauver fully developed his image of a nonprofessional politician. Reporters noted that voters were disarmed by his earnest demeanor as he shook their hands and introduced himself, a plainspoken man of strong facial features, with thin lips that broke “easily into a wide grin.” He had few friends in the Senate and was regarded as one of its dullest speakers, but voters saw those qualities as indicators of his sincerity and independence. Awkward episodes during the campaign, such as wearing two right shoes and looking, as his wife described it, as if he were walking around the corner all the time, only reinforced this popular perception. It did not matter that Kefauver voted the straight Democratic line in the Senate; the voters saw him as a maverick up against professionals.

Kefauver came to the convention with the largest number of committed delegates and was the most popular Democrat in public opinion polls. But the very independence he sought to convey to the public alienated the party regulars. The Democratic presidential nominees for 1972, George McGovern and Thomas Eagleton, sought to convey a sense of a new beginning to American politics. After the party’s bitter divisiveness in the 1968 election, a reform commission under McGovern successfully took much of the power from the Democrats’ “old guard” and gave it to younger members, women, and minorities. The number of young voters had vastly increased the previous year with the passage of the Twenty-Sixth Amendment, which lowered the voting age to eighteen. McGovern’s platform was aimed at those younger voters, and the candidate pledged an immediate end to the Vietnam War, huge cuts in defense—with the money going to social spending—and higher taxes for the wealthy.

Running against a popular incumbent, McGovern contrasted himself with the politically savvy Richard Nixon (branded “Tricky Dick” by Democrats) as a man of moral conviction, honesty, and integrity. Ten days after the Democratic convention in Miami, these very qualities would be put to the test. Stories had begun to circulate that Eagleton had been hospitalized and had received electric-shock treatments for depression. At first, McGovern announced his strong support for Eagleton and promised to keep him on the ticket. Shortly after, however, he bowed to political pressure and replaced Eagleton with Sargent Shriver. The character issue was gone, and the McGovern campaign never achieved momentum. The Eagleton and McGovern Time cover of July 24, 1972, was as fleeting as their ticket.

Estes Kefauver by Boris Chaliapin, 1952, gift of Time magazine

Thomas Eagleton and George McGovern by Ken Regan, 1972, gift of Time magazine
In early March 1980, Gordon Nelson, the chairman of the Republican Party in Massachusetts, confidently asserted that if Ronald Reagan won a major victory in the upcoming New Hampshire primary, then Nelson was the Easter Bunny. George H. W. Bush had trounced Reagan in Iowa, and even Reagan’s followers were beginning to think that the sixty-nine-year-old two-time loser for the Republican presidential nomination might no longer have what it took to win. But Reagan campaigned vigorously in New Hampshire, tackling the long, arduous days with no apparent diminution in energy or enthusiasm and looking every inch the movie star when he graced Time’s cover on March 10, 1980. He clobbered Bush by more than a two to one margin.

The January 29 debate in Nashua may have been the pivotal event in his victory. Reagan had agreed to pay the $3,500 cost of holding the debate between him and Bush after the Federal Election Commission ruled that the Nashua Telegraph could not sponsor it. On the day of the debate, Reagan, reacting to complaints about excluding the other four candidates, invited them to the event. When Bush entered the hall and saw Reagan with the other candidates, he refused to participate. At this point, moderator Jon Breen, the Telegraph’s editor, stated that the debate would revert back to the two-man format. When Reagan grabbed the microphone to complain, Breen ordered the power cut off. Reagan shouted defiantly at Breen, “I am paying for this microphone!” Bush looked confused, and responded meekly that since the Telegraph had invited him to the debate, he would play by their rules. The whole chaotic, absurd scene demonstrated to New Hampshire voters that it was Reagan, and not the more experienced Bush, who could best manage himself and the country in times of peril.

Even those who are not fans of President Bill Clinton would agree that he is a political figure of almost irresistible charm and magnetism. It is easy to forget, however, that this did not translate into big electoral victories; in both elections he won the presidency with less than 50 percent of the vote. During his reelection campaign in September 1996, Clinton led in the polls by nearly as much as Ronald Reagan did over Walter Mondale in 1984. But he aroused far less enthusiasm and won far less affection than either Reagan or Dwight D. Eisenhower, two post–World War II Presidents who did win reelection. Americans told pollsters that they would vote for Clinton even though they did not approve of his character, but most gave him credit for his earnestness, his political abilities, and his facility to expound, off the cuff, on even the smallest details of public policy. In predicting an easy Clinton victory over Senator Robert Dole in November 1996, pundits pointed to the excellent state of the economy; to an apparent acceptance by voters that all politicians were flawed; to the electorate’s preference for gridlock (Congress was expected to remain Republican); to Dole’s weakness as a candidate; and, perhaps most significantly, to the presence of Dick Morris, Clinton’s chief campaign guru. Clinton had called for help from Morris in 1994, after the Democrats’ devastating defeat in the congressional elections. For Republicans, this meant that Morris would re-create the candidate’s image through “triangulation”: getting Clinton reelected by promoting Republican policies such as welfare reform and a balanced budget. For Democrats, Morris provided a plan for Clinton to “capture the center,” to move—as almost all presidential candidates do—to the center of the political spectrum. Morris has been depicted as a “gleeful genius” who has worked indiscriminately for both Republicans and Democrats and who has a “blind spot on character.” Interestingly, Time’s editors rejected a cover treatment by artist Stephen Kroninger that had Morris appearing to pop out of the top of Clinton’s head. Whatever one’s view, there is no doubt that Clinton and Morris made an effective political team.
The Editorial Cartoon as Portraiture

Wendy Wick Reaves
Curator of Prints and Drawings

“I owe America so much,” Australian-born cartoonist Pat Oliphant once stated, “for providing such a beautiful and varied canvas as a backdrop and then peopling the foreground with a rich, almost overabundance of charlatans of all shades—wonderful Barnum politicians, . . . shiftless bureaucrats, and assorted lickspittles, greedmongers, and common thieves.” Oliphant’s words remind us that portraiture encompasses the irreverent along with the dignified. The National Portrait Gallery’s collection of Oliphant’s drawings, covering twenty-five years of the presidency from Lyndon Johnson to George H. W. Bush, invites us to consider the editorial cartoon as a form of portraiture.

The political cartoonist both reflects and influences public opinion about a prominent figure. But the portrayal that emerges from successive cartoons gathers strength as a cumulative form of persuasion. Our first response to a cartoon is assessing how the artist has editorialized on a newsworthy issue. For example, A Neutral Ship in a Neutral Sea seems to be more “about” a neutral site for the Vietnam peace talks than about Lyndon Johnson. Frequently, it is not a single cartoon about a President that influences us as much as the building up over time of a memorable, amusingly damning characterization.

All the elements of a cartoon affect that cumulative portrait. Oliphant’s work usually hone a distinctive, repeatable caricature of each incoming President. His regular distortion of Johnson, for example, featured a large nose and a protruding, double-knobbed chin. In the honeymoon after an election, exaggerations are minimal. But fortunately for the art of satire, each President fails to live up to his expectations, and the caricature evolves. Johnson sags and ages; Bush weakens; Carter shrinks. Nixon’s bloated jowls and squinty eyes convey corruption even without the pirate’s getup.

Small symbolic accessories can wield increasing power in repetition. How do intelligent leaders develop a reputation for being dumb? How do we come to perceive strong, athletic men as bumbling or weak? Surely Oliphant’s permanent Band-aid on President Ford’s forehead or the ever-present purse accompanying Bush are as influential as TV coverage of a ski-slope tumble or journalists’ discussion of the “wimp” factor.

When it comes to the analogous imagery of the cartoon, Oliphant bemoans the present ignorance about once-usable literary sources. “No more ‘Alas, poor Yorick!’,” he complains, “No more ravens quoting ‘Nevermore!’ . . . Send not to see for whom the bell tolls.” Nonetheless, Oliphant’s imagery—capitalizing on our responses to the cowboy, the movie star, the politician, surrogate motherhood, or homelessness—seldom misses its mark. The Cardboard Messiah transformed Reagan, during his unsuccessful 1976 presidential campaign, into a shallow, movieland cutout. In The Goddam Ant, Carter morphs into Aesop’s famous ant versus Ted Kennedy’s fiddling grasshopper. Like the distortions of the caricature, the allusions become more negative as presidential terms progress. Images of power—a doctor, athlete, or ship’s captain—are replaced by imagery of insanity, diminution, or corruption in a Mad Hatter, an ant, or a pirate. An able wordsmith, Oliphant aims additional satiric thrusts through captions, titles, and signs. Carter’s dialogue as Aesop’s ant captures the whining of an insignificant player: “Aw, jeez, Jody, do I have to be the ant? I mean, I understand the motives of the play, but playing a goddamn ant . . . ?” The caption for Shopping for a Special Prosecutor sets a chillingly dictatorial tone for Nixon as he searches a pet shop for a polite parrot who will “speak when he’s spoken to.” The title of The Emperor’s New Clothes suggests the theme of Bush’s unfulfilled campaign promises, but Oliphant spells it out by tagging the hangers “Space,” “Acid Rain,” “Drugs,” etc. Incidental comments extend the humor. Oliphant’s Punk the penguin, a tiny, outrageous onsite observer, proves useful for such purposes. In the Nixon cartoon, Punk turns to a vulture, saying, “You’re needed up front!” Confronting the naked Bush, Punk comments, “You need a tie to go with that?”

Oliphant, a Pulitzer Prize winner, can be a brilliantly angry satirist. But when artists use a highly charged approach, we are conscious of the confrontation. More commonly, they manipulate us with less-emotional humor, and we absorb on a subconscious level their underlying messages. Thus, as a form of portraiture, editorial cartoons in the aggregate can be more subtly influential than our laughter suggests. Lest we become—as historians or as citizens—too respectful of our leaders in high office, a glance at Oliphant’s shameless charlatans can provide a bracing corrective.

Neutral Ship in a Neutral Sea, 1968
Stalemated on finding a “neutral” site for the Vietnam peace talks, Lyndon Johnson was also frustrated by protracted negotiations for the release of the USS Pueblo, which had been seized by North Korea.

Shopping for a Special Prosecutor, 1973
Having finally succeeded in firing special prosecutor Archibald Cox, Richard Nixon hoped for the appointment of a successor whom he could control.

Pardon Me, 1976
As the election loomed, Gerald Ford had to account for such controversial actions as pardoning Richard Nixon and defending Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz after he told an offensive racial joke.

The Goddam Ant, 1979
Cast here as a busy little ant versus Senator Ted Kennedy’s frivolous grasshopper, Jimmy Carter shrinks into insignificance in a presidential role scripted by his press secretary, Jody Powell.

The Cardboard Messiah, 1976
Narrowly losing the Republican nomination to Gerald Ford in 1976, Ronald Reagan already seemed larger-than-life to some and shallower than a cardboard cutout to others.

The Emperor’s New Clothes, 1989
Several months into his presidency, George H. W. Bush seemed to have nothing to show the public but bare campaign promises.

All images are the gift of Susan Corn Conway in honor of Alan Fern, on behalf of Patrick Oliphant
Joshua L. Chamberlain (1818–1914)

*Albumen silver print by an unidentified artist, c. 1866*

Joshua Chamberlain is seen in his role as a distinguished Civil War soldier in this cabinet card, which was a popular photographic format in the post–Civil War era. After leaving a university teaching post to answer Abraham Lincoln’s call for more troops in 1862, Chamberlain distinguished himself as a brave and resourceful officer, eventually earning a promotion to major general. He was also awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroism at Gettysburg. After the war he served four terms as governor of Maine and then became president of Bowdoin College.

Carolina Herrera (born 1939)

*Gelatin silver print by Robert Mapplethorpe, 1979*

In this striking image of Venezuelan-born Carolina Herrera, photographer Robert Mapplethorpe captured the elegance and grace that would characterize Herrera’s work as a fashion designer. After many years of being recognized internationally for her fashion sense, Herrera was able to parlay that refined style into a successful business venture in a difficult and competitive field. She launched her first collection in 1981. In her more than twenty years as a designer, Herrera has become a well-known name in fashion, garnering a distinguished list of clients while expanding her enterprise to encompass multiple clothing lines, accessories, and fragrances.

Fats Domino (born 1928)

*Three-dimensional color lithograph by Red Grooms, 1984*

In the 1950s Fats Domino played an important role in the transformative cultural crossover between the African American rhythm-and-blues tradition and mainstream pop music that gave birth to rock and roll. Here, Red Grooms—in his characteristic playful and witty style—has created a three-dimensional representation of Domino using paper that has been printed, folded, cut out, and glued. The vibrant portrait particularly suits the depiction of a figure who has secured a place in the history of twentieth-century American pop culture with such hits as “Ain’t That a Shame,” “Blueberry Hill,” and “I’m Walkin.’”
Faith Ringgold (born 1930)
*Book and quilt, both with hand-painted etching and pochoir borders, self-portrait, 1998*
Faith Ringgold has been an innovator throughout her artistic career. Influenced by the traditional arts of both Africa and Tibet, she often incorporates textiles into her work to create soft sculptures, masks, and quilts. Her art has consistently provided commentaries on the sociocultural status of women and African Americans. In this self-portrait, Ringgold creates a remarkable and expressive portrayal that conveys an image of the artist with great sensibility yet defies conventional methods of representation. She illustrates her life by sharing formative moments in this limited-edition artist’s book, *Seven Passages to a Flight*, and its accompanying hand-stenciled quilt.

Tom Wolfe (born 1931)
*Oil on canvas by Everett Raymond Kinstler, 2000, gift of Sheila Wolfe*
Writer Tom Wolfe has been portraying America for more than forty years, constructing animated and astute observations that have illustrated modern times. His works include *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, which typifies the hippie culture of the 1960s. Known for his satirical cultural commentary, Wolfe has also been successful as a novelist, creating an incisive characterization of the “Me Decade” culture of the 1980s in his first work of fiction, *The Bonfire of the Vanities*. In this painting, portraitist Ray Kinstler, a friend of Wolfe’s, presents the writer in confident repose, nattily clad in the white suit that is an essential expression of his lively persona.

Mia Hamm (born 1972)
*Gelatin silver print by Rick Chapman, 2001 (printed 2002), gift of Rick Chapman and ESPN*
Mia Hamm is the world’s all-time leading scorer in international soccer play. Her career exemplifies the surge in women’s athletics brought on by the passage of Title IX, which banned sex discrimination in schools. Hamm, a member of the U.S. team that won the first-ever Women’s World Cup tournament, also captured a gold medal at the 2000 Olympics—the first games in which women’s soccer was recognized as a medal sport. In this picture, taken as part of a series of America’s top athletes for ESPN, photographer Rick Chapman sought to capture his subject’s personal rather than public persona. Taken on an overcast day as the sun was breaking through the clouds, the image shows a more intimate side of the athlete than generally revealed by sports photography. ●
The American Presidents

Marc Pachter
Director

While it is a commonplace of American childhood that every young American should have at least the chance to grow up to be President of the United States, it goes without saying that very few of us ever know what it is like to run for the office, much less to carry its magnificent burden. As citizens, however, we have the opportunity to participate in the election of Presidents and the obligation to understand what the office means in the shaping not only of our times but, in the end, of our identity as a nation.

For that reason, the Hall of Presidents lies at the very heart of the National Portrait Gallery’s mission to tell the American story through the individuals who have shaped it. When we are asked who “gets in” to our collection of significant Americans, our answer is that we try to determine who has made a particularly strong contribution in each field of endeavor. But the presidency is the exception that proves the rule. Every President gets in, even those whom his-tory judges disappointing. Put another way, it is possible not to be a great President but impossible not to be an important one. The chapters of our history as a people are told through the terms of our highest office. This is far less true of other nations. In the family of national portrait galleries around the world, none of our sister institutions groups its heads of state together in the telling of their national history (although of course they do find a place for those leaders in their collections).

No Australian, for example, would see his or her tradition of political leadership as forming the essence of national life. And while the English and Scottish Portrait Galleries recognize, of course, the significant role of the monarchy in their long histories, they have not seen the lineup of kings and queens as equivalent to the story of what it means to be English or Scottish into our own time. We alone have seen our political history, rooted in our evolving democracy, as the core of what holds us together as a people, and have combined in the presidency both head of state and of government.

Oddly, though, the Constitution that governs us says less about the presidency than about any other branch of government. It may be hard for us to realize, now that we have experienced well over two hundred years of presidential administrations, that the country’s eighteenth-century founders had virtually no experience of the role of the head of a modern republic. What was it not to be a king and yet to have significant authority, real and symbolic? In the end, they decided, in effect, to “let George do it” by imploring George Washington to take on the office and then watching him shape the presidency. Gilbert Stuart captured the essence of that office in 1796, the last year of Washington’s second term, in the “Lansdowne” portrait, which is the greatest historical painting in our nation’s history and the core image in our Hall of Presidents (see p. 12).

Perhaps the most important thing that Washington did for us, in a life of extraordinary patriotic achievement, was to willingly give up presidential power. The very notion of relinquishing authority was, for that era, an astonishing affirmation of the intentions of the new democracy. Indeed, it was the restraint of authority that marked what was unusual, and even, to some, confusing about our society. The balance of power built into our system made, and continues to make, the authority of the presidency hard to define, and makes it dependent on the particular occupant of the office and the times and conditions the President confronts. When we stroll through the Hall of Presidents, we see an astonishing variety of temperaments and circumstances, trials and triumphs. There is no one way to be President. The only thing certain is that his—and sometime soon, her—authority
will come to an end.

We Americans, then, give our Presidents great power and then make it quite difficult for them to exercise it without negotiation and compromise. Truth be told, we both call for and fear the strength of the office. The American experiment has been an effort to have both order and freedom. We trust no one with absolute power and have never been tempted by a government that was efficient, if it meant that the give-and-take of democracy was compromised. We can also be fickle in our allegiances. Presidents often come into office on a wave of enthusiasm but then suffer all manner of criticism, from supporters as well as opponents. We seem to others around the world to be both extraordinarily reverent toward the office and equally irreverent to the Presidents themselves. We love them and leave them, or ask them to leave us. This can be exhausting for the individuals themselves, and for the nation over which they preside. But it has been our strength and continuity as a democracy.

Given the importance of the presidency, its portrayal has played a great role in our history. Portraits of the Presidents, particularly as candidates or as occupants of the office, have been a way for Americans to become acquainted with these individuals and also to transfer to them the ongoing grandeur of the office. It is hard to imagine now in the age of media blitz, but the only way for the first citizens of our republic to get to know their Presidents was through painting, sculpture, or prints. Later, the role of representation was enhanced, first through photography and then through the technological revolutions of film, radio, television, and new media. In all of these forms, representation of the President has reflected an ongoing dialogue about the office itself, and posing for the presidential portrait has become part and parcel of the process by which Presidents have affirmed their understanding of their role.

The National Portrait Gallery is proud to hold one of two official national collections of presidential portraits. The other, of course, belongs to the White House. Surprisingly, for more than a half century, the only portrait of a President in the White House was the “Lansdowne”-type image of George Washington—the one saved by Dolley Madison. Not until the second part of the nineteenth century did the nation begin to actively commission and collect portraits for its presidential residence. With the Portrait Gallery’s founding in the 1960s, the building of the second official group of presidential images began. We are involved with both collections, advising each administration on selecting portrait artists, not only for our own paintings but also for those in the White House. In this era of heightened security concerns, the Portrait Gallery’s paintings have increasingly become the most accessible to the American people.

So when we reopen our doors after extensive renovation in July of 2006, our visitors will see an enhanced and extended Hall of Presidents. With the addition of another room and an adjacent gallery devoted to exhibitions on presidential themes, we will have tripled the space given over to our understanding of an office that embodies our hopes and fears, our vitality, our past, and our destiny as a nation. As the roster of Presidents grows in the twenty-first century, the National Portrait Gallery will strive to do justice to their place in our lives. But nothing they have done—or will do—will be as important as the fact that every four years it is we who choose them, and that their authority is borrowed from us.
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Ellen G. Miles  
Curator of Painting and Sculpture  
The National Portrait Gallery’s “Lansdowne” portrait of George Washington, the “Athenaeum” portraits of George and Martha Washington, and the “Edgehill” portrait of Thomas Jefferson will join eighty-eight other works by American portrait painter Gilbert Stuart (1755–1828) in an exhibition that opens at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City on October 21, 2004. “Gilbert Stuart,” a joint project of the Metropolitan and NPG, has been five years in the making. Curators Ellen G. Miles of the National Portrait Gallery and Carrie Rebora Barratt of the Metropolitan have selected portraits that represent Stuart’s entire career, from his early work before the American Revolution to his last works, painted in the 1820s. They have also written a 352-page catalogue, published by the Metropolitan and distributed by Yale University Press, to accompany the exhibition.

Closing on January 16, 2005, in New York, the exhibition reopens in Washington, D.C., on March 27 and runs through July 31. Because NPG’s exhibition spaces in the Patent Office Building will still be under renovation, the National Gallery of Art will host the Washington venue for “Gilbert Stuart.” The exhibition in New York is being made possible by The Henry Luce Foundation and The Peter Jay Sharpe Foundation. The exhibition in Washington is made possible by the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation. The exhibition is proudly sponsored by Target Stores, as part of its commitment to arts and education.

Stuart painted more than one thousand portraits, including almost one hundred of George Washington. The exhibition focuses especially on Stuart’s relationship with his sitters so that his approach to portraiture may be better understood. The narrative begins with the artist’s early training in Newport, Rhode Island, and in Edinburgh, Scotland, and continues in his years in London (1775–87); portraits from these early years show the transformation in his style from a closely observed directness to a more elaborate and sophisticated English manner. After five-and-a-half years in Dublin (1787–93), Stuart returned to the United States, settling briefly in New York City and moving to the capital city of Philadelphia in 1794. There, he arranged for sittings with the President: Stuart, perpetually in debt, planned to build a potentially lucrative business by painting copies of Washington’s portrait for the President’s many admirers. The exhibition features fourteen portraits of Washington, including the original Lansdowne image and two replicas.

Stuart’s great talent, widely remarked on at the time, was his ability to depict the personalities of his sitters. He firmly established his reputation during the decade that he spent in Philadelphia (1794–1803) before going to the new national capital in Washington, D.C. During his eighteen months in Washington (1803–5) he painted, among others, President Thomas Jefferson and his secretary of state, James Madison. Sitting for Stuart was described as “all the rage,” and the artist was equally sought-after to paint portraits of “the ladies,” including Dolley Madison. Stuart settled in Boston in 1805, where he continued to paint until his death. ●
Retratos: *2,000 Years of Latin American Portraits*

Carolyn Kinder Carr
Deputy Director and Chief Curator

“Retratos: *2,000 Years of Latin American Portraits*” is a groundbreaking exhibition exploring Latin American art and history through portraiture. This exhibition, which includes more than one hundred painted and sculpted portraits from seventy-six leading museums and private collectors in Mexico, Central and South America, the Caribbean, and the United States, is the first to consider the rich traditions of portraiture in Latin America from a multinational point of view.

Consisting of five sections, “Retratos” begins with works from the Moche and Maya cultures to underscore the fact that portraiture existed in Latin America before the arrival of Europeans. The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century portraits from the viceregal, or colonial, period show the era’s secular and religious leaders and demonstrate the transformation and adaptation of European portrait models in various colonies. This section also includes the first of several representations of crowned nuns, a portrait genre that began in the mid-eighteenth century and had a hundred-year history.

In the nineteenth century, a time when countries in the Americas established their independence from European rulers, the portraits portray the new secular and social leaders of the time, most of whom, like Simón Bolívar, were native-born. Many of these portraits were undertaken by indigenous artists, such as Peruvian-born José Gil de Castro (1785–1843), whose career took place mainly in Chile, and Mexican José María Estrada (c. 1810–c. 1862). The nineteenth century is complex, however, and paradox reigns. European stylistic traditions were not wholly ignored: by the middle of the century, numerous native-trained painters journeyed to Europe, particularly Paris, to complete their training and make their reputation by participating in juried exhibitions there.

Portraits made during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century underscore both the internationalism of Latin American art as well as its strong nationalist impulses. Contemporary portraiture, featured in the last section of the exhibition, demonstrates the vitality of the genre today in the work of those living in Latin America and those from Latin America currently residing in the United States.

“Retratos” is jointly organized by three museums and four curators: Carolyn Kinder Carr and Miguel Bretos of the National Portrait Gallery; Marion Oettinger of the San Antonio Museum of Art; and Fatima Bercht of El Museo del Barrio in New York City. A 300-page fully illustrated catalogue published by Yale University Press, containing essays by a dozen scholars in the field, accompanies the exhibition.


The exhibition’s organization and presentation at five venues, its publications, and its various outreach initiatives have been made possible by a generous grant from the Ford Motor Company Fund. The Latino Initiatives Pool, administered by the Smithsonian Center for Latino Initiatives, has also contributed to the research and educational outreach related to this exhibition.
George M. Elsey and Brian P. Lamb have been named the 2004 recipients of the National Portrait Gallery’s Paul Peck Presidential Awards, which honor individual excellence in presidential service and portrayal. Elsey, who served in the Roosevelt, Truman, and Johnson administrations, won the award for service to a President, and Lamb, chairman and CEO of the cable network C-SPAN, won for portrayal of a President. The winners will receive $25,000 and a specially designed Smithsonian medal at a gala dinner on October 28.

Education plays a key role in the awards, and both winners will participate in a town-hall forum from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m. on October 29 in the Lecture Hall of the S. Dillon Ripley Center in Washington, D.C. The event is free and open to the public. The winners will also appear on Close Up on C-SPAN that evening.

As part of the expanding Paul Peck Presidential Initiative, the National Portrait Gallery has partnered with the University of Miami, which will host the first presidential debate on September 30. The Peck Initiative and the University of Miami will cosponsor several programs about timely topics for the 2004 presidential election.

Panels will take place on the University of Miami campus in Coral Gables, Florida, and are open to the public.

First Ladies of Presidential Politics

Once publicly admired for her grace and dignity in the White House, Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis remains an iconic figure in popular culture. Her portrait in “American Women” will be on view at the Naples (Florida) Museum of Art beginning in January 2005.

Eleanor Roosevelt, regarded as America’s humanitarian, was fiercely devoted to welfare causes such as child labor and the civil rights of minorities. This portrait, from “Women of Our Time,” is on view at the George Bush Presidential Library and Museum in College Station, Texas.

Eleanor Roosevelt by Clara E. Sipprell, 1949, bequest of Phyllis Fenner

Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis by Boris Chaliapin, 1960, gift of Time magazine
## Portrait of a Nation

Tour Itinerary

Portrait of a Nation encompasses a series of exhibitions organized by the National Portrait Gallery while the Patent Office Building is closed for renovation. For further information, contact the Department of Exhibitions and Collections Management at (202) 275-1777; fax: (202) 275-1897, or e-mail: NPGExhibitions@si.edu.

### Women of Our Time: Twentieth-Century Photographs from the National Portrait Gallery

*Final venue:* George Bush Presidential Library & Museum, College Station, Texas

October 8, 2004–January 2, 2005

### American Women: A Selection from the National Portrait Gallery

**Naples Museum of Art, Florida**

January 7, 2005–April 3, 2005

*Final venue:* Columbia Museum of Art, South Carolina

April 30, 2005–July 10, 2005

### NPG on the Road

**Gilbert Stuart** (see article on p. 12)

*Co-organized by the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the National Portrait Gallery*

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City

October 21, 2004–January 16, 2005

National Portrait Gallery at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

March 27–July 31, 2005

**Retratos: 2,000 Years of Latin American Portraits** (see article on p. 13)

*Co-organized by the San Antonio Museum of Art, the National Portrait Gallery, and El Museo del Barrio*

El Museo del Barrio, New York City

December 3, 2004–March 20, 2005

San Diego Museum of Art, California

April 16–June 12, 2005

Bass Museum of Art, Miami Beach, Florida

July 23–October 2, 2005

International Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

October 21, 2005–January 8, 2006

San Antonio Museum of Art, Texas

February 4–April 30, 2006

## From the Curator’s Bookshelf

The American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Massachusetts, is known worldwide for its collections of materials that document American history: books, manuscripts, newspapers, maps, prints, and drawings. Its portrait collection is closely related to these holdings, as Lauren B. Hewes points out in *Portraits in the Collection of the American Antiquarian Society*, published by the society this spring and distributed by Oak Knoll Press. Readers will find full discussions of 164 painted and sculpted portraits, including miniatures. Linda J. Docherty’s introductory essay discusses the portraits as both works of art and historical documents. For further information, contact the society at [http://www.americanantiquarian.org/publications.htm](http://www.americanantiquarian.org/publications.htm).
Portrait Puzzlers

1. Louis Armstrong encouraged this jazz legend to switch instruments from the drums to the vibraphone in the 1930s.

2. This composer's contemporary works run the gamut from the opera Einstein on the Beach to the scores of movies such as Fog of War and Koyaanisqatsi.

3. This frontiersman's coonskin cap is even more famous than Estes Kefauver's (p. 4), perhaps because of Walt Disney's 1950s television program.

4. She grew up in Concord, Massachusetts, and made her home—and her three sisters—famous as characters in Little Women.

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

call (202) 275-1764 or e-mail friendlyp@npg.si.edu