

March 29th, 1915

Mr. Bertram G. Goodhue,
No 2 West 47th Street,
New York City.

Sir:

I have read with considerable amazement the article in the March number of the Architectural Record entitled "The Panama-California Exposition" with the sub-title "Bertram G. Goodhue and the Renaissance of Spanish-Colonial Architecture."

I really thought that I had a great deal to do with the design of the Exposition, but find that all I did was the "actual construction" and the "details of the planting." I do not see why you gave me credit for the planting - you had just as much to do with the design of that as you had with the design of the temporary buildings and the general plan - really, you should have taken the whole thing while you were about it.

When I think of the one sketch you made for the temporary buildings, and the childish sketches by Winslow (which you approved in writing), and compare them with the actual buildings, I am forced to admire the wonderful conceit that enables you to appropriate the credit for the whole work as "Advisory and Consulting Architect." Of course, I am well aware that you were employed in this capacity but cannot forget how miserably you failed in it, apparently making no attempt to do the work as you had agreed.

There are many things in this article that I do not understand. For instance, on page 236 you give the "Division of Works" credit for "An Arcade on the Commerce and Industries Building", and yet on page 238 is shown the same arcade and you take credit for the whole building as "Advisory and Consulting Architect." How did this happen? Is it possible that you cannot recognize your own (?) work and claim it in one place only to deny it in another? And, incidentally, the building in question (pages 238 and 246) is not the "Commerce and Industries Building" and has never been so named.

On the whole, I think you have been rather careless. I admit that it was not necessary for you to assist me while I was designing and building the Exposition - the result proves that - but I do think that you should have visited it after it was finished so that you might become acquainted with the buildings and be able to talk intelligently when claiming the credit as "Advisory and Consulting Architect."

You are the architect for the California State and Fine Arts buildings and fully entitled to all credit for them, and you did advise and consult on the Southern California building but kindly tell me for what are you

responsible in the rest of the Exposition? What part did you take in the design of the "South Facade of the Varied Industries Building" (page 234), the San Joaquin Valley Building, (page 243), the Pool by the Botanical Building, Commerce and Industries Building to the Left" (page 244), Face of the Commerce and Industries Building" (page 249) and the Commerce and Industries Building (page 250). Inasmuch as I designed these buildings (and most of the rest of the Exposition not shown in the article) after I last saw or heard from you and after Winslow had been discharged and, furthermore, as they are absolutely contrary to what little advice you did give, I fail to see how you honestly can claim to be "Advisory and Consulting Architect" for them.

If this were not a serious matter the whole article would be extremely ludicrous to those of us who know that you did not even select the architectural style and, what is more, strenuously opposed the way in which it has been handled.

But the most bare-faced thing in this article is the statement giving you credit for the general plan. You must have forgotten that, at a meeting with the Buildings and Grounds Committee and the Park Commission you specifically disclaimed any responsibility for either my plan or Mr. Olmsted's. The members of the Committee remember this even if you conveniently have forgotten it. Also, afterwards, when Mr. Olmsted resigned on account of the adoption of my plan, you telegraphed that you saw trouble ahead and were glad that you could "prove an alibi."

This article also mentions the bridge as my work, yet, a few months ago, it was published in the Brickbuilder over your name. You should have waited a little longer before admitting that I had anything to do with it.

In a way this article is quite flattering to me as it shows that my work is good enough to make you wish to steal the credit for it. By the way, why did you not fill out the article with pictures of the Fine Arts building instead of using my work? Is it possible that you think my work is better than your own?

If you have read as far as this you should realize fully my opinion of you but, lest you make any mistake, I will state it plainly as follows: if you are responsible for the article in question you are the most contemptible creature I have ever known.

Since seeing the manner in which you take the credit for work you did not do, I am curious to know who really did do the work which has made your reputation. Has your late partner been doing the work which you "advised and consulted" with him - the work for his share, the

credit for yours? I am led to believe so as that is the very fair division you are making with me.

This article constitutes an open theft of my work and I do not propose to submit to it if I have any legal recourse. I have engaged an attorney to protect my interests.

I shall allow you a reasonable length of time in which to answer this letter before taking action.

For your information I will say that all drawings and correspondence with you has been carefully preserved and will prove fully every contention I make.

Sincerely, Frank P. Allen, Jr.