

financial gain were endangering their existence. He gave historical context to his argument – citing the consequences felt by guilds and artists following the Industrial Revolution:

The machine as such quite logically and methodically resulted in the rapid and certain destruction of the Guilds, leaving a huge mass of labor power personified by the unattached artisans who became the unskilled specialists of the machine.

As time progressed it became apparent that while the machine was providing certain comforts of living, in its development there were many inconsistencies and deficiencies ... This tremendous gap from the first onslaught of the Industrial Revolution to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century amongst other things, brought to the attention the more romantically inclined that while it was true that a design could be made for the machine to produce a superior cooking utensil or a better pail, ax, etc., it did not speak for the soul.<sup>173</sup>

Macchiarini believed that the Industrial Revolution “liberated the artist to do his art work by taking over the production of functional items.”<sup>174</sup> He argued that artists were not equipped to compete with manufacturers, and in doing so placed an unfair financial burden on the artist. Additionally, stores misrepresented the goods they are selling by not having proper labeling, allowing the customer to “mistake a mass-produced article for one handcrafted.”<sup>175</sup> Macchiarini advised:

[I]t would be nice to be able to have a Cadillac. But being unable to afford it I should not have it. However, I can get along just as well with a Ford, but no one should sell me a Ford for a Cadillac. The artist doesn't deprive the masses with high prices. In fact he gives to them even though they may not be financially able to own artwork. They are in contact with that which is sold and that which is displayed in the museums and galleries.<sup>176</sup>

Such arguments put Macchiarini at odds with De Patta. In fact, they often debated the role of production and accessibility of craft to the public. They agreed that quality workmanship and good design was important in all wares. However, they had differing opinions regarding the stature of the designer and the craftsman. Further, De Patta wanted her work to be available to a wider audience, even if it meant using a production line to accomplish this goal. That being said, De Patta was unwilling to sacrifice quality for the increased quantity. Her desire was that, “[p]roduction processes [would] someday be utilized for fine quality, rather than for cheapness and for the corrupted reproduction of handmade articles – and will then bring pleasure to the vastly greater numbers of people.”<sup>177</sup> This was contrary to Macchiarini’s beliefs that production compromises the artist. According to Macchiarini, “I [did] not believe in the mass production of art or jewelry at all. That’s my philosophy; I’m stuck with it. It’s kept me poor. I’ve never made a lot of money.”<sup>178</sup>

A member of MAG since its inception, Macchiarini knew there was a need for an organization to support the economic interests of metalsmiths. As both a businessman and artist, Macchiarini saw firsthand the challenges facing artists in the 1930s and 1940s. Having faced the clubs of policeman and blacklisting by the U.S. government, Macchiarini was a witness to the attack on open and free exchange of ideas. An artist-advocate, he recognized a lack of protection for studio jewelers and infused MAG with union-like qualities. His prominence in the San Francisco artist community provided additional credibility to MAG. Experienced as a community organizer, Macchiarni had

the background and the knowledge of how to technically establish an organization.

Recognized by his peers, he was elected MAG's first treasurer.

His tenure with MAG was short-lived. After serving as Treasurer for a year, Macchiarini resigned from the organization on June 7, 1952, citing irreconcilable differences. (figs. 61-62) Similar to his debates with De Patta, he disagreed with the direction MAG was going. Although evidence suggests that he later rejoined MAG in 1955, and served as juror for the organization, Macchiarini's legacy to MAG and the American studio jewelry movement is evident in the endurance of MAG itself. He proclaimed in 1995, "I am proud to be one of its originators. Despite my differences, I do believe the [G]uild has performed many services for artists. I know that it can expand and improve for the benefit of art in general."<sup>179</sup>

### **Irena Brynner**

Irena Brynner, an internationally recognized artist-jeweler, benefited the most through her association with MAG. A trained painter and sculptor, Brynner had less than two years of jewelry experience at the time of MAG's founding. Her development as an artist-jeweler can be attributed to the successful implementation of the Guild's mission and the dynamic milieu that surrounded her. Some of the most important modernist jewelers and artists of the era shaped Brynner's oeuvre. While her initial contribution to MAG's formation may have been limited, her move to New York City and subsequent

move to Switzerland spread MAG's reach beyond the West Coast. In doing so, Brynner caused expanded MAG's international reach.

Born in Vladivostok, Russia in 1917, Irena was the double cousin of the actor Yul Brynner.<sup>180</sup> In 1931, her family fled Russia to Manchuria in Northern China where Brynner would begin studying art in Dairen and Harbin.<sup>181</sup> Recognizing her talent as an artist, in 1936 Brynner's parents sent her to study art and sculpture at the École Cantonale De Dessin et D'Art Applique (Cantonale School of Design and Applied Art) in Lausanne, Switzerland.<sup>182</sup> By 1939, Brynner and her family returned to Manchuria where she began teaching children at the Mary Knoll mission in Darien.<sup>183</sup> She also taught private classes in painting and sculpture. Following the death of her father in 1942, a Swiss Consul General, Brynner and her mother found themselves in a very precarious situation. Posthumously, the Japanese denounced her father as a spy and caused Brynner and her mother to flee to Beijing.<sup>184</sup> Following the end of World War II, Brynner and her mother left China and moved to San Francisco at the encouragement of their Darien friends who, by then, lived in the United States.<sup>185</sup>

On her arrival in San Francisco, Brynner began teaching art at various private schools, including St. Paul, St. Vincent de Paul, and St. Bridget.<sup>186</sup> Seeking more creative fulfillment, she continued her studies in sculpture under WPA veterans and sculptors Michael Von Meyer and Ralph Stackpole. Having already been trained in the classical tradition in Switzerland, Brynner was introduced to modernism and abstract art in California.<sup>187</sup> She made small maquettes in clay and began for the first time working in stone. She described the sculpture she carved in stone as abstract art.<sup>188</sup> During this

time, Brynner was trying to figure out ways to earn a better living. A Catholic, Brynner consulted a priest who told her, “[y]ou do sculpture! Well, that’s marvelous. People always die, so just learn to do lettering.”<sup>189</sup> She did not follow his advice, but instead enrolled at the California Labor School, where she took drawing and ceramics.<sup>190</sup> Brynner thought ceramics would be a viable medium for her; however, she later felt that it was too restrictive.<sup>191</sup> While at CLS, she discovered Claire Falkenstein’s sculpture and jewelry. Falkenstein’s jewelry showed Brynner that the relationship between the two media was intertwined.<sup>192</sup> This realization set Brynner off on her journey toward becoming an artist-jeweler. In 1949, Brynner was hired by Caroline Rosene to work as her apprentice for 60 cents per hour.<sup>193</sup> Due to personality conflicts and Brynner’s inexperience, the arrangement only lasted two months.<sup>194</sup> Then Brynner went to work for jeweler and ceramist Franz Bergmann, whom she credits for introducing her to the fundamentals of metalsmithing.<sup>195</sup> Bergmann hired Brynner only to prepare for the Christmas rush, so he could concentrate on his pottery. Step by step he showed Brynner how to make a piece of jewelry from start to finish. Unlike her experience with Rosene, Bergmann had patience and supported Brynner’s efforts. Although the position was also short-lived, Bergmann encouraged Brynner to continue studying jewelry-making.<sup>196</sup>

In January of 1950, she began taking adult-education classes to garner technical expertise.<sup>197</sup> This included taking a course with Bob Winston at the California College of Arts and Crafts where she learned the process of wax-working.<sup>198</sup> Due to limited funds, Brynner set-up her studio with repurposed equipment including an ironing board used as a soldering bench, a washing machine motor for polishing, and a Bunsen burner and

small alcohol torch for a source of heat.<sup>199</sup> (fig. 63) Through trial and error, Brynner learned the art of jewelry-making. Three months later, Brynner was selling selected pieces of works at Casper's, a local furniture store. Shortly thereafter, she began selling her work at Nanny's, a contemporary jewelry store in San Francisco.<sup>200</sup>

Brynner's early works were made of the rudimentary materials that all novice metalsmiths used – silver sheets and wire. At first, she used simple forms and shapes, but as her work progressed, it became more of sculptural and abstract. She referenced architecture as her inspiration. (fig. 64) Around this time, Brynner attended a meeting alongside Bergmann and Rosene, which would lead to the formation of the Metal Arts Guild. As a founding member, Brynner believed that the organization was “one of the most satisfying and successful craft organizations [she] ever belonged to.”<sup>201</sup> She thought of MAG as a “real professional organization” whose many members supported efforts in her career.<sup>202</sup> In fact, it was during a 1952 College of Marin silversmithing class for MAG artists that Brynner discovered forging. Brynner recalled:

In 1952 or 1953 a group of us from the Metal Arts Guild got together and decided to have a seminar in silversmithing on large hammered-out, or forged, hollow ware pieces. That was a great experience. I learned how, in the process of forging, one can force metal to stretch and shrink. I soon began applying this experience to my own jewelry-making.<sup>203</sup>

Brynner's insight into this new technique expanded the scope of her design options, and led her to develop a new direction in jewelry. Additionally, she began to use gold for its malleability. Her discovery led her to develop a series of forged necklaces. Brynner, no

longer limited by the gauge of wire and sheet, could now shape metal into new forms.

(figs. 65)

Brynnner regularly participated in MAG's outdoor art festivals, where she built up her clientele and interacted with Bay Area artists.<sup>204</sup> She discussed her interaction with MAG members:

Margaret De Patta was our guide. And we would meet and we would discuss the designs and how you come to the designs. And sometimes, we disagreed completely, you know. Taking Margaret De Patta, Bob Winston, and myself and Merry [Renk], we're all very different. But we were all just the young ones, you know. We didn't have such a strong voice as Margaret had.

But she initiated us to start doing some forging and holloware. And really those seminars of holloware gave me this idea that, you know, I want to hammer things and I want to forge things. And we were really like a family. And all those art festivals, you know, where we all got together to organize, to build the whole thing, to put together to jewelry.<sup>205</sup>

Although Brynnner respected De Patta as a mentor and as resource on modernist design, Brynnner developed her own aesthetic based on the notion that jewelry was sculpture for the body. Their view differed when it came to theoretical approach to design:

Margaret was very much a Bauhaus school person. And she always said, 'Well, you know, if you put a circle here and you put a triangle there, you have to be able to explain why you are doing that.' [Brynnner] said, 'I can't, Margaret. I live by intuition. I do my work by intuition. I can't explain. I feel that's where it belongs. That's why I do it. That's all I can explain.'<sup>206</sup>

This intuition led Brynnner to develop her own unique ideas about jewelry, and she was able to make innovative contributions to modernist American studio jewelry movement.

Brynnner, believed in simplicity of line and form; however, she wanted to express

femininity and the organic nature of the material. Her jewelry enveloped the body. Brynner believed that modernist jewelry should be functional, but it should also “augment the attractiveness of the wearer.”<sup>207</sup>

During this time, Brynner began to be recognized by leading educational institutions, art museums, and publications. She received her credentials from the California State Board of Education to teach adult education classes.<sup>208</sup> By 1956, she participated in several solo and group shows in San Francisco including: the M.H. de Young Museum; Nanny’s Gallery; and the San Francisco Art Festival. By this time, two pivotal shows in Brynner’s career took place on opposite coasts, one in Beverly Hills and the other in New York City. In 1953, her cousin Yul hosted Irena for a solo exhibition, *Distinctive Design*, on the Paramount Studios set of *The Ten Commandments*.<sup>209</sup> (fig. 66) It is there that she met Hollywood elites Cecil B. DeMille, Edward G. Robinson, Charlton Heston, and Anne Baxter. Because of this she “discovered the importance of gold because the public I met required a different standard of jewelry. In addition, it wasn’t difficult to calculate that gold jewelry, considering the price of gold at the time, was more profitable than silver. From that point on, everything I made was in yellow gold.”<sup>210</sup> The exhibition remained on display for a week at the Beverly Hills Hotel.<sup>211</sup> In 1956, *Craft Horizons* published an article on Brynner and her jewelry. At the same time, she was cataloging her work and selling it to 50 to 60 galleries and stores across the country.<sup>212</sup> (fig. 67) Already selling in New York gallery Georg Jensen, she flew to New York City to find new venues for her work. She met with *Craft Horizon’s* editor Conrad Brown who introduced her to several buyers and stores.<sup>213</sup> The jewelry shop, Walker &



Eberling agreed to host her first New York show in the Autumn of 1956.<sup>214</sup> This particular store sold traditional jewelry, and they gave her beautiful gemstones and the freedom to design as she saw fit. She made close to 60 pieces.<sup>215</sup>

By 1957, Brynner decided that she wanted to move to New York. She had already been well received there, and she loved the creative energy of the city. She and her mother left San Francisco for Manhattan. They moved to 46 West 55<sup>th</sup> Street, where she would open up her shop a year later. (fig. 68) David Campbell of Walker & Eberling sent her contractors, at his expense, to build her a little shop inside the lobby of her apartment building.<sup>216</sup> The move not only changed her scenery, but changed the direction of her work.

New York fire codes prevented Brynner from using oxygen as fuel for her torch, so she had to use alternate sources and methods to make her jewelry. In 1957, she turned to wax casting as a solution. That same year, Brynner saw the retrospective exhibition on Spanish architect Antoni Gaudí at the Museum of Modern Art, and began appropriating Gaudi-like forms into her jewelry. Brynner's work went from being geometric, contemporary, and architectural to organic in shape.<sup>217</sup> This was a due in part to the subconscious influence of Gaudí and in part to her working in wax.<sup>218</sup> (figs. 69) It is not until 1969, that Brynner found a new piece of equipment to solve her torch issue. She discovered the Henes Water Welder for electric soldering. The "tool allowed her to work directly with metal ... results reminiscent of lost-wax casting, that is, lacy patterns, soft rolled edges, and melted forms. Consequently, her style became even more sensuous and

fluid, often connoting plant life.”<sup>219</sup> (figs. 70) Such work became an Irena Brynner signature.

Between 1958 and 1964, Brynner’s career exploded. Her work was in a solo exhibition at The Museum of Contemporary Crafts in New York. She participated in the *International Exhibition of Modern Jewellery 1890-1961* at Goldsmiths’ Hall in London, and her work was accepted into the Brussels World Fair for the American section. Additionally, by invite from Victor D’Amico, Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art, Brynner taught metalsmithing and jewelry-making at the Museum’s Institute of Modern Art. She also taught at the Crafts Student League and lectured throughout the United States and abroad. In 1979, Brynner wrote *Jewelry As An Art Form*, a book that chronicled her early career and provided instruction on design and techniques.

Continuing to be recognized for her work, Brynner was awarded the Gold Medal, Bavarian State Prize at the International Handicrafts Fair in München, Germany in 1963. Over the years, she participated in many solo and group exhibitions including: 25 *Worldwide Known Artists*, National Museum of Darmstadt, Germany (1964); *American Craftsman*, Museum of Contemporary Crafts, New York (1965); and *Objects U.S.A.*, Various National and International Venues (1969), among others. Her work continued to be recognized at exhibitions in the United States as well as in Japan, Switzerland, Russia, and France. (fig. 71)

While Brynner’s work was acknowledged within the arts, she was also a darling of the gold and diamond industries. Her work was highlighted in the International Gold

Corporation's publication, *Aurum*, in 1983 and 1984. She also won several Diamonds-International awards. In fact, in a letter dated October 6, 1967 from the jewelry firm N.W. Ayer and Son, Inc., Donald C. Thompson congratulated Brynner on her "fifth award since 1958."<sup>220</sup> Like Macchiarini and De Patta, Brynner developed her own views regarding the relationship between industry and art. She believed that industry needed the craftsman more than the craftsman needed industry; however, if there was to be a partnership than the craftsman should be appropriately compensated:

Something is happening now between craftsmen and industry which I think should be pointed out. Industry has become interested in the contemporary craftsmen. Specifically, costume jewelry firms are aware that their public is tired of old traditional unimaginative designs and so they have turned to craftsmen for new creativity. It would seem that this coming together is a great achievement. However, in truth the industry is experimenting with new designs at the expense of the craftsmen. Designs are purchased at a nominal fee without any credit given to the craftsmen for the creation. For \$100 or \$200 dollars the industry has any choice it wants of good contemporary designs. I think it is time for craftsmen to agree and stand firm on a code of ethics deadline with industry/craftsmen relationships.<sup>221</sup>

It is evident that such views are a product of her involvement with the Metal Arts Guild. Not wanting to abandon industry all-together, Brynner fought for a balanced business relationship.

Although Brynner reached international acclaim early in her career, her biggest achievement is the contribution she made to the American studio jewelry movement. She was not the first to consider jewelry as miniature sculpture; however, Brynner made the body a functional component of her jewelry. In doing so, she redefined the meaning and aesthetic of modernist jewelry for a new generation of artists. Brynner's success as both

an artist and businessperson must be attributed, in part, to MAG. It was because of the founding MAG members' vision that younger artists, such as Brynner, were able to advance their careers with the support of the Guild in the crowded field of contemporary art jewelry.

Chapter three investigated the contributions of MAG members Margaret De Patta, Peter Macchiarini, and Irena Brynner, to MAG and the American studio jewelry movement. From their connections with leading modernists of the time, to the development of their approach to design, this investigation illustrated De Patta, Macchiarini, and Brynner's artistic achievements and contributions to the field of jewelry. The chapter detailed why and how this trio of artist-jewelers were pivotal to the advancement of modernist jewelry and helped spread MAG's influence beyond California.

## CONCLUSION

As detailed through the careers of Margaret De Patta, Peter Macchiarini, and Irena Brynner, the Metal Arts Guild (MAG) played an important role in the advancement of the careers of California modernist jewelers as well as the broader American studio jewelry movement. While MAG's enduring legacy can be attributed to the iconic magnetism of Margaret De Patta, the Guild drew strength from all its founding members — who believed that the Guild's existence was important and necessary.<sup>222</sup>

The benefit of working together as a group can be traced to the founding members' experiences of coming of age in an era of the expansion of workers rights. Standing at the crossroads of the California labor movement, the artists witnessed the tides of sweeping economic and political change throughout the interwar years. From their involvement with WPA programs and the California Labor School, artists realized that their social and economic interests were not adequately protected. Bay Area studio jewelers were inspired by organizations like the the Artists Equity Association, and established MAG as a platform for metalsmiths to come together to protect their commercial interests and relevance in the age of mass-production and industrial design. In doing so, the Guild promoted jewelry as an art form and established a historical precedent in standards for studio jewelers.

Although MAG formed as a regional organization, the Guild and its members had a much broader impact on the American studio jewelry movement. MAG's reach extended into California institutions such as Mills College and the California College of Arts and Craft, where MAG members taught metalsmithing and jewelry programs.

Throughout the 1950s and into the 1960s, MAG members participated in major exhibitions throughout the United States and abroad, continuing the spread of its influence.

Museums, galleries, and collectors continue to acknowledge MAG's importance in the decorative arts by acquiring the work of MAG members. They include: the Renwick Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution, the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, the Museum of Art and Design, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, the Oakland Museum of California, and the Seibu Museum of Art. Additionally, a few upcoming exhibitions are showcasing the work of MAG members. The Oakland Museum of California and the Museum of Arts and Design are currently collaborating on an Margaret De Patta retrospective exhibition *Space - Light - Structure: The Jewelry of Margaret De Patta* to open February 2012. The Los Angeles County Museum of Art recently opened the exhibition *Pacific Standard Time: Art in Los Angeles, 1945-1980* which showcases the work of Merry Renk, Margaret De Patta, and other MAG members. Finally, the upcoming Museum of Arts and Design's exhibition *Crafting Modernism: Mid-century American Art and Design* will show the work of Margaret De Patta, Merry Renk, Bob Winston, Byron Wilson, Irena Brynner, and Carl Jennings. The recognition of MAG's artist-jewelers at such prestigious institutions confirms the Guild's important legacy within the studio jewelry movement.

This thesis addressed under-researched scholarship pertaining to the Metal Arts Guild of San Francisco and its significant role in the American studio jewelry movement. The continued existence of MAG today is a testament to the foresight of its founding

members. The organization's goals and objectives are as relevant today as they were in 1951. Although this analysis ends in 1964, it is not a statement of the Guild's decline, but rather a demarcation of both the passing of their iconic founder Margaret De Patta and the start of a new artistic period in jewelry. The 1960s marked a time in which studio jewelers were no longer confining themselves to modernist principles or a modern style. Instead, artist-jewelers pushed beyond jewelry as adornment, and experimented with techniques, materials, and radical ideas to develop another form of contemporary art jewelry. While other regional metalsmith organizations formed subsequent to MAG, a national organization for metal artists would not be seen until 1969, when the Society of North American Goldsmiths was established.

The death of De Patta on March 19, 1964, left a void at the Metal Arts Guild and the American studio jewelry community. Her contemporaries acknowledged her significance in the field of modern jewelry, as shortly after her death in 1964, memorial exhibitions were held at the San Francisco Museum of Art and the Museum of Contemporary Crafts in New York.<sup>223</sup> A second show *The Jewelry of Margaret De Patta: A Retrospective Exhibition* was held at the Oakland Museum (now known as the Oakland Museum of California) in 1976.<sup>224</sup> In addition, for a time, the Metal Arts Guild established a Margaret De Patta Design award to recognize selected works in co-sponsored exhibitions with The Oakland Museum.

De Patta once proclaimed that, “[c]ontemporary jewelry must characterize our times.”<sup>225</sup> Such sentiments continue to inspire generations of artists and scholars who reflect on MAG's history as they forge a new path in the field of metalwork. (fig. 72) De

Patta and other founding members have cemented MAG's legacy, as the organization celebrates its 60th anniversary in 2011.



## ENDNOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Toni Greenbaum, *Messengers of Modernism: American Studio Jewelry 1940-1960*, ed. Martin Eidelberg (Paris and New York: Flammarion, Publishers, in association with the Montreal Museum of Decorative Arts, 1996).

<sup>2</sup> Toni Greenbaum, "Body Sculpture: California Jewelry" in *California Design: The Legacy of West Coast Craft and Style*, eds. Jo Lauria and Suzanne Baizerman (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2005), 124.

<sup>3</sup> Marbeth Schon, *Modernist Jewelry: 1930-1960: The Wearable Art Movement* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer Publishing, Ltd., 2004).

<sup>4</sup> Glenn Adamson, "Wearable Sculpture: Modern Jewelry and the Problem of Autonomy" in *Thinking Through Craft* (Oxford and New York: Berg, Publishers in association with the Victoria and Albert Museum, 2007), 22.

<sup>5</sup> Greenbaum, *Messengers of Modernism: American Studio Jewelry 1940-1960*, 15.

<sup>6</sup> In addition to being a sculptor, Alexander Calder is considered by scholars as an early pioneer of American modernist jewelry. Scholars consider his early kinetic sculptures as a precursor to his jewelry development. *Ibid.*, 30-32.

<sup>7</sup> Philip Brookman, Paul Greenhalgh, and Sarah Newman. *Essential Modernism*. (London: V&A Publishers, in association with the Corcoran Gallery of Art, 2007), 19.

<sup>8</sup> Margaret De Patta Handwritten Notes, "Jewelry Design - 20th Century," Margaret De Patta Archives, Bielawski Trust, Point Richmond, CA.

<sup>9</sup> Irena Brynner, interview by Arline M. Fisch, New York, New York, April 26-27, 2001, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

<sup>10</sup> Merry Renk, interview by Arline Fisch, San Francisco, California, January 18-19, 2001, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

<sup>11</sup> Ana Lopez, *Metalworking Through History: An Encyclopedia* (Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 2009), 158.

<sup>12</sup> Peter Macchiarini also befriended painters Diego Rivera and Frida Kahlo when they came San Francisco. Peter Macchiarini, interview by Mary Fuller McChesney, October 18, 1964, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.; Daniel Macchiarini, interview by author, San Francisco, CA, January 29, 2009.

<sup>13</sup> Irena Brynner, interview by Arline M. Fisch.

<sup>14</sup> The New Bauhaus in Chicago was established by László Moholy-Nagy in 1937. It later became known as the School of Design in Chicago in 1938, Institute of Design in 1944, and the Illinois Institute of Technology in 1949.

<sup>15</sup> Merry Renk, interview by Arline Fisch.

<sup>16</sup> In a moderated conversation with Jennifer Shaifer during MAG's 60th Anniversary symposium, Forging Communities, Merry Renk advises that she only had only a single class with László Moholy-Nagy before he died. Greenbaum, *Messengers of Modernism: American Studio Jewelry 1940-1960*, 132.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>18</sup> Wilk, Christopher, "Introduction: What was Modernism?," in *Modernism: Designing A New World 1914-1939*, ed. Christopher Wilk (London: V&A Publications, 2006), 14.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> Gillian Naylor, *The Bauhaus Reassessed: Sources and Design Theory* (Great Britain: Herbert Press Limited, 1985), 50.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 73. The Bauhaus was well-known for its approach to design. During a six-month probationary period, students were required to take preliminary coursework, that lead into studies of geometry, color, composition, materials, tools, fabrics, and nature. Training would later follow a traditional guild system, with the teacher as master and student as apprentice. Students would take workshops in clay, stone, wood, glass, textiles, and metal.

<sup>23</sup> Marbeth Schon, *Form and Function: American Modernist Jewelry, 1940-1970* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer Publishing, Ltd., 2008), 225; Greenbaum, *Messengers of Modernism: American Studio Jewelry 1940-1960*, 104.

<sup>24</sup> Marbeth Schon, *Form and Function: American Modernist Jewelry, 1940-1970*, 198.

<sup>25</sup> Patricia Bayer and Noël Riley, eds., *Elements of Design: A Practical Encyclopedia of the Decorative Arts from the Renaissance to the Present*, (New York: Free Press/Simon and Schuster Inc., 2003), 414.

<sup>26</sup> John Bound and Sarah Turner, "Going To War and Going To College: Did World War II and the G.I. Bill Increase Educational Attainment for Returning Veterans?," *Journal of Labor Economics* 20, no. 4 (October 2002): 785.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> Jo Lauria and Steve Fenton, *Craft In America: Celebrating Two Centuries of Artists and Objects*, (New York: Clarkson Potter Publishers, 2007), 27.

- <sup>29</sup> Bound and Turner, “Going To War and Going To College: Did World War II and the G.I. Bill Increase Educational Attainment for Returning Veterans?,” 790.
- <sup>30</sup> Brandon Hintze, “Cultivating the Crafts: Aileen Osborn Webb and the Instituting of American Craft, 1934-1964” (Masters thesis, The Smithsonian Associates and Corcoran College of Art and Design, 2008), 20.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>32</sup> Harold Brennan, “The School for American Craftsmen,” *Craft Horizons*, May/June 1960, 21-24.
- <sup>33</sup> Paul Boyer, “The United States, 1941-1963: A Historical Overview,” in *Vital Forms: American Art and Design In the Atomic Age, 1940-1960*, eds. Nicole Columbus and Stephen Robert Frankel (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc, Publishers, in association with the Brooklyn Museum of Art, 2001), 38.
- <sup>34</sup> Government documents list Irena’s last name with the official spelling of “Bryner.” In fact, she even had an article with the headline “A Bryner With One ‘N’ to Her Name.” However, several scholars and Brynner herself also spelled her name “Brynner.” For the purpose of this thesis, Brynner will be used. From Carolyn Anspacher, “A Bryner With One ‘N’ to Her Name,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 7, 1951, sec. S; Irena Brynner Papers, 1920-2002, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- <sup>35</sup> Barry Harwood. *From the Village to Vogue: The Modernist Jewelry of Art Smith*. Brooklyn, New York: Brooklyn Museum, 2008, 1.
- <sup>36</sup> Sam Kramer had connections with California. He took his first jewelry course with ceramist Glen Lukens at the University of Southern California. Greenbaum, *Messengers of Modernism: American Studio Jewelry 1940-1960*, 17, 74-76.
- <sup>37</sup> MAG member Irena Brynner moved to New York City in 1957.
- <sup>38</sup> Susan Grant Lewin, “Introduction: American Artists’ Jewelry,” in *One of A Kind: American Art Jewelry Today* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1994), 11.
- <sup>39</sup> The Museum of Modern Art, “Exhibition of Modern Handmade Jewelry Opens At Museum of Modern Art,” press release, September 11, 1946. [http://www.moma.org/docs/press\\_archives/1064/releases/MOMA\\_1946-1947\\_0047\\_1946-09-16\\_46916-45.pdf?2010](http://www.moma.org/docs/press_archives/1064/releases/MOMA_1946-1947_0047_1946-09-16_46916-45.pdf?2010) (accessed November 12, 2010).
- <sup>40</sup> Elizabeth Armstrong, “The Square and the Cool: California Art, Design, and Culture at Midcentury,” *Birth of the Cool: California, Art, Design, and Culture at Mid-Century*. Edited by Karen Jacobson. Newport Beach, California: Orange County Museum of Art. (Munich, London, and New York: Prestel Publishing, 2007), 25.
- <sup>41</sup> Greenbaum, “Body Sculpture: California Jewelry,” 140.

- <sup>42</sup> Donald Albrecht, "Introduction" in *California Design: The Legacy of West Coast Craft and Style*, eds. Jo Lauria and Suzanne Baizerman (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2005), 9; Elizabeth A. T. Smith, "Modern Architecture and its Image in Southern California," *Birth of the Cool: California, Art, Design, and Culture at Mid-Century*. Edited by Karen Jacobson. Newport Beach, California: Orange County Museum of Art. (Munich, London, and New York: Prestel Publishing, 2007), 66.
- <sup>43</sup> Greenbaum, "Body Sculpture: California Jewelry," 140.
- <sup>44</sup> Elizabeth Armstrong, "The Square and the Cool: California Art, Design, and Culture at Midcentury," *Birth of the Cool: California, Art, Design, and Culture at Mid-Century*, 25.
- <sup>45</sup> Greenbaum, "Body Sculpture: California Jewelry," 123.
- <sup>46</sup> Greenbaum, *Messengers of Modernism: American Studio Jewelry 1940-1960*, 108.
- <sup>47</sup> Roger G. Kennedy, "Coaxing the Soul of America" in *1934: A New Deal for Artists*. (London: D. Giles Limited, Publisher, in association with the Smithsonian American Art Museum, 2009), 19.
- <sup>48</sup> Joshua Paddison, "The Great California Labor Art Movement," in *At Work: The Art of California Labor*, ed. Mark Dean Johnson (San Francisco: California Historical Society Press, Publisher, in conjunction with Heyday Books, San Francisco State University, and the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, 2003), 21.
- <sup>49</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>51</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>52</sup> Kevin Star, "Angels Flight: Social Realism Comes to California Art" in *The Dream Endures: California Enters the 1940s* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 233.
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid., 234-235.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid., 236.
- <sup>55</sup> Mark Dean Johnson, "California's Collective Art Culture" in *At Work: The Art of California Labor*. Edited by Mark Dean Johnson (San Francisco: California Historical Society Press, Publisher, in conjunction with Heyday Books, San Francisco State University, and the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, 2003), 50.
- <sup>56</sup> "Scholars and School: New Targets for Bigotry" California Labor School Brochure, San Francisco Subjects Vertical Files, California Labor School papers 1942-1957, San Francisco History Center, San Francisco, California.