MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 4, 1935.

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1936, was held in the office of John Russell Pope, 542 Fifth Avenue, New York City, on Friday, October 4, 1935. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Swartwout,
Mr. Clarke,
Mr. Lawrie,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Coolidge,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

There was also present by invitation Mr. William Mitchell Kendall of the firm of McKim, Mead and White of New York City.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission, held September 13, 1935, were approved.

2. NEW BUILDINGS FOR THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK: Under date of September 14, 1935, the following letter was received from Mr. Louis Simon, Supervising Architect, submitting plans for several new buildings to be built in the National Zoological Park:

September 14, 1935.

The Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Sir:

There are being forwarded to you under separate cover, for comment and advice, elevations and plans for the following proposed new buildings to be erected in the National Zoological Park, this city:

Exhibition Building for Pachyderms
Exhibition Building for Small Mammals
and Great Apes
Completion of Bird House
Machine and Carpenter Shop, Garage, and
Store Rooms

Accompanying these sketches is a copy of the general layout plan of the Zoological Park, on which is indicated the existing and proposed buildings.

Your early action on this matter and the return of these sketches to this office will be very much appreciated.

Respectfully,
(Signed) L. A. Simon,
Supervising Architect.

Photostatic prints of the sketches had been sent to the architect members of the Commission and to Mr. Clarke for consideration prior to the meeting.

Mr. Clarke said that he had seen the plans and had talked with Mr. Simon about them. Mr. Clarke felt it was unfortunate to place monumental buildings on a hilly topography with no formal relation of the buildings to one another. If the buildings are not to be formally placed they should not be monumental in design.

Mr. Clarke said that he thought it very important to have a landscape plan prepared for the buildings so as to relate them properly before construction work is begun. Mr. Swartwout agreed with Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Clarke as to this. Mr. Swartwout also thought the buildings too monumental.

Thereupon Mr. R. W. Bristol and Mr. Edwin H. Clark of the Supervising Architect's Office and also Dr. Wm. M. Mann, Director of the Zoo, were introduced and they presented working drawings of the new buildings. These were inspected by the Commission.

Mr. Coolidge said that buildings of this kind are entirely out of date compared with modern buildings for animals in other zoological parks. What is used in England and certain other countries is an out-of-door treatment for animals except for those that must be kept inside to protect them from the elements.

Dr. Mann then pointed out the location of each building in the Zoological Park and said that in considering the designs for these new buildings they had studied their location with reference to the existing buildings and had tried to unify the group. Mr. Moore raised the question as to whether the Zoological Park should not be relocated, at least in part, in Anacostia Park in the northeast section of Washington. Dr. Mann was not in favor of this. He said they have 176 acres and with these buildings they would have seven buildings in all for their animals, occupying 20 acres, which would leave 156 acres for outdoor development. At the London Zoo, he said there are 32 buildings.

The question of buildings affording outdoor facilities for the animals was considered with Dr. Mann. He said that the mammal house would house many small animals and would have to be roofed. The monkeys would have indoor and outdoor cages. The building provides for skylights which can be removed so that the animals can get direct sunshine; also the metal parts are rustless so the animals may be in the rain and yet the building will not be injured.

The present bird house and reptile house are Romanesque in style, built of red brick with limestone trim. Dr. Mann said the present buildings are a heterogeneous mass but with these new buildings it is proposed to start a unified composition.

Mr. Bristol and Mr. Clark explained details of the working drawings. Mr. Swartwout expressed regret that the plans were coming to the Commission

at this stage because it virtually meant the Commission would have to approve plans as drawn. Mr. Bristol explained that there is a great hurry about these plans in view of an Executive Order of the President that P.W. Projects must be under contract by October 22, 1935. For this project they have received an allotment of $180,000 which must be obligated by that date.

The mammal house will be 179 feet long by 54 feet wide and 35 feet high. It is to be of red brick with limestone trim.

The pachyderm house will be 227 feet long by 114 feet wide by 35 feet high. It will provide quarters for the elephants and large open yards adjacent with suitable areas so that visitors can see the elephants. This is to be built of local Bethesda stone. It is a warm grey colored stone with iron rust spots and is all seam faced. The building will have arches of limestone.

A discussion followed as to the roads in the Zoological Park. Dr. Mann said he would now take out the winding road through the park. Fully 6,000 automobiles go over the Zoo roads Sunday. This is one of a few Zoological Parks that allow autos. There is need for fencing off the Zoo adjacent to Rock Creek and building a road across Rock Creek, which would thus provide for a through connection with the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Mr. Moore said Mr. Olmsted has been making a study of such roadway. It was suggested that the National Park Service take up the matter of constructing the road. Dr. Mann said the new buildings have been located with such a road in view.

After further general discussion as to the project the Commission approved the plans. A report was sent to Mr. Simon accordingly. (Exhibit A)

3. MERIDIAN HILL PARK, NICHE ON SIXTEENTH STREET SIDE: Mr. Malcolm Kirkpatrick, Landscape Architect of the National Park Service, submitted several sketches for proposed treatment of the niche on the Sixteenth Street side of Meridian Hill Park. The plans presented called for an elaborate treatment of the niche with a fountain in it. Mr. Kirkpatrick said that Mr. Peaslee had seen some of these plans and considered them too elaborate but that a plan (No. 3) has been made which he thought Mr. Peaslee would consider satisfactory. Mr. Swartwout and Mr. Coolidge advised that the fountain be re-studied and that the steps shown in the design should be omitted.

Mr. Moore said he was of the opinion that instead of having a fountain outside of the park it would be better to have another fountain in the park. Mr. Moore also called attention to a letter sent to the Commission of Fine Arts when a similar study was submitted by Mr. Peaslee in 1932 and how it was disapproved with the advice that a more simplified treatment should be given to the niche. (Exhibit B) The Commission decided to hold the plans in abeyance until the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts in Washington early in November when Mr. Peaslee should be consulted in connection with the project.

5. ANACOSTIA PARK: Mr. Kirkpatrick submitted a landscape plan for the development of Anacostia Park, which included the construction of a pool, roadways, and additional planting. Mr.Clarke had inspected the plan and upon his recommendation it was approved.

6. PALISADES RECREATION CENTER FIELD HOUSE: Mr. Kirkpatrick submitted a design for a field house to be built at the Palisades Recreation Center. The design was approved with the request that brick be used in the gables of the house instead of wood.

7. MARION PARK LANDSCAPE PLAN: The landscape plan for this park had been previously approved by the Commission. Mr. Kirkpatrick said since then objection has been made to closing a street that extends through the park and the design had therefor been changed so as to bring the two parts of the park in proper relation. The plan was approved.

8. MT. VERNON SQUARE PLANTING PLAN: A planting plan was submitted for the treatment of Mt. Vernon Square at 9th and K Streets, N. W., on which the Public Library is located. This plan was approved.

9. MONTROSE PARK: Mr. Clarke said that last Sunday he was in Washington and visited Montrose Park with Mr. Kirkpatrick. He saw a number of people playing tennis and felt this should not be allowed in the park. The plan has, therefore, been changed to omit the tennis courts and provide instead a playground for small children. The Commission concurred in this and approved the plan accordingly.

10. FRANKLIN SQUARE: A planting plan for Franklin Square was submitted. Mr. Clarke said he had inspected it and regarded it simple and dignified. The plan was therefore approved by the Commission.

A discussion followed as to the use of Aquia Creek sandstone for the fountain. Mr. Kirkpatrick called attention to the trouble with the Chevy Chase fountain and said they are considering the use of Briar Hill stone, which is fairly similar in color. Mr. Swartwout said that Aquia Creek stone is good but there is a soft and a hard Aquia Creek stone and it must be carefully selected.

11. FOLGER PARK: Mr. Kirkpatrick submitted a revised plan for Folger Park, showing a pool 8 inches deep in the center and four inches deep at the

edges; also bituminous walks instead of concrete. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Clarke the plan was approved.

A discussion followed as to the work of John J. Earley, an expert in the use of colored aggregate. Mr. Earley called it, so Mr. Kirkpatrick said, mosaic concrete and under such designation it is possible to eliminate competition. The work of Mr. Earley is known to the Commission.

12. KEY BRIDGE UNDERPASS: Mr. Kirkpatrick submitted a plan for an underpass on the Virginia side of Key Bridge to allow for the construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Mr. Kirkpatrick said the National Capital Park and Planning Commission roposes simply a tunnel on the Virginia side. Mr. Vint, Chief Architect of the National Park Service, was present and said the National Park Service prefers the construction of another arch on the Virginia side to allow for the underpass. There is enough money available he thought to pay for the arch. The two schemes were considered and the scheme providing for the additional arch was considered far superior and was accordingly approved. (Exhibit C)

Mr. Vint said that Wyeth and Sullivan, the designers of the Key Bridge, had contemplated an additional arch on the Virginia side and to carry out the scheme with the underpass is in accordance with their original plan.

13. DESIGNS FOR TWO TYPES OF BENCHES FOR THE WASHINGTON PARKS: Designs for two types of benches for the parks in Washington, one a concrete bench and the other an iron bench, were submitted. These were inspected by the Commission. The Commission regarded the designs generally satisfactory and interposed no objection to their being tried out.

14. LANDSCAPE PLANS, FOURTEENTH STREET FRONTAGE, AGRICULTURE EXTENSIBLE BUILDING: The Secretary submitted a landscape plan received from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the Fourteenth Street frontage of the Extensible Building. This was inspected by Mr. Clarke and upon his recommendation was approved by the Commission. (Exhibit D)

15. LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR SMALL SQUARES AND TRIANGLES: Mr. Clarke said that last Sunday (September 29) he inspected about 60 landscape plans for small triangles and parks in the District of Columbia. In general he regarded them satisfactory. Mr. Clarke said it would help improve the appearance of the National Capital to have these plans carried out. The Commission, therefore, decided that it would not be necessary for them to inspect the plans individually, and upon the recommendation of Mr. Clarke these plans were approved. (Exhibit E)

16. THOMAS PAINE AND GEORGE B. McCLELLAN MEMORIAL: Under date of October 1, 1935, the following letter was received from Mr. A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service, submitting a preliminary design and a letter that had been addressed to the President by Mr. A. O. Richardson of Chicago:

October 1, 1935.

Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
Navy Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

There is enclosed for your consideration a letter from Mr. Charles O. Richardson concerning a plan for a memorial to Thomas Paine and George B. McClellan. Under separate cover we are forwarding a sketch of the proposed memorial and four copies of the Mentor Magazine, containing information on Thomas Paine.

Mr. Richardson has been advised of this reference.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) A. E. Demaray,
Acting Director.

The letter from Mr. Richardson was read by Mr. Moore, Mr. Lawrie and Mr. Savage. Mr. Lawrie and Mr. Savage inspected the design and regarded it very unsatisfactory for a memorial. Also the other members of the Commission took note of the design and concurred with Mr. Lawrie and Mr. Savage. The Commission felt they had no jurisdiction over this matter and the design was disapproved. (Exhibit A)

17. SECOND DIVISION MEMORIAL: Mr. Moore read a copy of a letter received by him from Mr. Lorimer Rich protesting against the erection of the Second Division Memorial along Constitution Avenue near 17th Street, as follows:

Washington, D. C.
September 28th 1935.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
The National Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Moore:

It has recently come to our attention that the Second Division is proposing to erect a Memorial on the North side of Constitution Avenue, between 16th and 17th Streets and in the area known as the Ellipse grounds. This Memorial and its location, we understand, has been approved by the Fine Arts Commission and by the other necessary authorities.

This area has existed for generations as a most satisfying expanse of green, beautifully embellished with spreading elm trees. It now presents itself as one of the finest parks in Washington. It takes its place on one of the important axes of the Washington Plan and one of its chief charms is its lack of monuments and memorials. It is made up entirely of green turf and shade trees, giving a most pleasant contrast to the surrounding buildings.

This proposed Memorial of stone stands approximately twenty feet high and twenty-five feet wide at its base. We feel that the very presence of this amount of masonry (no matter how well designed) is a menace to the peace and repose of this important situation; and that it attacks the fine flat feeling of the lawns

and competes with the impressive elm trees, which do so much to make this a beautiful place.

We are concerned because of the possible erection of this one Memorial in The Ellipse, and also because of the precedent which will hereby be established. Already, we understand, the Commission has allotted a site for a Fourth Division Memorial and in addition to this a site for a Monument to the Early Settlers of the District of Columbia.

It appears to us that this park, designed and laid out as it is, with the splendid elliptical drive - open green in the center - and fine shade trees around the sides, can not be improved and can easily lose its present high distinction. In our opinion, the erection of other un-related Memorials in the Ellipse area can only lead to architectural chaos and confusion and the complete destruction of its greatest charm.

We, the undersigned, view with considerable alarm this or any other invasion of the Ellipse by a Memorial. We therefore respectfully request that the Commission review its decision to allow Memorials in this area and to consider the menacing possibilities that may ensue if the present Ellipse is molested in this manner.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Lorimer Rich.
Wesley Sherwood Bessell
Howard L. Cheney
R. Stanley-Brown
Wm. Dewey Foster
John C. Bollenbacher
Victor D. Abel

Mr. Coolidge submitted a note from Mr. Shepley, as follows:

Mr. Shepley hopes the Fine Arts Commission will reconsider locating the monument in the ellipse ground south of the White House. He suggests something like the Appian Way beyond the Arlington Bridge. As he remembers it that was the idea when the Arlington bridge was designed.

The Commission considered the matter of location of the memorial very carefully and called attention to the fact that the First Division Memorial had been located in the President's Park with the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library and that the Butt-Millet Fountain and the Sherman Statue are also in this area. Mr. Moore said that the question of locating the Second Division Memorial has been under consideration for four years and

that General Harbord in behalf of the Second Division took up the matter of locating the memorial at the site selected with committees in Congress. It was pointed out that the memorial was not so very large and that the Commission in approving the location of the Second Division Memorial at this site had considered the location appropriate for the memorial. Since the Second Division has broken ground for the memorial and also since the National Park Service has approved the location, the Commission decided to adhere to the location selected.

A letter in answer to the protest was sent to Mr. Rich. (Exhibit G) Also a letter was sent to Mr. Sullivan in reply to one from him. (Exhibit G-1 and G-2)

18. MEMORIAL FOR THE OLD G. A. R. HALL SITE: The Secretary presented a request from the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War for permission to place a marker at Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue to mark the site of the old G. A. R. Hall.

The Commission were of the opinion that such a memorial would require an Act of Congress, and in the meantime the matter should be taken up with York and Sawyer, architects of the Department of Commerce Building. A report was sent to Mrs. K. Rahn representing the organization. (Exhibit H)

19. GENERAL ARTEMAS WARD STATUE: Under date of September 23, 1935, a letter was received from Dr. M. M. Gray, Chancellor of American University, protesting against the erection of the General Artemas Ward Statue at the intersection of Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, as follows:

September 23, 1935.

The Secretary
Fine Arts Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

I shall be very glad if, without appearing critical, I may suggest to the Fine Arts Commission the advisability of some

change in their plans for what is now presumed to be the Ward Circle. Knowing nothing whatever of the conditions governing the Commission's selection of the Ward monument, I hesitate to make any suggestions; but if I am correctly informed, the proposed monument as designed will not be of a size appropriate to the scale of the circle. But my real point of criticism is that General Ward, however distinguished his services were, is unfortunately but little known to the general public, which, however, does know enough to realize a measure of incongruity between a monument to him and the university environment of which it will be the most striking feature.

I sincerely hope that the Commission may find it possible, without too great embarrassment, to relocate the Ward monument and to leave the present circle at Nebraska Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue incomplete until a monument, fitting the university environment both in size and subject, can be obtained.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Joseph M. M. Gray,
Chancellor.

The Commission considered the matter and felt that the whole project had progressed so far that there seemed to be no valid reason for relocating the statue at another site. Mr. Moore read the draft of a reply to Chancellor Gray, which the members of the Commission regarded very good. This was sent to Dr. Gray. (Exhibit I)

20. SIGN AT 1305 E Street, N. W.: An application was received from the Building Inspector for the erection of a sign at 1305 E Street, N. W., which would project 3 feet 6 inches beyond the building line. The Commission disapproved the application in accordance with their rule that no sign within the Shipstead-Luce Act area should extend beyond the building line.

21. SIGN AT 1013 D STREET: An application was received from the Building Inspector for the erection of a sign at 1013 D Street, N. W. It was noted that this sign projected 24 inches beyond the building line and the sign was, therefore, disapproved.

22. MURAL PAINTINGS FOR THE ARCHIVES BUILDING: The Commission visited the studio of Barry Faulkner, 319 East 72nd Street, to see the one-third size cartoons of murals for the Archives Building. Mr. Faulkner said he had been studying the characters all summer and had used models at his studio in New Hampshire for the sketches. The Commission regarded the sketches very well done and approved them. Mr. Pope, architect of the Archives Building, was present as also Mr. Kendall and they were well pleased with Mr. Faulkner's work.

Mr. Faulkner said he was now about ready to proceed with the full-sized drawings and for this purpose proposes to rent the studio of Ezra Winter. Each of the paintings will be 34 feet long and 14 feet high. The figures, of which there will be 28-30 in number, will be approximately 8 feet high. A report approving these sketches was sent to Mr. Simon. (Exhibit J)

23. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: It was agreed that the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts shall be held in Washington, Friday and Saturday, November 8 and 9, 1935.

The Commission adjourned at 3:00 p. m.

The Commission had as their guests at luncheon, Mr. William Mitchell Kendall and Mr. John Russell Pope.

C O P Y

October 9, 1935.

Dear Mr. Simon:

Dr. William M. Mann, director of the National Zoological Park, brought to the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 4, the plans previously tentatively submitted by you for new buildings.

The Commission, after an extended consultation with the zoological-architectural experts, Mr. R. W. Bristol and Mr. Edwin H. Clark, found that the plans had been prepared with a knowledge of the best contemporary practice in zoological work. The Commission approved the plans as presented.

At the same time the Commission gave certain advice as to the grouping of the buildings, and also expressed a desire to have a landscape plan prepared before the buildings are begun.

The Commission also felt that the shifting of the main road to the left bank of Rock Creek should be pressed at this time, so as to permit night traffic through the Zoo without undue disturbance to the animals. It is not conceivable that, with the new opening of the connection between Rock Creek Park and Potomac Park, that the detour around the Zoo at night will be tolerated.

The new road is in Mr. Olmsted's plan for the Rock Creek Park development.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

January 21, 1932.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 19, 1932, gave further consideration to the model of a fountain designed by Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, architect, for the Sixteenth Street side of the Grand Terrace of Meridian Hill Park.

The presentation to the Commission of a sketch model for the treatment of the side of the wall, followed by two inspections of the place itself, has demonstrated the value of models as a basis of judgment in such matters. The model convinced the Commission that the place called for a very simple treatment; and the visits led them to question seriously whether a fountain so near the street could be used to advantage. The available space is comparatively small. It is not on an axis and so is only an incident in the wall itself.

You will recall that the Commission recommended the elimination of an entrance at this place primarily for artistic reasons and secondarily with a view to saving money urgently needed for work within the park itself. The same artistic reasons would dictate for the treatment of the wall a design in conformity with the severity of the wall itself.

This is a question of taste, and the model will have much more than repaid its cost if the recommendations herein contained shall be adopted. At the same time the Commission desire highly to commend the idea of the model as a means of reaching a conclusion, and also Mr. Peaslee's careful presentation sketch.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Director, Public Buildings and
Public Parks of the National Capital,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

October 16, 1935.

Dear Mr. Demaray:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on October 4, 1935, considered two schemes which were submitted in behalf of your office by Mr. Malcolm Kirkpatrick for a George Washington Memorial underpass on the Virginia side of the Francis Scott Key Bridge.

Of the two schemes, the Commission approved the one providing for an additional span on the Virginia side of the bridge. The Commission strongly disapproved the sketch showing a small hole through the embankment as being inadequate for traffic and absolutely out of keeping with the parkway which it is to serve. The Commission feel that if there is a lack of money at present the matter should rest until adequate funds can be provided.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. A. E. Demaray,
Acting Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

October 5, 1935.

Dear Mr. Simon:

With reference to the planting plan (Drawing T-1) in connection with the Extensible Building of the Department of Agriculture, which was submitted to the Director of the National Park Service on June 22, the Commission of Fine Arts considered this plan at a meeting held on October 4, 1935, in New York City, and approved the plan. The plan is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Louis Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
BRANCH OF PLANS AND DESIGN
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ARCHITECT

October 17, 1935.

Memorandum to
MR. H. P. CAEMMERER:

The following is the list of Reservations reviewed by Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke in Washington, D. C., Saturday and Sunday, September 28 and 29, and recommended by him for approval at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 4:

277-D	154	196	313-B
168	311-B	157	167
546	25	273	376
553	194	75	22
72	313-F	70	24
313-D	313-E	191	33
176	159	76	180
311	73	195	192
71	190	313-C	193
175	27	160	179
28	23	165	471
74	313-G	166	33-A
68	77-B	29	374
31	169	30	170

Various suggestions made by Mr. Clarke at the time of reviewing the plans have been incorporated in the drawings and blue prints will be furnished you as soon as possible.

Malcolm Kirkpatrick
Malcolm Kirkpatrick

cc: Mr. Finnan
Mr. Castella

MK/tob

C O P Y

October 9, 1935.

Dear Mr. Demaray:

The Commission of Fine Arts return to you herewith the sketch for a memorial to Thomas Paine, Gen. George B. McClellan et al proposed for erection in Chicago, to be paid in part from the National Treasury.

This Commission would not approve any portion of the project, if they had any jurisdiction over it. They think they have none.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. A. E. Demaray, Acting Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

C O P Y

October 12, 1935.

My dear Mr. Rich:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on October 4, 1935, considered your letter asking them to reverse their approval of the site for the Second Division Memorial in that portion of the President's Park known as the Ellipse.

Such action the Commission declined to take. The location was not made either hastily or inadvisedly. It was made deliberately.

Several years ago, when the First Division Memorial was placed in a portion of that park, to correspond in location with that of the Sherman Statue, it was realized that possibly others of the Divisions heavily engaged in the World War would desire to erect memorials in Washington. Two sites were then considered available for such purposes. It is now seventeen years since the war ended, and only one of the two sites has been allotted. These considerations were discussed with committees of Congress and formed the basis of legislative action in accordance with which the Second Division Memorial was located.

These two memorials are primarily tributes to the bravery and sacrifice of the thousands of men, known and unknown, who gave their lives in the greatest of wars. They do not commemorate individual heroes. The patriotic significance of the memorials led Congress to give them places of high honor.

EXHIBIT G

The task of the Commission of Fine Arts, in cooperation with the Joint Committee on the Library, has been to secure designs expressing patriotic emotion and at the same time fitted to their surroundings. Through years of consideration in each case, results have been attained which must speak for themselves. Both the First and Second Division Memorials have been designed with special reference to their respective surroundings in the President's Park. The same thing was true of the Butt-Millet Memorial, which bears the same relation to the Ellipse as does the Second Division Memorial.

All these matters are of public knowledge. They are of record in the hearings before committees of Congress and were published in the press. The design for the Second Division Memorial was selected by competition; and both design and location were made the basis of the movement to raise the funds, generously and devotedly contributed.

The Commission of Fine Arts make this explanatory statement in response to the letter, which you sent to the press at the same time it was mailed to the Commission, by means of which a considerable number of people have been misled. It is manifest that such action as your letter suggests, even if taken, would be futile, and deservedly so.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. Lorimer Rich,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

C O P Y

October 12, 1935.

Dear Mr. Sullivan:

Replying to your letter of October 5, I would say that the subject of World War memorials was fully and carefully considered when the First Division monument was placed south of the State Department. This was planned as the dominant memorial and for seventeen years it has been the only one in Washington, other Divisions have gone elsewhere, if anywhere. Two other sites for smaller monuments were then tentatively arranged for. One such has been authorized by Congress and is now occupied by the Second Division, one of the heavy-fighting Divisions. The location balances the site of the Millet-Butt fountain at the north. The other and last site would bear the same relation to Constitution Avenue as does the Second Division monument.

The Commission have not been unmindful of the patriotic appeal made by these monuments, commemorative of heroism and valor. They should have places of honor. At the same time they should be decorations of Washington. Coming, as it does, between the series of buildings in the Triangle, with their highly sculptured pediments, and the Pan American building with its sculptures, the Second Division memorial should form a suitable and attractive link.

It is hoped that the recommendations of the Commission will be carried out--that the Bulfinch gatehouses now used as tool-houses, located at the corners of Constitution Avenue and Fifteenth and Seventeenth Streets, be restored, raised to the street level and placed facing the avenue. Also that the vistas south from the Sherman monument and the First Division monument, as planned in 1901, be fully developed for park purposes.

It is also hoped that these improvements may in time cause the Ellipse to be turned from an open-air garage with its all-day parked cars into the attractive park which it was intended to be.

This explanation will show how long and how carefully the Commission have considered these matters before giving advice to the Committees of Congress with whom the final decision rests. In the case of the Second Division the legislation has been completed.

The Commission appreciate your courteous letter. Should there be other points on which you and your committee desire information the Commission, as always, will be glad to furnish it.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Francis P. Sullivan, Esq.,
Chairman, Committee on the
National Capital,
American Institute of Architects.

EXHIBIT G-1

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS
COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL
FRANCIS P. SULLIVAN, CHAIRMAN
726 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

October 5, 1935.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Moore:

There has been referred to me for the attention of my Committee a letter from a group of architects now resident in Washington, asking that action be taken in protest against the erection of the Second Division Memorial on the site proposed for it near the Ellipse, and stating that, in their opinion, the erection of this memorial would serve as a precedent for building further structures of a similar nature in this area, with the possibility of injuring its distinction.

I would very much appreciate it if you would advise me as to the considerations which led the Commission to select this site and also whether it has adopted any policy with regard to the future in this respect.

Yours very sincerely,

Francis P. Sullivan

C O P Y

October 4, 1935.

Dear Mrs. Rahn:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, considered your request made in behalf of the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, to place a memorial on the site of the old G. A. R. Hall, which stood on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between 14th and 15th Streets, N. W.

The Commission are of the opinion that the erection of this memorial at the location mentioned will require an Act of Congress, since it would be on public grounds in the District of Columbia. Should Congress authorize the erection of the memorial it would then be necessary for you to take up the question of design with the firm of York and Sawyer, Architects, 100 East 42nd Street, New York City, who designed the Department of Commerce Building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mrs. K. Rahn,
Past National Inspector,
Daughters of Union Veterans
of the Civil War,
143 Uhland Terrace, N. E.,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

October 4, 1935.

Dear Chancellor Gray:

Your letter of September 23d, concerning the erection of the statue of General Artemas Ward, at the intersection of Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, was carefully considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held today. The Commission respectfully advise:

As far back as 1928, Harvard University offered $50,000 to place a statue of General Artemas Ward in Washington. Congress accepted the gift and provided that the Commission of Fine Arts should approve design and location. General Ward was a distinguished Massachusetts soldier, who turned over to Washington the command of the Continental Army at Cambridge. It was appropriate to place his statue on Massachusetts Avenue.

The Highway Plan of Washington had overlooked both the traffic desirability and the scenic opportunity of making a circle on the commanding height at the crossing of Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues; but, strangely enough, had located a circle in a hollow to the west of the crossing.

Here then was an opportunity to correct an obvious error by creating a circle on that crest. The District Commissioners, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts joined in the project to create a circle.

Public funds were too scanty to buy all the land needed. The matter was taken up with the American University first, and the question of placing a statue of General Ward in the circle to be created was fully considered with the then University authorities. After long negotiation the University agreed to donate from their property the land needed to create the circle in so far as the circle affected their grounds.

Next the Glover Estate, which owned the largest area included in the circle, met the situation half-way,--Harvard University paid for Glover land and also the assessment for improvements.

Thereupon, the Commission of Fine Arts set about the task of selecting a sculptor and a design. The Commission stipulated that Ward must be presented as a typical Revolutionary Soldier. Portraiture was a secondary consideration. Moreover, the silhouette must be satisfactory from every point of view--east, west, north and south; must be excellent as is the statue of Freedom on the dome of the Capitol when seen from any position.

EXHIBIT I

Two vain years were spent with a sculptor. Then a competition was held, and a design selected and a sculptor commissioned. For four years Mr. Crunelle has been working on his model, submitting to the Commission of Fine Arts from time to time the result of his progress. His work has been approved and is proceeding to completion.

The Commission of Fine Arts were forced to see the large circle they had so painstakingly secured, bisected by roadways from north to south. The Commission feel that this treatment is contrary to traffic experience and is a sacrifice of park space that should be regained at some future time.

Such are the long annals of the creation of the circle at the junction of Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, and the evolution of the Ward Statue.

It has been the constant policy of the Commission of Fine Arts to accept the legislation of Congress for the adornment of the National Capital and to carry out such legislation in the spirit shown by the legislative body. What more appropriate lesson could be taught the youth in our Universities than comes from the recalling and the recognition of the services of a man eminent in both military and civic life at the beginning of our existence as a Nation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Dr. Joseph M. M. Gray, Chancellor,
The American University,
Washington, D. C.

C O P Y

October 7, 1935.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts held a special meeting in New York on October 4, 1935, for the purpose of considering the progress made by Mr. Barry Faulkner in his mural decorations for the Archives Building, representing "The Declaration of Independence" and "The Constitution". The sketches are at one-third size. Mr. John Russell Pope, the architect of the building; and Mr. William Mitchell Kendall, a former member of the Commission, were in the consultation. This was the fourth submission.

The characters selected for presentation, as well as their historic significance as shown in the groupings, had been studied in consultation with Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, acknowledged dean of American historians.

The Commission approved the sketches, with hearty commendation of the artist for the ability shown, as well as for the promise of a result of distinction in keeping with the building itself.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J

INDEX TO MINUTES

Item