

January 22,  
1968

Mr. Frank Wardlaw,  
University of Texas Press,  
Austin, Texas.

Dear Frank:

A letter to you is long over due, but I have waited to write until I had finished work on the manuscript. It, with a long letter to Mrs. Spielam will go off tomorrow, I hope. To go back to your letter of Dec. 15, I refer to the first item.

Photo permissions. I have so often been warned about this that I am perhaps over cautious. Magazines usually insist on having a release when an individual's name is used. I have releases on perhaps two dozen Navaho people but these do not include all of those whose names we are mentioning. Quite a few of these I could obtain by letter.

Second: The jacket. I quite realize the added cost of using something for a jacket which does not appear in the book. I feel quite strongly that this one I have planned is the right one, but perhaps there are ways to obviate this added cost. One would be to substitute the picture I have for the cover, the black and white one, for the one of the same group which shows the white burro and the two boys on foot. Then, I wonder if a black and white print from a color negative, or even an original black and white, of the blanket w printed on top of a red base IF a printer could come reasonably close to matching that extraordinary red. One other way would be to delete one color plate inside, such as of the fair group, the covered wagon one which is not a very good transparency and besides the child has on a cheap cotton dress with an imitation Guatamala print. What could be as appropriate for this jacket than one of the very finest of Navaho blankets? I would be against a scenic for this book is about the people. Also Philip Hyde's book Navajo Wildlands is just out (Sierra Club), with a fine scenic on the cover. As to the spine of our book, I think the enlargement would put red along the spine and black ink would certainly show well on it.

Third: it was a slip of the tongue when I wrote collotype instead of offset because I knew perfectly well that your books were offset. I had quite made up my mind that Meriden was to do our book. I feel the process well suited to the subject matter. While I still think Hartmann is one of the great printers of the world, and certainly Die Hagia Sophia is just another proof of this. This is a real masterpiece of the printer's art. The color plates are superb, the halftones also and those marvelous text pages just make your mouth water. But there are things to be well weighed. Time being an important one. As the Navaho People are planning all sorts of special things for this centennial year, we just must have the book out of possible. As to relative costs, I have no idea how they would compare. I hope Hartmann would consider the job, even though I said no when he wanted to take my dummy, as it was when he was here last to present to their affiliate publisher. If Meriden does the job, I would like to not only go over my reproduction prints with them, but also go on when they start the run. I have had some experience here and I know that both Ansel Adams and Eliot Porter do this. I believe that Mr. Hugo would be agreeable to this. I am wondering if they have experimented with the addition of a small amount of wax to the ink. This can yield much richer blacks in halftone printing and perhaps in offset also. But I want to be certain that my prints satisfy Mr. Hugo. He might want either softer or more contrasty prints to obtain results in matching my originals. The Umlauf book is a most interesting book but when you lay one page with good dark values over an equivalent in Hartmann's the darks of the Umlauf go very flat. There are so many angles to be judged. I have Hartmann's Japanese Decorative Style, also the Chinese book, which he did for the Cleveland Museum. They are both superlative. I would hope that someday I could have him do one of mine but, perhaps a smaller book? I will return the Hartmann book in a day or so, and many thanks for letting me see it.

Now as to the manuscript. At first I was horror struck when I saw the amount of blue penciling! And my face has been very red over several bad errors of mine. But after going all through I decided it wasn't too bad. There are one or two things for us to discuss, however. I found that you both had evidently not understood my reason for dividing the book into four parts. Also I realize how thoroughly inadequate my Table of

Contents was. My reason has been a natural one, and second it conforms with Navaho thinking and the Navho symbolic Four. This is most important. All the educated Navaho who have seen my dummy have spoken with delight that I had done this; and all the people here say "Oh don't change it". This includes my good friend Winfield T. Scott, who went over several points with me just a few days ago. I have done two things, one rewritten a part of the Preface to give my explanation, and second reworked the Table of Contents. Certainly my headings were stupid and unimaginative. I hope you will like the new ones.

Mrs. Spielman quite naturally has moved a few of the pictures to a different order so that they would be placed with associated text. This would be most natural for an editor whose business is script. But I have put pictures together in an order to make the best visual statement. This of course is my emphasis. There are only a few and I will write her in detail about this. I have finished all the checking and will return everything in a day or two. I just want to go over it all one last time! Believe it or not, on the sixth time through I found several things Mrs. Spielman missed.

The very last thing I have done has been to try to round down the reason for the two spellings Navaho. Many writers have long used the h spelling. The Navajo Tribe officially changed to the j a few years ago and their reason was that it was a Spanish word. All the translations of the Salmeron reference in 1626 have been "Nabahu". I decided to call Dr. Jenkins, the archivist here at the State Capitol. She says that this has been a long battle between the anthropologists and the historians. That the original document which is in Sevilla is spelled with a j, as it should be if a Spaniard wrote it. I have always liked the h spelling because it leaves no doubt as to how to pronounce it. Now, what shall we do? I started to write a foot note on the two spellings which is what got me into this! There are places in the manuscript where reference is made to, for instance, The Navajo Tribal Museum, or The Navajo Tribe, where I must use the j. I also included a list of authors who used the h such as Dr. Washington Matthews, Father Berard Haile, Dr. Kluckhohn, Drs. Leighton and a good many others. What do you think we should do? With nice little question I sign off!

With the best of greetings,