

April 14th, 1915

Frank P. Allen, Esq.

San Diego, California.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of March 29th I have read and re-read; and try as I may I can see no justification and even no basis for what you say.

Had I written such a letter to you, however, it would have been entirely justified in view of the articles that for some months past have been appearing in various newspapers and periodicals which, thanks to my faithful clipping agency, have come to my notice. Concerning these I have said nothing though I admit I consider most of them offensively misleading, and it was to correct such misapprehensions as they obviously created, when the "Architectural Record" approached me for permission to use such few photographs as I had that I gave such information as I had, to Mr. Matlack Price, the author of the article that accompanied the photographs.

My contract with the Fair authorities makes me Advisory and Consulting Architect for all buildings built in connection with the Fair. Your contract, as I understand it, makes you Director of Works and not architect in any sense whatsoever. My understanding of my contract, a contract concurred in by Mr. Irving J. Gill, was, and is, that I should scheme out the whole Fair and make all necessary tentative drawings to establish such scheme and general plan; that on behalf of the then existing firm of Cra, Goodhue & Ferguson I should prepare the working drawings, specifications and details for one of the permanent buildings (the other to be designed by Mr. Irving Gill but later on upon his resignation I assumed all his duties under the contract) and should criticize, revise and approve as to their design all drawings for all structures whether permanent or temporary.

My understanding of your contract was, and is, that you were to act as constructor, as such to buy all material and engage all labour necessary for the construction of the buildings, and to supervise such construction; and that it was thanks to your knowledge of exhibitions, their requirements, prices of material, etc. and the prospect that such experience would result in substantial economies over the ordinary contract system that the exhibition authorities appointed you to the position you held, a position that, be it said in passing, made you virtually the client as well.

It is a matter of history that friction developed very shortly after your, and my, arrival in San Diego. The site selected by Mr. John Olmsted seemed for many reasons inadequate and objectionable from your, and my, point of view though it was ably defended by Mr. Olmsted as a landscape architect. You voiced your objection almost if not quite

immediately and I cordially supported your suggestion that the Fair should be moved to the position it now occupies; but as my letters clearly show, I did this as a private citizen; the city of San Diego had engaged Mr. Olmsted to do certain work with which I felt I had no right to interfere. Therefore, later on, when Mr. Olmsted's site was thrown over and the present site selected I telegraphed you from Santa Barbara that I was glad "that I could prove an alibi." My feelings have undergone no change since the sending of this telegram and its clear purport was that I was glad to have taken no active part in the reversal of the previously reached decision with regard to the site, to which I felt sure Mr. Olmsted would naturally and promptly express his bitter disappointment and disapproval, -something that in the event proved to be the case.

The 'Mission' style for the buildings was selected long before you or I, even I believe before Mr. Olmsted, ever reached San Diego. Because this style had been selected was the reason I was summoned from New York. I pointed out at once that "Mission" as a style did not contain sufficient possibilities to be used throughout so large and so ambitious a project as a World's Fair; that the 'Spanish-Colonial' used in Mexico was ethnically, climatically and artistically more suitable than 'Mission' ever could be. Mr. John Olmsted I think had felt something of the same sort before I expressed this as my opinion. At any rate, my view was straightway adopted and work on these lines immediately begun by me.

Olmsted's general plan-(for the abandoned site) to the making of which had been devoted a great deal of thoughtful study-naturally formed more or less of a basis for my plan for the new site though the new site permitted the straightening out of certain angles and axes while the bridge became even more a vital architectural feature than it had been in Mr. Olmsted's plan.

The present plan for the grouping of the buildings, the one that is, that now constitutes the Fair, was in all its main essentials determined by me in Plan F made in this office. This plan shows a great bridge spanning Cabrillo Canyon terminating in the Permanent Group. Beyond this Permanent Group a tree-bordered avenue ran to the brow of the next canyon through which canyon the street car lines were to make their approach to the Fair; a secondary axis, to which certain other minor ones were afterwards added, crossed this avenue and upon this main and these minor axes the temporary buildings were placed, though these temporary buildings have been so frequently changed as to position and name that I hardly know what comes where any longer; nevertheless, all the essentials of plan F have been retained, Plan F is my work and as such was cordially supported by you.



I have mentioned friction. On several occasions visiting San Diego, I found matters at very high tension indeed. This friction was no light matter, on at least one occasion reaching a point where I offered to tender my resignation. ----But I was told by you in writing that no wish was further from the minds of the exhibition authorities or from your own.

Nor did such friction always centre about me. Mr. Winslow, who, let me say here, was, and is, altogether the most capable man I know for the position he occupied--a fact that you have repeatedly recognized and expressed in writing though you now see fit to reverse this and characterize his sketches as "childish"---was as dissatisfied as I at the attitude taken toward both of us, and it was only out of consideration for his long and intimate association with me and my urgent appeals that he stuck by the job that the tendering of his resignation was so long deferred.

There is no reason for re-stating the grounds which prompted this step of his though they are well known to you as to me and indeed I fancy to practically every one concerned with the Fair.

On the occasion of one of my visits to San Diego I accepted, with deep regret, his decision to tender his resignation, a document which was promptly accepted; thereupon I asked him to stay in San Diego at my expense and from that day to the opening of the Fair his salary was paid by me instead of by the Fair, and he devoted himself to overseeing the work on the permanent buildings which, I was given to understand at that time, you admitted your inability to construct for so small a sum as they proved to cost when let out on the usual contract basis.

It is this resignation of Mr. Winslow's that gives your letter its only colour of plausibility for I have but recently learned from him that the buildings now known as the 'Commerce and Industries' building and the 'San Joaquin Valley' building were actually carried out by the Division of Works after I had begun paying Mr. Winslow's salary.

So it is evident that the terms of my contract with the Fair have not been faithfully adhered to in that drawings have not been submitted to me for my approval for the buildings planned and erected since Mr. Winslow's resignation; the process of designing these two buildings, therefore, went on without any information being vouchsafed me by you, a plain violation of my right to pass upon all plans and elevations of each and every building.

It is true I did suppose when talking to Mr. Matlack Price that Winslow had made, or at least stood over, the details of the 'Commerce and Industries' building and the 'San Joaquin Valley' building. He now tells me he did not--which proves to my mind how very capably his example, drawings and oversight

had established the draughting office of the Division of Works on its artistic side--the only side with which I am concerned.

It is therefore evident that while I might have told Mr. Matlack Price that the designs for the two buildings illustrated in the article, i.e. the 'Commerce and Industries' building and the 'San Joaquin Valley' building, have been prepared in the office of the Division of Works I did not do so, not only for this reason; but, as well, because under the plain terms of my contract I recognize no right on your part to design or erect such buildings from designs not approved by me.

The reason you were given credit "for the details of the planting as distinct from the general landscape layout" was because the general landscape layout in so far as this was correlated with the buildings was part and parcel of the general plan.

It was well known that Mr. John Olmsted's theory was to develop the wild natural foliage of the Park and to confine the planting proper to the immediate vicinity of the Fair buildings. My only concern with the planting, therefore, was to maintain the main features of plan F; in other words, the row of trees that line the 'prado' and certain groups of tall heavy specimen trees, Italian cypresses and the like, at certain points notably against the facades of the permanent group, a very interesting representation of which may be found in Mr. Birch Long's water colour now, I believe, in the Fine Arts Building.

You made the very excellent suggestion that we use black acacias for lining the 'prado'; but in addition have carried the planting scheme, where it comes against the buildings, enormously farther than I, and I am sure Mr. John Olmsted ever intended, and it is precisely these additions that I regard as "details of planting as distinct from the general landscape layout."

The fact that in the article your name appears as designer of the bridge is not because it is notoriously not my work; but because two designs had been prepared for it, one by me in the natural course of my duties and assisted by Mr. Meuser, the engineer of the Galveston Sew-wall, and the other by you or by Mr. Hunter under your direction. I maintain and always have maintained that in preparing this design you exceeded the authority vested in you under your contract; but judgment upon these designs was passed not by you or by me but by the Fair authorities and decided in your favour for financial reasons ~~and~~ that have since proved wholly shadowy. This action caused me bitter, and very definitely expressed, disappointment but to it I could not help but bow. Having been given due notice of this variation of my contract and having acquiesced therein I rightfully credited the bridge to the source from which it emanated.



The 'Varied Industries' building was the work of my representative, Mr. Winslow, and was, I am sure you will remember, verbally approved by me in small scale form. That you added wholly unauthorized ornament to the upper corners of the frontispiece and somewhat varied the windows (neither additions or variations being improvements to my mind) would seem to constitute a typical instance of what leads you to claim to have designed all the buildings with the exception of the permanent ones.

I should of course have been glad to publish more photographs of the Permanent buildings which, in my opinion, constitute the only genuine architectural contribution to the town; but the official photographer has been singularly negligent of the official architect and such photographs as I have received have come only after appeals to Mr. Winslow to obtain such for me; therefore the Fine Arts Building, which I regard as very good despite its extreme simplicity and which--judging from a hasty glance through the correspondence,--you favoured as strongly as I--is very inadequately reproduced in this article. Some day I hope, for my own satisfaction, to be able to obtain and publish adequate photographs of this building.

It is a pity that there should not seem to be as the phrase runs, "glory enough to go around"; but excepting the permanent buildings your letter claims for you all that there is. I should have supposed that the doing of the work your contract calls for and doing it well should have sufficed for any one man.

However this may be: For the firm of Cram, Godhue & Ferguson I claim the credit (or discredit) for the designing and construction of the Permanent Group; for myself the credit (or discredit) of the basic scheme of the general plan and for the criticisms, suggestions and approvals I have contributed to Mr. Winslow's excellent renditions and details of the temporary buildings, and do not propose to accord that credit to you or anyone else. That, thanks to your being on the spot and my being thousands of miles away should have enabled you to neglect to submit to me for my approval drawings for two of the temporary buildings in plain violation of my contract with the Fair, with which contract you were perfectly familiar, constitutes ~~such an injustice to me~~ no reason why I should expressly sanction such an injustice to me and that in print.

From all that I have written above you will see that I am responsible for the information given Mr. <sup>W</sup>atlack Price for the article in the Architectural Record.' This information I gave in good faith, and the personal opinion of my and my wwork, expressed in your letter but predicated on this admission, is, fortunately for me, your own opinion and no more.

Very truly yours,