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Abstract: The Santa Fe Style is an assembly of cultural features associated with the city of Santa Fe and its surrounding Upper Rio Grande Valley. The style, often dismissed as a confection for tourists because of its gloss and worldliness, is in fact a manifestation of reflexive regionalism. This overlooked cultural process occurs when worldly outsiders fashion regional traits into responses to the life challenges that they and their extra-regional reference groups face. In this case, outsiders fashioned what they found in early-twentieth-century Santa Fe into responses to challenges that accompanied the rise of American industrial capitalism. Threats to elite hegemony, the destruction of established lifeways, and the need for new perspectives on American society were prominent among the challenges to which the Santa Fe Style responded. Reflexive regionalism is thus the kind of cultural process that Regulation Theory posits but has found difficult to convincingly identify in the real world, i.e., one that adapts individuals and societies to periodic shifts in the logic and practices of capitalism. I examine seven individuals who made signal contributions to the Santa Fe Style. Each reveals a key facet of Santa Fe’s reflexive regionalism. Together they show how this process created the Santa Fe Style and, more generally, how it works as an engine of cultural invention. The key concepts here are reflexive regionalism, the Santa Fe Style, cosmopolitanism, Regulation Theory, the work of the age, and the project of the self.

The Santa Fe Style is an assembly of cultural features associated with the city of Santa Fe and the surrounding region of the Upper Rio Grande River. The style, often dismissed as a confection for tourists, is a manifestation of reflexive regionalism. This underappreciated cultural process occurs when outsiders fashion regional traits into responses to the life challenges that they and their extra-regional reference groups face. In this case, outsiders fashioned what they found in and around early-twentieth-century Santa Fe into responses to challenges that accompanied the rise of American industrial capitalism. The need for new class norms, the destruction of established lifeways, and the declining usefulness of established perspectives on American society were prominent among the challenges to which the Santa Fe Style responded. Reflexive regionalism is therefore the kind of cultural process that Regulation Theory posits but has found difficult to convincingly identify in practice, that is, one that adapts individuals and societies to periodic shifts in the logic and practices of capitalism. I examine seven individuals who made signal contributions to the Santa Fe Style. Each reveals a key facet of Santa Fe’s reflexive regionalism. Together they show how this process created the Santa Fe Style and, more generally, how it works as an engine of cultural invention.

The problem

New Mexico’s Upper Rio Grande region is home to one of America’s most distinct assemblies of region-based cultural traits. The Santa Fe Style, as this assembly is commonly called, includes an unmistakable architecture; unique expressive forms in many crafts including wood working, weaving, and pottery making; and a distinct mix of subjects and styles in the
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fine arts, especially in landscape and genre painting. The assembly also includes a cuisine, a literature that celebrates the region’s lifeways and landscapes, and even a life model built on region-inspired creativity and consumption. All these constituents of the style are bound up in a semiotic package and enveloped in a dense mystique.2

The style has become more pervasive over time; it is more of a presence in Santa Fe and its region today than it was a century ago. This does not square with the cultural theorists’ assumption that personal mobility and the fluidity of money, commodities, and ideas undermine place-bound cultural traits and weaken their hold on their domains, which allows cultural fragmentation and dissonance to replace cultural integrity.3 Such cultural “disembedding,” to use Giddens’ term, or “deterritorialization” to use Appadurai’s, is assumed to work with special force in cosmopolitan places.4 The Santa Fe Style nonetheless thrived in and around a wealth-saturated and worldly city.5

There are two common explanations for the Santa Fe Style. Each comports with received wisdom about modern cultural possibilities and so might be considered orthodox. Each also has shortcomings that have grown more obvious with the accumulation of scholarly work on the Santa Fe Style. The first explanation holds that the style is genuinely old and indigenous, but uniquely resistant to the normal agents of cultural corrosion. Formed in the crucible of Spanish and Native American experience many centuries ago, this explanation goes, elements of Indigenous culture were powerful enough to bleed through the layers of succeeding history like a strong dye. Perhaps Mather and Woods best articulate this view in their influential book, *Santa Fe Style*. Santa Fe, they write, “remains uniquely its own place, its residents stubbornly and stoically insisting that tradition take precedence over change.”6 This interpretation sees the Santa Fe Style as an authentic regional culture in folklorist’s understanding of authenticity; it is demotic and evolved.7 It also makes Santa Fe out to be a real place in Relph’s sense of the term; it is the product of the free choices and creative acts of those for whom it is home.8

The style’s connections to Hispanic and Native American pasts are beyond dispute, and so is the strong local commitment to that past. But the bleeding-through explanation does not explain why the style’s florescence began around 1890, precisely when the Santa Fe region’s connections to the rest of America began to multiply and its integration into national life started to accelerate. The explanation also seems too neglectful of the capitalism that has never been far beneath the surface of American life. One might try to address these shortcomings by encasing the “authentic” explanation in Wallerstein’s world-systems theory or a similarly broad theoretical framework that admits into its pale the play of cosmopolitan capitalism and local resistance. The style then becomes a redoubt of resistance to the intrusion of an alien order.9 Adding this resistance factor can account for the timing problem but it cannot account for how, far from resisting alien intrusions, the style fed on the attention and contributions of outsiders.10

The second explanation takes precisely the opposite tack. It asserts that the style is fundamentally contrived rather than fundamentally authentic. It was a concoction baked up, albeit with some genuine local ingredients, to feed to tourists and other outsiders. Stewart Brand expressed this view when he wrote that Santa Fe’s distinctive architecture sprang from, “the collusion of three building styles, [Pueblo, Hispanic, and territorial] and one generation of calculating boosters.”11 Chris Wilson, whose *The Myth of Santa Fe* is the definitive cultural history of Santa Fe, also saw such image creation at work, as the title of his book suggests. This contrivance explanation has abundant virtues. It gets the timing right. It squares with our understanding of how tourism prompts false claims to a certain kind of uniqueness.12 It aligns with what we know about the role of commercial intent in creating the American West of popular imagination.13 Perhaps most importantly, it squares with how Santa Fe’s early twentieth-century boosters embraced the Santa Fe Style as part of a tourism-based strategy of growth for their
city.\textsuperscript{14} But the contrivance explanation has a flaw that it difficult to ignore; it fails to account for the style’s depth, dynamism, and wealth of manifestations. These characteristics do not comport with our understanding of how tourism hollows out cultural forms for economy of reproduction, or with how the stages that commerce sets for the tourist’s undiscerning view tend to lack depth.\textsuperscript{15}

The last decade or so has seen many excellent scholars including Rudnick, Burke, Wingert-Playdon, Cline, Redding and Eldrick, Booker, and the Larsons, who closely examine elements of the Santa Fe Style. Their work has deepened our knowledge of the style’s history and of the individuals most centrally involved in that history.\textsuperscript{16} This work has encouraged a more nuanced general understanding of the style’s origins that recognizes the role played by talented newcomers. It also confirms that we are dealing with a cultural phenomenon that is beyond the interpretive reach of the ready dichotomies of authentic and artificial, real and unreal, folk and commercial.

In this more nuanced understanding, the creativity of these newcomers, sharpened by the emotional and cultural links they forged with the region, aided both the boosters seeking commercial advantage and the nobler task of celebrating something indigenous. If a new orthodoxy is emerging, it is this.\textsuperscript{17} This newer, more synthesizing explanation incorporates strengths of both received explanations and hews closer than either to the actual historical circumstances surrounding the style’s emergence. It does, however, have a shortcoming of both older origin stories in its genes; it does not acknowledge what these newcomers brought with them to the region—ideas, conventions, skills, preoccupations, etc. These things determined both how the newcomers saw the region and what they could make of what they found in it. The shortcoming leaves this newer explanation only a little more helpful than the older ones in illuminating the creative sources of Santa Fe Style that lay beyond the region, or in explaining the style’s relationship to wider currents in American socio-cultural history. As such, the new explanation fails to take full advantage of recent scholarly accomplishments.

**Reflexive regionalism**

The folklorist Archie Green proposed the term “reflexive regionalism” for the identity-enhancing relationship between folk culture and geographical area in which “lore delineates region and region delineates lore.”\textsuperscript{18} Green uses “reflexive” here to mean “involuted” or “turned in upon itself.” The region and its lore are in a closed, mutually reinforcing relationship that deepens and more sharply delineates each. We are dealing with a different sort of reflexive cultural process here, however, one involving both the region and the nation beyond it, and one in which “reflexive” carries a meaning closer to “occurring in reaction.” In this second kind of reflexive regionalism, regional cultural traits emerge in response to national cues. In other words, the nation provides the incentives and guidance for regional cultural invention. The nation then provides the scales on which this invention is weighted. The regional culture produced in this way thus reflects, albeit in an altered and refractory form, the nation as a whole.

Regulation theory, which has proven useful in probing capitalism’s relationship to its host society, allows us to fit such reflexive regionalism into the schematic of modern capitalism. Briefly summarized, the regulation theorists begin with the question that Boyer phrased as, “How can such a contradictory process [i.e. a capitalist economy] succeed over a long period of time?”\textsuperscript{19} Anyone can appreciate the question; capitalism’s accumulation strategies create an ongoing churn of social upheaval and personal dislocation. The regulationists concluded that the key to capitalism’s robustness is its capacity to shape, or “regulate,” its host society.\textsuperscript{20} In other words, regulation theory posits that capitalism tends to shape society into forms that both facilitate profit seeking and relieve the stresses caused by that profit seeking. Scholars have shown how this regulation works through institutions that serve the interests of capital, through the actions
of its conscious or unconscious agents, and through the many deep channels of convention, convenience, and practicality that accumulation strategies cut into society.\textsuperscript{21}

The Santa Fe Style and the reflexive regionalism that produced it were part of this change-accommodating process that the regulationists described. Each element of the style was a useful response to a challenge presented by industrial capitalism’s rise and increasing sway in America. Some elements of the style constructively articulated the social and psychic discontents that accompanied that rise. Some dampened them. Other elements were part of new life models that met the personal challenges presented by a newly industrialized society. Still other elements blazed new pathways of consumption. And almost always, these elements opened new profit opportunities and helped to more deeply integrate the Santa Fe region into the wider circuits of national and international capitalism. The sum of these responses was not an involuted regional culture as the folklorists of old conceived of them, but it was a region-based way of seeing, thinking, behaving, and living. In short, it was a regional culture nonetheless.

The mainstream literature on American regionalism contains a trace awareness of this national-regional reflexivity. It is latent in Mumford’s concept of emergent regionalism and in Botkin’s concept of dynamic regionalism. Reflexive regionalism seems to lurk just below the surface of the romantic-reactionary regionalism of the Nashville Agrarians and in the more recent literature on creative ethnicity.\textsuperscript{22} Some of the recent writing on the culture of Santa Fe and the Rio Grande region acknowledge that something akin to reflexive regionalism has been at work. Scholars, for example, have noted the influence of national styles on the region’s artists; others have pointed out the preoccupations that writers brought with them to the region; still others have noted the importance of national opinion and national markets in shaping the work of those who created the style.\textsuperscript{23} This awareness of outside influences has not inflated into a more general explanation for the Santa Fe Style, however.

Exploring reflexive regionalism is important business. We fear that our progeny will live in places that are wholly the product of sweeping and cunning accumulation strategies that deaden capacity for creative expression and thwart people’s efforts to construct meaningful environments for themselves.\textsuperscript{24} What happened at Santa Fe suggests sunnier possibilities of place. Although the Santa Fe creative project was effectively over by the middle of the twentieth century, it was the work of recognizably modern people responding, often skillfully and successfully, to pressing challenges posed by a recognizably modern form of capitalism.\textsuperscript{25} Understanding and encouraging reflexive regionalism may be the best way we have to create places where locally grounded creative responses to the challenges of capitalism are possible, in other words, places that Relph and others with his sensibility would recognize as real and spirit-sustaining.

A key enabling premise of reflexive regionalism is that imaginative and talented, but otherwise ordinary individuals were (and are) capable of responding effectively to the socio-cultural challenges of modern capitalism. We do not normally assume this. The cultural critics of modern capitalism have tended to see the responses of ordinary people as limited in practice to servitude, disengagement, or resistance, be the choice the subtle one of Raymond Williams or the starker one of Mike Davis. Moreover, many of the foremost observers of twentieth-century America including Randall Jarrell, C. Wright Mills, William H. Whyte, Eric Fromm, Hannah Arendt, and Herbert Marcuse believed that modern capitalism had a devastating impact on personal creativity.\textsuperscript{26} The interpretive personae that these observers constructed (the one-dimensional man, the other-directed man, the organization man, and the well-adjusted man) were shallow and passive entities. At best they were capable of furtive and ephemeral responses to their predicaments like creative consuming, ironic understanding, and little acts of sabotage. These constructs, with their limited capacity to respond to their predicaments and no capacity whatsoever to change them, continue to shape our view of individuals facing the challenges of modern capitalism.\textsuperscript{27}
We do know, however, that the rise of industrial capitalism elicited creative and durable responses from ordinary and often historically anonymous people at key points in the formation of modern America. While those responses served industrial capitalism in a regulatory fashion, that is, they adapted society to its operations and, in cases, paved new avenues for its profit seeking, they also gave ordinary individuals the space and tools they needed to take advantage of what capitalism brought into their lives. Zunz and Aron showed how Americans constructed micro-cultures for the office, the factory, and even the corporate boardroom when these places became part of their lives. Warner and then Jackson explored how the enterprise and creativity of ordinary Americans gave the suburb its form, substance, and much of its culture. The case for reflexive regionalism builds on such findings. It assumes that region-based cultural invention by talented and perceptive, but otherwise ordinary, individuals was within the range of effective responses to the rise of modern capitalism.

The case for reflexive regionalism builds on such findings. It assumes that region-based cultural invention by talented and perceptive, but otherwise ordinary, individuals was within the range of effective responses to the rise of modern capitalism.

The three resources that we need to probe for reflexive regionalism in Santa Fe’s cultural ferment are at our disposal. First, we now have a detailed picture of this period in Santa Fe’s past thanks to the appearance of substantial histories of Santa Fe and its region in recent decades. Second, our knowledge of the lives of the many figures that took part in the Santa Fe creative project has blossomed thanks to the organization of personal papers and the appearance of many excellent biographies. Third, our understanding of the socio-cultural challenges that Americans faced during those years has widened and deepened. Together, these sources let us explore reflexive regionalism’s role in the creation of the Santa Fe Style.

**America comes to Santa Fe**

When Spanish soldiers, priests, and settlers arrived in the region of the Upper Rio Grande late in the sixteenth century, they found the Pueblo Indians, who were settled agriculturalists living in more than a dozen large, nucleated communities, or pueblos. The Spanish built missions and churches and founded their own agricultural villages among the pueblos. They established their capital, Santa Fe, on a tributary of the Rio Grande. Once colonized, the Upper Rio Grande region became a remote bicultural region on the northern marches of the Spanish colonial empire, and so it remained for over two centuries. Elements of the region’s Hispanic culture became indigenized. The Native Americans embraced Christianity and modified elements of European culture to fit their own needs. Although maintaining their separate identities and economies, the two communities generally got along; intercommunity trade, intermarriage, a shared religion, equitable distribution of water, and the common threat posed by marauding Apaches and Comanches all encouraged amicable relations. The brief period of Mexican sovereignty in the early nineteenth century saw the beginnings of trade with the expanding United States, but little change otherwise.

Santa Fe made an unfavorable impression on the American soldiers who came to occupy it in 1846 during the Mexican War. Its squat adobe buildings struck them as barely fit for human habitation. One soldier compared the small, mud-colored city to a prairie-dog town. They noted the absence of shade trees, paved streets, and other town amenities that they took for granted back home. Private Daniel Hastings wrote in his diary that, “great indeed was the contrast between the beautiful and magnificent city which my imagination had pictured and the low, dirty and inferior place which I then beheld.” The inhabitants of the city and the region made a comparably unfavorable impression. The occupying soldiers described them as dirty, lazy, fond of drinking and gambling, and Catholic. As a whole, Americans with voice were no more pleased with the human fruits of their victorious war. They feared that the Mexicans and Native Americans of their newly annexed territories would pollute what they saw as the nation’s Anglo-Saxon wells of strength and virtue. The treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which ended the war, sharpened those
fears by automatically extending citizenship to all Hispanic residents of the annexed territories who desired it. An editorial in the *Richmond Whig* warned that the “debased population” of the conquered lands would, once “summarily manufactured into American citizens,” bring the nation no good.35

The first decades of American rule saw the trickle of Americans from elsewhere into the region widen into a stream. The newcomers brought their technology, commerce, architecture, and city planning preferences, and Santa Fe began taking on an American aspect.36 The most successful newcomers joined the foremost Hispanic families to form a new bicultural elite. Then in 1880 the railroad arrived, effectively linking Santa Fe to the rest of the nation for the first time. More Americans now arrived as settlers, entrepreneurs, sojourners, and tourists, and in many other roles.37 Whatever brought them, and whatever else they brought with them, these newcomers arrived with two very American items in their psychic luggage. One was a need, indeed a compulsion, to establish their place in the world. The other was a sense of belonging to a new and unfinished nation. Both were essential for the region’s subsequent cultural florescence.

**The project of the self**

The right to construct a satisfactory life for one’s self by one’s own lights and means was among the personal rights on which the American republic was founded. The rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness fed into and sustained this right.38 Personal development and fulfillment, which we might call the project of the self, was a civic obligation as well as a personal right. The founding fathers held that only those who set themselves to making their place in the world, and acquired the civic virtues that the task imbued in individuals, could keep American society on an even keel and keep its democratic governing institutions properly inflated.39

This project of the self was generally straightforward in the early days of the republic because people had to find themselves and create their places in communities that were for the most part small, predictable, and as Wiebe described them, “homogenous [and] enjoyed an inner stability that the coming and going of members seldom shook.”40 The local economy provided the material resources for social self-creation; local society provided the social resources; local norms provided the moral guidance; and successful local citizens provided the models. The range of personal strategies and the scale of realistic aspirations were limited by this localism, and the possibilities of innovative self-construction were scant. On the other hand, the local instruments of self-construction were simple enough for most individuals to grasp and use.

The middle decades of the nineteenth century undermined the localness and the simplicity of the project of the self. As American cities grew and the national territory expanded, the lure of distant opportunities drew people away from their birthplaces. Conversely, corporations and other great institutions intruded on local communities, weakening their hold on individuals, even on individuals who never left them.41 Traces of this weakening of the local permeate the writings of Henry David Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Thoreau’s high place among American thinkers derives largely from how he disentangled his life from the lives of his neighbors and his thoughts from their thoughts. Once free of the grip of the local, the misanthropic Thoreau turned inward, but his friend Emerson advised his readers to turn outward instead and forge what he called “an original relation to the universe.”42

Many Americans had no choice but to form an original relation to the universe. The new corporations and the national economy they created thrust individuals onto a wider life stage regardless of their wishes. Many people found themselves in surroundings they did not understand, in lives they could not manage.43 This disorientation in new places and new lives became a preoccupation of late nineteenth-century American thought and a prominent theme in its literature, as attested to by the popularity of such novels as Theodore Dreiser’s *Sister Carrie* and the Oz novels of Frank Baum.
The outward turn created many new opportunities to shape one’s own life, however, and it introduced a new plasticity into the project of the self. In their drive for profits and markets, corporations created new ladders of mobility for the eager manager and the imaginative mechanic. The new universities and museums of the era allowed greater scope for lives founded on scientific learning and scholarly pursuits. National markets for arts and letters multiplied opportunities for building lives on talent in these fields. The easier accumulation of assets by the middle and upper classes of a now-wealthier nation expanded opportunities for travel, for disinterested learning, and for the pursuit of avocational interests. The new railroads, telegraph, and mail service that allowed commerce and industry to penetrate so many of the nation’s heretofore inaccessible regions also permitted individuals to tap the resources of many new places in their self-creation, especially Western places on newly opened frontiers where so little had yet taken firm form. New ideals of inner growth and fulfillment, born of European Romanticism and filtered into American thought, added a more expressivist dimension to the personal project.

As its field of opportunity expanded and the project of the self assumed new interior dimensions, it remained an intertwined personal and social obligation. Transcendentalism stressed how the search for their own well-being joined individuals together in socially beneficial union. The popular utopian literature of the late nineteenth century was at pains to show how the redemptive possibilities open to the individual were linked those available to society as a whole.

Both practical progressives like Walter Lippmann and those of a more romantic inclination like Scott Nearing insisted that creating a worthwhile life for oneself and the great social projects that industrialism forced on the nation, projects that Walter Lippmann called “the work of the age,” were the private and public sides of the same task. It is useful to note that Lippmann’s concept of work of the age is similar to regulation theory’s concept of social regulation. And in late nineteenth-century America, both involved adapting society to what the nation’s industrial capitalism had engendered: great cities, a consumer economy, great-power status, and all their consequences.

The work of the age

The social and cultural work that industrial capitalism forced on the nation had many facets. Simply understanding the many dimensions of American newness was one of them. Writers like Dreiser, Edith Wharton, and William Dean Howells probed the nation’s new social mores. Painters like Thomas Eakins and Winslow Homer sought telling visual clues to the new America in its bourgeois parlors, farm fields, and even in its hospital operating theaters. The utopian Edward Bellamy searched America’s new social landscapes for paths to public harmony and personal perfection. Understanding was just the prelude, however. The work of the age also meant building and creating on that understanding. Institutions to manage new forms of education and administer newly professionalized services had to be constructed. New lifeways that complemented the new opportunities for working and consuming had to be created. Social classes needed the kit for their new roles in a changing America. The national elite required values that would allow it to lead a new great power onto the center stage of world affairs; the enlarged middle class needed habits and values that would fit city life and bureaucratic work; the working class needed norms and lifeways suited to mill towns and the factory districts of large cities.

Although sometimes exhilarating, coming to grips with all the newness often provoked anxiety and sometimes even a sense of dire urgency. Observers like Herbert Croly, Henry Adams, Frederick Jackson Turner, and even Theodore Roosevelt fretted about the disappearance of old opportunities for personal accomplishment. Anomie and kindred threats to the spirit, they feared, were waiting to pour into the void. Some observers feared that the spread of mechanism and the rise of new and unfair forms of competition were injecting a debilitating coldness toward
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Others saw the vividness of everyday life disappearing beneath the soot of industry and the pallor of office complexions. Moreover, many contemporary observers feared that society’s guideposts were disappearing faster than new ones could be erected. Henry Adams, on whom this fear weighed heavy, described an America that was “wandering in a desert more sandy than the Hebrews had ever trodden about Sinai.” The nation, he wrote, was trying “to realize and understand itself” and, earthworm-like, “catch up with its own head, and to twist about in search of its tail.”

These many challenges forced individuals to view the world differently and to live in new ways. In responding to the need to understand the nation taking shape around them, the learned and the inquisitive built the stock of knowledge on which the changing nation depended. In seeing the nation in new ways, the perceptive devised ways for others to see it. By living in new ways, forward-looking men and women created life models for others to emulate. When the railroad joined Santa Fe to the rest of America in 1880, the region and its features became more readily available for projects of self-creation and, through those personal projects, for the work of adapting America to the newness of its circumstances.

The individuals who would give the Santa Fe Style much of its form and substance began arriving in the region. Most came as adults, already intellectually formed, usually by experiences in large cities, major universities, or other culturally fecund places. Many of these individuals were already engaged with the era’s challenges, and they brought that engagement with them. Their contributions to the Santa Fe Style were part of life work that looked beyond Santa Fe and the region for its orientation and its audience. Their wider frame of reference did not make these individuals cosmopolitan in Merton’s sense of the term, that is, worldly-wise sophisticates with only superficial local connections. Their attachments to the city and the region were undoubtedly genuine, but so was their sensitivity to their extra-regional reference groups: their readers, buyers, agents, patrons, reviewers, and friends elsewhere. Its founders’ wide frame of reference accounts for many of the Santa Fe Style’s striking features including its sustaining matrix of national institutions; its sensitivity to national aesthetic trends; and how it took the nation as a whole as the audience for its performances, the market for its products, and the student for its lessons.

This wide frame of reference also accounts for why the style had little resonance among region’s Native American and Hispanic inhabitants. The elaboration of this new style in their midst clearly had many consequences for these inhabitants. The socio-cultural challenges of urbanization and industrialization to which the style was a response, however—challenges such as the chilling of the national spirit, the need to live tastefully in a world of shoddy goods, and the need to adapt to office–or factory-centered working lives—had little bearing on their lives. Hence the style had little meaning for them as cultural expression per se.

Botkin understood that key individuals could serve as magnifying lenses in cultural studies because the fine workings of a cultural process could often be seen reflected in their lives. Botkin had folk cultures in mind, but given the importance of individual outsiders in creating the Santa Fe Style, his insight appears useful for our purposes. Their lives should reveal how national challenge and personal response worked in and around Santa Fe and, more generally, how reflexive regionalism works as both an engine of cultural invention and an instrument of capitalist regulation. Hundreds of individuals made identifiable contributions to the Santa Fe Style, and more than twenty were considered for scrutiny. In the end, seven whose lives seemed especially illuminating were selected: the writer Charles Lummis, the painter Ernest Blumenschein, the designer Mary Colter, the architect John Meem, the salonist and diarist Mabel Luhan, the administrator Edgar Hewett, and the lawyer and capitalist Frank Springer. Each made important contributions to the Santa Fe Style. Each has been the subject of at least one full-length biography that treats both life and work. Together these individuals reveal many of the national
challenges to which Santa Fe's reflexive regionalism responded. They also offer a diverse sample of the life projects from which the Santa Fe Style grew.

**Charles Lummis: Humanizing the American spirit**

Charles Lummis forged the first clearly reflexive cultural links between Santa Fe and the rest of the nation. Lummis was born into the family of a prominent New Hampshire clergyman in 1859. Like many sons of his state and social stratum, Lummis went to Harvard, where he absorbed distillates of the era’s optimism about national achievements and its misgivings about the loss of old virtues. Bright but eccentric, rambunctious, and free-spirited, Lummis never fit in at Harvard and eventually left to become a journalist. He was working for a newspaper in Chillicothe, Ohio in 1884 when Harrison Grey Otis, the publisher of the fledgling Los Angeles Times, saw one of his pieces and offered him a job. Ever the eccentric, Lummis set out on foot from Ohio to his new job in California. Ever the self-promoter, he arranged to send dispatches on his adventures ahead to his new paper and back to his old one.

Lummis’ first dispatches from the Upper Rio Grande region played to the negative racial stereotypes that were still so much part of its national image. In fact, Lummis’ initial descriptions of the region’s inhabitants were fiercely and gratuitously cruel. He found everything about the lazy and dirty “greasers” he encountered to be repulsive, even their food. “Not even a coyote will touch a dead Greaser,” he wrote, “the flesh is so seasoned with the red pepper they ram into their food in howling profusion.” As the nearly penniless young traveler continued through the region, however, he repeatedly benefitted from local hospitality, offered, he later reported, without hesitation or fanfare by those who had little to spare. Lummis had an epiphany; he beheld a people untouched by the rest of America’s increasing materialism, competitiveness, and coldness of spirit. Native New Mexicans still appreciated the non-material aspects of life, had an intact sense of dignity, treated each other with a respectful warmth, and enjoyed the comforting certainties of an ancient faith. The grandeur and beauty of their land and the luxuriant warmth of its abundant sunshine, he concluded, nurtured these virtues in them. The region-celebrating books that Lummis wrote in the 1890s, including *A New Mexico David*, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*, and *The Enchanted Burro*, were well received by a reading public wearying of the psychic costs of material achievement. With these books, Lummis began transforming the region in the national imagination from an alien and inferior place into a region where deep indigenous wisdom and humane traditions immunized against America’s new ills of the spirit. In so doing, Lummis, in Cline’s words, “plant[ed] the seeds of a fertile literary movement.”

When others came to Santa Fe and the region, they came looking for the characteristics that Lummis had found. They found them and further celebrated them. Writers including Willa Cather, Mary Austin (a Lummis protégé), Mabel Luhan, Haniel Long, and John Nichols all wrote of the unique, enduring, and endearing qualities of the people and their land. These writers more deeply etched the regional traits that Lummis described onto the national imagination. They strengthened the new national view of the region as a small, self-contained, alternative America, one free of many common American ills. These writers also turned this view into an elevating and creatively potent regional self-image.

Lummis’ epiphany about the region and its inhabitants, although dramatic, did not deflect him from his journey or plans; he continued his trek to Los Angeles and became one of the young city’s leading intellectuals, for many years editing the California-celebrating periodical, *Out West*. He built a grand, eccentric Spanish-style house for himself in the hills above the city; it remains a minor tourist attraction to this day. Lummis returned to the Rio Grande region periodically, sometimes for extended stays, and he continued to celebrate it in his writing, but it became just one of the places in the Southwest that figured in his great life project, freeing America from the grip
of what he saw as its deadening Anglo-Saxon heritage. Lummis’ experiences in the Rio Grande region and then throughout the Southwest caused him to reject what was still the most privileged element of national ethno-cultural heritage. He came to see it not as a source of national strength, but as a source of a blinding national arrogance and the root cause of a national unhappiness.62 He wanted all Americans to experience the Southwest, where the “Saxon excrescences” that he detested had so little purchase. He hoped that other Americans would be changed by the exposure to the region, much as he had been, and that a warmer and more humane national spirit would arise.63

Ernest Blumenschein: Creating a reflexive iconography

Painters of the era were drawn to the same master task that drew Lummis: responding to the new America taking shape around them.64 They asked themselves how they might capture the newness for others to see, how they might celebrate the nation’s fresh opportunities and point out its new shortcomings. By using what they found in the region, artists complemented the regional literature with a regional iconography that encompassed a wide variety of painting styles and incorporated many personal idiosyncrasies, but was united in its focus on the people and the landscapes of the region, and in the intensity of its engagement with both. Ernest Blumenschein, among the foremost of these artists in critical standing, was typical of them in many ways.65 He came to the region as a trained artist, already well aware of the era’s pictorial challenges. After growing up in Pittsburgh and Dayton, he learned to paint at the Art Students League in New York City and the Julian Academy in Paris. Blumenschein was already a successful New York-based illustrator and artist in 1898 when a Western illustrating assignment for McClure’s magazine took him and another artist, Bert Phillips, through Taos, a village north of Santa Fe. A broken wagon there forced an unplanned sojourn. While waiting for the repairs, the depictive possibilities of the Hispanic village, the nearby Native American pueblo, and the surrounding land forcefully struck Blumenschein. It was, he later wrote, the first great inspiration of his life. Like Lummis’ epiphany, Blumenschein’s was life changing, but not all at once. He returned to his home in New York City and soon departed for another sojourn in Paris. Although in continual demand as an illustrator by East Coast-based magazines and publishers, Blumenschein began going west to paint in the summers, primarily to Taos, where Bert Philips had already settled and a community of artists was forming. Finally in 1919, some twenty years after what he called his great inspiration, he settled with his family in Taos, where he became one of the most widely recognized and celebrated of the New Mexico artists.

Much as Lummis had done in this writing, Blumenschein portrayed the Rio Grande region as a place with lessons for a nation beset with troubling forms of newness. The brilliant colors of his landscape paintings chided America for its sooty and gray new industrial landscapes. His paintings of the region’s wild places reproached Americans for what Higham called their “vices of gentility,” that is, for spending too much time indoors, for acquiring office pallors, for putting up with confining and crowded cities.66 Many of Blumenschein’s paintings of life in the region had a timelessness that scolded America for giving itself over to heedless change.66 The Native Americans and Hispanics he painted, often in the style of classical painters and sculptors, seemed to project a wisdom that was deeper and more durable than industrial America’s growing stock of technical knowledge.67 Blumenschein was not oblivious to the changes coming to the region, however, and he capitalized on what they could teach as well. He painted the new dams that were bringing the region’s water, its lifeblood, under bureaucratic management. He painted his younger Native American neighbors in their purchased clothing, hinting how America’s commerce was penetrating the lives of even its most spiritually independent and robust inhabitants.
In spite of their focus on local subjects and their physical remove from the centers of American art, Blumenschein and the other painters in the region remained very much part of the larger art world. Many followed the general stylistic shift from academic realism to modernism that occurred in the second and third decades of the twentieth century. Their work often referenced the major promontories in the era’s artistic imagination. Their landscape paintings often recalled Mediterranean landscape paintings, for example. Their intimate paintings of rural village life in the region owed a debt to the era’s popular genre paintings of European peasant life. Georgia O’Keefe’s now-iconic paintings of the region’s rock formations are indebted to paintings of the stone canyons of Lower Manhattan, including some of her own earlier works. These links to the prevailing styles and the iconic places of the wider art world made the paintings of region’s artists readily interpretable as responses to the era’s wider iconographic challenges, and they were valued as such. By the 1920s, Blumenschein and other region-based artists were regularly showing in leading American art museums and were getting high prices for their work in galleries in New York and San Francisco.

These artists created communities as well as art, and in so doing they fashioned a response to one of the foremost life way challenges of the era: how to combine the old advantages of small, self-contained communities with the newer opportunities of a more easily accessible world. The artist communities of Santa Fe, Taos, and several smaller places around the region offered local benefits like informal exchanges of goods and services, friendships reinforced by proximity, and perhaps most importantly, mutual encouragement in creative endeavors. A visiting journalist wrote of Taos that, “The spirit of the place is to make something. Artists affect everyone and everyone affects artists, until Taos is now a whirlpool of self-expression.” These communities also helped their members remain professionally engaged with the national art scene. The Taos Society of Artists, which Blumenschein co-founded, sent works by resident painters on annual rounds to galleries in the nation’s art centers. The Santa Fe artist community had similar arrangements.

Blumenschein and his fellow New Mexico artists thus forged a life model in the region that combined participation in the national art scene with participation in an intimate and creatively fecund local community. They also forged a life in which successful purchase in the national arts economy was advantageous in their cash-poor local economies. The artists could hire models, casual and skilled labor, and domestic help in the low-wage local labor market. They could acquire native artifacts at prices that did not bear the markups that took place when these artifacts entered larger markets. They could buy land in the local property market at prices reflecting the relative isolation of their communities and the modest financial resources of their indigenous neighbors.

Mary Colter: A frame for the exotic

Mary Colter was another artist who helped shape the Santa Fe Style, but unlike the Taos and Santa Fe painters, she did so primarily in response to just one task within the work of the age: fitting the middle class psyche to its new urban and industrial circumstances. Born in Saint Paul, Minnesota in 1869, Colter grew up in comfortable middle-class surroundings. She showed precocious talent in many forms of visual expression and her family sent her to the California School of Design in San Francisco. Coulter’s time at the school, the late 1880s, coincided with the American ascent of the Arts and Crafts Movement. Inspired by John Ruskin and other anti-modern British intellectuals, the movement offered crafted, aesthetically informed artifacts as a counter to the crude and tasteless manufactured products pouring out of the era’s factories. The Arts and Crafts Movement also proposed an antidote to the social ills of industrialization: artisan communities based on simple hand-production of goods. The movement spread to America,
where its social ideal appealed to anti-industrial sentiment and its aesthetic principles made deep inroads into popular taste, especially middle-class domestic taste. Californians drew on their local Hispanic heritage to forge a regional variant of the Arts and Crafts aesthetic, the Mission Style, and Colter absorbed it at the School of Design.

After graduating, Colter took a position in “visual merchandising” at Frederick and Nelson, Seattle’s leading department store. As objectivity and instrumental reasoning rose to new levels in public life, the family home became what Taylor called “the haven of warm sentiment in an otherwise cooling world.” Thanks in part to the Arts and Crafts Movement, the middle-class home was also becoming a place where one might live tastefully in a tasteless industrial world. Colter mastered the art of arranging hand crafted and hand crafted-appearing merchandise into appealing domestic displays that stressed both taste and warmth for the store’s showrooms. Then in 1910 the Fred Harvey Company hired her to design the interiors of the new hotels and restaurants it was building in partnership with the Santa Fe Railroad.

Western railroads were by then promoting the territories they traversed as exotic places of escape and spiritual nourishment for the middle-class, whose “horizons of emotional fulfillment,” in Taylor’s words, were being straitened by bureaucratic routine and behavioral formality. The celebration of the Southwest by Lummis and now others had elicited a favorable popular response and the Santa Fe Railroad threw itself headlong into the strategy. It established a marketing department that vigorously promoted the Southwest as the “Land of Enchantment” and engaged artists, including Blumenschein and others of the Taos colony, to provide art for use on posters, calendars, and brochures. It also engaged the Harvey Company to establish tourist facilities at stops along its route.

These facilities presented a formidable design challenge; what was strange, unfamiliar, and perhaps threatening to middle-class Americans had to be rendered comforting and warm without sacrificing freshness or the capacity to excite. Colter managed it brilliantly by filling her restaurants and hotels with Hispanic and Native American motifs that she reworked just enough within accepted, but still-fresh, Arts and Crafts design principles to achieve a balance between the exotic and the familiar.

In 1926, the Harvey Company acquired the La Fonda, Santa Fe’s foremost hotel, as part of this “Land of Enchantment” strategy; it intended to use the hotel as a base for guided excursions to the Native American pueblos and scenic attractions of the surrounding country. Called on to help renovate the hotel, Colter used the same strategy of wrapping the exotic with the familiar when she designed the hotel’s interior spaces, furniture, and fixtures. She refined Native American motifs, alloyed them with elements from the California Mission Style, and enriched them with her trained and disciplined imagination. She also filled the hotel’s interior spaces with locally crafted objects that referenced the Arts and Crafts aesthetic.

This centrally located hotel became the preferred lodging place for the city’s visitors and a favorite watering hole for its residents. As such, it became a fixture of Santa Fe’s social life and an important part of its aesthetic signature. The many travellers who passed through La Fonda were exposed to Colter’s interpretation of regional crafts and design motifs; it was Colter’s interpretation that many undoubtedly took back home with them. The hotel’s interiors and the objects that filled them were also available to guide the region’s artists, writers, and life-style seekers in the arrangement of their own domestic interiors.

Colter’s work in Santa Fe, although important, was only one part of her creative relationship with the Southwest. She worked and found inspiration in other parts of the region. Membres pottery from southern New Mexico inspired her tableware for the Santa Fe Railroad’s dining service. Navajo sand paintings figured large in her interior designs for Harvey hotels in Arizona. The cliff houses of Mesa Verde in Colorado inspired the enchanting buildings and
follies that she designed for sites on the rim of Grand Canyon. Unfortunately, when rail travel declined, so did the commercial strategy that had given rise to her work, and she saw much of that work demolished in the name of progress. Shortly before her death in 1958, she remarked that perhaps she had lived too long. Colter continued to be honored in Santa Fe until (and after) her death, however. And while recent years have brought a belated recognition of her genius and accomplishments, including the creation of a “national park” architectural style, Santa Fe was the one place where her work quickly transcended its original commercial context and become part of a larger cultural project.

John Meem and the architecture of place

No element of the Santa Fe Style is more recognizable than its architecture, with its earth tones and textures, its rounded, ground-hugging, organic-like forms, and its simple wooden embellishments. And no one contributed more to that architecture than John Meem, Mary Colter’s collaborator on the La Fonda restoration. Born to American missionary parents in Brazil in 1894, Meem came to America as a teenager to attend school in Virginia. After embarking on a banking career in New York City, he contracted tuberculosis and went to high, dry Santa Fe to recover in one of its sanatoriums. While there, he discovered the region’s building traditions. After recovering, Meem went to Denver for formal architectural training. With certificate in hand and a bit of work experience in Denver under his belt, he returned to Santa Fe in 1924 to establish a practice.

Meem soon became the city’s foremost architect and remained so for the next four decades. During his long career, he designed several hundred buildings in and around Santa Fe and played a leading role in restoring the region’s ancient mission churches. A style based on the indigenous adobe building tradition had already emerged when Meem began practicing, but he brought genius to its possibilities. The adobe-based forms of his buildings flow into each like living things. They seem to have sprung from the soil of the region.

Meem innovated in layout as well as form. In most of his hundred or so residential commissions, Meem eliminated the enclosed central patio and the semi-enclosed placiito of the traditional regional dwelling and placed the outdoor living space around the house. In effect, he turned the traditional regional house inside out, which allowed him to more efficiently arrange the entertaining and dining areas, bedrooms, guest quarters, terraces, servant quarters, and garages that affluent modern Americans demanded in their residences. It also allowed him to establish a more sensitive relationship between house and site, and a more intimate one between the interior of the dwelling and the vistas. With his combination of aesthetic and layout innovation, Meem created ideal dwellings for those drawn to the region by its scenic virtues and cultural ferment, dwellings where, what Patricia Brown called “a poetic meeting of the pueblo spirit and the material world,” might take place.

Santa Fe was the center of Meem’s mature life, and he became one of the city’s foremost and most civic-minded citizens. Santa Fe’s horizons were never Meem’s horizons, however. He wrote on architecture for a national readership. He took commissions elsewhere and he worked in styles other than the one he perfected. He was especially adept at a cool, classical modernism that carried only hints of regional references, a modernism that he brought to a peak of refinement in the art museum he designed for Colorado Springs. Meem in fact viewed himself as a thoroughly modern architect. Wilson described Meem’s Santa Fe buildings as Pueblo gateways from the modern world. While they can certainly be viewed as such, Meem also saw his buildings as responses to the architectural dictates of modern times. Eliel Saarinen, an eminent architectural theorist that Meem admired, held that every historical period had a unique form-giving spirit that its architects had to respect. Modern times, Saarinen wrote, demanded elegantly simple buildings
in keeping with the elegance of the mathematics that undergirded so much of contemporary civilization and the simplicity of the basic laws that science was discovering at the heart of natural world. Meem argued that the adobe building tradition of the region aligned so completely with the spare and elegant underlying spirit of the time that it was an ideal base for a modern regional architecture that complemented the reigning international style. Moreover, Meem often gave his buildings, whatever their style, a cool restraint and proportionality that reflected the wider aesthetic sensibilities of the era. As if ratifying the modernist spirit of Meem’s work, the American Institute of Architects made him a fellow in 1950, a year in which modernism, running at full tide, was sweeping all before it.

Mabel Luhan: New elite lifeways and modes of cultural leadership

One of foremost challenges facing Americans of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was forging life models that blunted the assaults of change and capitalized on its opportunities. Blumenschein and his artist colleagues used what they found in the region to forge a life model that capitalized above all on new opportunities for creative endeavors. Mabel Luhan forged another life model within Santa Fe’s cultural project. Hers was built on creative endeavor as well, but also on inherited wealth and established elite status, and on the cultural entrepreneurship that these things made possible.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the American elite demanded of its members high levels of emotional self-restraint and conformity to stringent rules of behavior. Women were expected to focus their energies on supporting their husbands’ careers and nurturing their families; men were to focus theirs on commercial and professional success. Public expressions of personal idiosyncrasy or deep inner feelings were discouraged. Not surprisingly, some members of the elite, especially those with a creative or otherwise strong expressive bent, felt trapped. Moreover, when called on to support the arts, the elite gravitated toward mannerism and academic formalism that reflected its own norms of self-restraint. This made it difficult for the elite as a class to exercise leadership in some of the most dynamic areas of high culture, and for members of the elite to benefit from engagement with fresh art forms.

Mabel Luhan (nee Gansel and then Dodge for a while) was born into a prominent Buffalo, New York banking family in 1879. As a young woman she rebelled against the life prescribed for those of her gender and station, escaping to Paris. The bright and forceful Luhan established herself there as a cultural impresario after the fashion of Gertrude Stein, who came from a similar provincial-elite background (and who had likewise rejected the restraining norms of her upbringing). Luhan then moved to Italy, where she acquired a villa near Florence, her Villa Curtoria, and made it a center for artists and writers. In 1912 she returned to America and settled in New York where, true to form, she acquired a large apartment in Greenwich Village and made it a gathering place for artists and intellectuals, mostly of a reforming or radical bent. Her New York circle included Margaret Sanger, Emma Goldman, Walter Lippmann, and John Reed. In 1917 Luhan visited the Rio Grande region and, charmed, she bought a property adjacent to the Taos Pueblo. Shortly afterward, she made Tony Lujan, a member of the Pueblo, her fourth and final husband. (She changed the spelling of his surname to Luhan when she assumed it.) She envisioned making her property a base for exploring a region where the land, climate, and native lifeways combined to show Anglo civilization a path toward renewal.

She built Los Gallos, a large and rambling regional-style house, on the property, along with several guesthouses, and she was soon playing host to creative luminaries, much as she had done at her Villa Curtoria in Italy. Her New Mexico visitors included Leopold Stokowski, Thornton Wilder, Robinson Jeffers, and D.H. Lawrence. She pointed out the region’s virtues as the subject of creative endeavor and encouraged them to incorporate it into their work. Luhan was especially
anxious to point out how, by incorporating Native American wisdom into their work, her visitors could help in “saving Western civilization from its rotting core.”

Luhan also contributed to the region’s literary identity with several books of her own. Her intimate and reflective *Winter in Taos*, often considered her best, showed how her inner life had become intertwined with the history, seasons, and moods of the place. With this and her other books, she helped strengthen the introspective and quietist element of the region’s literary identity.

In creating a life for herself in the Rio Grande region, Luhan helped establish an elite life model that threw off chaffing bourgeois norms of behavior, political and artistic conventionalism, and an all-consuming commitment to family and commerce, but which did not reject elite prerogatives or elite responsibility per se. Rather, she showed how to use privilege and wealth to explore the creative possibilities of one’s surroundings and encourage such exploration by others. In working out a personal solution to the restrictions of her class, Luhan gave the members of the elite a path to personal liberation while offering the elite as a whole a means of re-exerting leadership across a broad range of cultural endeavors. Luhan also showed that the reflexive regional project under way around her was responsive to her kind of cultural entrepreneurship. Others, especially other women with varying measures of her creative talent, financial means, and force of personality, followed her lead, reinforcing the region’s distinctiveness as a place where the options and responsibilities of wealth could be linked to aesthetic sensibility and the creative urge.

Meem designed houses for those who followed Luhan’s lead. Colter provided an aesthetic of objects and spaces for them.

**Edgar Hewett and cultural entrepreneurship**

Like Mabel Luhan, Edgar Hewett was a promoter of the cultural project underway in the region. But he differed from her, and from all the above-discussed individuals, in that he was not an artist and he made no direct creative contribution to the Santa Fe Style. Nonetheless, his supporting role in so many of the region’s creative endeavors made him as important as anyone in the formation of the style.

One of the striking characteristics of the Santa Fe Style was the suite of formal institutions arrayed around it. Museums, galleries, institutes, and foundations curated, interpreted, promoted, monetized, and reported on the style almost from its beginning. Edgar Hewett, who led two of the core institutions and profoundly influenced many of the others, was a tireless promoter—Brand may have had him specifically in mind when he spoke of calculating boosters lurking in the style’s shadows. Hewett was certainly calculating and he was a tireless promoter of the style, but he was not a booster in the normal sense of the term. While he took steps to aid the city’s commercial growth, promoting commerce was not his foremost aim; he was primarily intent on sustaining Indigenous forms of cultural expression and supporting the emerging Santa Fe Style. Hewett was an entrepreneurial administrator who saw that the region’s cultural past and its present cultural ferment needed modern institutions to promote them—and sometimes to protect them from baser sorts of commercialization. He created and led such institutions, and made a life for himself out of the work.

Hewett’s journey to Santa Fe had many stops along the way. Born in rural Illinois in 1865, he grew up there and in Missouri, where he became a schoolteacher while hardly out of his teens. Hewett’s flair for teaching and his skill at administration led to a succession of ever more important education posts in Missouri, Iowa, and Colorado. By the early 1890s, he was the school superintendent of Florence, Colorado. There, his boyhood interest in Native American lore flowered into a disciplined passion for Native American art and artifacts. He spent his summers exploring the region’s ancient sites in a wagon he fitted out for his expeditions. In 1897, Hewett made a big career leap when he assumed the presidency of the newly established New Mexico
Normal College in Las Vegas. The innovative curriculum that he built around archaeology and native arts brought him national repute, but territorial political machinations cost him his job in 1903. He capitalized on the latter by going to Switzerland to pursue a doctorate in archaeology at the University of Geneva. After completing his course work, he returned to America and established himself in Washington, D.C., where he threw himself into the affairs of the American Institute of Archaeology. Hewett became the secretary of its committee on antiquities, and in that position played key roles in establishing Mesa Verde National Park in 1906 and securing the passage of the important antiquities-protecting Lacey Act of 1907.

While in Washington D.C., Hewett also threw his energies into a proposal for an AIA-supported field school for New World archaeology. When New Mexico offered to host the school and affiliate it with its new museum in Santa Fe, the AIA accepted and invited Hewett to establish the school. Hewett returned to New Mexico in triumph to head both the school and the museum, and the two institutions formed the base of his long administrative career in the state. Under Hewett, the School of American Archaeology and the Museum of New Mexico made a wealth of ancient artifacts accessible to contemporary crafts practitioners, enriching the craft dimension of the region’s cultural project. Hewett made space in the museum available to contemporary artists and arranged for the museum to show their work. With Hewett’s encouragement, other museums were founded in the region, creating more display venues for ancient art, modern art, and sometimes both, drawing the two still more tightly together. Hewett personally encouraged two potters from the San Ildefonso Pueblo, Maria Martinez and her husband, Julian, to produce works modeled on the ancient pottery being discovered at the school’s excavation sites. The two responded with the “black on black” style. Its references to both ancient pottery and modern abstraction in the plastic arts made it popular, especially with avant-garde collectors, and it soon became one of the more recognizable styles of contemporary Santa Fe pottery.

Hewett’s stature within the AIA grew with his successes in Santa Fe. He assumed a seat on the editorial board of its popular national magazine *Art and Archaeology*, and arranged for several of his New Mexico associates to join him on the board. This New Mexico group kept the magazine focused on the region and its cultural ferment. Frequent articles on the field school written by Hewett and his fellow Santa Feans portrayed the region as one where the continent’s antiquity was a forceful living presence and creative urge. The magazine ran articles on the region’s Native American cultures and its recent cultural achievements, advancing Santa Fe’s image as a place where the American past flowed effortlessly into a living regional culture.

Although Hewett was central to the emergence of the Santa Fe Style, it was only one part of the work of the age that he took on. He frequently traveled to Washington D.C. on AIA business and to Mexico to oversee archaeological work. Hewett’s institution-building talents and wide pale of interests even gave him a career in Southern California, and for many years it paralleled the one he built for himself in New Mexico. Between 1915 and 1928 he spent several months of each year in San Diego, where he directed that city’s Museum of Man and held a professorship of anthropology at San Diego State College. Thus while Hewett’s administrative role in advancing the Santa Fe Style was unique, the spacious modernity of the life in which that role was embedded was not unique; it was in fact typical of the lives of the style’s signal contributors.

Frank Springer: Harnessing frontier capitalism to the Santa Fe Style

Anyone looking for the controlling hand of wealth behind the Santa Fe Style would sooner or later come across Hewett’s friend and patron, Frank Springer. Hewett’s accomplishments would not have been possible without the support of Springer, the shrewd and wealthy lawyer who personified the frontier capitalism of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century New Mexico. Springer, reputedly the only person to whom the strong-willed Hewett habitually deferred, often
provided financial support when Hewett’s plans needed it. He provided the political support of a wealthy political insider when that was needed. He was thus the strongest link between the region’s moneyed elite and style’s institutional matrix. However, while Springer may have personified frontier capitalism, he cannot be viewed in simple functionalist terms, that is, as capital’s instrument with regard to Santa Fe Style. Like others whose lives have been examined here, his role in advancing the style was part of his own very personal project of self-construction, and Springer’s project owed as much to his avocational interests as to his place in the edifice of regional capitalism he helped build.

Born in 1847, Springer was the oldest of the seven examined individuals. He grew up in rural Iowa when it was still frontier country and studied at the state university when it was still new. In 1873, with a fresh law degree in hand, he set out for the West, more precisely, for still-wild northeastern New Mexico, where he had been engaged to provide local legal services for the Dutch investment consortium that controlled the Maxwell Trust, a vast tract of land that had devolved from a Spanish land grant. Springer faithfully advanced the consortium’s interests in the legally clouded tract, sometimes deploying force and taking other questionable measures against small farmers and ranchers who occupied land claimed by the consortium. Springer’s work for the Dutch investors over many years brought him wealth, which he enhanced through ranching, land speculation, and other forms of investing.

Springer’s rise made him part of the regional elite and drew him into public affairs in Las Vegas, the local seat of the Maxwell Trust and the largest city in northeastern New Mexico. The territorial government appointed him to head the board of the newly founded New Mexico Normal College in Las Vegas, and it was Springer who hired Edgar Hewett to head the school. Like Hewett, Springer had hunted for Native American artifacts in the fields around his boyhood home, and the boyish diversion matured into a disciplined enthusiasm for Native American cultures in Springer as well as Hewett. This shared enthusiasm brought the two men into a friendship as well as a close alliance in college matters; Springer was a strong supporter of Hewett’s innovative Native-American-arts-based curriculum.

With Hewett’s return to New Mexico in 1907 to assume his important new positions, the two men renewed their friendship and Springer renewed his role as Hewett’s backer. Hewett’s return also intensified Springer’s interest in the Native American past; he participated in the field school’s digs, sometimes throwing himself into the physical labor alongside Hewett and the students. Springer’s wealth and statewide influence now made him an even more formidable backer for Hewett, and as Hewett’s interest expanded to include the entire cultural project underway in the region, Springer’s backing did as well. His political support protected Hewett and the museum from the vagaries of territorial (and then state) politics. His financial support allowed Hewett’s museum and field school to underwrite several significant contributions to the Santa Fe Style, including Carlos Vierra’s photo documentation of Santa Fe’s indigenous architecture; the work of painter and Native American scholar, Kenneth Chapman; and that of the archaeologist Jessie Nussbaum. Springer also supported several of the early steps in the development of a modern regional architecture.

Ironically, the personal fortune that made Springer such a force in Santa Fe’s cultural project also drew him away from it. Springer’s boyhood interest in natural history paralleled his interest in Native American lore, and the former also matured into a disciplined scientific passion, one that focused on crinoids, a class of small marine animals whose fossils he had collected as a boy in Iowa. Throughout his adult life, Springer expanded his fossil collection and used it to work out a definitive crinoid taxonomy. Springer eventually donated his collection to the National Museum in Washington, D.C. and took an apartment in the city so he could continue his taxonomic work on the collection. The publication of his completed taxonomy, a major work, brought him national
renown as a naturalist and drew him into the era’s great debate about Darwinian evolution. (He was a skeptic.) Springer maintained his interest in the Santa Fe project as he grew older, but it faced ever-greater competition from this other part of the work of the age that he had taken on.

Several conclusions might be drawn from Springer’s life. First, it showed that even those near the privileged heart of the capitalist order were not above the project of the self or immune to the tugs of the work of the age. Springer’s life also showed that wealth and power gave individuals special freedom and effectiveness when they took up these intertwined personal and social tasks. Finally, it showed that the relationship between the era’s capitalism and Santa Fe’s cultural ferment had a mutually beneficial reticulate quality. While the Santa Fe Style served the ends of capitalism by opening up new frontiers for profit opportunities and dampening discontents, Springer’s life illustrated how the cultural project that created the Santa Fe Style accessed capitalism’s privileged circles and drew the resources it needed from them.

Conclusion

Examining the lives of key individuals in the formation of the Santa Fe Style has illuminated the contours of reflexive regionalism as it operated in Santa Fe and the surrounding Upper Rio Grande region. The lives of those individuals also illuminated the scope of personal and social challenges on which that regionalism was built. The seven lives do not span the full breadth of participation in the project, however, nor do they reveal all roles on which the project was built. It was the work of hundreds of individuals who contributed to it as painters, writers, curators, journalists, designers, craftspeople, business people, decorators, collectors, and in many other roles. In this breadth of participation, the Santa Fe Style was likely as demotic as the regional cultures of the folklorists. Most of those who made significant contributions to the style were unlike the creators of the older regional cultures in their degree of contact and depth of experience with the wider world, however. That wider world raised them, educated them, sent them to the region, and remained a point of reference for their creative endeavors or other work in advancing the style. Consequently, breadth of knowing reference is among the style’s foremost characteristics. This defiance of what we expect of regional cultures has made it difficult to take the full measure of the Santa Fe Style as a creative achievement as well as to discern the reflexive regionalism that drove it. We would expect such worldliness in a large, modern cultural project, however, if we assume that it will be deeply intertwined with the era’s capitalism. As we saw, it was precisely the worldliness of the Santa Fe project that made it such a useful complement to a capitalism that was itself worldly, needed a worldly host society, and created worldly participants.

In the case of the Santa Fe Style, the demands and challenges of modern capitalism led to something rich and profound because they stimulated a high degree of creativity in individuals. Capitalism, expressing itself as a market for art that visually articulated the challenges of the industrial era, drove and disciplined the personal creativity of the New Mexico artists. Manifesting itself as a market for an aesthetic style that responded to the needs and anxieties of the new middle class, capitalism stoked the talents of Mary Colter and the others who created the crafts dimension of the Santa Fe Style. The book market, responding to the nation’s discomfort over the loss of the softer virtues of rural and small-town life, gave rise to the Santa Fe Style’s literary dimension.

In responding to industrial capitalism, Santa Fe’s reflexive regionalism thus prompted a great variety of personal creative impulses, which produced a style that was as original and spacious as the lives of its foremost creators. It also produced a style that was capable of fitting into peoples’ lives without rupturing their psychic or economic ties with the wider world. This allowed the style to meet the needs of people operating within the ambit of modern capitalism; hence it met the needs of modern capitalism itself.
This conclusion forces a final question on us. Can contemporary America host the kind of vigorously creative and personally meaningful regionalism that produced the Santa Fe Style? Today’s Santa Fe is not encouraging. The city and its region have become a node of highly aestheticized consumption. As Patricia Brown quipped, John Meem made Santa Fe safe for Ralph Lauren.107 While the Santa Fe Style can still garner admiration, the conventions on which it built seem dated, the tropes threadbare. The portrayal of the region’s Hispanics and Native Americans as noble innocents, for example, lost much of its power when more of them found their voices and insisted that they never were such beings. Some challenges to which the style responded no longer seem very pressing. Long ago the elite cast off the Victorian self-repression that the style responded to, for example. On the other hand, some of the challenges to which it responded now seem too great for the solutions that the style once offered. For example, a few crafted artifacts no longer seem capable of providing sufficient warmth in a cool world or of making for tasteful living in a tasteless one.

With so many of its referents no longer vital, the Santa Fe Style no longer seems capable of pushing back against the commercialization that has always accompanied it. The style has become formalized and glossy under the imperatives of a commerce that now seems to dominate and define it. So rendered, the style hangs heavy on the city and weighs down its spirit. Moreover, aestheticized consumption in Santa Fe has leapt past the city’s eponymous style; expensive baubles of every conceivable cultural provenance—Italian clothing, African textiles, Japanese porcelain, and rare European books, to name but a few—threaten the style’s privileges in the city as they crowd into its shops and galleries.108 It is hard to imagine today’s intensely commercialized Santa Fe inspiring the genius of a contemporary Meem, Colter, or Blumenschein.

Nor at first glance does the today’s capitalism seem to offer much cause for optimism about individual creative potential. Hochschild has noted how consumer capitalism seems intent on forcing itself ever deeper into our interior lives and rearranging what it finds there for its own benefit.109 It would not welcome threats to its plans for us. On the other hand, the project of the self remains alive in the lifestyle choices, experiments with identity, and personal narrative options that Giddens identifies as hallmarks of contemporary life.110 Moreover, Hochschild shows that many people perceive and resent profit-driven attempts to colonize their inner lives. Such resentment can be a powerful creative stimulus; resentment, sometimes of a very personal kind, over the impact of industrial capitalism provided creative fuel for the Santa Fe Style a century ago. Perhaps more Americans will seek out places where the prospects for pushing back this frontier of inner colonization seem bright. And perhaps they will enhance these places with reflexive cultural invention of the sort that Santa Fe and its region saw in the past, invention that links the project of the self with the work of the age.

Reflexive regionalism is unlikely to take exactly the same forms today as it did in Santa Fe a century ago. As noted, many of the broader challenges to which the Santa Fe Style responded have lost their sharp edge; many of its expressive forms seem dated. But new problems and challenges have certainly sprung up to give us the work of our age. Some have arisen from the long operation of established accumulation strategies, some from the newer strategies of a more globalized and technology-enhanced capitalism. Environmental problems will undoubtedly loom larger in any contemporary reflexive regionalism, as will lifeway challenges posed by new technologies and by new uses of labor in more internationalized and finance-dominated production settings.

Perhaps places like Boise, Idaho; Asheville, North Carolina; Bozeman, Montana; Chattanooga, Tennessee; and Charleston, South Carolina, and their surrounding regions offer the most obvious prospects for contemporary reflexive regionalism. They all have a strong sense of their history, of their physical setting, and their uniqueness as communities, but each also has a
worldly spirit; many of their inhabitants, often from elsewhere, are in touch with the wider world and perceive its challenges. In other words, such places appear to have the resources for reflexive regionalism, much as Santa Fe once did. Perhaps the energy that emanates from these places today comes from reflexive regional projects getting underway.

Any cultural invention occurring in these places will be intertwined with capitalism from the beginning, to be sure, but so it was in Santa Fe. The real danger is not capitalism per se, but its more culturally destructive manifestations. There is the danger, for example, that incipient place-based cultural initiatives will immediately be overwhelmed by commercialization and place promotion that are more alert than ever to the opportunities that lay in cultural uniqueness. In other words, instead of supporting creativity, as commercial interests did in the early days of the Santa Fe Style, there is the danger that they will smother it at birth. If such initiatives do escape this fate and begin to develop into rich and deep reflexive cultures in a few favored places, they face the danger of becoming exclusive, their bounty available only to those who can withstand the consequent rise in land prices and then the ensuing design codes and growth-management initiatives that further raise land prices—what happened in Santa Fe.

One possible approach to countering these threats is to encourage reflexive regionalism wherever it shows signs of creating placed-based responses to the challenges that contemporary Americans face. Such encouragement might be incorporated into the livable-city initiatives now underway in so many places. The aim should be to foment as many reflexive regional projects as possible. In this way they might become common, and their fruits widely available instead of rare, precious, and intensely commodified. All cities and regions are unique in their histories, identities, and settings. Perhaps in that uniqueness, many places, including not particularly prepossessing ones, can find the resources on which a reflexive regionalism builds. After all, what part of America seemed less in possession of useful cultural resources in 1848 than the Upper Rio Grande region? If this is so, if such useful resources are in fact widely available, perhaps the kind of reflexive regionalism that once created the Santa Fe Style will give a spirit-sustaining cultural richness to many, perhaps even most, of the places where we lead our lives.
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