

Los Angeles, California.

2d June, 1911.

Mr. Bertram G. Goodhue;

My dear Goodhue;

Mr. Allen said he would write you fully as to practical conditions in exposition matters at San Diego but I have a later impression than he has as I attended a meeting of the Directors yesterday at which he was not present.

The exposition is at the present moment practically bankrupt. There is a deficit of \$12,000 in the form of over drafts on the 1st National Bank besides sundry bills unpaid. The trouble is that the subscribers hold off from paying their subscription installments for various reasons. One is that they see or learn of no actual grading or building on the exposition site. Another is that influential men are attacking the site which was formally adopted by the Committee and formally leased by the Park Commission to the Exposition. Those who favored that site do not feel like paying for one they don't want. Those who favor an electric railway up through the middle of the park and an exposition site in connection with that up on the central mesa don't want to pay up until that site has been agreed upon. Another and far more wide spread reason is that many if not most subscribers believe gossip of irresponsible persons who are not acquainted with enough facts to form a wise opinion. These tales relate to the gross extravagance of the present management, to the employment of outside architects and engineers, to the expressed intention of the Director of Works to maintain "open shop as regards Union Labor", to the confident assertions of local contractors and material men that they are to be excluded from participation in the profits, and finally to the assertions of a great many persons, who have not read the contract between the Park Commission and the Exposition dated January 11th, that the Park Commission had delegated its powers to the Exposition's Division of Works by that contract, which they had no legal right to do any lawyer would agree, and which the disgruntled labor agitators, contractors and material men say shall not

on any account be permitted. The present Mayor and Park Commission have unequivocally announced that that contract must and shall be broken. Unless the two organizations can come to an amicable agreement with the aid of lawyers as advisers the Park Commission has the power to refuse to sanction any payments of city funds under that contract, so they can to all practical intents and purposes block the execution of the contract. It is clearly impossible for the exposition to go on, therefore, unless the Mayor "throws over" the men who got him elected which he is extremely unlikely to do unless the "interests" guarantee him some satisfactory and reasonably permanent position in which he can earn much more than he does as Mayor (it is said he has only a small income as a lawyer and has lost all his wife's money and is chronically "hard up") or unless the Exposition people agree to throw over Allen and award a lot of small contracts for each building and for such work on the grounds as is frequently let by contract and to employ only "Union Labor". The local architects are also howling for work and it may be the Mayor gave them his sympathy if not promises in return for vote getting. This reminds me that Mr. Safton appeared to be unfriendly to you in the Directors Meeting. At any rate he said your contract was very foggy in at least three important particulars. You had the exposition lawyers advise as to its phraseology didn't you? If so, I don't see why he should criticize it. The "interests" are so scary and sensitive to attack and so unable to defend themselves just now that it would not surprise me if that element in the Exposition Directory of which Safton is the most aggressive in matters of policy and management just now, he being Acting Director General, vice Mr. Collier, who keeps away because the Mayor bitterly hates him, should finally compromise with the Mayor and his party and either throw over Allen or compel him to work with Union Labor and local contractors. I do not think the local architects are strong enough to compel the Exposition to throw you over, but unfortunately

(I understand) they have joined forces with the local contractors and Union men who may "see to it that they have a square deal". If the job is unionized and local contractors and material men are favored it seems a reasonable guess that all the work will cost 25% more than it would if Allen is left with a free hand. That means that the extent and quality of all work on both grounds and buildings must be reduced correspondingly or still more as the contractors must get their 10% and many more engineers and inspectors will have to be employed to prevent bad work and that extra cost must come out of each building appropriation.

You must realize that I would not write you this long letter except from friendly interest in you and your work and it seems to me you ought to reciprocate by making your plan for the adopted site just so complete in all details and as elaborated in architectural details such as patios, towers, domes, terraces, and so on as the other site. The difference in the two drawings was so marked that both Allen and Gill laughed and intimated that you were resolved to show the Committee that the adopted site was a small impossible scheme to "work up" architecturally. You could certainly treat the adopted site more fairly by adding a sketch elevation or two.

So far as your project of having your family at Santa Barbara this summer depends upon this exposition work going ahead, I am afraid there is nothing for you to do but to wait as patiently as you can for news as to some settlement of the dispute between Labor and Capital as exemplified in this particular case. To us, the wrangle is extremely inconvenient, but to an independent, forceful, well-to-do citizen of San Diego such as Mr. Soften, it might be decidedly interesting to educate the mass of voters as to what unreasonable demands Union Labor is making, how wasteful and unartistic their power makes all they do and so eventually get the votes of non-union citizens on the side of efficiency and beautiful works. I believe I sympathize with Labor in many respects, but they certainly need a vast deal of education before they can run

Mr. Goodhue - 4

municipalities efficiently and with due regard for beauty. The idea of ruining the best part of a beautiful park by running a railway through it is simply horribly bad art, and not necessary now, nor for many years. It ought to be killed off.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) John C. Olmsted.