Sample

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Held in Washington, D. C., July 19 and 20, 1951

The first meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1951, was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, on Thursday, and Friday, July 19 and 20, 1951. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,
Mr. Biddle, also

H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

Prof. Belluschi was reported absent in Europe until the middle of September.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The Minutes of the first session of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on June 25, 1951, were approved.

2. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS: The Secretary presented a letter (Exhibit A), requesting help from the Commission of Fine Arts to secure 6,000 lbs. of bronze, which is very much needed by the Association to complete their headquarters building, which is being built at First Street and Indiana Avenue, N.W.

The Commission felt the request was reasonable and necessary, and a report was sent to Mr. Keating accordingly (Exhibit A-1).

3. "OLD GEORGETOWN ACT": Chairman Finley presented a letter which he received from the Architectural Board of Consultants (Exhibit B), complaining of the action taken by the District Commissioners in granting an appeal of Katherine Gibbs, architect, permitting her to use a contemporary style of window in her new house in Georgetown. Also a letter was received from the Secretary of the Board of D. C. Commissioners regarding the granting of this appeal (Exhibit B-1); and also a letter advising that hereafter the Commission of Fine Arts will be notified by the Inspector of Buildings for an expression of their views before an appeal is considered (Exhibit B-2). The Commission took these matters under advisement.

On Tuesday morning, the 20th, the Commission discussed the subject with Messrs. Macomber, Foster, and Winslow, and concurred in their complaint that to have the District Commissioners ignore the decisions of the Board of Review and the Commission of Fine Arts is a distinct handicap in carrying out the law of Congress pertaining to Old Georgetown.

The Commission decided that the Board of Review and Mr. Peets draw up a statement of policy for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts at the next meeting. Also the Commission requested that Chairman Finley have a talk with Commissioner John Russell Young, President of the Board, concerning this matter.

4. S.1712, "Last Farewell:" The Commission considered a communication received from the Bureau of the Budget, with a copy of the Bill (Exhibit C) concerning this proposed Memorial.

Attention was also called to a Memorandum received from Mr. H. T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks, in support of this memorial and of the proposed Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove (Exhibit C-1).

The Commission felt that the design of the Memorial (by A. A. Weinman, sculptc is inappropriate for the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Biddle felt the niche was too small for such a large figure, and recommended a large fountain in front of the niche. The Commission decided that further study should be given to the question of type of memorial at this site.

As for the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, the Commission could not see why the group of trees in question should commemorate Italian soldiers, since the trees are virtually a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, which is a great National shrine.

After some further discussion the Commission disapproved the Bill, and the Bureau of Budget was notified accordingly (Exhibit C-2).

5. STATUARY FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Chairman Finley called the attention of the Commission to a letter (Exhibit D) which he had received from Mr. Leo Friedlander, sculptor, complaining of defects in his equestrian statue entitled "Sacrifice" that was recently cast in Italy and placed as one of two statues at the entrance to the Arlington Memorial Bridge near the Lincoln Memorial; also a copy of a letter from Mr. Friedlander addressed to Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, on the same subject (Exhibit D-1).

The Commission expressed concern over this matter. Mr. deWeldon was asked for his views on the subject and he said:

"Mr. Friedlander came to see me and I went to inspect the bronze castings. One bronze casting is perfectly all right. The other one he mentioned here, Sacrifice, has many cracks, and it is very porous. It has many holes so big that I can put my thumb into them. Apparently the Italians do not have the method of welding cracks and openings. They drill screw holes and put plugs in. But on that figure "Sacrifice" they didn't put the plugs in everywhere where they were supposed to have them.

Mr. Friedlander said he was very much concerned when they hoisted the statue, which was in a crate, in order to give the additional strength to the hoisting; he felt it is not structurally sound. Otherwise, they would have done as with the other three figures--uncrated them on the ground and hoisted them in place.

I feel that a good finish of any American foundry that is familiar with the welding process could easily rectify these faults and put the statue in perfect condition. Of course, it will have to be regilded in places where it is refinished and it also needs regilding in other places. The gilding is by gold leaf. We don't have the mercury method. The law forbids us to use the mercury method

whereby mercury is applied to the bronze and then the gold is applied on top of the mercury and the bronze; an alloy is formed. The gold and mercury make the most permanent gilding. Our method is the regular method. We use varnish, because the mercury fumes are deadly, and the law forbids using that method.

To remedy the situation I would follow Mr. Friedlander's suggestion to get Mr. Bedi, who is probably the most outstanding bronze finisher in this country, to come to Washington and look the statue over and then repair it. He could be paid either by the hour or by the job. The expense would probably be less than $300."

Professor Hudnut, commenting on this matter, said to Mr. deWeldon, "You don't meet the objection that this is a very poor reproduction of the plaster model. That is more serious, isn't it?" Mr. deWeldon replied:

"On certain sections, certain lines of the draperies, where it should be in a perfect curve, they have unevenness now. I think Mr. Bedi can touch up those too. But there is one thing,--the face of the woman doesn't look anything like the plaster model. Apparently some of the men when they made the wax cast have touched up the face of the woman in the group. I saw Mr. Friedlander's plaster model before, and the face doesn't look anything like it. The only way to rectify that would be to make another bronze cast of the face and cut the head off from the figure on the statue and weld the perfect head on and regild it. That would have to be done in Italy, because the model is in Italy. Or they could send the plaster model over here."

Mr. Neild asked if the face of the woman is objectionable to Mr. Friedlander. Mr. deWeldon replied, "It is very objectionable to Mr. Friedlander, and I felt very badly about it too. The face of the woman doesn't look anything like the face of the woman on Mr. Friedlander's model at all."

Mr. Biddle asked if it was a defect in the casting. Mr. deWeldon replied:

"I think probably they made the wax cast and didn't make the mold right away, and the wax was exposed to heat. It looks as if melted butter had run down over the face. You still see some indication of the original form, but it went out of shape to a certain extent. It doesn't look as if it has been touched up after the cast was done but that it is just a poor cast.

"I think the best thing to do would be, in order not to get into any argument with the Italians, to have the plaster model returned to this country and then have a plaster cast made of the head of the woman in this country and then gild it. I mean we can use the Gervani process for gilding which is just as permanent as the mercury process. The Gervani process couldn't be done on the whole group, but it could be used on the head. Mr. Friedlander insists on perfection, and I think it is his right to ask for perfection. Actually, in the torso of the woman there are 42 plugs. I think the best thing to do is to get the plaster cast back and then have the head of the woman recast; weld the cracks."

After further discussion, the Commission decided that a letter be sent to Mr. Thompson, advising him that it is the sense of the Commission of Fine Arts that his organization should recover the plaster cast from Italy, at least the haad of the woman, and have another cast made and regilded in this country; that it is not satisfactory to the artist nor to the Commission of Fine Arts as it is.

Chairman Finley remarked, "Well that will make a good deal of trouble. I think, however, it is due to the artist and also perhaps as a matter of discipline in cases where they have castings done abroad, that they should also arrange for the artist either to go abroad to the foundry or have a representative there."

Mr. Neild said, "It is too important a group not to be corrected if there are faults." Mr. Peets urged that no publicity be given this matter; that it be treated strictly as a matter of the American sculptor's wish to have the work comply with his model. (Exhibit D-2).

As to Mr. Fraser's figures, Mr. deWeldon said: "I inspected those too and they are all right. Mr. Fraser had a representative there all the time to watch the foundry.

6. SEATON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Municipal Architect, presented four sketches for the entrance doors of the proposed Seaton Elementary School. Mr. Coe said, "Regarding a suggestion to place windows over the door, I think that is somewhat forced because it raises the ceiling in the lobby too high; it looks all right on the front but I think it gives the effect of a two-story building where there is no intermediate floor."

Professor Hudnut said that he suggested the windows, but that he did it under the apprehension that it was necessary to have light. Thereupon, on motion of Professor Hudnut, the sketch showing a low transom, marked "Scheme A" was approved by the Commission (Exhibit E).

7. SCULPTURE FOR THE ENTRANCE TO THE AMERICAN RED CROSS ANNEX: Mr. Allen Thorn, Supervising Architect, in company with Mr. C. David Persina, Chief of the Division of Design, P. B. A., General Services, as also Mr. David Eggers, representing his father, Otto Eggers of the firm of Eggers and Higgins, architects of the building, and Mr. Edmond Amateis, sculptor, discussed with the Commission the question of sculpture for the entrance to the American Red Cross Annex, which is being built at 20th and E Streets, Northwest.

Chairman Finley asked Mr. Eggers concerning the project. Mr. Eggers said:

"Frankly, my father asked me to find out first what the objections and what the discussions had been at the last meeting of this Commission before discussing the details of the derivation of this motif that we are trying to place on the Red Cross building. We have gone into some detail on it, and I have some information here that maybe you gentlemen have not seen, so that perhaps I ought to place that before you before we go into any lengthy discussion. This is a photograph of the original sketch. Last winter the time came to work out the sculptural detail for the main entrance to the building, and my father developed this scheme to give to Mr. Amateis a more exact idea of what his intent was for the sculpture over the main entrance. Now you notice that this conflicts slightly with what we show on our rendering. We show the two figures back to back. They

were turned in, I should say, on our rendering, of which we have a picture here. But in the further study of the composition it fell apart slightly. So Mr. Amateis took the sketch and developed a quarter-scale model of each figure back to back, adjacent to a window over the doorway."

Thereupon Mr. Amateis explained his ideas regarding the models, saying:

"I can only follow through what Mr. Eggers has said--that in the first sketches by Mr. Eggers he made the figures faced in and they were thus shown on his perspective drawing. I tried that out in sketch models. But we found that in doing so it broke up the lines of the outside of the door. So we made a design with the figures in reverse, that is back to back. From there we went to the quarter-scale models we now have.

"The story that we have tried to portray was based somewhat upon a telegram that Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross, sent from Havana. She stated in her telegram, "I am with the wounded." A man named Harvey at that time wrote a poem in three stanzas, each stanza commencing "I am with the wounded; I am with the starving; I am with the happy." And I thought that was a nice sentimental tie-in with the idea that this was a blood-bank building. I didn't show the happy side of it. I merely showed the one on this side (indicating) with the bottle for the blood transfusion, and on the other side the figure shown to be clothing and feeding the starving, because a great deal of the Red Cross work has to do with disaster cases. That is the story we have tried to show here."

Chairman Finley asked the members of the Commission if they had any questions to ask. Professor Hudnut remarked, "We didn't have any criticism of the sculpture. We thought the sculpture was excellent. But we did, as I remember it, raise some questions about placing them in the angle between the window and the door. Since they are not in relief but are rather vigorous, rather bold statues, they give the effect of figures perched on a pedestal. Isn't that true?" We didn't think the doorway was quite the right conception for a pedestal, and we suggested, I think, that the figures be treated as relief and placed on the upper cornice band above the window."

Mr. Eggers replied that location had never been tried, but if placed there the figures would be back from the facade of the building.

Professor Hudnut said it would be much more interesting to see the figures carved in relief flanking a panel with an inscription over the doorway. "I should like to see the architects and the sculptor study that." It was pointed out that the window is necessary to add light to the building.

Mr. Eggers then pointed out difficulties that would be involved in making a restudy, and called attention to two factors which he said must be considered.

"I believe one is that the conception of this design has been held pretty firmly through the whole creation of the building. The location of sculpture was established when the design of the building was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts some years ago. Consequently we proceeded with the approval of shop drawings and the necessary approving of limestone to make the cuts. We approved the stone about two months ago for the stock in which these figures were to be put. The details of the figures were subject to review by this Commission, naturally, but the location of them had been substantially approved. The upper stone has all been approved and is cut, though not carved. Whether the Public Buildings Service would desire us to continue and make studies on something that has been so thoroughly worked into the composition of the building is a question to be settled."

Chairman Finley then asked the Supervising Architect, Mr. Thorn, for his views in the matter. Mr. Thorn said:

"That brings up a rather difficult situation in which we have found ourselves in the past, Dr. Finley. Rightly or wrongly, we don't engage sculptors until after we know we can award a construction contract for the building. Necessarily much of the overall design, except the character of and some detail of the sculpture is somewhat jelled because that is done before we get an actual sculptor in the picture. And although we are going to try harder to present certain things here, for instance, and to settle things earlier if we can, the placing of a sculptor under contract involves often a considerable sum of money, and we have never felt justified in doing that before we were certain that we could go forward moneywise and award a contract for the construction of the building.

In this instance--and I am very frank about it--it is awfully late to attempt to change the detail and design where it involves stone that is fabricated,--construction that is in place as far as the lintels and columns and the like is concerned. The impact of this on time and money could be considerable. Just how much that means in money I am not prepared to say at this time. We had felt we were safe because Otto Eggers was so convinced that he had given plenty of study and thought to this matter of the sculptural embellishment of this entrance. So a marked change, any drastic change now, would be expensive from the standpoint of change of materials and the time element.

As far as Mr. Amateis is concerned, I don't know what would be involved. We negotiate those contracts on a basis of a certain conception and the proper development of that, and that may or may not entail money and time as far as he is concerned. That presents the situation as we see it today."

Mr. Biddle said: "I would like to suggest this: It seems to me from the discussion that has gone on that this whole thing to some extent is not so much in the line of severe criticism as just the choice between two different conceptions or two different problems to be worked out, and, personally, I have always leaned over backwards in feeling that in such cases the execution of the problem should be left to the artist,-in this case the architect and the sculptor."

After some further discussion, on motion of Mr. Neild, seconded by Mr. Biddle The Commission approved the models and the location as presented by the architects and sculptor (Exhibit F). Mr. Peets commented on the drapery of the figures, and Mr. Amateis said he would take note of it in further work on this sculpture.

8. STEPHEN FOSTER MEMORIAL: The Secretary presented a letter (Exhibit G) received from the Stephen Foster Memorial Association, advising that a location for the proposed memorial plaque had been chosen in the Music Division of the Library of Congress, near the Stephen Foster Collection. The Commission regarded it an appropriate site for the plaque.

9. EXHIBITION ON THE PLAN OF WASHINGTON: Chairman Finley presented a letter that he received from Dr. Solon J. Buck, the Acting Librarian of Congress (Exhibit H), endorsing a suggestion that permanent space be secured for an Exhibition on the Plan of Washington that could be seen by the many visitors to Washington.

10. STATE AND CITY ART COMMISSIONS: In accordance with a request of the Commission, the Secretary presented a Memorandum showing that there are five State Art Commissions and ten City Art Commissions in this country. (Exhibit I), organized strictly as such so far as is known.

11. PATHOLOGY INSTITUTE BUILDING: Army Medical Center. Colonel Alan McCutchen, District Engineer, in company with Mr. A. Merrick of his office, Messrs. Faulkner and Kingsbury, consulting architects, and Mr. Woodward of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, met with the Commission to discuss further the question of material for the exterior of the Pathology Institute Building, which is under construction at the Army Medical Center, formerly known as Walter Reed Hospital, at Sixteenth Street and Alaska Avenue.

The Commission had been advised that excavations for the building had begun, and a ground-breaking ceremony had taken place a few days ago. Nevertheless the

the question of exterior material for the building had been left undecided at the June meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, for further consideration at this meeting.

Colonel McCutchen said:

With regard to the Institute of Pathology Building, in which the Commission expressed a preference for a limestone surface treatment, we informed our Chief of Engineers' Office of that preference, and they restated their position that they felt that under present policies they could not entertain the suggestion for any treatment other than that of concrete forms. So we are here before you this morning to tell you what our initial ideas are on the treatment of such concrete. I will ask Mr. Merrick if he will give you the discussion of the proposal of the architects.

Mr. Merrick said: "That presentation made by Mr. Faulkner gives a feeling that they think is the best they could bring out with concrete alone. There may be other variations. We have looked up the concrete association people's literature, and most all of them followed such a pattern. That is what we submit as a possibility for plain concrete finish. I have no explanation further than except answering questions.

Colonel McCutchen called attention to a design and said, "This is also shown here in the Norris Dam power house. It gives a little bit different shading from this rendering.

Mr. Neild asked, "Do you propose that those joints will be, you might say, weakness planes that will contain cracks that will result from temperature changes probably?"

Mr. Merrick replied, "I think not. They will be merely for appearance. The wall is 12 inches thick, all heavily reinforced. Our design criteria runs up to 32 pounds per square inch as a criteria, so, therefore, our structural man is not providing any planes of weakness throughout the entire wall.

Mr. Neild remarked, "I have seen concrete exterior wall construction in Louisiana, and it is very difficult. It will crack--not structurally, but from temperature changes. It will discolor. It is very displeasing."

Mr. deWeldon asked, "Did you consult the Bethesda Naval Hospital authorities? So far they have spent over $115,000 on repair." Mr. Merrick said, "They have spent $275,000." Colonel McCutchen said, "We did consult the Bethesda hospital people, and we are in receipt of correspondence from the builder, McShain, who advised against it,--against cast stone.

Mr. Merrick said, "The type treatment that they did at the Naval Hospital was veneer, and it was not poured behind. It was a different type treatment from what has been discussed here, and it was not a good job."

Mr. Faulkner remarked, "May I make a comment on what Mr. Neild said about the cracking and staining? We heartily agree with that. Our feeling is from comparing buildings that are built in Washington of mass poured concrete--we have looked at a great many of them. Very definitely over a period of years the exposed mass concrete does crack and stains badly.

Mr. Kingsbury added, "It is a very porous material. You can't pour concrete into a frame, no matter how you vibrate it, and get anything but a porous result. The cast stone or cast concrete, which is poured in flat pans, is a very closely integrated material which does not absorb dirt and dust. As a matter of fact, it can be made a less porous material than limestone if properly made.

"But I don't believe you can pour a concrete wall, no matter how much you vibrate it or how you try to take care of it, without leaving a porous surface, and it is the reason that the building after a period of time absorbs dirt and the like and you can't do anything about it."

Mr. Neild remarked, "Your construction joints are a source of leakage too usually and are usually disfiguring in the exterior."

Mr. Kingsbury said, "That is right. Of course, this building is being built to resist the bond, and our engineer feels that the amount of cracking which would cause moisture to get in would be small. Of course, we will have to waterproof the wall, put integral waterproofing in it, but I don't think there will be large cracks because of the amount of steel we are putting in it."

Thereupon Mr. Faulkner asked, "Would it be appropriate to discuss the matter of limestone as long as it was mentioned? Would you like to talk about your investigation on that, Mr. Kingsbury?

Mr. Kingsbury replied,"Well, at the last meeting Mr. Belluschi recommended limestone. Of course, as far as we are concerned, that is out. We have been instructed to build a building without any finish on it,--without any facing on the monolithic concrete wall. But we are also required to build a building so it will be a bombproof structure within certain limitations, of course. There is no such thing as an absolutely bombproof construction. One of the requirements is that we shall not put on the building a facing which is apt to be blown off.

The only way that we could put a limestone facing on a concrete wall would be by anchors at the joints, which means, if the stones were the appropriate size for the mass of the building, the anchors would be some three feet apart. Well, our engineer proved to us quite conclusively that the suction from a bomb would just pull those things right off the building. They would fly right off the building.

"With the cast stone, we can, of course, put as many anchors in that as we want. The anchors are cast right into the stone. They can be of any interval that we want them. And our engineer feels sure that a cast stone finish would become an integral part of the wall and would not be apt to fly off from the wall any more than this wall without the finish would. There is going to be some danger from that of course, but I don't believe that a stone finish is possible under the present regulations for making this a bombproof building. I'm sure it isn't."

Prof. Hudnut said, "Mr. Belluschi suggested that the limestone would not have to have anchors. Do you remember? He suggested that it could be made an integral part of the wall by the grouting process."

Mr. Biddle remarked,"He did suggest that very strongly--that it would entirely integrate itself with the cement."

Mr. Kingsbury said, "We talked to the stone people about it, and they said they could put it against the wall. The usual practice with stone is to butter the back of the wall, as we call it, with non-staining cement. We have done that for years. We always do it. I asked these gentlemen from the stone company if they didn't do that and poured concrete against the back of the wall what would happen. Of course, they're trying to sell the stone. I'm sure that our building would be badly stained unless it was protected in the back.

"There is another point our engineer made and that is that between a cast concrete piece and a concrete wall you get a lot of natural bond because the materials are the same. They are the same composition. Now, you might say that limestone has some of the properties of a concrete wall, but it really doesn't, and you don't get the same bond. In one building where they had this cast concrete or stone finish on a concrete wall, when they tried to take a piece off the wall came with it. That was an added assurance to us that the original design of having a

cast concrete finish would meet the requirements of the protective angle. The joint between the concrete and the pre-cast concrete was stronger than the concrete.

Mr. Neild asked Colonel McCutchen if this is a precedent? "Are there going to be more buildings like this in Washington? Is this the beginning of concrete exterior finish? Colonel McCutchen replied:

"I am unable to answer that, of course, but I can for this particular building state that this is the center portion and constitutes about a third of what that building will eventually develop to by two wings extended on each side. This is a third of the entire building.

Mr. deWeldon asked "Have certain experiments been made whereby limestone slabs are cemented to a concrete wall and your cast stone cemented to a concrete wall, then both put in a suction chamber at the Bureau of Standards to get all the actual facts? I would feel that the cast stone with the reinforcements at the dowels would crack right then and fly into hundreds of bits, which the limestone would never do. (Mr. Kingsbury interposed by saying, "The cast stone is all reinforced.") Yes, but you have tremendous suction pressure, and these reinforcements will really wedge these parts of the stone apart which you don't have in a natural stone. In the bombing in Italy it seems that these natural limestone structures, unless they were directly hit, are still standing, while many of the modern buildings there were destroyed.

Mr. Kingsbury replied, "I can't answer that. The more I try to learn about the bombing the more mystified I am. We are just doing what the protective people have told us to do. The building is designed as a bomb-proof structure.

Mr. deWeldon said, "Unless there is an actual experiment in the laboratory that will tell us the facts actually, it is just speculation. (Mr. Merrick remarked, "Those are welded to the reinforcing steel." Mr. deWeldon replied, "The steel ties will remain there, but the stone will fly away unless the heat is so tremendous that it melts the steel."

Mr. Neild asked, "Is it proposed that this stone or cast stone, let's say, is to be applied afer the 12-inch concrete wall is constructed, or is the wall to be poured against it?"

Mr. Merrick replied,"The wall is poured against it. The front face will be this concrete pre-cast stone." Mr. Neild remarked, "That will make a much better wall construction."

Thereupon Mr. Faulkner showed the Commission samples of what his firm would like to suggest as a pre-cast finish if it should be used--what we have suggested, not what we would like to suggest.

Mr. Neild said, "I hate to see a seven and a half million dollar building faced with cast stone, and Mr. Finley added, "Especially if there are going to be two other wings equally as large as this one. That is quite a mass of concrete."

Mr. deWeldon asked how does the same of cast stone that is proposed compare with that used at the Bethesda Hospital. Mr. Kingsbury replied, that the difference is in the aggregate.

Mr. Faulkner presented the samples and said, "These are samples that we have had made, but they in a general way represent what we would have liked to have seen on this building and purposely would have some play of color, although the aggregate is the same in each case. It is only the color of sand and possibly some coloring material that would give you some variation in the coloring. Our idea was not to make this thing look like stone but to get a scheme in which we would get a darker base and gradually introduce the lighter materials, so that at the top we get the lightest. It would seem to us in a building as large as this that a uniform color such as we get in cast concrete would be a great objection."

Mr. deWeldon asked, "What is the aggregate in this composition?" Mr. Faulkner

replied, "It is an aggregate that comes from West Virginia, but there is a local aggregate that we can get that looks almost like this. It is a natural stone. The aggregate is the same in all three samples. There is some coloring material in this and the others in proportion of sand."

Mr. deWeldon asked,"How can you water proof it?" Mr. Kingsbury said, "The stone itself is waterproof." Mr. deWeldon then asked, "But the cement, how is that waterproofed?" Mr. Faulkner replied, "In the way it is made,--poured in a gypsum form. The water is taken out. You get a very dense concrete. You could play a fire hose on this and it wouldn't be able to force water through it."

Mr. Kingsbury added, "The stone itself is much more waterproof than limestone, which isn't waterproof. Where you get joints you have the same problem either in limestone or in this. But in this we do not need to provide any waterproofing."

Mr. Neild asked, "Do you have any examples of this type of construction in Washington?" Mr. Faulkner replied, "Yes. The best example I think that we have seen is out at the Taylor Testing Basin. There are three buildings there built of this precast stone material. That is the best example. It was built the same way we intend to build this, with the precast slab used as a form and the concrete poured behind it. The reason the Naval Hospital looks like a stone-finished building is that they purposely used an aggregate in it that would give, at least from a distance, the appearance of stone."

Mr. Neild remarked, it is a veneering. It is not an integral part of the building, and of course it would leak."

Mr. Biddle asked, "Did you ever think of a treatment where you would use two different colored bricks as in sienna to get a tile effect, black and white or red and white,--a decorative effect instead of a graduation?"

Mr. Faulkner replied, "Our feeling is this--it is such a tremendous surface that it would become, we felt, awfully dizzy. In a small building I think it would be very useful. Here we have tremendous area of unbroken wall. Some of these precast slabs measure 5 x 8 feet. And this is another reason in favor of the precast slab--that we get a material which can be cast in such large slabs that we get a scale that is commensurate with the scale of the building. This is an enormous surface, and our feeling is we ought to have a material which in itself can come in very large sections."

Mr. Kingsbury added, "The slabs are two and a half inches thick. You can make them as large as you want. If you made stone pieces that large they would have to be five inches thick at least."

After some further discussion, the Commission decided that some tests should be made at the Bureau of Standards before a building material for this structure is decided upon (Exhibit J).

12. DOMICILIARY BUILDING, United States Soldiers' Home: Col. McCutchen submitted a set of drawings for this building, together with letter of transmittal.

The drawings were inspected by the Commission. Mr. Neild had inspected them on Wednesday and reported that he had noted a change made in the roof, though this was rather an unimportant detail, and some changes in the facade which improved the design. Mr. Neild pointed out that these drawings were made in 1949, whereas the perspective heretofore objected to by the Commission was made in 1947.

During the discussion the Commission deplored the oversight in presenting the plans to the Commission of Fine Arts at this late date, when the building was under construction. The Commission sent a report to Col. McCutchen accordingly, and recommended that, since this is the first of a group of buildings,the Commission of Fine Arts should be advised before additional buildings of the group are built (Exhibit K).

13. THE WHITE HOUSE: In accordance with arrangements made, the Commission proceeded to the White House at 11:45 a.m. to examine architectural drawings by Lorenzo S. Winslow, Architect of the White House, that were placed on display in his office. Major General Glen Edgerton, Col. Gillette, Mr. Chandler, Assistant to Mr. Winslow, and Mr. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher, were also present.

The Commission examined the drawings in detail, noting in particular the changes proposed in the renovation of the White House, especially the new stairway from the second floor to the first floor, the treatment of the second floor corridor, which formerly had the appearance of an ordinary hall; additional basement facilities; and the convenient arrangement of the President's sleeping room in relation to his study, adjacent to the second floor balcony. After inspecting the drawings, Mr. Winslow pointed out these features of the designs, during an inspection trip through the White House.

The Commission unanimously approved the drawings, and expressed their appreciation to Mr. Winslow of the work done on the renovation of the White House (Exhibit L).

14. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: Major General Edgerton expressed a request that the Commission of Fine Arts meet with his Commission on the Renovation of the White House on Friday, August 17, 1951, at 11:00 a.m. This was agreed to accordingly.

The Commission adjourned at 1:15 p.m. to reconvene at 2:30 p.m.

OPY

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

1525 H Street, Northwest

Washington, D.C.

July 13, 1951

Hon. David E.Finley,Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

The National Association of Letter Carriers has under construction an eight-story building built of Vermont marble at the site of First and Indiana Avenue, facing the Capitol. The plans for the building have been submitted and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts and the building is now actually under construction. The plans for the building call for the use of bronze in doors and windows. It requires approximately 6,000 pounds of bronze.

It is necessary that we file an appeal with the National Production Authority for permission to secure and use the bronze. We are filing such an appeal based on two grounds - first, it would cause considerable financial hardship on the part of this Association if we were compelled to use a substitute and later change to bronze; secondly, on a fine monumental type of building such as ours is to be, fronting the Capitol of the United States, the use of a substitute material would not be in the least satisfactory and would serve as an eye sore.

In filing our appeal, we would like to have a letter from you setting forth the viewpoint of the Commission of Fine Arts on this matter or setting forth your regulations on the type of construction required in such a location. I am positive that this is the only building being built in a similar location. We would appreciate hearing from you on this subject.

With many thanks for your fine cooperation in the past, I am

Sincerely yours,

Jerome J. Keating
Secretary

EXHIBIT A

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

1529 H Street, Northwest

Washington, D.C.

July 13, 1951

Hon. David S. Finley, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

The National Association of Letter Carriers has under construction an eight-story building built of Vermont marble at the site of First and Indiana Avenue, facing the Capitol. The plans for the building have been submitted and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts and the building is now actually under construction. The plans for the building call for the use of bronze in doors and windows. It requires approximately 6,000 pounds of bronze.

It is necessary that we file an appeal with the National Production Authority for permission to secure and use the bronze. We are filing such an appeal based on two grounds - first, it would cause considerable financial hardship on the part of this Association if we were compelled to use a substitute and later change to bronze; secondly, on a fine monumental type of building such as ours is to be, fronting the Capitol of the United States, the use of a substitute material would not be in the least satisfactory and would serve as an eye sore.

In filing our appeal, we would like to have a letter from you setting forth the viewpoint of the Commission of Fine Arts on this matter or setting forth your regulations on the type of construction required in such a location. I am positive that this is the only building being built in a similar location. We would appreciate hearing from you on this subject.

With many thanks for your fine cooperation in the past, I am

Sincerely yours,

Jerome J. Keating
Secretary

EXHIBIT A

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Keating:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 19, 1951, gave careful consideration to your letter of the 13th, in which you set forth the need of about 6,000 pounds of bronze to enable you to complete your National Association of Letter Carriers building, which is now under construction at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest, by providing for the use of bronze doors and window frames, as specified in the design.

The Commission recognizes the fact that your building will be one of the monumental Vermont marble buildings adjacent to the United States Capitol grounds. It is of the utmost importance that the doors and window frames harmonize with the marble exterior. Therefore, the Commission unanimously approve your request to be furnished the bronze you need so as to enable you to complete the building as planned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Jerome J. Keating, Secretary,
National Association of Letter Carriers,
1525 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A-1

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Keeting:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 19, 1951, gave careful consideration to your letter of the 13th, in which you set forth the need of about 6,000 pounds of bronze to enable you to complete your National Association of Letter Carriers building, which is now under construction at First Street and Indiana Avenue, Northwest, by providing for the use of bronze doors and window frames, as specified in the design.

The Commission recognizes the fact that your building will be one of the monumental Vermont marble buildings adjacent to the United States Capitol grounds. It is of the utmost importance that the doors and window frames harmonize with the marble exterior. Therefore, the Commission unanimously approve your request to be furnished the bronze you need so as to enable you to complete the building as planned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David A. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Jerome J. Keeting, Secretary,
National Association of Letter Carriers,
1525 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A-1

PY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 10, 1951

Dear Mr. Finley:

We are writing you in connection with the recent decision of the District Commissioners regarding the window treatment in the house of Miss Katherine Gibbs on Dumbarton Avenue.

As you know, the question of the windows was discussed by our Committee with Miss Gibbs on several occasions and she agreed to our request for double-hung windows, with the usual division of panes, six over six. However, she has gone ahead with the installation of Anderson sliding sash and the Commissioners have allowed her to use them with horizontal muntins only, although at the hearing we proposed the compromise of using the sliding sash with vertical as well as horizontal muntins, making a generally colonial appearance.

At the hearing, there was much talk about the possible unconstitutionality of the law, of the ease of washing the windows, and of comparative costs of replacing broken glass. All of this was beside the point, as was the statement signed by various neighbors that they had no objection to the proposed windows. The fact is that Congress passed a law which states "In order to *** preserve and protect the *** exterior architectural features and examples of the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years, etc." This law exists and has not to date been declared unconstitutional by any Court. One of the most important architectural features of our early architecture is the division of windows into panes, sometimes small and, in the case of shop windows, somtimes large. The importance of this one feature is attested by the fact that, when alterations in the manner of early Georgetown are being made, the windows are invariably divided in small panes; it also was vividly attested during the recent Georgetown Bicentennial celebration when most of the merchants of the area pasted tape on their windows to simulate smaller panes and give a colonial appearance. One can also see throughout Georgetown many Victorian houses where the large windows in the square bays have been divided voluntarily by the owners to give an appearance more in character with the surrounding early architecture.

Realizing the importance of this particular feature with relation to the law as written, our Committee of three professional architects has insisted on breaking up windows glass area with muntins and did so in this case. However, the Commissioners apparently did not realize the essentiality of this important matter, which seemed minor to them, and have now set a precedent which makes impossible our work of carrying out the full intent of the law as written.

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 10, 1951

Dear Mr. Finley:

We are writing you in connection with the recent decision of the District Commissioners regarding the window treatment in the house of Miss Katherine Gibbs on Jackson Avenue.

As you know, the question of the windows was discussed by our Committee with Miss Gibbs on several occasions and she agreed to our request for double-hung windows, with the usual division of panes, six over six. However, she has gone ahead with the installation of Anderson sliding sash and the Commissioners have allowed her to use them with horizontal muntins only, although at the hearing we proposed the compromise of using the sliding sash with vertical as well as horizontal muntins, making a generally colonial appearance.

At the hearing, there was much talk about the possible unconstitutionality of the law, of the ease of washing the windows, and of comparative costs of replacing broken glass. All of this was beside the point, as was the statement signed by various neighbors that they had no objection to the proposed windows. The fact is that Congress passed a law which states "In order to preserve and protect the exterior architectural features and examples of the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years, etc." This law exists and has not to date been declared unconstitutional by any court. One of the most important architectural features of our early architecture is the division of windows into panes, sometimes small and, in the case of shop windows, sometimes large. The importance of this one feature is attested by the fact that, when alterations in the manner of early Georgetown are being made, the windows are invariably divided in small panes; it also was vividly attested during the recent Georgetown Bicentennial celebration when most of the merchants of the area pasted tape on their windows to simulate smaller panes and give a colonial appearance. One can also see throughout Georgetown many Victorian houses where the large windows in the square bays have been divided voluntarily by the owners to give an appearance more in character with the surrounding early architecture.

Realizing the importance of this particular feature with relation to the law as written, our Committee of three professional architects has insisted on breaking up window glass area with muntins and did so in this case. However, the Commissioners apparently did not realize the essentiality of this important matter, which seemed minor to them, and have now set a precedent which makes impossible our work of carrying out the full intent of the law as written.

MARIAN D

We beleive our Committee cannot profitably give our time further in reviewing plans unless some change in attitude is made by the Commissioners at an early date. It is suggested that possibly you as chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts can approach the Commissioners in an informal way and convince them of the importance of the muntined panes for colonial architecture as opposed to the horizontal panes which are truly accepted as a sign of contemporary architecture, the architecture which Public Law 808 proposes to eliminate from the area of Old Georgetown. In spite of the presedent set by this case, they should consent to uphold our Committee in future similar cases. We see no other way out of our dilemma.

Sincerely yours,

Walter M. Macomber
Chairman

Wm. Dewey Foster

Lorenzo S. Winslow

Members of the Committee
"Old Georgetown Act"

We believe our Committee cannot profitably give our time further in reviewing plans unless some change in attitude is made by the Commissioners at an early date. It is suggested that possibly you as chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts can approach the Commissioners in an informal way and convince them of the importance of the mentioned cases for colonial architecture as opposed to the horizontal cases which are truly accepted as a sign of contemporary architecture, the architecture which Public Law 808 proposes to eliminate from the area of Old Georgetown. In spite of the precedent set by this case, they should consent to uphold our Committee in future similar cases. We see no other way out of our dilemma.

Sincerely yours,

Walter H. Beacham
Chairman

W. Dewey Foster

Lorenzo S. Winslow

Members of the Committee
"Old Georgetown Act"

PY

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

WASHINGTON, 4, D.C.

July 5, 1951

Mr. H.P.Caemmerer, Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Reference is made to the discussion at the Commissioners' Board meeting this morning of the case of the residence of Miss Katherine Gibbs, 2817 Dumbarton Ave., N.W. at which time you and other representatives of the Commission of Fine Arts were present, as well as Miss Katherine Gibbs and Mr. and Mrs. Harold B. Hinton.

Following the meeting and after careful consideration of statements made at the meeting the Commissioners unanimously reaffirmed their previous action in approving the request of Miss Gibbs for permission to install horizontally sliding wood sash in the building under construction.

In the event that Miss Gibbs, of her own voltion, desires to make some concession or compromise with respect to the design of the windows, as was suggested by Mr. Macomber at the meeting, the Commissioners authorized the Director of Inspection to consider the changes as coming under the terms of the present building permit without any further action by the Board of Commissioners.

Very sincerely yours,

G.W. Thornett

Secretary
Board of Commissioners, D.C.

EXHIBIT B - 1

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 5, 1951

Mr. H.A.Gemmerer, Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gemmerer:

Reference is made to the discussion at the Commissioners' Board meeting this morning of the case of the residence of Miss Katherine Gibbs, 2817 Rockbridge Ave., N.W., at which time you and other representatives of the Commission of Fine Arts were present, as well as Miss Katherine Gibbs and Mr. and Mrs. Harold E. Winton.

Following the meeting and after careful consideration of statements made at the meeting the Commissioners unanimously reaffirmed their previous action in approving the request of Miss Gibbs for permission to install horizontally sliding wood sash in the building under construction.

In the event that Miss Gibbs, of her own volition, desires to make some concession or compromise with respect to the design of the windows, as was suggested by Mr. Mecomber at the meeting, the Commissioners authorize the Director of Inspection to consider the changes as coming under the terms of the present building permit without any further action by the Board of Commissioners.

Very sincerely yours,

G.M. Fornett

Secretary
Board of Commissioners, D.C.

EXHIBIT E - 1

COPY

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

WASHINGTON, 4, D.C.

July 2, 1951

Mr. H.P.Caemmerer, Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Reference is made to your letter of June 29, 1951, concerning the action taken by the Board of Commissioners in the case of the residence of Katherine Gibbs of 2817 Dumbarton Avenue, Northwest.

I brought your letter to the attention of the Commissioners at their Board meeting on Friday, June 29, 1951, and they indicated that they would afford the Commission of Fine Arts an opportunity to express their views in any case involving a disagreement with respect to the esthetic features of proposed buildings, but thought it necessary to hold formal hearings only in major issues.

Your letter has been sent to the Director of Inspections, District of Columbia, with a copy of my reply, for his guidance in future cases.

Very sincerely yours,

G.M Thornett
Secretary
Board of Commissioners, D.C.

EXHIBIT B-2

COPY

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BUREAU OF FIRE

WASHINGTON, 4, D.C.

July 2, 1951

Mr. F.P. Gasmerer, Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gasmerer:

Reference is made to your letter of June 29, 1951, concerning the action taken by the Board of Commissioners in the case of the residence of Kathleine Hope of 2417 Sunderton Avenue, Northwest.

I brought your letter to the attention of the Commissioners at their board meeting on Friday, June 29, 1951, and they indicated that they would afford the Commission of Fine Arts an opportunity to express their views in any case involving a disagreement with respect to the esthetic features of proposed buildings, but thought it necessary to hold formal hearings only in major issues.

Your letter has been sent to the Director of Inspections, District of Columbia, with a copy of my reply, for his guidance in future cases.

Very sincerely yours,

C.M. Thornett
Secretary
Board of Commissioners, D.C.

EXHIBIT B-2

COPY

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 26, 1951

My dear Mr. Finley:

Pursuant to provisions of Budget Circular - 19, and the delegation of authority from the President referred to therein, the Bureau of the Budget has received a communication regarding the following legislative proposal:

S. 1712, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece know as the Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove." (Congressional request)

Before advising the submitting agency of the relationship of the proposal to the program of the President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would appreciate receiving an expression of your views with respect thereto.

It would be appreciated if your reply could be received by ...

It it is desired to confer on this matter, please communicate with Mr. H.H.Titus, Bureau of the Budget, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., telephone Code 189, Branch 460.

In addition to your agency, requests for views have been transmitted to the following agencies:

Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission

National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Department of the Interior

Defense Department

Sincerely yours,

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D.C.

Roger W.Jones
Assistant Director
Legislative Reference

EXHIBIT C

COPY

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 26, 1971

My dear Mr. Finley:

Pursuant to provisions of budget circular - 19, and the delegation of authority from the President referred to therein, the Bureau of the Budget has received a communication regarding the following legislative proposal:

S. 1712, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as the Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove." (Congressional request)

Before advising the submitting agency of the relationship of the proposal to the program of the President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would appreciate receiving an expression of your views with respect thereto.

It would be appreciated if your reply could be received by ...

If it is desired to confer on this matter, please communicate with Mr. H.N.Fitts, Bureau of the Budget, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., telephone Code 189, Branch 460.

In addition to your agency, requests for views have been transmitted to the following agencies:

Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission	National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Department of the Interior	Defense Department

Sincerely yours,

Honorable David E. Finley
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D.C.

Roger W. Jones
Assistant Director
Legislative Reference

EXHIBIT C

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1712

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 20 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

A BILL

To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, from the Christopher Columbus Memorial Foundation the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell. The Secretary shall, at the expense of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Foundation, erect such sculptural piece within the central niche of the Memorial Avenue entrance

1 to the Arlington National Cemetery, and it shall be main-
2 tained by the National Park Service, under the direction of
3 the Secretary, as a perpetual tribute to those members of
4 the Armed Forces of the United States who gave their lives
5 in Italy and elsewhere during World War II for the preser-
6 vation of freedom in America and the establishment of peace
7 and justice throughout the world.

8 SEC. 2. (a) The grove of white oak trees bordering the
9 Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Ceme-
10 tery shall hereafter be known as the Christopher Columbus
11 Memorial Grove, and shall be maintained by the National
12 Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary, in honor
13 of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of America.

14 (b) The Secretary is authorized to accept, on behalf of
15 the United States, from the Christopher Columbus Memorial
16 Foundation, a bronze tablet, appropriately inscribed, and
17 shall, at the expense of the foundation, erect such bronze
18 tablet at a suitable location in the Christopher Columbus
19 Memorial Grove.

20 SEC. 3. (a) The first section of this Act shall be null
21 and void unless within five years from the date of enactment
22 of this Act the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell
23 has been donated to the United States for erection as provided
24 in such section.

25 (b) Section 2 of this Act shall be null and void unless

1 within five years from the date of enactment of this Act the
2 bronze tablet referred to in subsection (b) of such section
3 has been donated to the United States for erection as pro-
4 vided in such section.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1712

A BILL

To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove.

By Mr. CHAVEZ

JUNE 20 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS
WASHINGTON, D.C

July 13, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Department of the Interior
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Subject: Report on S. 1712 qnd
Companion Bills
H.R. 2156
H.R. 2473
H.R. 4445

This is in reply to a request by Mr. H.P.Caemmerer for a report on S. 1712, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece know as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove."

This bill has the unqualified endorsement of the National Park Service and of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The proposed statuary conforms to the original plan for a Memorial Bridge and its approaches and is indeed as essential element of that plan. The opportunity to secure this additional ornament to the National Capital through the generous contribution of a patriotic organization and without cost to the Government should not be lost.

The proposed establishment of the "Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove" simply amounts to assigning an appropriate name to a grove of trees that has been in existence for many years. Such action could hardly meet with objection.

The trees in question were planted many years ago as a background to the hollyhedge on both sides of Memorial Avenue. We have had considerable difficulty in preserving these trees, due to requests for encroachment and use of the area occupied by a number of agencies.

The legislation is consistent with numerous plantings of both individual trees and groves of trees, numbering several hundred single and multiple plantings through the National Capital Parks.

Sincerely yours,

Harry T. Thompson
Associate Superintendent

EXHIBIT C - 1

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 13, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Department of the Interior
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Subject: Report on S. 1712 and
Companion Bills
H.R. 2456
H.R. 2473
H.R. 4445

This is in reply to a request by Mr. H.P.Sommerer for a report on S. 1712, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece know as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove."

This bill has the unqualified endorsement of the National Park Service and of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The proposed statuary conforms to the original plan for a Memorial Bridge and its approaches and is indeed as essential element of that plan. The opportunity to secure this additional ornament to the National Capital through the generous contribution of a patriotic organization and without cost to the Government should not be lost.

The proposed establishment of the "Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove" simply amounts to designating an appropriate name to a grove of trees that has been in existence for many years. Such action could hardly meet with objection.

The trees in question were planted many years ago as a background to the holly hedge on both sides of Memorial Avenue. We have had considerable difficulty in preserving these trees, due to requests for encroachment and use of the area occupied by a number of agencies.

The legislative is consistent with numerous plantings of both individual trees and groves of trees, numbering several hundred single and multiple plantings through the National Capital Parks.

Sincerely yours,

Harry T. Thompson
Associate Superintendent

PY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON D.C.

July 30, 1951.

Dear Mr. Jones:

At a meeting held on July 19, 1951, The Commission of Fine Arts considered Senate Bill 1712, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Grove."

This project for a sculptural motif in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery is of long standing ans has several times received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts.

In 1935, the services of a sculptor, Mr. A.A.Weinman, were secured by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, to develop a sculptured motif for the niche above mentioned and he modeled a heric figure which he named The Last Farewell as part of a fountain treatment. We are informed that he has been paid for his work to date.

However, the Commission of Fine Arts is not satisfied with the model, and at the meeting of the Commission on July 19th, at which the design was given further consideration, the model was disapproved. The figure is not well adjusted to the scale of the niche; the coffering of the half-dome competes with the head of the figure, reducing its visibility at a distance; the symbolism is not clear. The Commission also questioned the pose and modelling of the figure.

The Commission is of the opinion that when the Arlington National Cemetery is extended toward the Potomac River, as is now contemplated, certain changes in the landscape treatment of the Great Entrance and the exedra will be desirable. The Commission believes that a small fountain at the niche, or a large one at the center of the open space, may be preferable to the use of a sculptured figure. The Commission, therefore, urges that nothing be done now that may prevent the harmonious adaption of this important area to the new conditions that will arise a few years hence.

With regard to the designation of the trees adjacent to the Memorial Avenue as the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, the Commission again calls attention to the fact that this land is planned for inclusion in the Arlington National Cemetery. The management of the Cemetery would find it inconvenient, the Commission believes, to have part of its land already dedicated as a memorial to a particular historic figure.

The members of the Commission appreciate the patriotic motives of the sponsoring organization and are aware of the desirability of having, in the National Capital, memorials to the great men of history. There ought, however, to be an expression of order and propriety in the location of such memorials. The Arlington Memorial Bridge is a monument to the Unity of the North and the South; its axis connects the Lincoln Memorial and the Lee Mansion. If there are any monuments along this line they should be dedicated to all the nation's fallen heroes, without special identification of time or place.

There are many places appropriate for memorials to those who fell in particular theaters of action. And there are locations suited to honoring famous men. The Columbus Monument, in front of Union Station and facing the United States Capitol, is a conspicuous demonstration of the city's regard for the

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON D.C.

July 30, 1931.

Dear Mr. Jones:

At a meeting held on July 19, 1931, The Commission of Fine Arts considered Senate Bill 1912, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as the Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Grove."

This project for a sculptural motif in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery is of long standing and has several times received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts.

In 1928, the services of a sculptor, Mr. A.A. Weinman, were secured by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, to develop a sculptured motif for the niche above mentioned and he modeled a bronze figure which he named The Last Farewell as part of a fountain treatment. He was informed that he was been paid for his work to date.

However, the Commission of Fine Arts is not satisfied with the model, and at the meeting of the Commission on July 1931, at which the design was given further consideration, the model was disapproved. The figure is not well adjusted to the scale of the niche; the suffering of the half-nude couples with the head of the figure, reducing the visibility at a distance; the symbolism is not clear. The Commission also questioned the pose and modelling of the figure.

The Commission is of the opinion that when the Arlington National Cemetery is extended toward the Potomac River, as is now contemplated, certain changes in the landscape treatment of the Great Entrance and the avenue will be desirable. The Commission believes that a small fountain at the niche, or a large one at the center of the open space, may be preferable to the use of a sculptured figure. The Commission, therefore, urges that nothing be done now that may prevent the harmonious adoption of this important area to the new conditions that will arise a few years hence.

With regard to the designation of the trees adjacent to the Memorial Avenue as the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, the Commission again calls attention to the fact that this land is planned for inclusion in the Arlington National Cemetery. The management of the Cemetery would find it inconvenient, the Commission believes, to have part of its land already dedicated as a memorial to a particular historic figure.

The members of the Commission appreciate the patriotic motives of the sponsoring organization and are aware of the desirability of having, in the National Capital, memorials to the great men of history. There ought, however, to be an expression of order and propriety in the location of such memorials. The Arlington Memorial Bridge is a monument to the unity of the North and the South; its axis connects the Lincoln Memorial and the Lee Mansion. If there are any monuments along this line they should be dedicated to all the national heroes, without special identification of time or place.

There are many places appropriate for memorials to those who fell in particular theatres of action. And there are locations suited to honoring famous men. The Columbus Monument, in front of Union Station and facing the United States Capitol, is a conspicuous demonstration of the city's regard for the

great explorer.

Therefore, the Commission feels it its duty to advise against the adoption of Senate Bill 1712.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman

Hon. Roger W. Jones,
Assistant Director,
Legislative Reference,
Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D.C.

great employer.

Therefore, the Commission feels it its duty to advise against the adoption of Senate Bill 1712.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman

Hon. Roger C. Jones,
Assistant Director,
Legislative Reference,
Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D.C.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

August 17, 1951

Dear Dr. Singh:

Upon the receipt of your letter of June 21, 1951, tentatively reserving the Bernard Hill Park site for the proposed memorial to Mahatma Gandhi, it was decided at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on June 26th to request the views of the National Park Service and of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as to the question of making the site available, in the light of stipulations which you presented:

(a) That not less than half of the area of Bernard Hill Park should be allotted for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial;

(b) That it is understood that no other building will be erected on the balance of the site;

(c) That it is also understood that whatever use is made of the other half of this site, it will be in keeping with the spirit of the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial;

(d) As I personally indicated to the representatives of the three departments who recommended me to this site, the area which stands highest on the hill is to be designated for the Mahatma Gandhi Memorial.

I am enclosing a copy of a report from the National Park Service, replying to the stipulations as above stated.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission, at a meeting held on August 5, 1951, "voted to approve the use of a part of Bernard Hill Park, in the vicinity of Eastern Avenue and Randolph Street, N.W., as a site for the Gandhi Memorial, subject to the acceptance of plans for the development of the site and for the building to be erected."

Before bringing this matter again to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Library, the Commission of Fine Arts desire that your Committee give further consideration to it, with a view to a conference in the premises as set forth by the National Park Service and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commission of Fine Arts feel that they have made a reasonable compliance with your desires concerning the Bernard Hill Park site.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Dr. J.J.Singh, President,
India League of America,
48 East 67th Street,
New York 17, N.Y.

ENCLOSURE B

PY

LEO FRIEDLANDER

HARTSDALE ROAD, WEST WHITE PLAINS

NEW YORK

July 14, 1951

Mr. David Edward Finley:
National Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

The following report, I believe , will be of interest to the Fine Arts Commission, as it involves matters of artistic nature.

I have just returned from an inspection of my groups for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and I cannot possibly conceive how a self-respecting concern could have delivered a casting of such very inferior quality as was produced by the Florentine foundry which cast "Sacrifice" in bronze. It is not only a poor reproduction of my plaster model, but also it is technically unacceptable as evidenced by its surfaces. What structure has been provided within the casting, cannot, of course, be determined from without. However, judging from its many surface defects, fissures, cracks, holes plugs, and considerable porosity, indicating that the casting is very thin in numerous places, hardly holds out much optimism as to its structural integrity.

It is my understanding that Mr. Marino Marnelli, of the Florence foundry, who came to this country, advised on the erection of "Sacrifice" at the site and insisted that the group be hoisted into place within its supporting crate. This unusual procedure, I have learned, was complied with in this instance, while the other three groups were uncrated on the ground, and hoisted with slings at either end of the bellies into place. On inspection, this raises the question, particularly of the plinth of the Marinelli cast, as to whether it could have taken the strain of installation without the crate.

The gilding of this group is poorly done and over the entire surfaces of the work there are many places where the metal has not been covered with gold and where these protrusions of the bronze already show advanced evidence of tarnishing in a spotty and sightly manner.

Under the bellies of both castings of my groups there are to be found a few vent holes, placed there for purposes of condensation. Howeber, the dripping from these perforations in "Sacrifice" are more frequent and could be caused by leakages in the upper section of the casting.

Had such a bronze been done in this country, it would have been rejected without further question; but in view of the international aspects involved, perhaps the only remaining course of action is to have the work carefully inspected by a foundryman to see what can be done. For this purpose, may I request that the casting be inspected by Mr. Eugene Bedi, who has cast satisfactorily several of my commissions. I have shown him the Park Department's

EXHIBIT D

LEO FUCHSBERG

HERTSBERG ROAD, NEW WHITE PLAINS

NEW YORK

July 14, 1941

Mr. David Edward Finley:
National Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

The following report, I believe, will be of interest to the Fine Arts Commission, as it involves matters of artistic nature.

I have just returned from an inspection of my groups for the Lincoln Memorial bridge, and I cannot possibly conceive how a self-respecting concern could have delivered a casting of such very inferior quality as was produced by the Florentine foundry which cast "Sacrifice" in bronze. It is not only a poor reproduction of my plaster model, but also it is technically unacceptable as evidenced by its surfaces. That structure has been provided within the casting, cannot, of course, be determined from without. However, judging from its many surface defects, fissures, cracks, holes plugs, and considerable porosity, indicating that the casting is very thin in numerous places, hardly holds out much optimism as to its structural integrity.

It is my understanding that Mr. Darino Fornelli, of the Florence foundry, who came to this country, advised on the creation of "Sacrifice" on the site and insisted that the group be hoisted into place within the supporting arcs. This unusual procedure, I have learned, was complied with in this instance, while the other three groups were uncrated on the ground, and hoisted with slings at either end of the bellies into place. On inspection, this raises the question, particularly of the plinth of the Fornelli cast, as to whether it could have taken the strain of installation without the crack.

The gilding of this group is poorly done and over the entire surfaces of the work there are many places where the metal has not been covered with gold and where these protrusions of the bronze already show advanced evidence of tarnishing in a spotty and slightly manner.

Under the bellies of both castings of my groups there are to be found a few vent holes, placed there for purposes of condensation. However, the dripping from these perforations in "Sacrifice" are more frequent and could be caused by leakage in the upper section of the casting.

Had such a bronze been done in this country, it would have been rejected without further question; but in view of the international aspects involved, perhaps the only remaining course of action is to have the work carefully inspected by a foundryman to see what can be done. For this purpose, may I request that the casting be inspected by Mr. Eugene Neff, who has cast satisfactorily several of my commissions. I have shown him the park department's

photos (dated July 12, 1951, Nos. 1201-EO to 1201-EW, inclusive) of some of the defective parts and from them he has concluded that it is a poor casting technically and a poor replica artistically, and will not stand up for long. As the sculptor, I should very much like to accompany him and further suggest that if possible, a member of your Commission also attend. I Consider it of importance to the Government to do what can be done to determine the stability of the group and insure its endurance and appearance.

It is my understanding that there will be ameeting shortly of the Commission of Fine Arts, so may I await hearing from you in this matter at your earliest convenience.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Leo Friedlander

photos (dated July 12, 1951, Nos. 1201-30 to 1201-40, inclusive) of some of the defective parts and from them he has concluded that it is a poor casting technically and a poor replica artistically, and will not stand up for long. As the sculptor, I should very much like to accompany him and further suggest that if possible, a member of your Commission also attend. I consider it of importance to the Government to do what can be done to determine the stability of the group and insure its endurance and appearance.

It is my understanding that there will be meeting shortly of the Commission of Fine Arts, so may I await hearing from you in this matter at your earliest convenience.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Leo Friedlander

OPY

LEO FRIEDLANDER

July 16, 1951

SPECIAL DELIVERY

Re: Bronze casting
of "Sacrifice"
Arlimgton Mem.
Bridge

Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Assoc. Supt.
National Capital Parks
Department of the Interior
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

As the result of a series of efforts and experiments last week to repair the ungilded area under the belly of "Sacrifice", it was found that the Italian gilder could hardly have used 24 karat gold as reported. Insofar as it could be determined, they employed a gold containing an alloy. The best results we obtained in our efforts to cover the exposed bronze places was with 18 karat gold.

The gilding of this group is poorly done and over the entire surface of the casting there are many places where the metal has not been covered by gold and where these protrusions of the bronze already show advanced evidence of tarnishing in a spotty and unsightly manner. These areas are visible from the sidewalk below and will continue to darken perceptibly in a comparatively short time.

While occupied with the gilders, I had occasion to observe how very poorly this casting was made. It is not only a very poor reproduction of my plaster model, but also it is technically unacceptable as evidenced by the surfaces of the bronze. It is incomprehensible how a self-respecting foundry could have had the affront to deliver to this country, for such an important place, a casting of such inferior quality. Much of the sculptural detail has been effaced or blurred by their methods. What structural provisions have been installed within the casting cannot, of course, be determined by eye from without. However, judging from its many surface defects, cracks, fissures, plugs, holes, and considerable porosity, an indication that the casting is very thin in numerous places, it hardly gives cause for optimism as to its structural integrity.

It is my understanding that Mr. Marino Marnelli, of the Florence foundry, who came to this country, advised on the erection of "Sacrifice" at the site and insisted that the group be hoisted into place within its supporting crate. This unusual procedure, I have learned, was complied with in this instance, while the other three groups were uncrated on the ground, and hoisted with slings at either end of the bellies into place. On inspection, this raises the question, particularly of the plinth of the Marinelli cast, as to whether it could have taken the strain of installation without the crate.

Under the bellies of both castings of my groups there are to be found a few vent holes, placed there for purposes of condensation. However, the dripping from these perforations in "Sacrifice" are more frequent and could be caused by leakages in the upper section of the casting.

EXHIBIT D - 1

THE FLORENCE

July 10, 1951

SPECIAL DELIVERY

Re: Bronze casting
of "Guardian"
Arlington Mem.
Bridge

Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Asso. Supt.
National Capital Parks
Department of the Interior
Washington, 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

As the result of a series of efforts and experiments last week to repair the unpolished area under the belly of "Guardian", it was found that the Italian gilder could hardly have used 24 karat gold as reported. Inasfar as it could be determined, they employed a gold containing an alloy. The best results we obtained in our efforts to cover the exposed bronze places was with 18 karat gold.

The gilding of this group is poorly done and over the entire surface or the casting there are many places where the metal has not been covered by gold and where these protrusions of the bronze already show advanced evidence of tarnishing in a spotty and unsightly manner. These areas are visible from the sidewalk below and will continue to darken perceptibly in a comparatively short time.

While concerned with the gilding, I had occasion to observe how very poorly this casting was made. It is not only a very poor reproduction of my plaster model, but also it is technically unacceptable as evidenced by the surfaces of the bronze. It is incomprehensible how a self-respecting foundry could have had the effront to deliver to this country, for such an important place, a casting of such inferior quality. Much of the sculptural detail has been effaced or blurred by their carelessness. What structural provisions have been installed within the casting cannot, of course, be determined by eye from without. However, judging from its very surface defects, cracks, fissures, pluges, holes, and considerable porosity, a indication that the casting is very thin in numerous places, it hardly gives cause for optimism as to its structural integrity.

It is my understanding that Mr. Darino Zarnelli, of the Florence Foundry, who came to this country, advised on the erection of "Guardian" at the site and insisted that the group be isolated into place within the supporting cross. This unusual procedure, I have learned, was complied with in this instance, while the other three groups were mounted on the ground, and bolted with flanges at either end of the pillars into place. On inspection, this raises the question, particularly of the plinth of the Lincoln case, as to whether it could have taken the strain of installation without the crate.

Under the pillars of both castings of my groups there are to be found a few vent holes, placed there for purposes of ventilation. However, the dripping from these perforations in "Guardian" are more frequent and could be caused by leakages in the upper section of the casting.

Had such a bronze casting been done in this country, it would have been rejected without further question; but in view of the international aspects involved, perhaps th only remaining course of action is to have the work carefully inspected by a foundryman to see what can be done. For this purpose, may I suggest that the casting be inspected by Mr. Eugene Bedi, who has successfully cast several of my past commissions. I have shown him the Park Department's photos (dated July 12, 1951, Nos. 1201-EO to 1201-EW inclusive) of some of the defective parts, and from them he has concluded that it is a poor casting technically and a poor replica artistically, and will not stand up for long. As the sculptor, I should very much like to accompany him and further suggest taht, if possible, you and a member of the Fine Arts Commission join us. I consider it of vital importance to the Government to do what can be done to determine the stability of the casting in order to insure its endurance, appearance, and above all, its safety.

Surely you must realize that after all these trying years, the final result has proven to be a painful disappointment to me.

I had hoped to see you personally regarding these matters before leaving Washington, Commander Clark thought you would return from a trip early Friday, July 13; but later, he informed me that you had been detained and would not be in your office until today.

Since the defective casting deals considerably with the artistic aspects of the projects, I have therefore, communicated with the National Commission of Fine Arts and I am also sending tham a copy of this letter.

Awaiting your reply at your earliest convenience, I am

Sincerely yours,

Leo Friedlander

cc Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
National Commission of Fine Arts

had such a bronze casting been done in this country, it would have been rejected without further question, but in view of the international aspects involved, perhaps the only remaining course of action is to have the work carefully inspected by a foundryman to see what can be done. For this purpose, may I suggest that the casting be inspected by Mr. Eugene Peck, who has successfully cast several of my bronze commissions. I have shown him the Clark Gerstenhaber photos (dated July 12, 1951, Nos. 1601-10 to 1601-[illegible] inclusive) of some of the defective parts, and from them he has concluded that it is a poor casting technically and a poor replica artistically, and will not stand up for long. As the sculptor, I should very much like to accompany him and further suggest that, if possible, you and a member of the Fine Arts Commission join us. I consider it of vital importance to the Government to do what can be done to determine the advisability of any casting in order to insure its endurance, appearance, and above all, its safety.

Surely you must realize that after all these trying years, the final result has proven to be a painful disappointment to me.

I had hoped to see you personally regarding these matters before leaving Washington. Commander Clark thought you would return from a trip early July 19; but later, he informed me that you had been detained and would not be in your office until today.

Since the defective casting deals considerably with the artistic aspects of the projects, I have therefore, communicated with the National Commission of Fine Arts and I am also sending them a copy of this letter.

Awaiting your reply at your earliest convenience, I am

Sincerely yours,

Leo Friedlander

cc Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
National Commission of Fine Arts

OPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON D.C.

August 1, 1951.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on July 19, 1951, the Commission considered a letter of complaint, being a copy of one sent to you by Mr. Leo Friedlander, sculptor of the equestrians at the entrance to the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

As you doubtless have noted, Mr. Friedlander complains bitterly about the poor workmanship done by the foundry in Italy on one of the figures, namely "Sacrifice"; that it has numerous cracks and is porous. This has been confirmed by the sculptor member of this Commission, the Honorable Felix W. deWeldon, who has reported to the Commission of Fine Arts that he has inspected this equestrian, and that he found holes in it large enough to enable him to put his thumb into them.

The Commission feel that an artist has the right to complain about poor workmanship, and that he has the right to expect that such steps be taken as are possible to remedy the defects. Thus the Commission endorse the suggestion of Mr. Friedlander that Mr. Bedi, an expert bronze finisher, be asked to come to Washington and inspect this equestrian, "Sacrifice", and submit a report with recommendations concerning it. This should include another particular item of complaint by Mr. Friedlander, namely the head of the woman, which is a poor reproduction of this model. The head of the woman should be recast, and for this purpose the model should be returned from Italy. The Commission suggest, of course, that no publicity be given this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Harry T.Thompson,
Associate Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D - 2

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON D.C.

August 1, 1931.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on July 19, 1931, the Commission considered a letter of complaint, using a copy of one sent to you by Mr. Leo Friedlander, sculptor of the equestrians at the entrance to the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

As you doubtless have noted, Mr. Friedlander complains bitterly about the poor workmanship done by the foundry in Italy on one of the figures, namely "Sacrifice"; that it has numerous cracks and is porous. This has been confirmed by the sculptor member of this Commission, the honorable Felix W. Seldom, who has reported to the Commission of Fine Arts that he has inspected this equestrian, and that he found holes in it large enough to enable him to put his hand into them.

The Commission feel that an artist has the right to complain about poor workmanship, and that he has the right to expect that such repairs be taken as are possible to remedy the defects. Thus the Commission endorses the suggestion of Mr. Friedlander that Mr. Redd, an expert bronze finisher, be called to come to Washington and inspect this equestrian, "Sacrifice", and submit a report with recommendations concerning it. This should include another particular item of complaint by Mr. Friedlander, namely the head of the woman, which is a poor reproduction of this model. The head of the woman should be recast, and for this purpose the model should be returned from Italy. The Commission suggest, of course, that no publicity be given this matter.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Harry T.Thompson,
Associate Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D.C.

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Coe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 19, 1951, approved Scheme A, of the several sketches which you presented for the treatment of the entrance to the Seaton Elementary School.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Mr. Merrel A. Coe,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT E

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1931

Dear Mr. Doe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 19, 1931, approved Scheme A, of the several sketches which you presented for the treatment of the entrance to the Beaton Elementary School.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Mr. Merrel A. Doe,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT 2

OPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Thorn:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 19, 1951, approved the models by Edmond Amateis, on the basis of photographs submitted, proposed to be placed at the entrance to the building of the District of Columbia Chapter, American Red Cross, at 20th and E Streets, Northwest.

For the Commission of Fine Arts,

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Hon. Allan S. Thorn,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
General Service,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Thorn:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on July 19, 1951, approved the models by Edmond Amateis, on the basis of photographs submitted, proposed to be placed at the entrance to the building of the District of Columbia Chapter, American Red Cross, at 20th and E Streets, Northwest.

For the Commission of Fine Arts,

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Hon. Allen S. Thorn,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
General Service,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

COPY

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

PITTSBURGH 13, PENNSYLVANIA

June 26, 1951.

Mr. H.P.Caemmerer, Secretary
National Commission of Fine Arts
Department of the Interior Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

When Walker Hancock and I visited your office on March 9, to discuss possible sites in Washington for the Stephen Foster Memorial, you suggested that we see whether the Library of Congress was interested.

Your suggestion was most helpful! Mr. Hancock and I found that the Library of Congress was interested and they assigned an alcove in one of the passages of the Music Division, to become the site of the Memorial. After discussion of the project with Library officials, and a visit, earlier this month, to Mr. Hancock's studio at Lanesville, Massachusetts, tentative plans have been made for the form of the memorial. As now planned, the memorial will consist of a bust of Stephen Foster, located in the alcove. A plaque above the bust will memorialize Foster; the pedestal of the bust will bear an inscription describing the gift.

Mr. John C.L.Andreassen, Director of Administration of the Library of Congress, has written me as follows:

> "We are now in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar Chapman, which reads as follows:
> "
> " 'I have received your letter of June 5 requesting the views of this Department on the suggestion of Mr. Fletcher Hodges, Jr., that the memorial plaque to the memory of Stephen Collins Foster to be accepted on behalf of the United States as provided in Public Law 782 be erected near the Music Division in the Library of Congress where a large Stephen Foster collection is preserved.
>
> " 'The Department of the Interior feels that the proposed location of the tablet in the Library of Congress contiguous to the Foster Collection has great merit, and highly endorses the plan.'
>
> "I trust this information will be of interest to you."

Your own interest in this project has been deeply appreciated. Thanks, again, for all your help.

EXHIBIT G

Sincerely yours,

(signed) Fletcher Hodges, Jr., Curator
(The Foster Hall Collection)

COPY

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 13, 1951

Dear Mr. Finley:

Since your letter of June 26 to Dr. Evans concerns activities of the Library of Congress that are under my supervision as Assistant Librarian, the letter was referred to me for my consideration. I am sure that Dr. Evans intended to reply to it himself, but both he and the Chief Assistant Librarian are now absent attending the American Library Association meeting in Chicago, and it therefore becomes my privilege, as Acting Librarian, to acknowledge and reply to your letter.

We are indeed very interested in your suggestion that there ought to be "a permanent exhibition on the City of Washington on display, for the benefit of the thousands of tourists and others who come here each year," and we shall certainly explore the possibilities of getting something provided for along these lines. In the meantime, you will be interested to know that we have postponed the closing date for our Sesquicentennial Exhibition on the District of Columbia to the first of September. After that date, we shall have to use the cases it occupies for another of our series of State Exhibitions, plans for which were initiated some time ago.

Sincerely yours,

Solon J. Buck
Acting Librarian of Congress

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Building
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT H

The Library of Congress

Washington, D.C.

July 10, 1951

Dear Mr. Finley:

Since your letter of June 20 to Mr. Evans concerning activities of the Library of Congress that are under my supervision as Assistant Librarian, the letter was referred to me for my consideration. I am sure that Mr. Evans intended to reply to it himself, but both he and the Chief Assistant Librarian are now absent attending the American Library Association meeting in Chicago, and it therefore becomes my privilege, as Acting Librarian, to acknowledge and reply to your letter.

We are indeed very interested in your suggestion that there ought to be "a permanent exhibition on the City of Washington on display, for the benefit of the thousands of tourists and others who come here each year." and we shall certainly explore the possibilities of getting something provided for along these lines. In the meantime, you will be interested to know that we have postponed the closing date for our Sesquicentennial Exhibition on the District of Columbia to the first of September. After that date, we shall have to use the cases it occupies for another of our series of State Exhibitions, plans for which were initiated some time ago.

Sincerely yours,

Solon G. Auer
Acting Librarian of Congress

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Building
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT H

STATE AND MUNICIPAL ART COMMISSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES *

STATE COMMISSIONS

CONNECTICUT - Commission of Sculpture
The Capitol, Hartford

Est. 1886, by act of Legislature, to pass on all matters relating to the decoration of the Capitol building and grounds. Five Commissioners.

LOUISIANA - Louisiana Art Commission
Old State Capitol, Baton Rouge

Est. 1938 by State Legislature, to promote and sustain artistic activity in and of the State. Supported by public funds. Annual exhibition by Louisana artists and also art students; special exhibits. Owns permanent collection and circulates traveling exhibitions. Lectures; reference library of books, slides, reproductions. Publishes "Newsletter" monthly.

MASSACHUSETTS - Art Commission of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
14 Beacon St. Boston

Est. 1910. Commission of five members appointed by the Governor; passes upon works of art to be installed on property of the Commonwealth.

PENNSYLVANIA - State Art Commission
1311 Payne-Shoemaker Bldg., Harrisburg

Est. 1919. Five members. Examines and approves or disapproves the design and proposed location of all public monuments, memorials, buildings, or other structures and certain private structures to be erected anywhere in the Commonwealth, other than in the cities of the first and second classes.

VIRGINIA - Art Commission of Virginia
The Capitol, Richmond

Est. 1916 by Act of Assembly. Passes upon all works of art purchased by or presented to the State and proposed location; also on designs of all buildings on State property or erected with State funds.

* American Art Annual - 1948

EXHIBIT I

STATE COMMISSIONS

CONNECTICUT - Commission of Sculpture
The Capitol, Hartford

Act. 1886, by act of legislature, to pass on all matters relating to the decoration of the Capitol building and grounds. Five Commissioners.

LOUISIANA - Louisiana Art Commission
Old State Capitol, Baton Rouge

Act. 1928 by State Legislature, to promote and sustain artistic activity in and of the State. Supported by public funds. Annual exhibition by Louisiana artists and also art students; special exhibits. Owns permanent collection and circulates travelling exhibitions. Lectures; reference library of books, slides, reproductions. Publishes "Newsletter" monthly.

MASSACHUSETTS - Art Commission of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
14 Beacon St. Boston

Act. 1910. Commission of five members appointed by the Governor; passes upon works of art to be installed on property of the Commonwealth.

PENNSYLVANIA - State Art Commission
1911 Payne-Shoemaker Bldg., Harrisburg

Act. 1919. Five members, examines and approves or disapproves the design and proposed location of all public monuments, memorials, buildings, or other structures and certain private structures to be erected anywhere in the Commonwealth, other than in the cities of the first and second classes.

VIRGINIA - Art Commission of Virginia
The Capitol, Richmond

Act. 1916 by Act of Assembly. Passes upon all works of art purchased by or presented to the State and proposed locations; also on designs of all buildings on State property or erected with State funds.

* American Art Annual - I 46

12

MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONS

BALTIMORE - Art Commission of Baltimore City

City Hall, Baltimore Maryland

Est. 1895 to pass upon designs for all public structures. Composed of the Mayor and 7 representatives of independent art organizations of the City and Park Board.

BOSTON - Art Commission of the City of Boston
Faneuil Hall, Boston, Massachusetts

Est. 1890. Five members appointed by the Mayor, one each year for 5 years. No work of art can become the property of the City without the approval of the Art Commission.

COLUMBUS - Columbus Art Commission
City Hall, Columbus, Ohio

Est. 1945; nine members to serve in an advisory capacity to the Mayor and the City Planning Commission. Designs for public buildings, arches, gates, and other constructions, paintings, murals, sculpture, and monuments must have the Commission's approval.

DENVER - Art Commission of the City and County of Denver
City and County Bldg., Room 463, Denver, Colorado

Est. 1904. Consists of five members, including Mayor ex-officio. Passes judgment on design and location of gifts of monuments and other works of art to City.

KANSAS CITY - Municipal Art Commission
City Hall, Kansas City, Missouri

Created 1925. Nine members; is Department of City Government which passes judgment upon all works of art that are to become the property of the City, whether by purchase or gift. Designs for buildings and bridges to be erected on public property are also subject to its approval.

LOS ANGELES - Municipal Art Commission
Room 351, City Hall, Los Angeles, California

Est. 1903. Charter granted 1911. Five Commissioners; pass upon architectural design of municipal buildings and structures over public property and upon works of art acquired by City. Maintained by City appropriation. Initiated Los Angles Art week held annually.

NEW HAVEN - Municipal Art Commission
205 Church St. New Haven, Connecticut

Est. 1913. Five members appointed by the Mayor to serve 5 years. Public works referred to the Commission for approval.

E. Lubl, I

INDIANA DEPARTMENT

BALTIMORE - Art Commission of Baltimore City

City Hall, Baltimore, Maryland

Est. 1925 to pass upon designs for all public structures. Composed of the Mayor and 7 representatives of independent art organizations of the City and Park Board.

BOSTON - Art Commission of the City of Boston
Faneuil Hall, Boston, Massachusetts

Est. 1890. Five members appointed by the Mayor, one each year for 5 years. No work of art can become the property of the City without the approval of the Art Commission.

COLUMBUS - Columbus Art Commission
City Hall, Columbus, Ohio

Est. 1924; nine members to serve in an advisory capacity to the Mayor and the City Planning Commission. Designs for public buildings, arches, gates, and other constructions, paintings, murals, sculpture, and monuments must have the commission's approval.

DENVER - Art Commission of the City and County of Denver
City and County Bldg., Room 405, Denver, Colorado

Est. 1924. Consists of five members, including Mayor ex-officio. Passes judgment on design and location of gifts of monuments and other works of art to City.

KANSAS CITY - Municipal Art Commission
City Hall, Kansas City, Missouri

Created 1925. Nine members; is department of City Government which passes judgment upon all works of art that are to become the property of the City, whether by purchase or gift. Designs for buildings and bridges to be erected on public property are also subject to the approval.

LOS ANGELES - Municipal Art Commission
Room 351, City Hall, Los Angeles, California

Est. 1923. Charter granted 1921. Five commissioners; pass upon architectural design of municipal buildings and structures over public property and upon works of art acquired by City. Maintained by City appropriation. Initiated Los Angeles Art Week held annually.

NEW HAVEN - Municipal Art Commission
205 Church St. New Haven, Connecticut

Est. 1913. Five members appointed by the Mayor to serve 3 years. Public works referred to the Commission for approval.

MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONS (CONT'D)

NEW YORK - Art Commission of the City of New York

City Hall, New York, New York.

Est. 1898. Composed of Mayor and lo members. Pass on all City structures and works of art on New York City property. Art Commission Associates - Est. 1913 and composed of former and all present members of the Art Commission; acts in an advisory capacity to the Commission. Membership approximately 50; dues $10.

PHILADELPHIA - Art Jury
Room 121 City Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Created by act of Legislature 1907, reenacted 1919. Consists of 10 members. Department of the City Government which passes upon the design and location of all buildings and other structures or fixtures to be presented to the City, or for which the City is to pay, or for which the City or any other public authority furnishes the site.

SAN FRANCISCO - Art Commission of the City and County of San Francisco
1000 Larkin St., San Francisco, California.

Est. 1932. Consists of 7 professional and 3 lay members appointed by the Mayor, with advice of art societies, and 6 ex-officio members. Passes on all buildings and works off art placed on property of City and County; supervises and controls all appropriations made by the Board of Supervisor for music and the advancement of art and music. May volunteer advice to private owners who submit plans for suggestions.

MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONS (CONT'D)

NEW YORK - Art Commission of the City of New York

City Hall, New York, New York.

Est. 1898. Composed of Mayor and 10 members. Pass on all City sculpture and works of art on New York City property. Art Commission Associates - Est. 1913 and composed of former and all present members of the Art Commission; acts in an advisory capacity to the Commission. Membership approximately 30; dues $10.

PHILADELPHIA - Art Jury
Room 121 City Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Created by act of Legislature 1907, reenacted 1919. Consists of 10 members. Department of the City Government which passes upon the design and location of all buildings and other structures or fixtures to be presented to the City, or for which the City is to pay, or for which the City or any other public authority furnishes the site.

SAN FRANCISCO - Art Commission of the City and County of San Francisco
1000 Larkin St., San Francisco, California.

Est. 1932. Consists of 7 professional and 3 lay members appointed by the Mayor, with advice of art societies, and 6 ex-officio members. Passes on all building and works of art placed on property of city and County; supervises and controls all appropriations made by the Board of Supervisor for music and the advancement of art and music. May volunteer advice to private owners who submit plans for suggestions.

PY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting on July 19, 1951, gave careful consideration to the suggestion made with regard to the materials proposed for the exterior of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology building at the Army Medical Center.

From the point of view of the appearance of the building, the Commission of Fine Arts cannot approve any building with surfaces of concrete. The Commission hopes the Corps of Engineers will not use this material without first having suitable tests of other surfaces made by the United States Bureau of Standards. The Commission feels that, since a direct hit by an atomic bomb will not save the building, the use of natural stone such as limestone as a surface or veneer is justified. There should not be intruded into an otherwise beautiful landscape such a massive building with an ugly exterior that will stand for a great many years to come.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Colonel Alan L. McCutchen,
District Engineer, Washington District,
First and Douglas Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT J

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Colonel McIntosh:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting on July 19, 1951, gave careful consideration to the suggestion made with regard to the materials proposed for the exterior of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology building at the Army Medical Center.

From the point of view of the appearance of the building, the Commission of Fine Arts cannot approve any building with surfaces of concrete. The Commission hopes the Corps of Engineers will not use this material without first having suitable tests of other surfaces made by the United States Bureau of Standards. The Commission feels that, since a direct hit by an atomic bomb will not save the building, the use of natural stone such as limestone as a surface or veneer is justified. There should not be intruded into an otherwise beautiful landscape such a massive building with an ugly exterior that will sound for a great many years to come.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Colonel Alan L. McIntosh,
District Engineer, Washington District,
First and Douglas Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT 4

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

The drawings for the Domiciliary Building of the United States Soldiers' Home, which you submitted with your letter of July 5th, were reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on July 19, 1951. It was noted that you propose to make changes in the construction plans as may be possible.

The Commission regret very much the oversight and misunderstanding that developed regarding the submission of the design directly to the Commission of Fine Arts long before this. The criticisms that the Commission made at the meeting last June were set forth in the letter addressed to you on June 27th.

However, since this is to be the first of a number of buildings in the group, the Commission hope that suggestions made by the architect and landscape architect members will be embodied in the further development of the project.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Colonel Alan J. McCutchen,
District Engineer,
Washington District,
First and Douglas Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT K

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

The drawings for the Domiciliary Building of the United States Soldiers' Home, which you submitted with your letter of July 5th, were reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on July 19, 1951. It was noted that you propose to make changes in the construction plans as may be possible.

The Commission regret very much the oversight and misunderstanding that developed regarding the submission of the design directly to the Commission of Fine Arts long before this. The criticisms that the Commission made at the meeting last June were set forth in the letter addressed to you on June 27th.

However, since this is to be the first of a number of buildings in the group, the Commission hope that suggestions made by the architect and landscape architect members will be embodied in the further development of the project.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman

Colonel Alan M. McCutchen,
District Engineer,
Washington District,
First and Douglas Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT K

OPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 20, 1951

Dear Mr. Winslow:

On behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts, I wish to advise you that the Commission unanimously approved the designs for the renovation of the White House, which were shown to us yesterday in your office.

The Commission enjoyed the opportunity to inspect the White House and to note the details of construction as indicated in the plans which you showed us. The Commission regard the alterations as being decided improvements over former conditions that existed in the White House and wish to compliment you and the members of the Commission on the Renovation of the White House for the work that has been so far accomplished.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley

Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow
Architect of the White House
The White House
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT L

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 26, 1951

Dear Mr. Hinslow:

On behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts, I wish to advise you that the Commission unanimously approved the designs for the renovation of the White House, which were shown to us yesterday in your office.

The Commission enjoyed the opportunity to inspect the White House and to note the details of construction as indicated in the plans which you showed us. The Commission regard the alterations as being decided improvements over former conditions that existed in the White House and wish to compliment you and the members of the Commission on the Renovation of the White House for the work that has been so far accomplished.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley

Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow
Architect of the White House
The White House
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT 1