

that was the crux (?) of the whole thing, he gave them the rudiments or principles and then turned them loose.

(He gave them some guide lines and then let them do their own expression?)

Right. But here again is the European or the white man's influence.

Art phases have effected his capacity as a creative artist and I felt this is the crux of the whole thing. Now the first portfolio that came out of these four Kiowa's lets say they have already felt the impact of the white man's art. So, but these authorities and experts say that is the acme, if you deviate the style, then it is no longer Indian art. That is where West contends why not let them go on assimilating these influences and this innates something I term distinctly Indian will always prevail, will always be in evidence.

(It shows some place.)

It shows some place in his painting, now if you say this was 35 years ago when these Kiowas were there, if you use that as a standard say if you deviate, where do you stop it? And there's nothing else but decadence (?)

(Because 70 years ago is different than what they were painting 85 years ago?)

That's right. So with any art, now that's evidence of history, as a stagnate and decadence such then and then it dies. Well, to me, I pursue these same lanes yet. That (?) today's Indian artists assimilates outside influence. This art live will continue to live. And I think it will do two things: I've thought of many facets that can go from his own paintings to contemporary paintings. Now these we say if so endowed and let's say in his plight of today if he wanted to make a living, he can't do it by just painting Indian art, so he has formal training or self-taught.