General Grant National Memorial
Historical Resource Study

Prepared by:
David M. Kahn
Curator,
Manhattan Cites
January, 1980

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

One of the most famous wisecracks of all times seems to be Groucho Marx's query, "Who's buried in Grant's Tomb?[1]" What is truely astounding is that today many Americans would be unable to answer this ridiculous question with any degree of confidence. As a matter of fact, some will go to great lengths to insist that Grant is not buried there at all, although they are hard pressed to come up with an alternative suggestion as to where he is buried.

Two or three generations ago, American would have had no trouble at all in answering the question. Every man, woman and child knew very well who was interred in the Grant Monument (Fig. 1), as it was originally called. The victor at Ft. Donelson, Vicksburg, Chattanooga and Appomattox, the Eighteenth President of the United States, Ulysses S. Grant (Fig. 2), lay in the crypt next to his wife Julia (Fig. 3). During and immediately following his lifetime Grant was surely America's greatest hero. He had saved the Union - almost single-handedly one might suppose from the way in which he was revered. A medal issued to commemorate the dedication of the Grant Monument, and now in the Museum of the City of New York, emphasizes the General's importance. It represents his tomb on one side while on the other profiles of Washington, Lincoln and Grant are superimposed and surrounded by the motto "Father, Saviour, Defender.[2]"

The movement to erect a suitable tomb for the General was initiated within hours of his death and led to the formation of the Grant Monument

Association. In 1889, before a design for the Grant Monument was selected, the Grand Army of the Republic for the State of New York summarized most people's feelings when it stated that the soon to be realized memorial would characterize "the veneration of (Grant's) fellow citizens for his virtues and achievements...(and) be a lasting evidence and lesson to posterity of the gratitude of a united people and worthy in its grandeur both of the Nation saved by him and of the Metropolis honored by his citizenship...[3]" Two years later, after a design was selected, the Treasurer of the Grant Monument Association, Horace L. Hotchkiss, referred to the Grant Monument in the following terms when addressing the New York State Senate:

> The Memorial...will last as long as the American Republic. It will be built for all time. Its situation will be second to no other monumental structure in the world. It will rank with the PYRAMIDS of Egypt; with the Pantheon at Rome; with the rock-hewn grottoes and shrines of India and China; with the Arc de Triomphe; with the Albert Memorial which the English Government has erected; with the Hotel des Invalides where sleeps the mighty Napoleon and with the Germania which looks out upon the Rhine and speaks for the United Father-land.[4]

In short, the Grant Monument was intended to be one of the greatest memorials in the world. Ultimately 90,000 individuals were to volunteer their contributions to realize this dream. In all, they gave some $600,000 to build the General's tomb - the largest sum of money raised for a public monument up to that time. And when it was dedicated in 1897, one million Americans crowded the streets of New York to view the ceremonies.

Around the turn of the century over half a million people visited the Grant Monument every year. Now, when the population of the country is

much greater, the annual visitors have decreased to between 10 and 15% of what they once were. The public seems to have largely forgotten Grant, and we have even reached the point where the architectural critic for the New York Times has dismissed his tomb as:

> ...pompous beyond even the requirements of a Mausoleum for a national hero. It is heavy and dry, utterly humorless...[5]

Leaving aside the question of whether or not the tomb should be humorous it was never universally acclaimed by critics as an architectural masterpiece even at the height of Grant's popularity. But to evaluate it with the same aesthetic criteria that might be applied to a new skyscraper on Third Avenue in New York, as the Times critic did, is surely to miss the point. The tomb is not a mere building. It is a monument, and as such it embodies the spirit and ideals of the American people at a particular point in history. The mammoth and costly building in a very real sense symbolizes an entire generation's feelings not just about Grant, but about the Civil War and the role every foot soldier played in it.

What follows is a detailed history of the Grant Monument, now officially known as the General Grant National Memorial but still popularly called Grant's Tomb. Given the drastic decline in visitation in the last decade, it is hoped that the information presented here will serve as the basis for a much needed reinterpretation of the tomb and its significance for the American people today. This can only come about after the National Park Service reevaluates its goals for the site - or better still, after it establishes some. For in the twenty years that the Park Service has administered the tomb, it has been struggling with the question of what to do with it, and in the process no cohesive policy or interpretive program

has emerged, regardless of what the Master Plan, Interpretive Prospectus and other official documents may say. Modernization of the physical plant and moves to make the tomb more "relevant" have been totally unsuccessful in increasing visitation or in achieving the Park Service's larger goal of commemorating Ulysses S. Grant. In fact, as will be demonstrated below, a number of rehabilitation and other projects carried out at the General Grant National Memorial in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in what can only be viewed today as unacceptable sacrifices in the historic integrity of the site and its collections.

This Historical Resource Study was originally inspired by the fact that Park Service historianshad never fully examined the archives of The Grant Monument Association that were stored in the crypt of the tomb until they were removed to Federal Hall National Memorial in 1977. In fact, they totally ignored extensive records for the period 1885-1897 during which funds for the Grant Monument were raised and the structure itself was built.[6] The information in this study has been drawn from these newly examined archives as well as extant Park Service reports and extensive new research into the history of the tomb. A substantial amount of visual material has been assembled, and where possible reference to items in the collections of the General Grant National Memorial have been made so that they can be better understood in their proper context.

CHAPTER II - GRANT'S ILLNESS AND DEATH

Our story begins on a sad note - Grant's death. This took place after a year or so of unfortunate reverses. The general's problems began on May 6, 1884, when his Grant and Ward banking house failed. The four year old firm had largely been run by the general's partner, Ferdinand Ward, who, as it turned out, had been embezzling from the very beginning. Although Grant had considered himself a millionaire, overnight he was reduced to poverty.[1]

In an attempt to earn a bit of money, the General wrote a few articles for Century Magazine in the summer of 1884. He also began to consider writing his memoirs. Ominously, however, his throat began to bother him.[2] In October, his doctors diagnosed his ailment as cancer. The family kept the information to themselves and the General underwent extensive treatment. Rumors that he was ill finally reached the public by January 1885. In February Grant's doctors determined that his cancer was terminal, and this news was leaked to the press by March 1.[3]

The public was shocked by the news, and soon everyone became absorbed with events at 3 East 66th Street, where the General and his family had lived for several years. The General's doctors issued medical bulletins twice a day, and these were published in newspapers across the country. Reporters gathered in front of the house along with the curious, all attempting to learn the latest regarding Grant's condition (Fig. 4).[4]

One of the more interesting manifestations of public sympathy came in the form of hundreds of get well letters and testimonials that were sent to the General from individuals and organizations across the country. The Park Service has a number of these interesting documents in its collections (Fig. 5). They are apparently part of a much larger collection which the Grant family deposited at the tomb in 1904.[5] Typical of these expressions of sympathy is a letter dated March 29, 1885:

> Dear General:
>
> We little ones of the "Children's Hour" of the Sixty First Methodist Church New York have heard that you are sick. We are very sorry and pray to God to make you well again. We know that you was (sic) once our President and we have heard our fathers tell about how wise and brave you were in the great war. We shall remember you when the big people now living are dead. We hope your example will help us to lead nobler lives then we would have done if we had never heard of you. Please accept our hearty love, good wishes and prayers.[6]

The message is followed by a ten foot long scroll which is filled with signatures. It was also reported that school children marched by the General's residence in groups singing national anthems and scattering flowers on the stoop as they passed in tribute.[7]

The General's condition continued to deteriorate as the weeks passed, and the only thing that seemed to keep him alive was the energy he devoted to the writing of his memoirs. The project was primarily intended to provide for his family after his death, and this it admirably succeeded in doing as it ultimately yielded Mrs. Grant over $400,000.[8] As the warm weather approached, Grant's physicians recommended that he leave New York for a

change of climate. Conveniently, one of the General's friends, Joseph W. Drexel of the banking house of Drexel and Morgan, offered him the use of his cottage at Mt. McGregor, New York. Evidence would seem to indicate that Drexel's offer was prompted not so much by humanitarian reasons, as the fact that he had a part interest in a budding resort at Mt. McGregor, and that he hoped the General's stay there would promote business.[9] On June 6, 1885, Grant and his family left New York for the vacation spot.

The Drexel cottage had been built in 1878 and originally served as a boarding house/hotel named the Mountain House. Designed in the then new and fashionable Queen Ann style of architecture, it sat at the very top of a great hill and contained a dozen or so rooms. By the summer of 1885 the building had been moved from its original location to a place a bit further down the hill to make way for a new and larger hotel. During Grant's stay the cottage was painted gold with brown trim (Fig. 6).[10]

During his first few days there, visitors besieged the ailing General and word had to be circulated that he needed rest and relaxation. Reporters camped out at Drexel's nearby hotel and continued to supply the public with information on the General's condition. Photographs show Grant and his family sitting peacefully on the cottage's porch shortly after their arrival (Fig. 7). The General kept busy working on his memoirs, and one photograph shows him thus occupied while bundled tightly in a blue wool cap and blankets, even though the temperature was 80° (Fig. 8).[11] By

mid July, Grant finally finished work on his memoirs. Within days he took a turn for the worse, and on Thursday morning, July 23, 1885, at 8:08 A.M. he died.[12]

CHAPTER III - SELECTION OF GRANT'S INTERMENT SITE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF HIS TEMPORARY TOMB

As the nation plunged into deep mourning, the question of where Grant would be buried was on everyone's mind. New York, obviously, was the site ultimately decided upon. But before the General's death no one anticipated this choice.

The decision to inter the General's remains in New York was made by his family. It seems to have been based to some degree on a note Grant wrote just before his death to his son Col. Fred D. Grant. However, exactly what the note said and how much influence it had on the family's decision was - and to some extent still is - open to question. According to an article appearing in the New York Times in 1885, the General's note read as follows:

> There are three places from which I wish a choice of burial place be made:
> West Point - I would prefer this above others but for the fact that my wife could not be placed beside me there.
> Galena, or some place in Illinois - Because from that state I received my first General's Commission.
> New York - Because the people of that city befriended me in my need.

The Times went on to say, "West Point was excluded by his own conditions; his reference to Galena awakened no response that seemed to his representatives to demand especial attention; there remained New York...[1]"

Later, General Horace Porter, president of the Grant Monument Association from 1892-1919, attempted to convince the public that Grant had been more specific about New York. Writing in 1897, Porter offered this

version of the exchange between Grant and his son:

> The General named Galena, Illinois, his old home, then paused, and shook his head. He then wrote West Point, but expressed the fear that the rules governing interments there would prevent the burial of Mrs. Grant by his side. He finally referred to New York, where he had found such kind and devoted friends, but added that he wished no place selected where his wife could not be buried by his side. He was apparently attempting to write more, but a paroxysm of pain seized him, and the subject was not renewed. As New York was the last place he had indicated, the fact created a sentiment in favor of that city, as it had been apparently the General's final request.[2]

Actually, the Times and Porter's creative account notwithstanding, Grant does not really appear to have expressed preference for any particular burial site. In fact, he never even mentioned West Point at all in his famous note! The three cities he did refer to were St. Louis, Galena and New York. The authoritative account of the exchange between the General and his son was written by Fred Grant himself, and has not been previously uncovered. It appeared in a letter sent to the New York World on September 13, 1889, while he was serving as American Ambassador in Austria. Given the significance of this letter, it is here quoted at length:

> About a week before General Grant's death he handed me a paper which he indicated that he would like me to read. I found its contents were directions in regard to his own burial, the note being in about the following words which I quote from memory: "I have given you directions about all my affairs except my burial. We own a burial lot in the cemetary at St. Louis, and I like that city, as it was there I was married and lived for many years, and three of my children were born. We also have a burial lot in Galena, and I am fond of Illinois, from which state I entered the Army at the beginning of the war. I am also much attached to New York where I have made my home for several years past, and through the generosity of those citizens I have been enabled to pass my last days without experiencing the pains

> of pinching want." The last sentence seemed to indicate that a burial lot might be purchased in New York City.
>
> After reading this note I said: "It is most distressing to me, father, that you think of this matter, but if we must discuss this subject and you desire to have my opinion I should say that in case of your death, Washington would probably be selected for the place of your burial." Father then took back the paper he had written me, which he tore up. He then retired to his own room, but soon returned and handed me another little note...which was in substance as follows: "It is possible that my funeral may become one of public demonstration, in which event I have no particular choice of burial-place; but there is one thing I would wish you and the family to insist upon, and that is that, wherever my tomb may be, a place should be reserved for your mother at my side." My own mention of Washington seemed to have reminded General Grant that the Nation might wish to take part in his funeral.
>
> Upon the death of General Grant, July 23, 1885, many telegrams were immediately received, containing offers for various pieces of ground for his last resting-place. The telegrams being considered by the widow and his family, it was soon decided that the offer made by New York was the most desirable one, as it included the guarantee which General Grant had desired before his death - that his wife should be provided with a last resting-place by his side - therefore, this offer was accepted.[3]

The only facet of Fred Grant's account that is questionable is his failure to mention that the General's reference to New York in the famous note had anything to do with the family's decision to bury him there. Fred Grant indicated simply that New York's offer was "the most desirable one." This can, perhaps, be explained by the fact that when he wrote his letter in 1889, the Grant family was annoyed with New York for having failed as of that date to erect a permanent monument to Grant. There was some talk of relocating the General's remains to Washington, D.C., at the time, and Fred Grant may have wished to minimize the Empire City's claims in order to make

its citizens nervous enough to get the project moving.[4]

That the General's reference to New York had at least something to do with the family's decision to bury him there is indicated in a letter Julia Grant wrote to New York City Mayor William R. Grace to explain both to him and the public at large why the decision had been made to inter the General's remains in New York. Writing several months after her husband's death, Mrs. Grant claimed:

> Riverside was selected by myself and my family as the burial place of my husband, General Grant. First, because I believed New York was his preference. Second, it is near the residence that I hope to occupy as long as I live, and where I will be able to visit his resting place often. Third, I have believed, and am now convinced, that the tomb will be visited by as many of his countrymen there as it would be at any other place. Fourth, the offer of a park in New York was the first which observed and unreservedly assented to the only condition imposed by General Grant himself, namely, that I should have a place by his side.[5]

In sum, the family's choice of New York as Grant's final resting place seems to have been based on a number of factors: the General's mention of the city in his note; the city's prompt offer of a site and its willingness to allow Mrs. Grant to be buried by the General's side; and the fact that in New York the tomb would be easily visited by both the family and members of the public.

New York's Mayor William R. Grace had indeed moved very swiftly after the announcement of Grant's death. Within hours, at 1:00 P.M. to be exact,[6] he sent a telegram offering the family a burial spot in one of the city's public parks. Fred Grant immediately wired back asking that a representative be sent to Mt. McGregor to discuss the matter.[7]

The city's Chief Clerk, William L. Turner, was dispatched to Mt. McGregor the next day. Before accepting New York's offer, the family insisted on obtaining a firm commitment from the Mayor on the matter of Mrs. Grant's being buried next to her husband. Grace assured them by telegram that they need have no worry.[8] So by 3:00 P.M. on July 24th, an official announcement was made that General Grant would be buried some place in New York City.[9] The Park Commissioner's official approval of Mrs. Grant's interment by her husband's side was then obtained a few days later on July 27th.[10]

Mayor Grace had also sent Mrs. Grant a letter on July 23, to confirm the offer of a burial place that he made by telegram. In the letter, he mentioned for the first time a specific site for the General's final resting place:

> In this connection I might say, as a matter for your own consideration, that the prominent height in Riverside Park, on the banks of the Hudson, has been suggested as an appropriate site for a great national monument which will undoubtedly be built in memory of the General. There is this advantage in such a site, that all improvements which may hereafter be made will look toward it as the central object of interest to which everything must be subordinated in order to give it commanding effect.[11]

The family, however, did not initially like the idea of Riverside Park and instead opted for a site in Central Park.[12] One of the reasons for their choice was that the General had been an admirer of Central Park, and the family felt the Mall (Fig. 9) might make a particularly nice spot for his tomb.[13] Another reason for the Grants' initial rejection of Riverside Park was undoubtedly its remoteness from the

center of town, which was then at about 23rd Street. According to a contemporary New York historian, Martha Lamb, some people had never even heard of the area:

> "Where is Riverside Park?" was the question asked by thousands of New York's own intelligent citizens...and outside the city this park was a myth indeed.[14]

These circumstances also probably caused others to favor the idea of Central Park as well. The New York Times endorsed the idea,[15] and an editorial in the Tribune warbled:

> It is here in the vernal beauty of Central Park, surrounded by the most peaceful and tender woodland scenery, yet lapt in the arms of this great population...that the great soldier should rest at last.[16]

Only a few expressed doubt over the wisdom of burying the General there.[17]

A number of other possible sites were mentioned in the press, including Union Square.[18] In order to settle the matter, on July 25th, Mayor Grace sent Col. Grant a telegram asking him to come down to New York to meet with the city's Park Commissioners;[19] and on July 27th the Colonel joined Mayor Grace and the Commissioners to inspect what were considered to be the leading sites. These were: the Plaza at the 59th Street entrance to Central Park; the Mall; what was then called Watch Hill (and now called the Great Hill) in Central Park at about 105th Street; and, of course, Riverside Park between 123rd and 125th Streets.

No one seems to have seriously considered the 59th Street location

because it was too public and busy. The Mayor and otherstried to discourage Fred Grant from selecting the Mall because the surrounding area was so densely planted and architecturally embellished that they feared this would force the tomb to conform too much to its surroundings. The Watch Hill location had great possibilities until Col. Grant spotted a large building under construction nearby on the Park's western edge. In response to his inquiry, he was told that it was the New Cancer Hospital. He then made a remark about how discouraging it would be for the patients to gaze out their windows at the tomb of a man who died from the same disease they suffered from. This seemed to leave Riverside Park, which was visited last. Its advantages were precisely, as Mayor Grace had pointed out to Mrs. Grant, that it was undeveloped, so that any monument could be erected there without fear of its clashing with its surroundings. The particular spot the Mayor suggested lay at the northern end of the park between 123rd and 125th Streets. This was actually an embankment that towered some 130' above the Hudson, and from which spectacular views of the surrounding countryside could be obtained. After viewing the site, Col. Grant returned to the city with the Mayor and the others without making a commitment. On their way back the party went through Central Park again and stopped at Belvedere Castle (Fig. 10) to consider it as a temporary tomb for the General until a permanent monument could be erected.[20]

Back in Mt. McGregor the next day, Col. Grant consulted with other members of the family. They decided to accept the Mayor's original recommendation - that the General be buried in Riverside Park. They

also directed that a temporary tomb be built for him there as well, thereby eliminating the need to press Belvedere Castle into service. Obviously pleased, Mayor Grace declared that the future monument would:

> ...vie in beauty and fitness of location with the famous statue of Germania on the Rhine.

There was also some speculation that Riverside Park might be renamed Grant Park.[21]

As soon as Col. Grant's approval of the Riverside Park site was received, Jacob Wrey Mold, the official architect of the Department of Parks was ordered to prepare a design for the temporary tomb. He did so in twenty minutes, or so it was reported (Fig. 11). The structure's outside dimensions were 17x24'. It was built primarily of red bricks with bands of black brick trim, a bluestone base and cornice, and a white limestone keystone. The polychromatic effect thus created was similar to that in other buildings Mold had designed for the Department of Parks, such as his 1870 Sheepfold in Central Park. The side walls of the vault rose to a height of four feet before the springing of the arch. The whole was surmounted by a large, probably iron, cross in front and a smaller one at the rear. The 4x6' entrance was fitted with two oak doors with large iron hinges. These doors opened inward so that weather permitting, visitors could peer through an outer iron gate and catch a glimpse of Grant's coffin. The gate was ornamented by a large gilded "G". The interior was lined with white enameled bricks, probably so as to reflect the light that passed through the doorway and a small round window in the rear wall. The tiny interior compartment measured only

7x12' and its floor was 4' below grade level. The newspapers reported that the coffin would "rest free on two stone or brick piers." Two large blocks of marble that were reportedly used for this purpose are now stored in a stairwell at the present tomb.[22] Construction of the temporary vault was largely completed by 12:00 noon on August 7, 1885. As one later commentator remarked, once Grant's steel encased coffin was placed inside, the whole affair resembled a "gas retort enclosed in a bake oven.[23]"

The temporary vault was erected facing west on an island of ground surrounded by two branches of Riverside Drive and just opposite 123rd Street - or where 123rd Street would have been had it been opened at the time. The spot was near a giant oak tree which had been struck by lightning at just about the time Grant had died. Once the announcement of the temporary vault's location was made, people flocked to the site to gather up leaves of the tree - apparently in the belief that the oak was a kind of divine messenger.[24] The surrounding area had been condemned as parkland by the State Supreme Court back in 1872. This was done because construction had slowly begun to creep up the west side of Manhattan Island, and the City Fathers decided to set aside the west bank of the Hudson River from 72nd Street to 125th Street to preserve something of the area's natural environment.[25] Earlier, in the 18th and for most of the 19th century, the district had been one of open spaces dotted with a few country villas. One of these structures, the Claremont, was built just after the year 1806 and still stood a few hundred feet directly north of the tomb site.[26] By the time of Grant's death the Claremont had been a roadhouse for approximately a quarter

of a century.[27] Some sources indicated that it might eventually be removed in order to make way for the permanent Grant Monument.[28]

As mentioned above, Riverside Park was quite far from the center of town. One paper remarked, "the park is a part of the city little known except to those who dwell in its vicinity, or who do much driving.[25]" Harper's Weekly mentioned that, "The drive has not been greatly frequented because it has not really been laid out, and the young maples do not yet cast a shade on it in the afternoon.[20]" And after Grant's funeral Martha Lamb even published a pocket guide containing directions on how to reach the General's out-of-the-way tomb.[31]

Artists tended to depict the spot as very lush - filled with greenery, flowering plants, etc. (Figs. 12 and 13). A photograph taken at least five years after the completion of the temporary vault, however, reveals quite a different picture with just a bit of scraggly vegetation in an otherwise barren area (Fig. 14). The artists obviously found the true picture to be too horrible, or perhaps just too uninteresting, to depict accurately, so they added their own embellishments. In the lithograph view, weeping willows were added to either side of the vault simply because they were traditional signs of mourning.

There was some local criticism of the tomb site. Frederick Law Olmstead, who designed both Riverside and Central Parks along with Calvert Vaux, suggested that there was some conflict between the tomb and what had

originally been intended as festive surroundings. Shortly after making this remark, he modified it to say that he did not really question the wisdom of the selected site per se, only the manner in which it would be developed.[32] An idea of just what he may have been driving at can be obtained by referring to a suggested site plan Calvert Vaux actually drew up in the fall (Fig. 15). It shows the addition of a new road cut to the terrain so as to effectively isolate the tomb grounds from the precincts of the park proper.

Far more vocal criticism than Olmstead's concerning the site came from newspaper editors around the country who found the entire idea of burying General Grant in New York scandalous. Many believed that Grant should have been buried in Washington, D.C. Some even charged that the whole affair was a scheme by New York real estate men to raise the values of land in the vicinity of Riverside Drive! The editors of the American Architect and Building News (published in Boston), dismissed the tomb site as "a neglected strip of unimproved land, adjoining the Hudson River Railroad tracks." Expressing the feelings of many Americans they also stated that the possibility of buring the General anywhere else was:

> ...summarily swept aside by the enterprise of the great City of New York, which immediately appointed a huge committee of its most eminent beer-sellers, brokers, politicians and Railroad men to take charge of a memorial of some unexplained sort...[33]

The New York Post attacked this critique as "the most astonishing of all the manifestations of the curious jealousy excited by General Grant's desire that his body should lie among the people of New York.[34]

The hostility did not, however, disappear. It was to have a deep and lasting effect on efforts to construct a permanent monument to Grant in New York. Instead of being a temporary vault, the structure Jacob Wrey Mold had designed to receive the General's body was to serve as his tomb for almost twelve years.[35]

CHAPTER IV - GRANT'S FUNERAL

For the time being, New Yorkers took no notice of the carping of the rest of the nation. They were both proud and delighted that Grant's final resting place was to be in their city. Within hours of the General's death, Gothamites began to drape their buildings with mourning decorations. Many of them had purchased the necessary materials months earlier in anticipation of Grant's death. Those who had not been industrious enough to plan ahead quickly made up for lost time. The decorating continued unabated for over a week, and everyone commented on the fact that never before had such displays been mounted, not even for Lincoln. It was suggested that this was not necessarily because Grant was the more beloved of the two, but that the city was bigger and richer than it had been twenty years earlier, and also because the old antagonisms associated with the war had lessened with time.

Department stores, hotels, newspaper and government buildings were the most elaborately decorated (Fig. 16). But sewing girls and clerks living in the tenement districts also mounted their own humble displays in the windows of their hovels. Perhaps most touching of all was a sign a "poor colored bootblack" mounted on his shack in the wilds of Manhattan's upper west side. It read "He Helped to Set me Free."

The only major category of buildings that was left unadorned were the private residences of the well to do. They and their staffs were

vacationing out of town since it was the middle of the summer. New Yorkers became so involved in preparing for the funeral that critiques were being offered of the decorations on the various buildings! The ornaments on the Herald Building, for instance, were branded as "sloppy". Generally in New York as in the rest of the nation, the embellishments were to remain up for the thirty day period following the General's death.[1]

There was at least one bit of humor in the midst of all the sorrow, and it concerned the embellishment of City Hall, where Grant was to lie in state before the funeral. Commissioner of Public Works Rollin M. Squire was in charge of the operation, which he left largely in the hands of the Unexcelled Fireworks Company.[2] Included in the decorative scheme at the Commissioner's request were a few poetic lines extolling Grant's virtues. Several days after the work was completed, someone realized that the lines of verse were excerpts from the Commissioner's own poem "War and Freedom" written in 1865. New Yorkers were scandalized by this self advertisement, and Mayor Grace ordered the stanzas torn down on August 6th.[3]

As preparations for the funeral proceeded, vendors set up stands all over the city selling busts of Grant and a host of other items. Small black silk mourning ribbons were among the most popular items, and were dispensed in large quantities. The Park Service has one of these in its collections (Fig. 17). Bleechers were also erected along the route of the funeral procession, and again, the Park Service is fortunate

in having in its collections a rare broadside offering seats for $2.00 each at the corner of Broadway and East 4th Street.[4]

There was an intense, almost morbid, curiosity on the part of the public in regard to every facet of the funeral preparations. When Grant's coffin - "Style E. State Casket" - was finished by the Stein Manufacturing Co. in Rochester, local citizens insisted they be allowed to see it; and 15,000 people dutifully filed past it inside the factory on July 26th before it was shipped off to undertaker and Methodist Minister Stephen R. Merritt in New York. Once it was in Merritt's hand, he too placed it on exhibition. An estimated 70,000 people saw it in his establishment on July 27th before it was finally sent off to Mt. McGregor to receive the General's body. It was reported that shop girls and clerks ran home after work in order to change into their Sunday best before getting in Merritt's line.[5]

Mayor Grace had appointed a special committee to oversee all details connected with the funeral.[6] While the committee members pondered such niceties as whether or not to wear bands of black crepe around their hats,[7] the drama at Mt. McGregor was drawing to a close. The Drexel Cottage had been under guard to keep away the curious since Grant's death (Fig. 18). Inside, the body lay under a canopy richly decorated with black broadcloth satin, and silk trimmings and tassels (Fig. 19). Rich flower arrangements filled the house (Fig. 20). On the morning of August 4, the family held a private funeral service. Dignitaries

sat on the porch and others spilled over on to the surrounding lawns. At the conclusion of the ceremony, Grant's remains were sent by train to Albany, where they remained on view in the Capital building for one day. After 80,000 people filed by to pay their last respects, the body was transferred to New York, and on the evening of August 5, it was placed on view in the vestibule of City Hall where the walls and ceilings had all been draped in black crepe, making it seem like a giant tent (Fig. 2). The coffin was left open and 250,000 people filed past, or in the words of one reporter, were "hustled past."[8]

The funeral procession's seven mile route was to begin at City Hall (Fig. 22 and 23), proceed up Broadway to 14th Street, then across to Fifth Avenue and up Fifth as far as 57th Street. There it would again cross over to Broadway and continue north as far as 72nd Street. Passing through 72nd Street to Riverside Drive the procession would then move directly north to the temporary vault at 123rd Street.[9] At 9:30 A.M. on August 8, a howitzer placed in City Hall Park fired three times as a signal to the marchers to fall in line. At 10:00 A.M. General Aspinwall, who was officially in charge of the ceremonies, ordered the signal fired again, and the procession was underway with Major General Hancock in the lead.[10]

President Grover Cleveland and ex-Presidents Hayes and Arthur were among the many dignitaries who took part in the procession. There were, in fact, so many of them - politicians, generals, foreign emmisaries - that virtually every available carriage in New York,

Brooklyn and nearby New Jersey had been hired to carry them. Most of the distinguished gentlemen joined the parade at Fifth Avenue and 23rd Street, in front of the Fifth Avenue Hotel where the majority of them were staying.[11] Conspicuous by her absence was Mrs. Grant who remained at Mt. McGregor, unable to bear the emotional strain of the funeral.[12]

General Grant's cataflaque was drawn by 24 black horses, each of which was attended by a black groom (Fig. 24). Waves of marchers stretched both in front and in back of it - an estimated 60,000 men in all. Rifles were carried upside down, flags were wrapped and drums were muffled. The line of march was almost three miles long and it took a full five hours to pass a given point (Figs. 25, 26 and 27). An estimated one million spectators had flowed into the city to watch the procession. Hords of people filled the streets and bleechers. They also hung out or windows and lined the rooftops in order to get a good view. The more adventurous even shinned up trees and telegraph poles.

Just before 5:00 P.M. the funeral car reached the tomb site (Fig. 28). Grant's coffin was placed inside a lead-lined, cedar case that had been on display since that morning (Fig. 29). These were then inserted in a riveted steel container which was later sealed by workmen. The gate to the temporary vault was symbolically locked and Mayor Grace was handed the brass key.[13] From that moment until the early months of 1886,

a twenty four hour a day military guard was posted at the site (afterwards to be replaced by the grey uniformed Park Police). The day after the funeral, the gate of the temporary vault was opened to receive flowers (Fig. 30).[14]

It is interesting to note how eager people were not only to be kept informed concerning every detail of Grant's death and funeral, but also how so many longed for some tangible souvenir of the event. Not only were oak leaves gathered from a tree near the temporary tomb, but at Mt. McGregor people grabbed blossoms, ferns - whatever they could get hold of - from the grounds surrounding the Drexel Cottage.[15] Flowers were delivered to the Cottage in such great quantities that they had to be changed twice a day. As quickly as the old arrangements were removed, they were snapped up as precious relics.[16] When the temporary tomb was under construction, people raided the site and carried away bricks until a guard was posted, and as workmen sealed Grant's outer steel coffin on the evening of the funeral, others:

> begged and tried to buy bits of coal from the furnace at which the bolts were heated, pieces of burnt candle, rings of rubber from the bolts, and even scraps of wood from the box in which the bolts were placed.[18]

The cataflaque was also fair game. At least one man cut off one of the large silk tassels while Grant's body was being carried into the vault![18] Many more waited until the ceremony was over and politely sent in requests for scraps of the cataflaque's mourning drapery or whatever else might be available. The newspapers then published stories that the undertaker was giving out souvenirs, and requests poured in both to Merritt and the newly formed Grant Monument Association. They came from Massachusetts,

Iowa, Michigan, Ohio, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, in short, from all parts of the country. Adolf Schippert, a clerk from Tiffany's stationery department who had marched in the funeral procession with a New Jersey GAR Post wanted a piece of mourning drapery. A twelve year old boy whose father had worked in the War Department while Grant was President asked for "anything from a piece of the canopy to a splinter of the car." Mrs. Major D.H. Hurdley wrote "as my husband fought under General Grant for nearly four years, we think we are entitled to a piece of the drapery used at his funeral, cannot you send us a piece, we would prize it highly.[19]" The National Park Service actually has a small piece of this once highly prized cloth in its collections. It was sent to the Grant Monument Association by one of its founding trustees in 1913.[20]

Also in the possession of the Park Service is a stupendous collection of memorial resolutions sent to Grant's family after his death (Fig. 31). They came from organizations across the country and around the world, and not only document the reverence with which Grant was held, but many of them rank highly as art objects. Perhaps the most impressive of them all is a massive volume sent by the City of New York. Bound in blue velvet, it weighs approximately 35 pounds. Its enormous folio leaves were richly embellished by D.T. Ames. The volume was thought to be so impressive that it was minutely described in the New York Times when presented to Mrs. Grant.[21] Many of the other expressions of sympathy are equally impressive, some being bound in leather with gilded straps. Others are beautifully colored.[22]

CHAPTER V - THE FOUNDING OF THE GRANT MONUMENT ASSOCIATION AND ITS EARLY FUND RAISING EFFORTS

At 9:10 A.M. on July 23, 1885, just a little more than an hour after Grant's death, a woman walked into the office of the Mayor of Rochester, New York, and handed him a $5.00 bill. She had come to America, she said, 45 years earlier and had done well for herself. She felt she owed a great deal to the country and to Grant in particular, because he had preserved the Union. The $5.00, she told the Mayor, was to be an anonymous contribution towards the construction of Grant's Tomb. This "Native of Ireland," as she styled herself, became the first contributor to the future monument. No site had yet been selected for Grant's burial, nor had there been any mention of a memorial. But the "Native of Ireland," like hundreds and thousands of other Americans know what had to be done and was ready to do her part.[1]

Once Mayor Grace received word that the Grants had agreed to inter the General's remains in New York, he immediately took steps to harness the great emotions that were being expressed across the nation in response to Grant's death. On the afternoon of July 24th, he sent the following form letter to many of New York's most illustrious citizens:

> Dear Sir:
> In order that the City of New York, which is to be the last resting place of General Grant, should initiate a movement to provide for the erection of a National Monument to the memory of the great soldier, and that she should do well and thoroughly her part, I respectfully request you to act as one of a Committee to consider ways and means for raising the quota to be subscribed by the citizens of New York City for this object, and beg that you will attend a meeting to be held at the Mayor's office on Tuesday next, 28 inst., at three o'clock...[2]

On the 28th, 85 prominent New Yorkers answered the mayor's call. They

quickly endorsed his suggestion to erect a "National Monument" in Grant's honor. They then appointed a committee to "prepare a plan of organization" for the group. Ex-President Chester A. Arthur (who while in office only months earlier had signed the bill restoring Grant to the rank of retired general) was made Chairman of the Committee. A black man, Richard T. Greener, was named Secretary.[3]

The next day the Committee on Organization as it was then styled, met for the first time. Those present decided to name their group The Grant Monument Association, and its goal would be to erect "a great national monument which shall appropriately testify to future ages, the appreciation by the civilized world of the genius, valor and deeds of the grandest character of the century." The committee recommended that Arthur's and Greener's positions be made permanent. Later that day at a full Association meeting the actions of the Committee on Organization were confirmed.[4]

Already contributions were pouring in for the Grant Monument, although no one had yet given any indication of exactly what that monument might turn out to be. Would it literally be a statue, a mausoleum or some kind of useful building like a hospital? Apparently it did not yet matter. Western Union announced its donation of $5,000 towards the cause on the very day The Grant Monument Association's Committee on Organization met.[5] The much more common, small contributions were generally sent to the various newspapers in town and from there they were forwarded to the mayor until the Association opened its own office.

By July 30th, if not earlier, New York's newspapers began to publish on a daily basis the names of contributors and the amounts they gave.[6] Many of the anonymous donations were quite touching both in size and sentiment. "Two Yankee Women" sent 20¢; "A Soldier's Orphan," 5¢; "A German Who Gives Up His Beer," 15¢. A boy named Johnny who sold papers and blacked boots, and whose father was a "soger", also sent a nickel.[7] And a George Sadding of Central Islip, Long Island, sent along $1.00 because "the General was a kind friend to me on the field.[8]"

As early as July 29th, the Mutual Life Insurance Company offered The Grant Monument Association a rent free office in its building at 146 Broadway. The next day the company instead offered an office on the first floor of its brand new skyscraper at the corner of Liberty and Nassau Streets.[9] Ultimately the Association ended up in a third floor office at the Insurance Company's 146 Broadway location, at the southeast corner of Liberty Street. The structure had been erected in 1863-1865 after designs by John Kellum, and shortly after 1870 joined the city's small group of early skyscrapers when it was raised four stories and had elevators installed.[10] The Association maintained their office there for the next seven years.[11]

Greener (Fig. 32), who was in charge of this office, was himself a rather significant nineteenth-century figure. Born on January 30, 1844, he prepared for college at Oberlin and Phillips Academy at Andover. He became the first black to receive a degree from Harvard University.

He held a number of academic posts afterwards, then studied law at the University of South Carolina and became Dean of Law at Howard University. He was involved in Republican politics, met Grant while a student at Harvard and, in his own words, "had political relations with him, and enjoyed his friendship during his last illness." Because of his academic background Greener was addressed as "Professor." His inclusion in The Grant Monument Association and his appointment to its chief administrative office was obviously intended, at least in part, to demonstrate the fruitful results of Grant's labors during the Civil War. The Republican Party in particular had been most eager to advance the cause of blacks in the post war period, and Greener's position was probably due largely to ex-President Arthur.[12]

In anticipation of the great crowds that were expected in New York on the day of Grant's funeral, the Association had distributed subscription sheets to the various hotels in town in its first active fund raising effort.[13] More than a week later its members held a meeting at which ex-Governor Alonzo B. Cornell made a motion that they raise $1 million for Grant's Monument. He suggested that if $300,000 had been raised for the base of the Statue of Liberty, $1 million was not too much to ask for the illustrious hero of Appomattox. At that point they had $50,000 in hand.[14]

Cornell's motion had passed and in the following weeks the organization shifted into high gear. Printed circulars appealing for funds together with subscription books were mailed to banks and postmasters all over

the country.[15] Attempts were made to organize the various branches of business in New York for fund raising efforts, including, among others, the insurance companies[16] and the iron trade.[17] One of the leaders of New York Society, Lispenard Steward, solicited funds at the famous and fashionable resort, Saratoga.[18] Quasi-commercial relationships were even entered into, such as one where in return for an endorsement, the Consumers Coal Company agreed to pay The Grant Monument Association 37½¢ for each ton of coal it sold.[19] The $50 proceeds from a benefit baseball game held between the "young businessmen" of Kingston and Rondout, New York, were also added to the Association's coffers.[20]

There were a host of other suggestions for raising money which the Association declined to act on. For instance, one S. Vos, who had demonstrated an inoperable snow shoveling machine to New Yorkers the previous winter, urged the Association to endorse a new puzzle he had designed.[21] D.F. Adams requested the right to sell a "Grant Mourning Button" in cooperation with the group. In order to boost sales, he planned to affix pieces of Grant's cataflaque to each of the buttons. He suggested that the cataflaque be set up right in City Hall Park, where pieces of it could be cut off and attached to the buttons right before everyone's eyes to convince "unbelievers".[22] And A.A. Esdra recommended that all of the mourning cloth in New York be gathered together and sold for the benefit of the fund.[23]

Despite a flurry of activity, the needed $1 million failed to

materialize in the months following Grant's death. The largest single explanation for this was the intense opposition in the rest of the country to Grant's having been interred in New York. This sentiment was so intense that out-of-town newspapers led a vituperative campaign urging people not to contribute to The Grant Monument Association's fund raising efforts.[24] Most editors felt that Grant should have been buried in Washington, D.C., and only days after his funeral, they began making suggestions that his remains be transferred there.[25] It was said that only two papers outside of New York State approved of the Association's objectives.[26] For instance, on August 27, 1885, a weekly paper in Windham County, Connecticut, wrote:

> The New York Monument Committee have voted to raise one million dollars for a Grant Monument. They have raised about $50,000 which will probably be spent in sending begging letters to other parts of the country.[27]

A few days later, the editor of the Michigan City, Indiana, Enterprise, commented:

> The feeling is pretty general in the West that as the Empire City secured the remains of General Grant over the protest of 9/10ths of the citizens of the United States she is in duty bound to place a monument over the grave of the grand old commander at her own expense second to no other monument in the country, but superior. I was one of General Grant's soldiers, and love him as no one but a soldier can, and I shall never get over the disappointment I felt when it was decided that his remains were to be deposited outside of Washington.[28]

And the general attitude was bluntly summarized by the editors of the Clay County Enterprise in Brazil, Indiana who wrote:

> ...we have not a cent for New York in the undertaking, and would advise that not a dollar of help be sent to the millionaire city from Indiana...If the billions of New York are not sufficient to embellish the city...let the remains be placed in Washington or some other American city.[29]

That the newspapers reflected the feelings of a large segment of the

population is confirmed by numerous letters that poured into The Grant Monument Association's office. People quibbled with every possible facet of the affair. R.L. Olds, a Baptist Pastor in Ludlow, Vermont, took issue with the choice of New York as a burial location:

> Why...should he be buried there? and especially in the most unsuitable of all places - a pleasure park, where gaiety and abandon abound?[30]

The Rev. S.S. Weatherby of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Le Roy Kansas wrote:

> if you propose - as we suppose you do - a pile of stone in your park for you New Yorkers to look at, we do not think we feel much interest in it.[31]

Another common refrain was that New York, in the words of one E.J. Crossett, only "wanted to bury our old Commander there for the purpose of 'booming real estate.'" He lamented, "I wish I had some property near Riverside Park.[32]" The Rev. Wayland Spaulding of the First Congrationalist Church in Poughkeepsie agreed:

> I am reliably informed that the Grant Monument proposition is a speculation gotten up for money, money, money and for enhancing the value of New York property...[33]

The out-of-town business community responded in largely the same way. The President of the Fourth National Bank of Cincinnati, M.M. White wrote:

> Our people are of the opinion that Washington is the proper location for a monument to so distinguished a character as the late General Grant and are willing to contribute to any other location believing that New York has no claims that are as prominent as other locations that have been mentioned.[34]

And one Edward Hammond of Chicago retorted to a circular sent him "I consider it a piece of well developed cheek to have such a document sent here.[35]"

Other cities were planning to build their own Grant monuments, and this only fanned the flames of rivalry and served to divert funds which might have gone to New York. As early as August 1, 1885, Chicago had raised $30,000 for a monument and Philadelphia had collected quite a tidy sum for its monument as well.[36] To make matters worse, the Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic was also opposed to building a national monument to Grant in New York and instead promoted the idea of erecting a separate memorial in Washington, D.C.[37] This effectively precluded any possibility of raising funds within that gigantic and influential organization.

The contentious atmosphere created by accusations, suspicions, rival plans for monuments, etc., ultimately led Mayor Grace to solicit Mrs. Grant's written statement, excerpted above,[38] on why New York had been selected as her husband's burial place. Both his letter and her reply were widely published,[39] but this did little to quell the controversy.

Aside from the opposition The Grant Monument Association faced outside of New York, there were internal problems as well. The members were simply not active enough, and although they were some of the wealthiest men in New York, they had themselves failed to contribute generously to the fund.[40] A later commentator remarked that they were "too respectable" to raise the necessary funds from others![41] The New York Times criticized them for "sitting quietly in an office and signing

receipts for money voluntarily tendered.[42]

Part of the internal problem may be attributed to political tensions between the Republicans and Tammany Hall Democrats in the Association. Years later, one member, Horace L. Hotchkiss, was to recall:

> When Mr. J. P. Morgan turned over to me the Treasurership of the Association, the organization was largely under the local influence of Tammany Hall - (Mayor) W.R. Grace was President and the Board of Trustees was dominated by that faction. There was no particular friction, simply, we were not functioning - there was quite evident a feeling that the Republicans might gain national and local influence. This thought was in the air - I cannot define its influence.[43]

Whether from political differences, over-refinement in breeding or just plain laziness, the Association really began to bog down when the active fall business and social season commenced in October 1885. Between then and February 1886, at least ten scheduled meetings of the Executive Committee had to be adjourned for lack of a quorum.[44] The press regularly called attention to this neglect of what many considered an almost sacred duty.[45]

One final stumbling block the fund raising effort had to contend with was the fact that the public still had not the slightest idea of what the called for $1 million was to be spent on. In this regard, William D. Sloane, the furniture manufacturer and retailer, wrote to Chester A. Arthur:

> ...the majority will hesitate sending in their subscriptions until they know what the monument or memorial is to be - its style as well as the actual cost."[46]

He also expressed the belief that the goal of raising $1 million was

unrealistic - as it indeed turned out to be. William Lummis, a later trustee of the Association also wrote:

> ...the members of the (New York Stock) Exchange wish some definite plan proposed before they will feel much interest in the work.[47]

Regardless of these admonitions, the Association did not get around to deciding what type of monument it would build and adopting a design until five years later.

Clearly, the leadership of The Grant Monument Association was either too ill equipped or ill disposed to carry out the necessary task. Richard T. Greener was soon named Chief Examiner of New York City's Civil Service Board and had less time then ever to devote to Association business, even though he was being paid a rather substantial salary.[48] Nevertheless, some new initiatives were launched before 1885 came to an end. Canvassers were hired to solicit contributions both in and outside of New York. One of these men, S.W. Thompson, had recently succeeded in raising funds for a statue to Peter Cooper, and negotiations were held with William Jenson, who had worked with the New York World in raising the money for the Bartholdi Pedestal Fund.[49]

In other efforts Civil War General George A. Sheridan was sent out on a lecture tour on behalf of the fund, for which he was to receive 25% of the proceeds.[50] The Association also made plans to sponsor a fair at Madison Square Garden in November 1885. It was to feature music by Gilmore's famous band and there was to have been a "beautiful and novel electric fountain" in the middle of the exhibits. But a

number of the Association's members, Seth Low prominently among them, objected to such commercial enterprises, so the plan was dropped.[51] An occasional benefit performance, such as a "Grosse Theateroorstellung (Fig. 33)" presented in Jersey City on December 14, 1885, supplied some additional money.[52] And all along the Association continued to mail out its circular appeals for donations. Requests for commercial endorsements also continued to pour in from people like on Jacob Studer who was trying to promote a volume on The Birds of North America.[53]

Miraculously, at the end of the year The Grant Monument Association had $111,006.17 in hand.[54] This was surely a princely sum of money, but far short of the hoped for $1 million. In the early part of 1886, the Association decided to incorporate. The first draft of a bill they submitted to the State Legislature, called for twenty trustees and three ex-officio members of the board. The numbers were later increased to 29 trustees and four ex-officio members, including the Mayors of New York and Brooklyn, the Governor of New York and the President of the Park Board of the City of New York. The list of trustee/incorporaters of the Association included distinguished New Yorkers Chester A. Arthur, Hamilton Fish, J.P. Morgan, Cornelius Vanderbilt (II) and the publishers of some of the city's more important newspapers, including James Gordon Bennett (Herald), Joseph Pulitzer (World), Oswald Ottendorfer (Staats-Zeitung) and Charles A. Dana (Tribune). The Act of Incorporation took effect on February 3, 1886. Richard T. Greener had personally supervised its passage in the state legislature.[55]

The official incorporation of The Grant Monument Association did not, however, generate any new and dramatic activity. In the Association's 1886-1887 fiscal year, only $10,000 was raised, and a similar sum was obtained the year after that. Some of the trustees began to resign in disgust because so little progress was being made.[56]

Given how difficult it was to obtain donations the Association attempted to go after a congressional appropriation. In January 1886, the House Committee on Military Affairs approved a bill for a $500,000 appropriation for the Grant Monument, provided the Association first raised $250,000. The next month Congressman Abraham Dowdney introduced a similar bill on the House floor calling for only $250,000. But as might have been expected, there was intense opposition to it. The Association did some lobbying for what had become House Bill #1600E, but its opponents introduced a rival bill in the Senate calling for a like amount to be appropriated for a Grant Monument in Washington, D.C. After a long and hard battle one of the House Bill's few supporters was forced to write on July 25, 1886, "...there is no probability of any action this session.[57]" The matter was effectively dropped and defeated.

While all this was going on, thousands of people were still visiting the temporary tomb on a regular basis. On January 15, 1886, the military guard had been withdrawn and New York's Park Police took up the post.[58] Among their more important functions was to prevent

anyone from taking pictures in the vicinity of the vault since The Grant Monument Association had the exclusive privilege to sell photographs of the site.[59] On Decoration Day 1886, the U.S. Grant Post #327 of the G.A.R. planned to hold a grand commemorative ceremony at Grant's Temporary Vault (Fig. 34). The Association took advantage of public interest in the event by placing collection boxes in hotels all around town.[60]

The ceremony itself was quite impressive; elaborate flower arrangements were sent from all over the country to decorate the vault. One of the most elaborate, a life sized horse and rider, was unfortunately damaged in transit and never displayed. Some 20,000 people gathered at the tomb site (Fig. 35) and waited patiently until the sheets of cloth which surrounded the vault were dropped, revealing the elaborate flower displays set on tiers of bleechers (Fig. 36). There were wreaths, shields, a cannon and other unusual arrangements (Fig. 37).[61] Decorating the temporary tomb became a fairly regular occurance after this, although on a far less elaborate scale (Figs. 38 and 39).

Fund raising schemes in 1886 were fairly limited. Attempts to organize the various trades in New York into committees failed to elicit any response.[62] One Harley Newcomb managed to convince the Association to sponsor a third-rate opera of his entitled the "Hermit of Cashel." It was to play at the Metropolitan Opera House for an entire week beginning October 4, 1886. As it turned out only one performance took place because of a lack of public interest and the Association netted

a wopping $20-$50 for its efforts.[63] One George W. daCunha started a "Nickel Fund Association" in Montclair, New Jersey, for the benefit of the Grant Monument, and it yielded no more than a dollar or two.[64] Finally, just before the year ended the humorous weekly The Judge sponsored a puzzle contest that surprisingly managed to raise about $1,000.[65]

In January 1887, Mrs. Grant donated $987.50 to the monument fund, which had been sent to her as back pay due her husband from the Mexican War era.[66] Otherwise the only highlight of the fund raising campagin in 1887 was the New York Star's decision to launch its own drive for the Grant Monument. Call "The Star Fund for the Grant Monument," it was obviously inspired by the World's earlier campaign on behalf of the Statue of Liberty. The goal was to raise $125,000 - in other words to match the sum then in the hands of The Grant Monument Association. A fairly successful start was made. Leaflets were sent out all over the country. Old emotions seemed to be reawakened and once more the sort of sentimental letters that had flooded newspaper offices in the summer of 1885 were received by the Star. "Two Hungry Jews," for instance, sent in what they could.[67] But the old cynicism and rivalry also managed to surface. After a notice of a modest contribution to the Star Fund by the President was published, the following letter was received:

> Kind Sir:
> The generosity of Pres. Cleveland giving $10.00 to the Gen. Grant Statue Fund (sic) has prompted me to be equally as open hearted. Mr. Cleveland's salary averages $137.00 a day including the days he attempts to fish and holidays

on which he is loafing from business-

The $10.00, he gives, being 7 3/8 per cent of his daily wages - I enclose the same percentage on mine. I can easily keep pace with him in Charity...7 3/8% on $1.50 is .1206 hardly 2¢ - but enclosed please find 2¢ -

Modesty prevents signing my name and I have nothing to win from political friendship.

Rothschild[68]

When all was said and done only $10,000 was raised by the Star. Their effort had been a dismal failure,[69] and the general propects for completing the Grant Monument fund were not good.

CHAPTER VI - IN PURSUIT OF A DESIGN: THE FIRST COMPETITION FOR THE GRANT MONUMENT

Although there were mixed feelings over whether Grant should have been interred in New York, there was widespread interest in the monument that would be erected there in his memory. As early as July 26, 1885, the editors of the New York Tribune expressed their ideas about the monument. They recommended it be:

> ...a modern and not a classic edifice...its emblems and friezes and tablatures (sic) should represent scenes from the life of the Nineteenth Century...and it is to be hoped that it will be so far as possible a representation and example of modern and expecially American art, and not a mere servile copy of the Antique.[1]

The idea of building a modern and distinctly American monument in Grant's memory was brought up over and over again over the next few years and seems to have been taken to heart by a number of architects. Naive members of the public were excited by the same idea. Within days of Grant's death George F. Ditson, a doctor from Cleveland, Ohio, urged The Grant Monument Association to erect a monument composed of diminishing tiers of red, white and blue glass columns placed one on top of another and surmounted by an angel "pointing heavenward." The recommended material was modern, the colors patriotic. In later letters Ditson elaborated on his plans and provided The Grant Monument Association with sketches (Fig. 40).[2] A Mrs. Clary A. Sheafor of Burlington Kansas had ideas on the subject as well. She argued Grant was a modern man and that his monument should properly be built of modern materials. The ones she specifically proposed were glass, paper, and iron, although the particular manner in which they were to be combined was not

specified.[3]

The architectural profession took an immediate interest in the subject of memorializing Grant as well. In their issue published the day Grant was interred, the editors of the American Architect and Building News announced a competition. It was to be an exercise along the lines of one of the concours d'emulation of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris. The editors emphasized that they were not calling for designs for the national monument/tomb of General Grant that was to be erected in New York. Rather, they were soliciting designs for a more modest structure that would cost no more than $100,000 and which would be suitable for a small city. Only preliminary sketches, not elaborate finished drawings were required. The editors stated that they were sponsoring the competition because they had been appalled at the badly designed commemorative monuments that had sprung up all over America following the Civil War. They hoped that the results of their contest would serve as a positive influence and prevent a new crop of badly designed Grant monuments from being built. Architects Charles A. Cummings and Henry Van Brunt were to judge the competition along with sculptor Truman H. Bartlett, and there were to be $50 prizes for each of the top three designs. Newspapers across the country publicized the contest.[4]

Exactly how many designs were received in response to the invitation was not recorded, but approximately twenty of them were published by the American Architect at the end of September.[5] Widespread interest

in the results was demonstrated later that year when Moniteur des Architects published in Paris, reprinted thirteen of the designs.[6]

Many of the competitors had ignored the requirement that they design a small memorial. Chief among them was Harvey Ellis whose proposal won first place (Fig. 41). This Utica, New York, architect, designed an enormous Romanesque structure which was quite handsome and had a decidedly military character to it. Clearly, Ellis had the Grant Monument in mind, since he placed his building on top of a steep hill overlooking a body of water - a clear reference to Riverside Park and the Hudson River.

A fellow competitor called Ellis' design "a preposterous piece of nonsense.[7]" A New York Times critic did not feel too strongly about it one way or another. But as a general comment on the entire exercise, he stated:

> None of the work of these bright young men has been simple enough for the object proposed, but some have made suggestions very fit for the monument of a smaller man...

In his eyes the second prize design by Otto Von Nerta of Washington, D.C. (Fig. 42), was "a square monument of the conventional type found in all German cities...It stands on the regulation platform." The monument designed by the third prize winner, Clare S. Luce of New York City, was, "the only one with enough merit to be worth discussion, and that merit lies chiefly in soberness of treatment, not in originality (Fig. 43)." Calling all the sketches "more or less mushy," he concluded, "the showing is not such as to fill one with encouragement.[8]"

The rest of the designs covered a bewildering range of shapes, sizes and styles. There was a gothic pavilion, variations on the bell tower in the Piazza San Marco in Venice and the tower of the Cathedral of Seville. This competition was in many ways a dry run for the actual Grant Monument competition held in 1888-1889, both in terms of the variety and uninspiring nature of the results. A number of the architects who participated in the American Architect's contest took part in the later official competition, including Otto Von Nerta, C.C. Yost and Henry O. Avery. In fact, Avery simply reworked one of the two designs he submitted to the American Architect and sent it on to The Grant Monument Association three years later.[9]

As mentioned in the last chapter, the members of The Grant Monument Association really had no idea at all of what kind of a monument they cared to erect to Grant's memory. In an interview with the Brooklyn Magazine in the fall of 1885, Alonzo B. Cornell, Chairman of the Association's Executive Committee, stated that he and the other members of the group were waiting to see how much money they could raise before looking into "the character or design of the memorial." He did, however, suggest that it might be appropriate to construct a "monument, a library and a mausoleum" all in one.[10] At just about the same time New York Tribune was recommending the construction of a "national military museum."[11]

An interesting and lengthy article that appeared in the North American Review two months later pulled together many of the ideas expressed both publically and privately in regard to the proposed Grant Monument.[12]

Echoing the New York Tribune, the Review stated:

> One sees often and hears daily the demand that the tomb shall be "strictly American." "Give us," they say, "something characteristically American."

At the same time the periodical noted, as had the editors of the American Architect, that there was the real danger that a "monster" might be built. After a curious analysis of history and architecture, the Review theorized:

> The phase of national life and art to which we most nearly approach, the intellectual bent most akin to us, is that of the middle period of the Roman empire...What, then, could be more fitting for the plain, material, American people to erect to this large minded, but simple hero, than the sort of monument which the Romans reared to their great dead?

Because of some differences in the use of materials in the Nineteenth Century versus the Roman period, some adjustments would necessarily have to be made. But in the final analysis the Review recommended Grant's memorial be "a grand Roman tomb of noble dimensions treated as to its details in Romanesque style." If Harvey Ellis' design did not exactly fit this prescription, it approximated it. Some later designers were to follow it to the letter as will be demonstrated.[13]

In September 1885, the American Institute of Architects wrote to The Grant Monument Association urging that an actual competition, not simply an exercise such as the one conducted by the American Architect, be held for the design of the Grant Monument. The organization suggested that it be allowed to name ten architects to take part in the contest, each of whom would receive $1,000 for his services. Then, twenty judges, ten of which would be named by the

A.I.A., and ten named by the competitors themselves, would judge the results. The recommendation was widely published. The Grant Monument Association ignored the suggestion.[14]

Instead, the Association went about things in its own rather awkward way. At an Executive Committee meeting in October 1885, its members decided to encourage "artists, architects and all others" to forward designs and models to the Association for consideration. The next month a statement that they were ready to "receive designs" for the structure from interested parties was denounced as "ridiculous" by the New York Times which called on the Association to issue " a definite program," in sum, to make up its mind about what it was looking for before soliciting proposals.[15] A special committee was then appointed to decide on a plan of action for obtaining a design. A draft invitation for a competition was actually drawn up by Richard T. Greener, but never issued. The draft, interestingly, called for a $400,000 monument rather than a $1 million one.[16] The year ended with repeated calls in the press for the selection of a design.[17]

The year 1886 came and went with virtually no activity on the Association's part in respect to securing a design. Troubled by the fact that it should have been doing something, anything, in January the Association announced it would "make a selection at once from the designs" then in hand which had been sent in on speculation.[18] It did not. In December unsolicited proposals were still drifting in and most of them were dreadful.[19] The New York architect Calvert Vaux, co-designer of Central Park, submitted one that was so complicated that written descriptions give

little idea of what it was actually intended to look like.

Another design by George da Cunha, the creator of the "Nickel Fund Association," was dismissed by the Times in the following manner:

> If any other thing could frighten people more completely away from the (Grant) fund than this study it would be a kindness to keep it hidden.[20]

Regardless of all these delays, public interest in the project never flagged. Periodicals continued to publish descriptions of what were felt to be the more interesting of the unsolicited designs for the Grant Monument. Engravings were published as well. In the first half of 1887 the Architects and Builders Edition of the Scientific American carried illustrations of three proposals by architects Joseph Etchler, Joseph A. Stark and George Matthias (Figs. 44, 45 and 46).[21] Both Etchler and Matthias were later to submit their designs in the Grant Monument Association's formal competition.[22]

In the spring of 1887 Richard Greener sent out form letters to monument committees around the country asking what their experiences had been and how they went about obtaining designs for their respective projects. Among others he polled the Garfield Monument Fund in Cleveland, the Lee Monument Fund of Baltimore, and the Grant Monument Fund of Chicago.[23] At the same time other members of the Association solicited the help of noted New York architect Napoleon LeBrun in drafting rules for a formal competition.[24]

Abruptly, on June 9, 1887, the Grant Monument Association announced the

opening of the official competition for the Grant Monument, and the information was published in the newspapers the following day.[25] Unfortunately, the announcement was premature. The Association still did not have the faintest idea of what it was looking for and could only promise that further details on the subject would soon be released. In fact, about the only solid piece of information contained in the official announcement was that the competition was scheduled to close on October 31, 1887. Inquiries for further information came in from all over the world and were left unanswered. At least one member of The Grant Monument Association itself was annoyed with the manner in which the whole enterprise was being handled when he stated in a letter to Richard T. Greener that the announcement was "too crude and will amount to little."[26] He was right. Architects and the press heaped criticism on the Association for this ill considered move.[27]

As of October 31, 1887, the day the competition was to close, no details had been announced. The Association kept promising, however, to issue a circular "at an early date...together with a plan of the site," for the benefit of interested parties.[28] Towards the end of November, an editorial in the New York Times made an unfavorable comparison between inefficiency of The Grant Monument Association and the speed with which the Episcopal Church was going about the construction of the mammoth Cathedral of St. John the Divine.[29] Only later did Napoleon LeBrun deliver a final draft for the Grant Monument competition to the Association, and it was not until January that the

long-promised circular went to press.[30] This circular, addressed "To Artists, Architects and Sculptors," was dated January 26, 1888, and released to the press and public on February 4. The formal competition for the Grant Monument was at last underway. New York's newspapers published the announcement in its entirety,[31] and the essential details were immediately flashed to the European continent by wire so that they appeared in the London Times and other important journals on February 6.[32] Domestic and foreign architectural periodicals also carried the news.[33] The Association had officially lowered its expectations by calling for a $500,000 monument rather than the initial $1,000,000 monument it declared it would build in the days following Grant's death. Nevertheless, the competitors were encouraged to suggest how sums in excess of $500,000 might be used to embellish their proposed creations after an initial construction period, in case additional funds became available. All designs were to be submitted by November 1, 1888. They were to be drawn to a scale of 1/4" to a foot and the competitors were to submit 1 elevation, 1 or 2 sections, 1 perspective drawing and as many plans as necessary. They were also at liberty to submit models with their drawings if they so chose.

The circular promised that a committee of experts would be appointed to judge the competition and that the top five designs would be awarded prizes of $1,500, $1,000, $500, $300, and $200. In order to avoid favoritism, all entries were to be marked with either a motto or a cypher - not signatures - so as to prevent the judges from identifying

the work of their friends and pupils (common practice). The competitors' names were to be placed inside sealed envelopes bearing the same identifying marks found on their designs and only after the competition was decided were the envelopes to be opened thus revealing the names of architects. Written explanations of the designs were invited and the competitors were also requested to state how much compensation they expected to receive for their work if they were awarded the commission for the Grant Monument.

In what was becoming almost a time honored tradition, the Association again came under fire, this time from a broad spectrum of professional organizations that criticized the terms of the competition. The American Institute of Architects had a host of objections. The prizes were too small, the scale of the drawings too large and the reference to models too imprecise (either everyone should have been required to submit a model or everyone should have been forbidden to do so). The Institute found fault in the Association's failure to name the committee of experts at the outset and it insisted that the cost of the Grant Monument should have been more definitely stated. As it was, a competitor could theoretically submit a design for either $500,000, $1,000,000 or more and still be within the rules. Finally, the Institute was offended that the Association was obviously attempting to barter with the architects by asking each to name his price, since standard practice called for architects to receive a 5% commission on the cost of a given project. Similar objections were raised by the New York Architectural League, The Western Association of Architects, and the Illinois Association of Architects. Many of these protests were picked up and reprinted in the daily and professional press.[34]

Individual architects also protested that the required 1/4" scale was impractical since it would force the competitors to produce absolutely enormous drawings.[35] They also clamored for site plans, which the Association had earlier promised to provide but didn't.[36] Richard T. Greener was alarmed by the attacks since the Association had tried its best in having Napoleon LeBrun draw up the rules of the competition. Greener appealed to Professor of Architecture C.F. Osborne at Cornell University for a neutral appraisal of both LeBrun's circular and its critics' observations. Osborne replied that many of the points brought up by the A.I.A. and other were, in fact, valid. But more importantly, he questioned the:

> ...uncertainty as to whether this is to be considered a competition for a piece of sculpture pure and simple, or for an architectural composition...It is quite evident, I think, that your committee is itself in doubt at this point.[37]

The evidence, of course, was precisely in the fact that the competition circular was addressed "To Artists, Architects and Sculptors." Unquestionably even at this late date the Association hoped that a miraculous design of some sort would come into its hands and determine the nature of the as yet nebulous Grant Monument.

The Association did mend its ways in part by issuing a site plan to the competitors and reducing the permissable scale of the required designs to 1/8" to a foot.[38] In all an estimated 3000 circulars were sent out in response to requests among other places from Austria, Belgium, Canada, England, France, Ireland, Prussia, Russia, Switzerland, and, of course, all parts of the United States.[39] As the November 1, 1888, deadline approached, a number of the competitors begged for more time,

so the deadline was moved back to January 2, 1889. Already 40 designs had been received.[40] The deadline was then again rescheduled to January 10, 1889.[41] In the end, 65 designs were submitted, 42 of which came from Europeans and other foreigners.[42]

The Association originally planned to store the designs in a space that was made available to it for free - a loft over a beef packing house at 49th Street and 3rd Avenue. One of the competitors objected so strongly to the idea of placing his model there, that he ended up loaning a second floor space of his own for the Association's purposes. The building was located at the northwest corner of Broadway and 38th Street at the north end of the Tenderloin District.[43] Initially the Grant Monument Association had planned to appoint a committee of three experts to judge the designs, but it ended up appointing a committee of six, including architects Napoleon LeBrun (Chairman), James E. Ware (Secretary), George B. Post and James Renwick, Jr. Professors of Architecture William R. Ware of Columbia University and Solomon Woolf of City College also served.[44]

Illustrations for about one-third of the designs can be identified today. Given that these were for the most part published in the contemporary press and were, therefore, considered to be the more successful of the submissions they give a good idea of the results of the competition. The designs, with rare exceptions, can be described as quixotic.[45] The designers gave their creations strange stylistic appellations such as "Roman Antique."[46] Roman, Byzantine Gothic and Egyptian influences were combined at will.[47] A huge equestrian statue

set on top of improbable base, a tower of Babel-like affair (Fig. 47) and a monstrous assembly capped by an enormous hand and sword (Fig. 48) were all proposed.

Both the judges and the members of the Grant Monument Association were uneasy. Public expectations had been aroused and the fourth anniversary of the general's death was fast approaching. Yet there seemed to be no way to ignore the fact that the competition was a failure. Correspondence between Greener and the Secretary of the Committee of Experts, James. E. Ware, in April 1889 indicates a second competition was seriously under consideration.[48] Later that month the committee made its formal report to The Grant Monument Association. Five prize winners were selected, but the committee recommended that neither these nor any of the other designs be adopted for the Grant Monument. They explained:

> the terms of the competition...did not offer sufficient inducements to lead me of established reputation and experience to undertake the labor and expense of preparing drawings...only a few of the schemes submitted are worthy of serious consideration, and...even these consist either in a general plan or scheme which is good, coupled with details which are commonplace, if not actually bad, or radically bad general schemes with well studied and rendered details.[49]

Unwilling to admit defeat, the Executive Committee appointed its own sub-committee to consider the situation, while at the same time requesting the experts to reconsider the matter.[50] A second report by the experts confirmed their earlier judgment but offered the suggestion that the winning design could be used as a starting point in a new competition.[51]

It was not until December 1889 that the Executive Committee's sub-committee reported on the situation. In the opinion of its members,

a great many of the entries had not adhered to the rules of the competition. They added that the Committee of Experts had passed over a number of rather worthy designs, and that the designs recommended for prizes were not necessarily the best of the lot. Nevertheless, they concluded that the best thing to do would be to award the five prizes according to the expert's recommendations and to hold a second competition.[52] Although nearly a year had elapsed since the competition closed, no official announcement was yet authorized.

But secrets were hard to keep then as they are today. Both the New York World and Harper's Weekly managed to obtain photographs of what were purported to be the five designs selected by the committee of experts. Of these, four actually were prize winners, although the order of the awards was confused. In any event, the public was given a fair idea of what to expect once the results of the competition were made official.[53]

Turning to the winners, the first prize was awarded to Adolf Cluss and Paul Schulze, who were reputable architects from Washington, D.C. (Fig. 49).[54] As a demonstration of how casually the rules of the competition were observed by the competitors and the judges alike, the Cluss and Schulze design would have cost $1 million to build and not the $500,000 called for in the Grant Monument Association's circular. Even without its bronze ornaments the proposed monument would have cost $750,000.[55] The structure was to have had a 120 foot base and a shaft

rising to a height of 240'. A tall pedestal standing in front of the shaft was to have been surmounted by a large equestrian statue of General Grant. Harper's Weekly felt that:

> ...concerning (this) monument...there is little to say...the tower is a light-house decorated in the worst of taste, and crowned by a statue. The pedestal for the statue is raised out of all proportion in order to bring the horse and rider against a comparatively unfretted part of the tower.[56]

In overall concept the monument was rather similar, abeit on a much larger scale, to Larkin G. Mead, Jr.'s, 1868 design for the National Lincoln Monument (Lincoln's Tomb) in Springfield, Illinois (Fig. 50).[57] Two of Cluss and Schulze's drawings for this project - extremely rare survivors indeed - are in the collections of the National Park Service.[58]

The second prize was awarded to J. Philip Rinn of Boston, architect of the Bennington Monument.[59] His structure (Fig. 51) was to be an astounding 518' in height and topped by an angel holding up what was to be the largest electric light in the world. The scheme was essentially a variation of a well developed theme. "Washington having its shaft and Boston its Bunker Hill Monument (Fig. 52)." Harper's Weekly protested, "New York should not indulge in commonplace and seek to get a little higher obelisk, even if it were designed by a master." It added that in this particular case, "The details of the approaches are poverty stricken...[60]" Rinn neglected to submit an estimate with his proposal.

The Leipzig firm of Hartel and Neckelman took third prize.[61] The design was quite dramatic (Fig. 53), but "its fronts are too much broken and its shape as a whole unsatisfactory," Harper's Weekly complained.[62] This, too, had a well known precedent - Arthur F. Mathews "widely published and highly praised" 1879 proposal for a Washington Monument

(Fig. 54).[63] Again, the architects neglected to submit the cost of the project.

The fourth prize winner was the most interesting of all (Fig. 55).[64] It was submitted by Julius A. Schweinfurth of Boston and was the kind of monument the editors of the New York Tribune and the North American Review had called for four years earlier. Harper's Weekly claimed it showed the "most understanding of what is needed for a monument to a rough and taciturn soldier.[65]" According to Schweinfurth:

> The style used is that which seems fitting to the character of the illustrious hero - i.e. Roman...Although (I) have given it a distinctive American character.[66]

The proposal called for a 170 square foot platform. On top of this was to rise a 110'6" square structure surrounded by a circular tower 96' in diameter. The whole was to be 216'6" in height. "If one of the five (designs) must be accepted," Harper's Weekly concluded, "this meets best the need for solidity and sobriety in a mausoleum." Obviously, Schweinfurth's design bears a strong similarity in general conception to the monument known today as Grant's Tomb. But it also bore a very strong resemblance to a major monument that was then in the course of construction, the Garfield Mausoleum in Lakeview Cemetary, Cleveland, Ohio.

The Garfield Mausoleum was designed by architect George B. Keller and had been selected from among 50 designs in a competition similar to the one held for the Grant memorial. The original scheme was accepted in July 1884 and looked startingly like a lighthouse.[67] By

September 1885, Keller had revised his plans and produced a far more substantial and aesthetically pleasing design (Fig. 56). Its principal feature was a 50' in diameter circular tower surmounting a square base. The 180' high ensemble was dedicated on Memorial Day 1890.[68] Schweinfurth had been in Cleveland from 1884-1886, just when Keller had worked out the final details of his design.[69]
General William T. Sherman later called Keller's monument "magnificent enough for Grant,[70]" and evidently Schweinfurth was of the same opinion. Strangely, however, he took great exception to the comparison between Garfield Mausoleum and his own design. After the Harper's Weekly article appeared, he wrote to The Grant Monument Association:

> Having been informed that my design for the Grant Monument is "an improvement on the national Garfield Monument at Cleveland," permit me to place before your honorable body, the enclosed photo of the same that I may be, in your estimable opinion, cleared of the imputation.[71]

Schweinfurth's disclaimers notwithstanding, his design and the Garfield Monument were similar, and both bore a relation to the future design for Grant's Tomb.

Herbert A. Gribble, an Englishman and designer of the Church of the Oratory in South Kensington won fifth prize in the competition.[72] None of his drawings survived, and all that is known is the estimated cost of his proposal - $81,000 (12/16/89) - and the fact that it contained Mexican, Egyptian and Greek elements![73]

Whatever else might be said for them, the four known winning proposals in the Grant Monument competition were simply rehashes of well known,

established models. Both the architects and the judges seemed to be guided by the same conservative tastes. In referring to the still unofficial results of the competition, Harper's Weekly declared, "It is fair to assume that no one of these plans will be accepted," and an editorial in the New York World expressed the opinion that in general the designs were awful and failed to reflect General Grant's personality. The Association's failure to officially announce its decision in the matter brought numerous and sometimes angry inquiries through the fall of 1889, as to what was going on.[75] As if further proof were needed of the Association's indecision and lackadaisical attitudes, at just about the same time it began issuing souvenir certificates to Grand Army of the Republic contributors to the Grant Monument fund. On these certificates there appeared an engraving of competitor Max Schroff's design for the Grant Monument, even though he was not even being considered for one of the prizes.[76]

At long last the Association announced the awards after its annual meeting on February 20, 1890.[77] One disgruntled competitor referred to the experts who judged the competition as "old ladies.[78]" The New York Times in an editorial chided:

> An open competition does not attract men whose reputation is established and who have a more trustworthy occupation than engaging in what must be a lottery. The competitors (were) therefore for the most part either unsuccessful men or novices.[79]

Harper's Weekly (3/22/90 45) and virtually every other periodical agreed.[80]

CHAPTER VII - THE SECOND COMPETITION FOR THE GRANT MONUMENT

Over two years had passed since the opening of the competition for the Grant Monument, and the Association was still without a design. This did not reflect credibly on the group since its reputation which was already sullied by its inability to raise the necessary funds for the structure. An editorial in the New York Times scoffed that if the Association had simply accepted the proposal for a competition that the A.I.A. had submitted to it in September 1885, both time and money would have been saved and a design probably would have been selected long ago.[1]

The Association was apparently unsure on how to proceed after the crushing failure of the first competition. Adolf L. Sanger, a member of the Executive Committee, presented a tentative plan in an interview with a New York Times reporter towards the end of March 1890.[2] He stated that the Association would soon invite artists and architects to send new sketches for a $500,000 monument and that they would be paid for their sketches as long as their asking price was moderate. The Association would then have the option of asking the author of a particular design to elaborate on it or the Association might pass it along to others for elaboration. Sanger continued, "It will be in no sense a competition; it will simply be a response to a request from us for designs from men of acknowledged ability." He concluded by speculating that the third and fifth prize winners from the original competition would be invited to participate in this new adventure. Despite Sanger's disclaimers, there was very little

that differentiated this plan from that of the disasterous first competition.

Luckily, a more rational approach was being formulated by others within the Association. As early as December 1889, the special subcommittee appointed to review the first competition had reported to the Executive Committee:

> ...we recommend a second competition when the committee have decided whether to build a Monument or Memorial Building or both; that the area be covered, the height of the Monument or Memorial Building, the space required within the walls for the different purposes, whether it should provide a Sarcophagus, a Memorial and an Observatory; what the Memorial Building is to be used for and the spaces required for the different purposes to be clearly set forth in the second circular inviting competition designs to be issued by your association.
>
> ...we recommend that only such competitors deemed worthy, and meritorious by the association be invited to compete in the second competition under a clearly prescribed form of specifications and detailed directions of the style of monument or Memorial Building that will meet the requirements of the association.[3]

These recommendations appear to have been fully accepted and acted upon just a few days after Sanger's remarks to the Times. For on April 1, 1890, the same paper reported:

> After a long interchange of views, a resolution was adopted (by The Grant Monument Association) that the structure ought to be of such altitude and capacity as to present an attractive elevation, and to afford ample room within it, not only for a sepulchre for General Grant and his wife, but also for a memorial hall.[4]

In short, the Association at long last made up its mind as to what the Grant Monument should be - not an obelisk, a shaft nor a titanic piece of sculpture, but a large structure that would be both a tomb and a meeting place. If these requirements had only been stated years earlier, how simple things would have been! The Association at the

same time decided to invite "architects and designers" of "high standing" to present proposals for this structure.

On April 7, 1890, the Association mailed out letters to an undetermined number of architects asking if they would be interested in participating in a limited competition for the design of the Grant Monument.[5] The response was good, and on April 12, Richard T. Greener sent out a second letter to five architects announcing that on the previous day the Executive Committee had officially selected them to be the participants. The architects were John Ord of Philadelphia, and Napoleon LeBrun, Charles Clinton, Carrere and Hastings and John H. Duncan of New York. Greener wrote that each was at liberty to submit one or more designs for a $500,000 structure. The scale was to be either 1/4" or 1/2" to a foot, and the designs were to be submitted by July 1, 1890. The Executive Committee would recommend that the winning design be accepted by the full Grant Monument Association. The unsuccessful competitors were each to be awarded $500. Finally, Charles Clinton was to call all of the architects together to work out the details concerning the competition to the satisfaction of all.[6]

Within a few days the architects had met and established their own rules. Each would submit two elevations, one or two sections along with the necessary floor and site plans. No perspective views would be allowed. All drawings would be done in black lines washed in brown. Human figures were to be permitted to indicate scale. The sky could be either lined or washed in, but trees were not to be included. The

architects also made a number of requests. They wanted their drawings displayed publically before a decision was made, and they asked that a group of three "experts" and three Executive Committee members make the award. They also wanted their drawings returned to them at the conclusion of the competition, and they sought assurances that the winner would definitely be employed by the Association. Finally, they asked for an extension of the deadline to July 15, 1890, instead of July 1.[7]

The members of the Executive Committee appear to have been wary of their experiences in the first competition. They decided, therefore, that the decision making process would be theirs alone and that no "experts" would be involved. They refused to exhibit the drawings before making their decision and they refused to give assurances that one of the five architects would be employed by the Association until they saw the results of the competition. The only concessions they made were to return the drawings to the competitors and to extend the deadline to July 15, 1890.[8]

All of these arrangements appear to have been carried out in secrecy - possibly so that the Association could avoid further criticism in case of a second failure. However, at least one of the architects who submitted a design in the first competition seems to have had an idea of what was going on early in April, and he was upset he was not going to be asked to participate in the second competition.[9] But as late as May 11, the fourth prize winner in the first competition

Julius Schweinfurth, was busily recommending Follen McKim, Augustus St. Gaudens and August Rodin as judges for a possible second competition in which he hoped to participate. He referred to them as:

> ...men who are familiar with classic precedent and are not carried away with petty groups of cannon, shields, piles of cannon balls...and all the incongruities which have, heretofore, in this country been considered to be sine qua non in a monument...

It was only a week later that a shocked Schweinfurth asked for confirmation of a story he had heard that a second competition was already underway.[10] As late as July some architects were asking for instructions on how to compete the second time around although the details of the second competition surely must have been made public by that time.[11] Even later, a few architects were not about to let the small matter of an invitation stand in their way, and they went ahead and sent their unsolicited designs to The Grant Monument Association.[12]

The five competitors were not ready to submit their designs on the appointed day, and asked for an extension of the deadline until October.[13] The Executive Committee was loathe to grant their request because the rest of the nation was growing impatient with the Association's delays. Over two years earlier the New York Herald had called for all the members of the Association to resign and allow a fresh start to be made by a different group of men.[14] In 1889 at its National Encampment in Milwaukee, the G.A.R. passed a resolution calling for the removal of Grant's remains to Washington, D.C. The New York posts of the G.A.R. tried to fight this move pledging themselves to build the tomb. Gen. Charles H.T.C. Collis, a leader of the local G.A.R. began to badger the state legislature to revoke The Grant Monument Association's charter

and turn over its funds to a new group. The Association was able to turn aside this attack by making Collis a trustee and eventually Chairman of the Executive Committee.[15] But in August 1890, Senator Preston B. Plumb introduced a resolution in the U.S. Senate that was similar to the G.A.R.'s and called for relocating Grant's remains to Washington. It actually passed.[16] Now the resolution had only to go before the House of Representatives. The Executive Committee could only agree, therefore, to give the architects until September 1, to submit their designs.[17] The Association was under pressure and had to demonstrate to the public that it was vigorously fulfilling its obligations.

The finished drawings were packed in boxes "as tall as a man" and when they were turned in on September 1, virtually filled the Association's offices on the fifth floor of 146 Broadway.[18] After an initial review, one by one the architects were called in by the Executive Committee to explain their proposals in greater detail.[19] Some members seem to have retained a bit of pessimism concerning the enterprise to the very end. Collis, Chairman of the Committee, informed the New York Times that if none of the five designs were judged satisfactory, the Association was prepared to choose one of the designs from the first competition for execution. "He seemed to think that in any case some design would now be selected.[20]" Apparently Collis was quite eager to let the public in general and Congress in particular know that the Association was determined to act.

Happily, we know quite a bit about all of the designs submitted in the second competition. Reproductions of all the elevations survived as well as some sections and plans.[21] The architects' written proposals have also survived either in typescripts or the published accounts of the contest.[22] The Association had, of course, publically called for a memorial hall to be included in the monument's design.[23] But other features appeared in all five designs as well, indicating that further specifications were probably given to the architects and which are now lost. For instance, each of the proposals included provisions for observatories and exhibition space for trophies. All of the designs were also in a classical style as opposed to the mind boggling diversity that characterized the entries in the first competition. And all five of the architects were apparently instructed to make provisions for erecting the Grant Monument in stages.[24]

The Times reported that of the five designs, one would cost $400,000, three $500,000 (as requested) and one $800,000. Unfortunately which was which was not mentioned.[25] It would seem that Charles Clinton's simple design would have been least costly while the opposite would have been true of Carrere and Hasting's elaborate arrangement. Critical reaction to the five designs was quite varied after they were made public.

In the words of Napoleon LeBrun, his design was "a spacious dome-covered mausoleum...entered through a lofty triumphal arch (Fig. 57). The

112'x102' plan was "arranged...somewhat like the Pantheon of ancient Rome." An interior rotunda measured 65' in diameter and its dome rose 100' in height. The dome was to be constructed of concrete, just like the Pantheon's,[26] and its exterior was to be sheathed with gilded bronze scales. An exterior observation gallery was planned at the base of the dome, and at the very top of the 166' high monument there was to be "a statue of Victory...with standard and uplifted sword and branch of laurel, typical of war and peace." A critic writing for the Nation liked LeBrun's design the best,[27] but a reporter for the Herald called it "better in proportions than in detail.[28]"

The most elaborate of the designs was submitted by the firm of Carrere and Hastings (Fig. 58). In a clear demonstration of their Ecole des Beaux-Arts training, they asserted in their written proposal for the monument that:

> From an artistic point of view, the most interesting solution of any architectural problem, is to express outwardly the interior plan, so that the problem and its solution shall be as clearly revealed by the exterior grouping as by the interior disposition of the building - that is, each part of the interior, should be motivated clearly, and in the most honest and natural way, in the exterior effect.

At the center of their design was a small version of the Pantheon, which was to serve as the memorial hall. This was flanked by two small towers similar to the ones Bernini added to the ancient structure in the 17th century and which were subsequently pulled down. In back of

this the architects placed a lofty tower that resembled the campanile in the Piazza San Marco in Venice. This was to rise directly over Grant's sarcophagus, thus marking the spot for people to see from miles around. Finally, the entire affair was to be approached through the arms of an enormous semicircular colonnade adorned with "decorative charts and inscriptions" relating to the Civil War, as well as allegorical statues and emblems of "Liberty," "Justice" and "Peace." The New York World referred to this proposal as "in many respects the most striking" of those submitted.[29] The New York Daily Commercial Advertiser confirmed this opinion by stating that "public taste would have been...satisfied if Messers. Carrere and Hasting's design had been accepted.[30]" But the Nation in a more sober account noted "it cannot be believed that the effect would be altogether happy.[31]" The ensemble was far too complicated.

The design by architect John Ord had the sad distinction of being the least interesting of the five (Fig. 59). Its plan was in the form of a Greek cross with overall exterior dimensions of 126'x145'. Inside, its central dome was to have risen 152' above a sunken crypt, designed with the example of Les Invalides in mind. The exterior was to have been of white marble with gilded domes, and a statue of Victory was to surmount the 201' high structure. Elevators were to have led to observatory balconies. The kindest of Ord's critics simply observed "the memorial hall is not well planned.[32]" Others referred to the design as "not fortunate in detail or proportion,[33]" and "very ugly.[34]"

Charles Clinton, later a partner in the well known firm of Clinton and Russell, submitted a circular design because "it is the historical form for tombs (Fig. 60)." Actually his monument resembled structures such as the Temple of the Vestal Virgins in Rome more than any ancient tomb. It was to have been built on a 160' square, 17' high platform, and would have contained a crypt, a large rotunda and a memorial hall above the rotunda. Clinton placed a lantern which would be used as an observatory, above the main portion of the building, and on top of this a statue of either Columbia or Victory would have stood over the largest electric light in America.[35] The Daily Commercial Advertiser commented that Clinton's design was "not very attractive, and save for the...monumental rotunda would not deserve mention at all.[36]" The Nation hit the nail on the head when it said "the whole structure seems much smaller than it really is." It "appears to the eye as a slight and delicate garden pavilion,[37]" even though its proportions were gigantic.

The winning design was submitted by John H. Duncan, and it will be discussed in detail in the following chapter. The selection was made by the Executive Committee at a meeting held on September 9th, at 240 Fifth Avenue, the home of Col. Knox. The news was published in the evening papers for that day and was carried in the morning papers on the 10th.[38] John Ord was the first of the architects to hear the news and he hurried over to Duncan's office to let him know. One by

one the others then dropped by to offer their congratulations.[39]

On September 11, the Executive Committee made a report to the full board of The Grant Monument Association. It read:

> The results of (the architects') labors is now before you, and your committee takes pleasure in stating that the admirable work produced by all of them is the best assurance that their selection was judicious: in fact each of the designs found advocates among the members of your committee. The preference, however, was largely in favor of Mr. John H. Duncan, and your committee now unanimously recommend the adoption of his design.[40]

The report was so adopted and the next day Richard T. Greener mailed Duncan an official letter announcing his selection as architect of The Grant Monument Association.[41] Greener also ordered checks in the amount of $500 drawn for each of the five competitors, a decision apparently having been made to reward the winner as well as the losers.[42] By then, the architects' drawings were already on display for the edification of the public at the galleries of Ortgies and Co., 366 Fifth Avenue.[43] It probably seemed unbelievable to a great many people. But at long last, over five years after General Grant's death, a design had been accepted for his final resting place.

CHAPTER VIII - JOHN HEMENWAY DUNCAN
WINNER OF THE COMMISSION

Relatively little is known about John Hemenway Duncan (Fig. 61). Even his middle name is usually incorrectly cited as "Hemingway."[1] He was born in New Orleans on January 22, 1854, to John H. Duncan and Mary Hemingway. His father was a native of Scotland and his mother came from New York State.[2] Just before the outbreak of the Civil War the family moved to Binghamton, New York, where Duncan appears to have spent the rest of his youth.[3] He once told a reporter that he studied architecture at Cornell University, which was close by his home.[4] A check of the records at that institution failed to turn up any reference to Duncan. But he may have attended courses there without officially registering.[5]

Duncan first appears in Trows New York City Directory for the year 1879-1880. He listed himself as an "architect", though he had no office address. He disappeared for several years and was then back in New York in 1883-1884, when he was listed as having an office at 19 Park Place. He is said to have been associated with the well known architect James E. Ware,[6] who was also listed as having an office at 19 Park Place in 1883-1884. This would seem to indicate that the younger man was working in his shop. Duncan appears to have left New York again in 1884, and when he returned the next year he took an office at 237 Broadway, right next to the building where Ware had recently relocated his offices at 239 Broadway. Thereafter, Duncan was to continue his career in New York without

interruption for decades.[7]

James E. Ware generally designed buildings in the modern Romanesque style that H.H. Richardson had made popular in the late 1870s and early 1880s.[8] His principal remaining work in New York, the 1885 Osborne apartment building at 57th Street and 7th Avenue, is fair testimony to his stylistic preferences. Duncan followed in Ware's footsteps in his earliest buildings. Though referred to as having been proficient in the "eccliastical branch" of architecture,[9] no works by him in this genre have come to light. His first major commission was for what was variously called the "Washington Monument at Newburgh," the "Newburgh Monument" and the "Tower of Victory." It was intended to celebrate the 1883 centennial of the end of the Revolutionary War.[10]

Working under Maurice J. Power who was the general contractor for the job, Duncan designed a 53' high structure with a ground plan measuring 37 x 32'. His drawings were accepted in mid 1886 and by early 1888 the building was completed. Sculptural ornamentation was provided by William R. O'Donovan.[11]

The Tower of Victory (Fig. 62), as it is called today, was built of rough cut Albany limestone and white Indiana sandstone. Its heavy walls, massive arched openings and steep tiled roof set it

squarely in the Richardsonian tradition. A "belvedere" was provided under the roof, which was supported by 13 "columns," or piers, symbolizing the 13 original colonies. The simple slit-like openings created by these piers enhanced the Richardsonian look. Duncan's design was heavily lampooned in some quarters, probably because the Richardsonian vocabulary was still relatively new and the general public was as yet unaccustomed to it. One critic referred to it as appealing to "devotees of modern art" while dismissing it as a "three-story smoke house.[12]" Another called it "unsightly,[13]" and Harper's Weekly thought the building suggested "nothing so much as an incomplete windmill.[14]" The design did, however, have its admirers. One James A. MacLeod copied it in virtually all its details and in 1887 submitted it in a New York Architectural League competition for a "Memorial Clock and Bell-Tower on a Village Green (Fig. 63)." MacLeod won the first prize gold medal.[15]

Duncan became a member of the Architectural League in 1887 and began to show designs for both buildings and interiors the following year,[16] and he continued to do interior decorating for the rest of his career.[17] His drawing for a wood frame "Row of New York Houses" published in the League's Catalogue for 1887-1888 again emphasizes his interest in the prevailing picturesque architecture of the era (Fig. 64). In this case Shaw's Queen-Ann style influenced the architect as much as Richardson's Romanesque.

In 1888, Duncan entered two major competitions, both of which he was ultimately to win. The first was for a Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument for the main entrance to Brooklyn's Prospect Park. Some 36 architects submitted designs for the project in 1888. Professor William R. Ware and D.T. (?) Atwood served as judges, and their decision was announced in August 1889. Duncan was handed the commission plus a $1,000 prize. He brought his old friend sculptor William R. O'Donovan into the project with him as well as Thomas Eakins.[18]

For this important commission - in a move that was to have implications for all his future work - Duncan abandoned his predeliction for Romanesque and Queen Ann architecture, and instead designed a classical monument in the form of a Roman triumphal arch (Fig. 65). In the early months of 1889, Standord White had also designed a triumphal arch to celebrate the Centennial of Washington's inauguration on April 30th. It was, however, far more modest than Duncan's and was intended to be only a temporary fixture.[19] This later gave way to the permanent arch in Washington Square, and a host of temporary triumphal arches that were erected in New York in honor of Columbus, Dewey and others around the turn of the century. Since it was designed and exhibited in 1888,[20] Duncan's arch may with some justification be viewed as the father of all the rest.

The other competition Duncan entered in 1888 was for the Grant Monument. He was one of the 65 contestants in what turned out to be the fiasco of the first competition. Unlike his early projects, he had a partner in this one - a man probably named Jonathan Harder, about whom nothing is known.[21] Duncan probably discussed his proposal with Richard T. Greener in the fall of 1888, for he was given a letter of introduction to the latter from the office of Maurice J. Power in October.[22] The design Duncan submitted was undoubtedly thought well of since it was one of fourteen published in the Boston Daily Globe in May 1889 (Fig. 66).[23]

The illustration was a poor one and failed to show the entire building. But it gave some idea of Duncan's conception. He stated:

> The object of this design has been to produce a monumental structure that should be unmistakenly a tomb of military character.

The Boston Daily Globe thought it resembled the tomb of Napoleon (Fig. 67); and if a comparison is made between the domes of the two the analogy is readily seen. There are no other apparent similarities. Duncan's complex scheme included four subsidiary domes, logias, ambulatories, an exadra and an equestrian statue of Grant in front of the building set on a 70' high pedestal. The structure's overall height was 150' and the facade was to be 128' wide. Inside a rotunda dome was to rise 100' above the main floor.[24] A number of these details - dimensions, the placement of statuary, etc. - were to recur

in Duncan's second design for the Grant Monument. He estimated that the entire project could cost anywhere from $496,095 to $904,095.50, depending on how much sculpture and other detailing was desired.

An interesting question is why Duncan was invited to participate in the second and more exclusive competition for the Grant Monument. Although his Tower of Victory and Soldiers' and Sailors' Arch were substantial accomplishments, he was not really an "establishment" figure in the same league with Napoleon LeBrun, Charles Clinton and Carrere and Hastings (why John Ord was included in the competition is another mystery). In fact, after Duncan was awarded the commission for the monument, "some" of his fellow competitors snidely remarked "that if a Board of expert architects had made the selection Mr. Duncan wouldn't have been in (the competition).[25]"

There were probably a number of factors which led to his having been invited. His design for the first competition may have especially impressed some members of the Association. His old mentor James E. Ware was Secretary of the original Board of Experts that judged the competition, and William R. Ware, who handed him first prize in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Arch contest was on the Board as well. Either one, or both, of these gentlemen may have recommended Duncan's inclusion in the second competition. In addition, there is

no way to determine what other personal influence Duncan may have brought to bear on the situation. Perhaps his old patron Maurice J. Power promoted him. Furthermore, Duncan's wife was the former Dora Livingston.[26] If she was one of the Livingstons of New York, such a connection could have only helped her husband in any endeavor.

Duncan's winning design (Figs. 68 and 69) was far more polished than the one he submitted in the first competition.[27] The granite structure had a ground plan of 100 square feet and was 160 feet high. Its massive block-like lower section was surmounted by a great drum adorned with an ionic colonnade and this in turn was crowned by a stepped pyramid. A semi-circular apse, also topped by a stepped pyramid, projected from the north wall. A great flight of steps with two landings led up to a portico on the south facade. The portico was supported by succeeding rows of four, six and four doric columns. In terms of its general characteristics, Duncan wanted the tomb to avoid any "resemblance of a Habitable Dwelling." Among other things this meant:

> All openings for light and ventilation are either perforations of the stonework or filled with metal grills, protected carefully from the elements, and provided with suitable arrangements for drainage for any water which might drift in; all glass being avoided.

This philosophy also determined the nature of the one entranceway which lay beyond the portico. It was made up of three gigantic openings pierced through the structure's massive walls. Bronze gates alone guarded the passages.

The exterior was intended to be richly ornamented (Fig. 170). Doric piers corresponding in height to the portico columns were placed at the four corners of the structure. Between them stretched rows of doric pilasters and attached columns on the east, west and north facades. Window openings were pierced between the attached columns. Decorative moldings featuring Greek fret, anthemion leaf and other motifs were everywhere - on capitals, below windows, etc. The first of several cornices was supported by the columns, pilasters, and piers and was made up of the arms of the various states set between triglyphs.[28] The next cornice, at the top of the structure's block-like base, was adorned with more shields and eagles, and an upper molding of lions' heads flanked by egg and darts motifs. Just below the ionic colonnade in the drum Duncan placed a frieze of bull skulls and swags. Yet another heavy cornice topped by large and small anthemion leaves crowned the colonnade. And finally the base of the stepped pyramid was decorated by medallions containing the names of famous Civil War battles and flanked by fasces.

Elaborate sculptural decoration was everywhere, although Duncan indicated the drawings were only meant to suggest the "points were the edifice would best receive statuary and embellishments." An equestrian statue of Grant was placed in the middle of the second flight of front steps. Also equestrian figures of "the commanders of the four branches of the army under General Grant" were placed over th

four most southerly columns of the main facade. Room was provided for "full relief panels" featuring Grant's Major Generals on the east and west facades.[29] Unidentified figures were set to either side of, and above, an inscription-bearing plaque on the south facade. Tripods appeared at the four corners of the main parapet, and a great quadriga surmounted the pyramid. To the rear a figure of mourning facing north was placed on top of the apse.

The interior of the building was basically arranged in the form of a modified greek cross with enormous coffered vaults over each of its arms (Fig. 71). Galleries spanned the arms on three sides, and those to the east and west were supported by paired columns. A large central space was left free for meetings of patriotic and civic groups.[30] Directly ahead as one entered was a slightly raised platform, or "rostrum," that overlooked a sunken crypt where Grant's sarcophagus was to lay. This latter feature was clearly derived from the design of Les Invalides (Fig. 72), and Duncan acknowledged the influence stating:

> I cannot see how that can be avoided (it certainly cannot be improved upon).

Above the "Memorial Hall" pendentives supported a drum containing yet another gallery which was reached by staircases in the southwest and the southeast piers. Outside windows were on one side of the gallery and on the other thirteen openings communicated with the rotunda area. As in the case of the thirteen openings in the belvedere of

of the Tower of Victory, they represented the thirteen original colonies. Above the openings were placed another set of windows at the base of a high coffered dome.

Duncan placed a "Guardian figure" in the crypt and intended some form of "mosaic" decoration for the area as well, probably classical friezes as indicated in his section. He thought the pendentives were "capable of the highest ornamentation with figure subjects formed from Marble Mosaic," and suggested they feature Grant's "special victories...in the War of Union." Duncan's drawing represented these in the form of allegorical victories sounding trumpets. The panels above the thirteen openings in the upper gallery were reserved for the shields of the 13 original colonies. A continuous band of stars and then another of wreaths were set above them. Other than these features, the interior of the structure was ornamented with the same elaborate moldings the architect had earmarked for the exterior.

One feature of Duncan's proposal that was particularly attractive to the members of the Grant Monument Association was his provision for building the monument in stages:[31]

> Appreciating the situation of the committee I have made a special study of my general scheme with reference to such portion of the Mausoleum proper as could be built complete in itself for the amount of money which the committee have now in hand. This I have sketched separately and have obtained estimates which are sufficiently approximative, to warrant me in saying it could be built within a year or eighteen months complete for $150,000 to $160,000.

The first stage of construction would include only the north piers and crypt portion of the building (Figs. 73 and 74). Although in the front elevation this ensemble appears to be no more than a small pavilion, it must be remembered that the structure would still have been 100 feet wide and about 50 feet tall. All of the other architects had presumably been instructed to submit contingent plans similar to Duncan's but none of them seemed to take the request seriously.

Duncan also paid close attention to the area surrounding the building (Fig. 75). He followed the 1885 suggestion of Vaux and Parsons and separated the tomb grounds from the rest of Riverside Park with a new road cut. He also sited the building so that it was "not exactly on a line with a river front." Instead he faced it squarely south towards 72nd Street and Riverside Drive, the point from which "the majority of Tourists and Visitors" would be expected to approach it. From 72nd Street its pyramid would be visible, then gradually the lower portion would come into view as people moved north on Riverside Drive until the entire building would revealed to them at around 110th Street.

One of the most impressive features of Duncan's overall proposal was for a grandiose approach to the tomb which was intended to sweep up the bank of the Hudson River. It was adorned with a triumphal arch and was to include a landing for excursion boats and a stop

on the Hudson River Railroad line.[32] The approach was meant to be functional as well as ornamental. Duncan worried that the pecularities of the soil and rock foundations on Riverside Drive might not support the weight of the massive tomb he designed. Therefore, he reasoned that the river approach might serve "as an additional precaution against the possibility of a landslide by shoring up the steep bank.[33]

As in the case of his four competitors' proposals, reaction to Duncan's design was mixed. The New York Herald poked fun at what it called the "squat, ugly stepped pyramid" or "candle extinguisher" the architect had placed at the summit of the building.[34] The Nation referred to the general conception as "not fortunate:"

> Grace, indeed, and harmony of parts are not to be found in the exterior, which it would not be unfair to call clumsy.[35]"

The Commercial Daily Advertiser agreed calling the tomb "boxy" and again drawing attention to the pyramid:

> Whatever Greek precedent the architect may have found for the flight of steps on the roof of the tomb, its impression is not classic.[36]

Warm support, however, came from the American Architect and Building News, which declared:

> On the whole, most people will probably agree with the judges in giving the first place to Mr. Duncan's design, which...(is) beautifully proportioned...splendidly rendered, and masterful to a degree that none of the others, unless, perhaps, Mr. Clinton's, approach.[37]

An editorial in the New York Times concurred:

> The superiority of the accepted design to the...others... is that it has been more successfully studied with reference to the site, that it provides with equal care and success for several points of view of almost equal importance, and that its architectural character is one of greater severity, greater massiveness, and greater dignity. It has the further advantage over these that it recalls less strongly any building already extant. So far as novelty is a merit, this design has it in a greater degree than any of the others that were conceived in the same general spirit.[38]

The sources of Duncan's design can be identified today. But they were not all clear to the majority of the architect's contemporaries - with the exception to the architect's acknowledged reference to Napoleon's crypt.[39] The New York Times declared there were "no precedents, exact or approximate" for the architect's design.[40] Duncan's only known statement on the subject served to foster that perception:

> My idea was to follow the old Greek style, or in certain parts the old Roman. In reproduction, many alterations have taken place in these old buildings, but the crude idea was evoked from the Ancient Greek and Roman. So far as I know, there is no counterpart or even a shadowy resemblance to the tomb in any modern tomb.[41]

Some people disagreed. An anonymous letter was sent to the American Architect and Building News in protest after Duncan's design was selected charging that it had "all of the essential features of interior and exterior, and is similar in many ways, to the" design of Julius Schweinfurth which had been submitted in the first competition. In what was obviously intended to be

a slap at Duncan, the magazine published Schweinfurth's design along with Duncan's to show their similarity.[42] Both Schweinfurth's design (Fig. 16) and George B. Keller's Garfield Mausoleum which proceeded it (Fig. 17) may have influenced the architect in a general way. But certainly no more than reconstructions of Hadrian's Tomb such as the one Luigi Canina offered ca. 1842 (Fig. 76). The Nation, as a matter of fact, suggested that Duncan's design resembled a "tomb of the Roman Imperial epoch such as...that of Caecilia Matella or the great Mausoleum of Hadrian.[43]" Another - anonymous - architect who entered the first competition for the Grant Monument also designed a building similar to those of Schweinfurth and Keller. It was even closer to Duncan's design than either of their's in that it was purely classical and had no heavy Romanesque overtones (Fig. 77).

What may have been an even more important contemporary inspiration for Duncan is known only by description today. In 1887, the New York Tribune mentioned a photograph which had arrived in the United States from the well-known sculptor William Wetmore Story, who was living in Rome. It depicted a model Story had made for the Grant Monument, which had a square base below "a massive circular tower...surmounted by a colonade above which rise steps (as in the Mausoleum of Mausolas), crowned by an equestrian figure of Grant.[44]" This photograph was on display at the Banking house of Drexel Morgan and Company in New York in June 1888.[45]

The Tomb of Mausolus at Halicarnassus unquestionably influenced John Duncan and was the source of the stepped pyramid which so baffled his contemporaries. The New York Herald thought the pyramid had been "suggested by the base of the Pantheon dome,[46]" while no one else was willing to venture a guess as to just what its precedents were. Mausolus was Tetrarch of Caria and died in 353 B.C. His tomb was worked on by a number of famous architects and sculptors and when completed was declared one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. Its general design so influenced the Romans, that they coined the word "mausoleum" as a generic term for "tomb." The Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, in fact, served as the inspiration for the tombs of both Cacelia Matella and Hadrian, which The Nation singled out as possible models for Duncan's Grant Monument.[47]

The Tomb of Mausolus was destroyed in the Middle Ages,[48] and as a result the question of exactly what it looked like intrigued generations of historians and architects. Beginning in the Renaissance Period and continuing even into the present century, dozens of suggested reconstructions of the building have been advanced based on Pliny's description of it and - after excavations of the mid nineteenth century - some fragments of the tomb and its sculpture that are now in the British Museum. Almost everyone acknowledged that the building was rectangular, had a roof with 24 steps and was crowned by a quadriga.

But agreement stopped there. The height of its base, whether its 36 ionic columns were arranged in a single or double row and the amount and placement of its statuary were all subject to question.

The differences between two of the reconstructions offered in the late 18th and mid 19th centuries respectively (Figs. 78 and 79) will suffice to show the diversity of opinion on the subject. A third example (Fig. 80) is of interest not only as another illustration of the variety of possible solutions to the puzzle, but as the clear source of the design George Matthias submitted in the first competition for the Grant Monument (Fig. 46).

Duncan's design for the Grant Monument appears to have been influenced by still another reconstruction of the Tomb of Mausolus by the architect Bernier, a Prix de Rome winner of the Ecole de Beaux-Arts. His design was a fourth year envois and arrived in Paris in 1877 (Figs. 81 and 82).[49] The upper portion of Duncan's Grant Monument is a virtual reproduction of Bernier's design, although the one had a circular plan and the other a square one (Fig. 83). The French architect's high base is there, his ionic colonade and more importantly, both architects carried the wall behind the colonade up behind and above the cornice line to serve as a recessed base for the stepped roof. None of the other reconstructions

of the Tomb of Mausolus have this feature. Instead, their roofs rise directly from the cornice.

The question, of course, arises as to how Duncan became familiar with Bernier's design. It was not published until at least 1892,[50] and there is no evidence that Duncan spent any time at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris where he would have had the opportunity to view it first hand.[51] However, Duncan may very well have seen copies of Bernier's drawings in New York. Among the drawings of Henry O. Avery, for instance, (1/31/52 - 4/30/90) are a section (Fig. 84) and plan dated "March - April 1878," which he drew while a student at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts (1872-1879). His drawings are clearly adaptations of Bernier's reconstruction, although Avery chose a rectangular as opposed to square plan and made other minor changes. Avery's interest in the Tomb at Halicarnassus is further evidenced by his having taken detailed notes from C.T. Newton's and R.P. Pullan's A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Branchidae (London 1862, 2 vols) during his stay in Paris.[52]

Although Duncan may have seen copies of the Bernier drawings made by someone else, the Avery connections seems the most likely. The two New York architects must have known each other. They were approximately the same age and Avery was one of the founders of the

New York Architectural League,[53] which Duncan joined in 1887. Avery was also the author of a drawing that may have served as an intermediary between Bernier's envois and Duncan's Grant Monument (Fig. 85). Though undated, Avery labeled it "for Grant's Tomb." His penciled notations also indicated the structure was to have had a 100' square base and rise 153' in height. Duncan's building, it will be remembered, also had a 100' square base and was only 7' higher. What is even more significant is that Avery anticipated Duncan by rendering the colonade in the round. So too he applied medallions onto the drum just below the stepped roof, as Duncan was to do. In yet another, more quixotic, drawing for the Grant Monument, Avery also anticipated Duncan by including a river approach in his design (Fig. 86).[54]

Avery died in April 1890, so all of his studies predate the completion of Duncan's winning design. But if Avery was so very interested in the Grant Monument competition, why, it might be asked, did he bother to show a potential rival in his designs? The answer may lie in the fact that he considered his original scheme for the monument to be the best. It was first published in the American Architect and Building News in 1885, and he worked up a variation of it for the first competition (Fig. 87). This may have rendered his other ideas of only secondary importance and thus he may have felt free to show them to his friends. He certainly seems

to have had more than a personal interest in the Grant Monument project since he appears to have assisted Richard T. Greener in various matters, possibly even reviewing the terms of the first competition.[55]

Thus far a number of sources have been identified for Duncan's general conception and the specific motif of the upper portion of his design. One last crucial influence must be mentioned, and that is the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Although in all probability Duncan did not attend the Ecole, his Grant Monument was indebted to it in everyway, aside from its apparent direct or indirect reliance on Bernier. In a rather critical review La Construction Moderne noted that Duncan's design resembled the "Pantheon" students of the Ecole had been required to produce as an exercise for generations.[56] This was not an off hand remark. A project similar to a "Pantheon," this time for a "Necropole" was actually the subject of the Prix de Rome competition at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in 1883. The rules called for an ensemble of structures to be erected on top of a mountain. One especially large and imposing building was to be located at the center of the complex to house the tomb of the most important man in the "Necropole.[57]" The design by the second prize winner in this competition, Quatresons, bears a familial relationship to Duncan's Grant Monument (Figs. 88 and 89). Inside, the use of large barrel vaults, galleries in the drum of the dome, a row of attic windows above the galleries and a decorative band of stars all recur in Duncan's design.

In the year that the Grant Monument was completed, the Ecole held a projects rendus for "Un Pantheon."[58] It was to have a great hall, a crypt, a vestibule, in short, many of the features included in Duncan's design. There was even provision for what would have corresponded to Duncan's rostrum.[59] The drawings submitted by the architect Blot very much resembled Duncan's Grant Monument, especially in plan (Figs. 90 and 91). It is quite likely, then, that Duncan had closely studied a number of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts' competitions before completing his design for the Grant Monument. He studied them so well and incorporated so many of their general details in his scheme, that the later drawings by Blot independently reflected similar solutions to a similar problem. In general concept as well as in many of its details Duncan's design might very well have been the production of a Beaux-Arts student. The only difference is that he must have incorporated so many of their general details in his scheme, that the later drawings by Blot independently reflected similar solutions to a similar problem. In general concept as well as in many of its details Duncan's design might very well have been the production of a Beaux-Arts student. The only difference is that he must have obtained his knowledge of the school and its methods second hand from practicing architects and professors who studied there and from the journals that published the work of its students.

CHAPTER IX - THE EARLY PHASE OF CONSTRUCTION AND THE COMPLETION OF THE BUILDING FUND

Even though a design for the tomb and an architect had been selected, The Grant Monument Association still faced major opposition in Washington. In October 1890 Senator Hale introduced a joint resolution in Congress calling for the construction of a military and naval museum complex in the capitol would include the tombs of Grant and other important individuals.[1] Although nothing ever came of this measure, Senator Plumb's earlier resolution calling for the relocation of Grant's remains to Washington was still very much alive. Plumb and his allies had been encouraged in August by a remark U.S. Grant, Jr., had made which seemed to support their cause.[2] Their resolution had passed the Senate in that month and it finally made it to the floor of the House on December 9, 1890, where it was vigorously debated. New York Representative Quinn led the opposition to the measure by charging:

> The parties...who are really desirous for the removal are a few people who own real estate in or around Washington... There is not a particle of respect for the memory of General Grant.

He thus turned the tables on earlier critics who had accused New Yorkers of wanting Grant's remains in their city to bolster real estate values. Representative Flower of New York sarcastically recommended that Congress not stop at Grant, and that it bring the bodies of the nation's other generals and ex-presidents to Washington as well. Representative Raines of New York demanded Congress permit Grant's "remains to repose in the spot his family have chosen," and finally Representative Cummings

of New York exclaimed, "Grant said 'Let us have peace.' I say 'Let him have rest.'"

On the other side of the issue Representative O'Neill of Pennyslvania claimed that newspapers all over the country and even those outside of New York City in the State of New York were in favor of removing Grant's body to Washington. His colleague Cutcheon of Michigan asserted that the New York site was unfit for the general since right near it was "a roadside inn, erected and kept, as I was informed for the benefit of the sporting community, with its horse sheds and other surroundings..." In the end, when the vote was called, 93 went on record for the removal of the body, but 153 voted against the resolution and there were 85 abstentions. The measure was finally and soundly defeated.[3]

Even before the matter of the Plumb resolution was finally resolved the Association proceeded with its plans to construct the Grant Monument. In October it signed a contract with Duncan,[4] and then turned to the matter of exactly where the permanent monument would be located. Days after Grant's death both the New York Times and the Tribune had recommended that it be built on the site of Claremont.[5] At about the same time Calvert Vaux, Landscape Architect for the Department of Parks, and S. Parsons, Superintendent of Parks, expressed the opinion that the site of the temporary vault was the best in the area and that it would make sense to erect the permanent monument there.

In what was probably a response to Frederick Law Olmstead's suggestion that there might be some conflict between the tomb and the surrounding park,[6] it will be recalled Vaux and Parsons recommended separating the tomb grounds from the park proper by cutting a new road through the area. A bridge such as the ones separating pedestrian and vehicular traffic in Central Park could then be constructed from the western portion of Riverside Park across to the little island for the use of visitors to the tomb.[7]

Following Vaux's and Parson's suggestion, the members of the Association had always assumed the permanent tomb would be built on or near the location of the temporary vault. Thus when General Collis, Chairman of the Executive Committee, met with the Commissioners of Parks in early October 1890 to officially settle the matter, he was surprised to learn that everyone was not necessarily in agreement on the subject. The Commissioners insisted on once again bringing up the possibility of erecting the monument on the site of Claremont. They also made it clear that they had no intention of building the elaborate river approach to the tomb - a task Duncan had hoped they would undertake. Among other reasons, they cited the architect's $54,000 estimate for the approach as being ridiculously low and that it would probably actually cost $250,000 to build. Finally, the Commissioners insisted on assurances that if they were to permit construction of the monument to begin, it would be carried straight through to completion. After this meeting a shaken Collis remarked, "I realize that the lot of ground which I supposed was dedicated to us

had a red tape fence all around it.[8]"

The question of exactly where to locate the monument continued to be a problem for months. Groundbreaking ceremonies were set for April 27, 1891, the anniversary of Grant's birth, and as the date approached the issue was still unresolved. The Department of Parks ultimately gave permission for the ceremony to proceed even though the site had not yet been selected and no permit for construction had been granted.[9]

The groundbreaking ceremony itself was a dramatic and emotional event. The Grant Monument Association placed the Grand Army of the Republic in charge of the affair, probably in the hope of arousing the group's interest in the project. Charles H. Freeman, G.A.R. Commander for the State of New York made most of the arrangements. Political rivalry came into play when Gov. David B. Hill and Mayor Hugh J. Grant, both Democrats, refused to attend the event to as not to promote the interests of Grant and the Republicans.[10] But the day was a success anyway. The chief participants met at the Claremont Inn on the morning of the 27th. Then, in front of the temporary vault units of the G.A.R. lined up and formed a square around the spot where the groundbreaking was to take place. New York City posts assembled on the east and south sides of the configuration. Brooklyn posts on the west, and Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut and all other visiting posts were on the north side.[11] As the crowd sang "America" to the accompaniment of a brass band, the U.S.S. Yantic fired a twenty-one gun salute from the Hudson, and Freeman drove into the ground a silver shovel inscribed with the

principal events of Grant's career. The first clods of earth were dumped into a specially painted and flower bedecked wheelbarrow.[12] Speeches were delivered from a temporary grandstand nearby and the principal orator was General Horace Porter, who in a few short months was to assume leadership of The Grant Monument Association (Fig. 92). At the conclusion of the ceremonies, 300 orphans from the Sheltering Arms Institution filed by the temporary vault and cast down bouquets of forget-me-nots in tribute, while crowds converged on the wheelbarrow to strip it of its flowers and to snatch up the earth it contained as souvenirs.[13]

April turned out to be a particularly good month for architect John Duncan. Not only was work about to commence on the Grant Monument, but he was awarded the one other important memorial commission of his career - the Trenton Battle Monument (Fig. 93). It was to be erected in honor of the Revolutionary War battle won by Washington, and efforts had been underway to have it built since 1843. A competition for the design was finally held in the early part of 1891. Duncan was called in to act as judge and he ended up walking away with the commission himself. Duncan again availed himself of the services of William R. O'Donovan and Thomas Eakins for sculptural ornamentation and the monument was completed in 1898.[14]

On May 4, 1891, the Building Committee of The Grant Monument Association selected a contractor for laying the first portion of the tomb's foundations. This was John T. Brady, who had once been a journeyman

bricklayer before going on to establish a firm that specialized in residential construction.[15] Brady ended up receiving virtually all subsequent contracts for the construction of the tomb and remained on the job until 1897. His bid of $18,875 won out over those submitted by ten other contractors, whose quotes ran up as high as $32,637. On June 10, 1891, the Association signed a formal contract with him.[16]

Within a few days, a site was selected for the permanent monument that was acceptable to everyone.[17] It encompassed the spot where the temporary vault was located as recommended by Vaux and Parsons. This was the highest spot on Riverside Drive and it was felt the tomb would be most easily seen there from all around.[18] Back in February Duncan had made a drawing showing the tomb on this general site (Fig. 94), and in March he had had borings taken so he could calculate the depth to which the foundations would have to be laid.[19] The site that was finally selected differed only slightly from the one plotted on Duncan's February drawing (Fig. 95). The foundations for the northern section of the tomb alone were to be laid under the terms of the first contract, and these were so arranged that the temporary vault stood directly south of what would be the sunken crypt in the finished monument. Once the foundations were completed, Duncan intended to have the temporary vault moved on top of the crypt foundations, and then to continue building the tomb around the temporary vault. It is not altogether certain whether the Association intended to erect the apse portion of the structure first with the funds it had

in hand, or if it intended to proceed with the construction of the entire monument in the hope of raising the necessary funds as the work proceeded. In all probability the members themselves were undecided on this issue, as they were still debating it eight months later.

Excavations began at the end of June and continued throughout the summer and fall (Figs. 96 and 97). A small wood frame "cottage" at the site had been built for the sale of photographs and other souvenirs in May 1890 had to be moved out of the way and to the south.[20] Duncan originally planned to dig down 20 feet below grade, but for reasons of economy the Association decided to limit the depth of the foundations to 16 feet. Not satisfied with this, Duncan called in the engineer who originally did the borings on the site and had him submit a report recommending the additional depth.[21] This was accepted. Over the course of the summer, as the excavations proceeded, Duncan worked on a general set of drawings for the entire tomb and he submitted them at the end of July. According to him:

> These drawings include the entire structure which is more than I have been asked to make but it would be impossible to obtain satisfactory results by studying in sections and in case of delays or death, I wish to leave a record of the entire scheme as projected.[22]

What appears to be seven of these drawings have survived.[23] They indicate that only months after submitting his competition drawings, Duncan had rethought some of the details of his design. The size of the crypt opening in the apse was greatly reduced and its most

southernly pair of columns eliminated. The crypt was thus placed squarely beneath a barrel vault corresponding to those on the east and west sides of the rotunda and which was not included in the initial competition drawings. This alteration was an improvement over the initial design. The "attic" row of windows above the gallery in the dome was eliminated. On the exterior, Duncan modified the stepped roof of the apse and replaced it with a sloped roof instead. In between the attached columns on the apse he indicated the placement of elaborate reliefs and inscriptions.

By late August the excavations for the northern piers were completed and on the 27th Brady began to lay concrete in 1' thick, well rammed layers. The work continued on a round-the-clock basis (lamps were used at night) so that the various layers would all bond together and constitute one solid mass. Iron beams were included at intervals to further strengthen the piers. By early October all of the concrete was laid and negotiations were going on to extend Brady's contract to allow him to excavate and lay the foundations for the southern pier.[24] Before he could do so, the temporary vault had to be moved out of the way.

Giant jackscrews and hydraulic pumps were used to slowly lift the temporary vault up out of the ground, foundations and all. The entire mass was then slid along over three huge greased beams until it was set down on the exact spot where Grant's sarcophagus would one day rest in the crypt. The entire process took approximately one month

since the vault had to be moved slowly to prevent it from breaking apart.[25] One periodical remarked:

> ...with more sentimental people, this transfer of the tomb would have been marked by some ceremony, but the New Yorkers appear to have looked upon it simply as an engineering feat, and no one but the workmen and a few reporters seem to have witnessed it.[26]

One of the members of the Association's building committee suggested that the move ought to have been recorded with photographs that could then be sold as souvenirs, the proceeds going to the building fund.[27] But this does not seem to have been done as only one photograph of the move exists (Fig. 98).[28]

By November, before the frost settled in, Brady was able to complete the work assigned to him under the extension he was granted to the first contract. He completed both the southwestern and southeastern piers as well as the foundations for the steps in front of the tomb. He was also commissioned to erect a set of wooden steps from the top of the foundations to the doorway of the temporary vault, so that the public would continue to pay its respects to the General.[29] In all it was estimated that 6751 cubic yards of concrete were poured into the foundations and the total cost of work came to $47,286.80.[30]

In mid January 1892, the Association took bids on the first portion of the superstructure of Grant's Tomb.[31] This was a granite base that

was to rise from 6" above grade level to what was referred to as the water table which was ten feet high. A month or so later, a $17,000 contract for the work was let to Brady, who intended to obtain the necessary stone from the Union Granite Company's quarries in Friendship, Maine.[32]

Although the Association was moving ahead with the granite work up to the level of the water table, no decision had yet been reached as to what would happen after that. Duncan was asked to submit detailed estimates on the cost of erecting the apse portion of the tomb alone in early February,[33] and he prepared new studies of what that portion of the building would look like if completed in advance of the rest of the structure (Figs. 99, 100 and 101). As he then conceived it, the apse would have been much less elaborate than it was in his competition design. The stepped pyramid roof he originally proposed was dropped. More significantly, he tailored the design so that apse would be easily integrated into the larger structure. The southern facade was left bare of ornamentation since it was only intended to be a temporary curtain wall that would have to come down one day (Fig. 99). The side elevations were arranged with a single column and window opening so that these features would form the northern most bays in the overall east and west facades once these were completed (Fig. 100).

The principal reason for the Association's indecision on how to proceed was due to the fact that it had still failed to substantially

increase the size of the building fund. Harper's Weekly did point out that the Association had raised far more money than any other organization in the country that was planning on building a monument to Grant.[34] But this was small consolation. In March and April 1891 the Association had made a concerted effort to obtain $500,000 for Grant's Tomb from the state of New York. This was to come out of the money that the federal government was refunding to all the northern states as surplus tax monies from the Civil War era. The Association reasoned that at least a portion of this money could appropriately be applied to the construction of Grant's Tomb. Unfortunately, the state legislature did not see things that way and the money was denied the Association.[35]

In addition to this, the Association had continued to resort to the type of nickel and dime schemes for raising money that it had been relying on since 1885. In return for a fee one company was permitted to print Duncan's design for the tomb on soap bar wrappers.[36] A large colored lithograph of the tomb was to be issed,[37] and a musical production, "Allegory of the War in Song," was staged at Madison Square Garden.[38]

Clearly some new direction was needed, and a chain of events that would supply it was set in motion towards the middle of 1891. It was then that a controversy arose over Richard T. Greener's salary. Up until the Annual Meeting of 1887, he had been receiving $200 per month in return for his services. Then he voluntarily reduced his salary in half in

order to cut the office expenses of the Association.[39] Now that the organization was beginning to let contracts for the actual construction of the Grant Monument, Greener felt the added workload justified the restoration of his original salary. There were protests both within the Association and from the public at large. Gen. Collis was particularly angry about the situation. At an Association meeting in the beginning of October, Collis had two of his friends elected to the Board in the absence of the Association's President, William R. Grace, who sided with Greener. One of the new members was Civil War General Horace Porter, who had delivered the principal speech at the groundbreaking ceremony in April 1891, and been an aide-de-camp to Grant (Figs. 102 and 103). The other was James C. Reed. Their election had Richard T. Greener very much alarmed. Grace was furious over the new developments since they gave the Republicans a voting edge over the Democrats on the Board and because his authority was being undermined by Collis. So he resigned from the Association, leaving the group without a chief executive.[40] Finally, at the annual meeting on February 18, 1892, Horace Porter was selected to be the Association's fifth president, succeeding Chester Arthur, Sidney Dillon, Cornelius Vanderbilt II and William Grace. He held the position for 27 years.[41] Greener then "declined" to be reelected Secretary and James C. Reed took his place.[42] There were more resignations in the following days from Hamilton Fish, Seth Low and Governor Flower, but the Association was in new and capable hands.[43]

The ambitions of the news administration were revealed in the Annual

Report for 1891/1892, which expressed the hope that the Grant Monument could be completed in time for the opening of the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1892. Porter quickly moved to make the Association more efficient. He assured the public that no officers would be paid salaries. He also removed the Association's office from its old rented headquarters at 146 Broadway to the Mills Building at 15 Broad Street. Porter's own offices were there and the owner D.O. Mills had agreed to give the Association free of charge office #5 on the 9th floor that measured 15 x 30'.[44] The public was generally pleased with the change. One editorial referred to the old regime as "inefficient." "Its intentions were good, but it was impractical and its results nill.[45]" Bigger and better things were now expected.

Porter began by making some structural changes in the organization. He decided to increase the number of trustees from 33 to 100, in order to infuse more new blood into the operation.[46] He and his colleagues even decided to rename the group "The Grant Tomb and Monument Association" so as to underscore the organization's new life.[47] Both of these measures required action by the state legislature and through a slip up, the change of name failed to be included in a bill that was introduced for the Association's benefit by State Senator McMahon. So the bill pased without it and was signed into law on March 17, 1892.[48] Porter and the others didn't feel it was worth initiating a separate piece of legislation, so the organizations names was left as it was.

In terms of fund raising, General Collis recommended that the Association open a finance bureau to raise the money necessary to complete the tomb.[49] But Porter's initial impulse was in another direction. He hoped to work with the Grand Army of the Republic and raise as much as $250,000 within the group. He felt another $100,000 might then be obtained from the State of New York, and there was always the possibility of once again appealing directly to the public or the trustees.[50]

In an attempt to secure money from the state, Porter and the Association had Assemblyman Weed introduce a bill in the Assembly on March 7, 1892, which would have given the group $500,000 for Grant's Tomb.[51] It soon became apparent that the bill could be passed for the right price, which was to award the contract for the completion of the structure to John T. Brady and the Union Granite Company. They had strong political connections, and presumably they would pay off the necessary legislators with funds derived from the stated financed contracts. Brady and the Union Granite Company would receive a 10% commission on the net cost of the building materials and labor, so the bill would give them at least $50,000 or so for themselves and their political allies in Albany. A draft agreement for this arrangement was even drawn up, but in the end it all fell through. It may have been because of the disasterous effect the arrangement would have on public opinion of The Grant Monument Association if it became generally known.[52]

Shortly after his election to the presidency, one of Porter Chicago acquaintances, James W. Cott, wrote to him recommending the services of one Edward F. Cragin for the Association's fund raising drive. Cott told Porter that Cragin had organized Chicago's campaign to bring the World's Fair of 1893 to that city. Essentially, this involved his running a large fund raising campaign to ensure that the necessary monies would be available to actually build the fair grounds. Cragin was also responsible for organizing all sorts of other events, including a state wide celebration of Washington's Birthday.[53] Porter made inquiries and was told that Cragin was a man "full of push, enthusiasm, etc.[54]" Cragin and Porter then corresponded directly and the former assured the latter that he could raise the money for Grant's Tomb, and that it could be "accomplished in short time." Also, he recommended that Porter not make his involvement in the project known since he felt things would run more smoothly if it were not generally known that an out-of-towner was directing the efforts.[55] The two men finally met face to face in mid March and Cragin was given a green light to proceed. His compensation was left open.[56]

Cragin essentially planned to run the kind of finance bureau that General Collis had recommended. It was clear to him that the Association's best, if not only, potential source of funds lay in New York City because of the rest of the nation's hostility towards Grant's having been interred there. As one city paper bitterly observed:

> The intention was to make the work national, but that broad plan was thwarted by mean, narrow, sectional prejudices and

rivalries.[57]

Another also claimed that the rest of the country, which looked:

> to New York to help it in every time of calamady or need, to lend it money for all its local enterprises and to take a metropolitan lead in all national enterprises, has chosen to consider that the fame and tomb of U.S. Grant belong exclusively to New York City.[58]

Instead of looking at this as a problem Cragin decided to use it as an asset. With Porter as the front man, Cragin would whip up popular sentiment in New York and turn the building of Grant's Tomb into a defiant response to the rest of the nation's apathy and hostility. Local pride, egged on by the press, would allow him to accomplish what had seemed impossible to others over a course of six years.

The campaign was kicked off in the final days of March, 1892. The goal was to raise $350,000 in approximately 30 days, so that the building fund would be completed in time for the laying of the tomb's cornerstone on Grant's Birthday, April 27, 1892.[59] Instead of simply issuing an appeal for funds and then waiting for them to appear, Cragin intended to organize fund raising committees within each of the trade and business groups in the city. In that way there would in effect be scores of fund raising committees instead of just one. Thousands of printed circulars were mailed out by the Association to announce where and when the leaders of the various groups were to meet for the first time. Trows, the firm that printed the city's business directories, was hired to address the

envelopes so that everyone was reached.[60]

Porter made it a point of personally attending almost all of the preliminary meetings. He told each of the assembled groups, over and over again:

> ...I am here to explain the business-like organization that proposes to carry on this work. No plan that does not appeal to businessmen can be successful.[61]

As had been hoped, the response to Porter's new plan was overwhelmingly positive and a total of 185 committees were formed.[62] Some of the city's most distinguised citizens agreed to lead them. William Appleton was in charge of the book publishers; A. Bierstadt, the artists; Charles Delmonico, the restaurants; Richard M. Hunt, the architects; William Steinway, the piano manufacturers; Louis C. Tiffany, the decorators; Charles S. Tiffany, the jewelers, and the list went on.[63] The city's newspapers enthusiastically took up the cause and virtually every daily, weekly and professional journal began carrying progress reports in each issue. The mayor helped things along by signing a proclamation on April 8 that urged all New Yorkers to give to the fund.[64]

A bevy of clerks was hired by the Association to handle the enormous quantity of material that now passed in and out of the offices and to maintain the burdening financial records. Views of the tomb were widely published to remind everyone of what they were contributing towards. Small handbills were even printed up and widely distributed for this purpose.[65] The city was virtually flooded with volunteers

carrying subscription books from office to office (Fig. 104). Wooden contribution boxes were placed in banks, hotels, elevated railway stations, stores and even steamboats for the general public's donations. These came in a variety of sizes measuring 6" square (Fig. 105), 12" square and 16x16x12". Glass bottles were used as well, mostly on the elevated.[66] Neighborhood groups also collected money, and the owners of the advertising franchise on the elevated lines cooperated with the drive by posting notices of the various committee meetings in stations all over the city.[67] These efforts served to electrify the city. Everyone was caught up in the effort and as the Times put, "It actually became a fad to raise money for the Grant Monument Fund.[68]"

Not to leave any stone unturned, Porter actively pursued contributions from the G.A.R. In order to inspire its members, he had The Grant Monument Association pass a resolution in April that would provide a library within the tomb that would house the names of all surviving members of the Civil War era army and navy. The men were all to inscribe their names on parchment leaves which would then bound together.[69] It is not altogether clear how many (if any) veterans actually signed these sheets or how much money was raised in the process.[70] Porter also made an attempt to obtain $250,000 from Congress, but this effort was not successful.[71]

Cragin's campaign went exceedingly well, but all the credit, of course, was going to General Porter. One of U.S. Grant's old friends,

George Childs, wrote to Porter:

> The monument will not be only General Grant's, but yours as well...[72]

Porter used his personal influence with his friend, Postmaster General John H. Wanamaker, to have President Benjamin Harrison preside at the cornerstone laying ceremony on April 27 (Fig. 106). Harrison agreed to come as long as he would not be obliged to attend any banquets since he wanted to return to Washington that evening. To accommodate the President in every way, Porter arranged to have a special train waiting to take him to the capitol as soon as the ceremonies were over.[72]

Politics once again came into play when New York's Governor Flower only agreed to declare a half holiday on April 27 after a long struggle.[74] He did, however, refuse to call out the national guard units to participate in the ceremony. Thus when the presidential party departed from that long standing Republican stronghold, the Fifth Avenue Hotel, at 12:30, there were no regular troops in attendance. On the grounds surrounding the tomb approximately 60,000 people had assembled for the ceremony that was to begin at 2:00 P.M. Harpers Weekly observed that, "The spectators were the spectacle.[75]" There was a bit of confusion as many of those who held platform tickets had to be turned away. Apparently the ticket takers were making a bit of money on the side by having friends circulate through the crowd selling tickets that had already been taken from early arrivals! The result was that there was no room for many of the bonefide guests.[76]

The ceremony began with martial arts music played by the United States Band. A prayer was offered by Dr. John Hall and then Horace Porter stepped up to the small, canopied speakers stand. He was able to report only partial success. He had managed to raise $202,890.50 in 30 days. This was more than the previous leaders of The Grant Monument Association had managed to raise in six years. Yet it was still short of the $350,000 the Association needed. He, therefore, urged everyone to redouble their efforts so that by Memorial Day the fund would be completed.

President Harrison then stood up and said a few short words before walking over to where the cornerstone hung from a boom. This six foot square block of granite was at the southwest corner of the monument.[77] Inside the cornerstone was a copper box filled with everything from the traditional copies of the day's newspapers to the bylaws of The Grant Monument Association. While music boomed away, Harrison wielded a solid gold trowel with an ivory handle and the cornerstone was lowered into place (Fig. 107).[78] The trowel was later handed to Mrs. Grant who had been present.[79]

Chauncey M. Depew delivered an address, and Dr. John Hall gave the benediction before a flag signaled the U.S.S. Miantonomoh on the Hudson River to fire the twenty-one gun salute that marked the close of the proceedings.[80] No ceremony connected with Grant would have

been complete, however, without obligatory lines of children scattering flower petals in front of his temporary vault (Fig. 108).[81] That night a tradition that began on April 27, 1887, was observed when a huge banquet honoring Grant was held at Delmonico's. Silver spoons with images of Grant's Tomb on them were distributed as souvenirs (Fig. 109).[82]

The Association sent successive waves of circulars to the various committees urging them on. A new incentive was offered in the form of certificates that were promised to each contributor of 50¢ or more to the building fund (Fig. 110).[83] Contests were also sponsored in the city's grammar schools and colleges, calling for essays on Grant. These were intended to get the students and their parents talking and thinking about the General and his tomb. Grammar school students turned in some 8,000 essays.[84] The Association also advertised for paid canvassers, and prospective candidates were asked to state their nationality when applying![85] On a rainy Memorial Day, Porter was unable to announce whether or not the full sum had been raised because all of the contributions had not yet been tabulated.[86] The following day, however, he was able to state that the full $350,000 had in fact been raised with a little to spare.[87] Large contributions had come from many individuals and corporations whose names are still familiar today: Kuhn Loeb, John D. Rockefeller, William and Cornelius (II) Vanderbilt, Rogers Peet and Co., Lord and Taylor, Sterns, William W. Astor, Andrew Carnegie, Bloomingdale's, B. Altman, Brooks Brothers and many others.[88]

By the time the fund raising campaign was fully wrapped up in the Spring of 1893, it was calculated that $404,000 had been raised. That sum, combined with funds raised by the original officers of the Grant Monument Association, plus the interest that these monies yielded over the years, came to $600,000 altogether. An estimated 90,000 people had contributed to this titanic fund - more than had been raised previously anywhere in the world for a similar purpose.[89]

The expenses for Porter's campaign came to $17,960.26, or less than 5% of the sum raised.[90] Of this, Edward F. Cragin appears to have received the princely sum of $5,000 for his services.[91] He was only occasionally mentioned in the press,[92] whereas Porter was constantly praised. Some were speculating that his performance as President of The Grant Monument Association would make him governor of New York.[93]

CHAPTER X - ADVANCED STAGES OF CONSTRUCTION AND THE COMPLETION OF THE MONUMENT

Duncan's design for the Grant Monument evolved with the passage of time. The overall concept remained largely intact, but the details were significantly modified. A colored lithograph prepared on behalf of the Association in late 1891, and published in early 1892 already reflected some changes (Fig. 111).[1] The apse's stepped pyramid, as mentioned in the last chapter, was eliminated. So were the pilasters that Duncan used to ornament the corners of the structure in his original design. The four outer columns on the portico were gone, as was much of the elaborate ornamentation of the different cornices. In general Duncan was moving in the direction of simplification, whether for aesthetic or financial reasons, or both.

On February 28, 1892, Duncan had his first meeting with General Porter.[2] Exactly what took place at that meeting has gone unrecorded. But a few days later at a special meeting of the Association held on March 4, a resolution was passed that would enpower the Executive Committee:

> ...to modify the plan and general design for the tomb... provided that the theme of an elevated mausoleum containing a sarcophagus...shall not be interfered with but the apse may be dispensed with and the sarcophagus located beneath the center of the dome should the Executive Committee deem such change advisable...[3]

Duncan was then instructed to prepare a plan for the consideration

of the Executive Committee that would eliminate the apse and relocate the crypt to the center of the building. He was also invited to comment on the proposed change.[4]

Duncan appeared at a committee meeting on March 14 as requested and presented two plans instead of one. The first, which he seemed to favor, relocated the crypt to the center of the building, but did not eliminate the apse. No drawing of this arrangement survives. The second plan, for which a drawing does exist, simply relocated the crypt and dropped the apse as Duncan had directed (Fig. 112). The architect informed the committee that he thought the overall design of the interior would definitely be improved if the crypt were to be relocated, but he warned that this would automatically eliminate the possibility of using the central space as a memorial meeting hall. The alteration would also necessitate his dropping the east and west galleries and their supporting columns, but he retained the south gallery along with the columned and gated entryway to the building. After considering the matter, the Executive Committee gave Duncan permission to proceed with his preferred plan, and for the time being the now empty apse was retained (Fig. 113).[5]

A little more than two weeks later the Committee reconsidered and instructed Duncan to drop the apse.[6] After clarifying the

situation Duncan then passed the order along to the builder.[7] Now, more than ever, the interior plan resembled the one submitted by Julius Schweinfurth in the first competition for Grant's Tomb (Fig. 114). Soon another dramatic alteration to the original design was made, a reduction in the overall size of the building. In March, the designs Duncan had presented to the Executive Committee were still for a 100 square foot building and as late as the end of April the press continued to mention this as the tomb's size.[8] Yet in the midst of the fund raising campaign, Porter was concerned about the monument's final cost.[9] This no doubt led him to order Duncan to scale down the size of the structure, and by May 4, Duncan had done so (Fig. 115).

The original plan that called for a 100 square foot plan at the base of the building line was now modified to 90 square feet. At the base of the water table, in other words at grade level, the monument was 95' 10" square. The height was reduced from 160' to 150'. All other dimensions were adjusted accordingly as follows: the cube-like base became 72' high, the tower with its stepped pyramid, 78' high. Overall the tower was 70' in diameter while inside it was 40' in diameter. The greatest distance between the interior walls was 76'. The arches over the arms of the Greek cross-like plan were 50' high and from the main floor to the top of the coffered dome it was 105'. The crypt opening was 25' in diameter.[10]

When construction on the base of the tomb began in later spring 1892 (presumably the change in scale had been made in time for Brady and the Union Granite Company to make the proper adjustments), the temporary vault had to be moved once again from what had been intended as Grant's final resting place in the apse's crypt. The tomb's north facade was to rise right over the spot where the temporary vault had rested for approximately seven months. So on May 25, it was lifted up again and slowly moved 75' north to a spot in continued to occupy for the next five years or so while the Grant Monument was under construction (Fig.116).[11]

Duncan and Porter then turned their attention to an important matter - selecting the right grade of granite for the structure above the water table. Some 8,000 tons or 82,000 cubic feet of granite would be required to complete the building,[12] and some of those pieces such as the drums of the doric columns would have to be as large as 7' in diameter.[13] Given the size of the order and difficulty there would be in cutting out some of the pieces, they wanted to be especially sure of the material and the people they would be dealing with. The two men traveled about from one state to another inspecting monuments and materials And it was seven months before they settled on a particular stone.[15] It was supplied by the Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company from their quarries in North Jay, Maine, a little town 60 miles southwest of Bar Harbor.[16] Porter solicited appraisals

of their stone from builders all around the country.[17] Samples of the material were sent to Harvard for chemical and microscopic analysis, while a government testing laboratory determined its strength. It was discovered that the material would break under 15,720 pounds of pressure per square inch and that it crushed under 16,310 pounds per square inch.[18]

R.G. Dun and Company, predecessors of Dun and Bradstreets, were asked to report on the financial status of both the firm and its principals. The firm was "rather slow pay," Porter was told, but the quarries and other facilities were "good." The two chief executives, Tucker Payson and Ara Cushman were worth $100,000 and $200,000 respectively.[19] Everything seemed to check out properly and so Contract #3 for Grant's Tomb was awarded to the Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company in the spring of 1893 in the amount of $230,000.[20]

For this sum of money, the firm was to supply all of the exterior granite work for the building and set it in place. Of the total amount, $131,000 was for the square portion of the structure, $84,000 for the tower and $15,000 for the steps. The specifications the Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company were expected to follow were quite strict. The Association had the right to reject any

stones that were smaller than 18 square feet and which bore a blemish of any kind. For larger blocks intended to be placed up to the top of the doric columns, a single blemish per stone would be permissable as long as it was not over 3/8" in diameter. Above the top of the columns, a single blemish per stone was allowed up to 1/2" in diameter. In short, Duncan wanted to be absolutely sure that the building would present a sparkling, white unblemished appearance when completed, and he ended up rejecting $10,000 worth of granite that was shipped to the site.[21] The granite in the square portion of the building was to be dressed with ten cuts per inch, and that in the upper portion with eight cuts, except for the treads of the pyramid which were only to receive 6 cuts per inch. The risers on the entrance steps were to receive 10 cuts per inch and the treads 6. All stone was to be cut and laid in its bed, all mouldings were to be undercut and a fine mortar of equal parts LaFarge Cement and white sand was to be used. Although the columns would be made up of solid granite, the walls of the building were simply to be veneered with blocks ranging alternately in 8 1/2" and 13" deep courses. These were then to be backed up with hollow brick, solid brick and concrete in square portion of the building, while in the tower they were to be supported on a steel skeleton.[22] John T. Brady was then awarded contract #4 in the amount of $104,482 for all of the work in the superstructure other than supplying and

setting the granite.[23]

Many people who worked on the project complained of, "The remoteness of the area and its inconvenient accessibility by ordinary means of travel.[24]" The Superintendent of Work at the site remembered later in life that when he first arrived on the job, you could see for miles around just by standing at ground level. Long Island Sound and other distant points were visible and only a few buildings stood closeby.[25] As the work proceeded, the neighborhood became somewhat busier. Construction began on new campuses for Columbia University, Teachers' College and Barnard, and for St. Luke's Hospital and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.[26] The area was already being called the "American Acropolis.[27]" Yet months before the tomb was completed, the New York Times remarked that still only "carriage people" - owners of vehicles who were accustomed to long drives - were familiar with the area.[28]

Construction proceeded very slowly. It appears that little was accomplished in 1892, because of a serious stonecutters' strike in Maine. In February 1893 the papers were lamenting that no new stone would be on site until the summer.[29] The provisions of the Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company's contract called for the delivery of its stone to begin on June 1, 1893, but the company held back until Brady and the Union Granite Company finished work

on the watertable. That did not take place until the end of the construction season, when it was discovered that the west side of the building had been built 1 1/8" short of 90' and that the northwest and southeast corners of the building varied 1/4" from true right angles. Duncan then ordered the Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company to follow the "as built" dimensions rather than those indicated on his drawings.[30]

In early April 1894 a drawing was sent from the quarry to Duncan showing the progress that was being made in quarrying stones for the columns (Fig. 117).[31] The next month the blocks began to arrive on the site. Duncan was not very pleased with the initial shipment since it had been loaded on flatbed trucks without any protection and arrived smeared with coal dust. He had to warn the company that he would begin to reject stones if more care was not taken.[32] The months passed quickly and before anyone knew it, work in both the quarry and on the building had to be suspended once winter set in. As of December 1, the walls of the structure had reached the height of 45'.[33]

At the Association's annual meeting in February 1893, it had been estimated that the monument would be completed in the fall of 1895. At the following annual meeting, the date was moved up to early 1896.[34] Clearly not even that date would be realized.

During the following construction season there were further complaints about the slowness with which the stone was being delivered from North Jay.[35] A number of large stones intended for the columns were rejected and Duncan had a minor battle with the granite company because he claimed the smoke from its steam hoist was staining the stonework already in place.[36] Over the course of the summer, souvenir hunters began to chip away at the blocks of stone waiting to be set in place, and so a fence had to be built around the entire building site for protection.[37] However slowly the work proceeded, people were thrilled to see at least some progress made. A Mrs. Nellie E. Gunlock, National President of the Ladies of the G.A.R. was even inspired to insist "...that the captains of all boats going up and down the Hudson either cause a salute to be fired or colors dipped when passing the tomb of General Grant.[38] This was a ritual already in practice on the Potomac as ships missed Mt. Vernon.[39]"

Work on the drum of the building began towards the end of the season, and after some debate Duncan and Porter decided to add an extra course of stone to it, making it 3'4" higher than indicated in the specifications. Apparently they determined this would improve the aesthetic effect.[40] The iron skeleton for the drum and pyramid went up in the first half of 1896 (Figs. 118 and 119),[41] and by the middle of the summer Grant's Tomb was finally roofed over.[42]

All exterior work was substantially completed by September (Fig. 120).[43] What remained to be done was the clean up work that had to be delayed until all major contractors were off the site.

Preliminary estimates for finishing the interior of the monument were taken beginning in the summer of 1895.[44] But apparently no decision had yet been reached on the exact materials which were to be used. Tooled, hard Vermont marble and various types of polished granite and Italian marble were still under consideration in the fall.[45] In the spring of 1896, Duncan forwarded a report to the Association outlining his final plans for the interior. He emphatically stated:

> ...the entire interior of TOMB should be near as white as possible...

and recommended that marble be extensively utilized. He thought an Italian blue veined variety would be most appropriate for the lower portion and that Lee marble would be best for the upper portions of the interior. He also preferred marble to granite floors. He recommended that the coffered dome and vaults be of "refined plaster and Keene cement," although he consoled the members of the Association with the fact that marble vaults and a marble dome could be supplied at a later point in time if sufficient funds were obtained, since "the strength of the structure is laid out to receive the additional weight." At least one of Duncan's early drawings for the interior

indicated that he had wished to use white marble with black marble inlays in the upper portion of the interior.[46]

Once again, contract #5 for the interior work was assigned to John T. Brady,[47] although he subcontracted the marble work to the Schneider-Birkenstock Marble Co.[48] There were a few problems, such as the contractor's supplying damaged stones, but all turned out well in the end.[49] The Italian marble which was used was later referred to as Carrara marble and it is the close grained, highly polished stone that makes up the walls and paraphet in the crypt, the crypt stairs, the paraphet that surrounds the upper lip of the crypt, the door surrounds, the wainscoating on the main floor and the pilasters that stretch upward from there.[50] Lee marble, a looser grained stone that was for the most part employed in a tooled and unpolished state inside the tomb, appears in the square piers of the crypt as well as its capitals and ceiling, the floors and the paneled walls of the rotunda.[51] Careful attention was also directed towards finding an appropriate stone for Grant's sarcophagus. Duncan originally wanted to use a single sarcophagus for both General and Mrs. Grant's remains. In order to discuss this point, he met with Julia Grant at the end of 1891.[52] She objected to the architect's plan which was designed, in her words, only to "save space." "General Grant must have his own sarcophagus, and I my casket beside him," she declared.[53] A year later, Duncan's

drawings for the crypt still showed a single sarcophagus. But he eventually gave in. Black was initially deemed to be the appropriate color for the sarcophagi,[54] although other colors were considered. At one point the Association was thinking about building a special rail line in Tie Siding, Wyoming, in order to obtain the right stone.[55] Then a sample of fine red granite from the quarries of the Berlin and Montello Granite Company in Montello, Wisconsin, came to everyone's attention. When highly polished it closely resembled porphery - the material used for Napoleon's sarcophagus in Les Invalides.[56] In the spring of 1896 the Association signed a contract with the firm to supply both the general's and his wife's sarcophagi for $3500 FOB New York.[57]

The first stones quarried for the sarcophagi developed blemishes as they were worked down from the rough and had to be abandoned.[58] Then, one huge block was obtained from which fine stones for both sarcophagi were cut.[59] Originally Duncan planned to have Grant's names placed on the lids in raised letters, and their birth and death dates were to go on the sides of the sarcophagi.[60] This plan was abandoned and only the names in sunken letters were cut into the lids.[61] Grant's sarcophagus was finished first. It weighed 8 1/2 tons, was 10' 4" long, 5' 6" wide, 4' 8" deep and stood on two supports. Porter wanted to place the general's sarcophagus in the center of the crypt and then have it moved to one side once Mrs. Grant's

sarcophagus arrived. But Mrs. Grant again objected because she wanted her place assured right from the start. So the general's sarcophagus was placed to the west of center (Fig. 121).[62] It arrived in Jersey City by train on March 15, and was placed on a barge and shipped to a pier at the end of 37th Street in Manhattan. It was then hauled up to the tomb by five teams of horses. The New England Monument Company supplied a 10'10" square dias of dark, grey-blue Quincy granite for both sarcophagi to stand on. Together with this dias, Grant's sarcophagus stood 7 1/2" high.[63] Mrs. Grant's sarcophagus was subsequently installed in late January 1898.[64]

Duncan's original plans for the tomb had called for elaborate ornamentation, sculptural and otherwise, inside and out. The Association's financial resources, as has been noted, were inequal to the task. Under Contract #2, a Greek fret motif was cut at the top of the watertable on the north and south sides of the tomb, but no funds were available later to extend the pattern to the east and west.[65] There had been high hopes that donations from the army would permit the erection of an equestrian statue on the front steps, and Duncan went ahead and had a pedestal built for it. However, when it became clear that the funds would not be forthcoming, the pedestal had to be removed at a cost of $684.45.[66] A Duncan plan to place gas-lit bronze candelabra in the five niches of the crypt was also

abandoned.[67]

The panels above the blind colonades on the east, west, and north facades of the building had to be left blank, but Duncan and Porter were reluctant to leave the tomb totally devoid of embellishment. The Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company was, therefore, authorized to cut fourteen decorative shields in the cornice over the portico and two panels at the left and right corners of the paraphet over the south facade. It was some time before a vaguely militaristic shield was decided upon for the latter.[68]

In terms of the fine arts, J. Massey Rhind (7/9/58 to 10/22/36) appears to have been handed a commission without competition in April 1896, to work up a model for one of four pendentives for the main rotunda. Towards the end of the year there was some worry as to whether or not the Association's then meagre funds would be sufficient to cover the cost of the pendentives.[69] Although we have no record of exactly when, Rhind was ultimately commissioned to execute all four of them. By the end of January 1897, Rhind's full size models were ready to be cast in plaster by Klee Brothers and a few weeks later they were ready to be set in place.[70]

Originally Duncan seems to have envisioned placing trumpeting victories in the pendentives.[71] Allegorical figures were settled upon instead,

although virtually no contemporary accounts interpret the meaning of Rhind's ensembles. General Horace Porter made one passing reference to them as being "emblematic of the birth, military and civic life, and death of General Grant.[72]" With this in mind, it is a fairly easy matter to decifer the imagery. In the Birth pendentive a tree of life serves as a foil for two figures (Fig. 122). The one on the left holds an open book, a symbol of the learning that takes place in one's youth, while the other holds a distaff, symbolizing the woman's domain, or the home, where Grant was reared. In the next pendentive both figures hold martial emblems referring to the General's Military Life (Fig. 123). The figure on the left clutches a large sword with a lion's head hilt and a shield adorned with Medusa's image. The figure on the right has a helmet tucked under her arm. The Civilian Life pendentive, an allegorical figure on the left holds a palm bough signifying victory, while her companion supports a cornacopia wrapped with garland and symbolizing the prosperity brought on by the end of the war (Fig. 124). Between the two is Roman faces, probably alluding to Grant's authority while President. The imagery in the final Death pendentive is less clear (Fig. 125). What is probably intended to be a votive lamp rests on top of a pedestal (of strength?) between the two figures. The one on the right holds a globe which may have been intended to represent "eternity.[73]"

Two ornamental figures were also to flank the central plaque on

the paraphet of the south facade. Apparently Duncan had fairly specific ideas about what they were to look like since an 1891 drawing for the south elevation shows two figures sketched in that very much resembled the executed sculptures. Duncan solicited proposals and estimates from Charles H. Niehaus, Phillip Martiny, Daniel Chester French and J. Massey Rhind. French was too busy and declined to compete, but all of the others did, and the commission went to Rhind who was already working on the interior pendentives.[74] By the fall two large blocks of granite were set in place for the figures,[75] and in the course of the winter a shed was built over them so that work could proceed during the cold weather.[76] The figures were described in 1897 as representations of Grant's famous phrase "Let Us Have Peace."[77] This was the inscription carved into the plaque that two figures frame. The figure Rhind placed on the left holds a sheath of palm leaves - a symbol of victory. The figure on the right holds a sword wrapped in what are probably olive leaves. The figures, therefore, were probably intended to be symbols of Victory and Peace.

As will be recalled, Duncan originally did not intend to glaze any of the openings in the tomb. With the passage of time he became more practical, and the entire building was made weather tight. Fifteen square windows were set in the lower portion of the building, only nine of which were visible from the rotunda. The other six lit the vestibules to the two staircases and the occoli

of the small domed "reliquaries[78]" in the northwest and northeast corners of the building. The fifteen windows were glazed with clear glass and wooden frames fitted with purple silk panels were then placed over them.[79] Although Duncan had originally intended to pierce the drum of the dome with thirteen windows, symmetry won out over symbolism and only twelve openings were made. After some debate, they were fitted with curved sash and glazed with white enameled glass.[80] Around the spring of 1893 when the specifications for contract #3 were written, Duncan was contemplating placing an occulus in the center of the rotunda's dome and the stepped pyramid, in lieu of ornamenting the summit of the latter with statuary.[81] Practicality won out here too, however, when Duncan decided that an inner roof lying under the pyramid would be necessary to protect the building from leaks (Fig. 126). Such roofs were commonly placed inside church steeples and the one for Grant's Tomb cost $685.[82]

The triple entrance in the south facade was ultimately pared down to a single portal and instead of bronze gates a huge pair of doors was called for. Everything from all wood to all bronze doors was considered. Bronze was preferred but the weight would have been too great, so a compromise was reached. The doors were made of ash covered by bronze panels held in place by 296 bronze rosettes. Each door measured 16 1/2' high and 4' wide and together

they weighed 3½ tons and cost $1900. Mr. Borkelt, of the firm Borkelt and Debevoise, manufacturers of the doors, added something that was not called for in the contract. He took sheets of parchment and had them filled with the signatures of scores of people, many of them prominent. The sheets were then laid on top of the ash doors before the bronze panels were sealed over them. In that way many New Yorkers had their names permanently incorporated into the fabric of the tomb. The doors were hung in place on April 12, 1897.[83]

In addition to work on the tomb itself, the grounds surrounding it had to be graded and landscaped. Both in 1895 and 1986 Duncan again urged General Porter to see what he could do to convince the city to build the sweeping approach from the river he included in his original competition plans.[84] And General Collis in the spring of 1895 came up with a master plan of his own for laying out elegant boulevards leading to the monument. He also recommended the city's acquisition of a large piece of land to the east of the tomb to prevent any structures from being erected in its vicinity. If the entire plan had been carried out, it would have involved the condemnation of vast tracts of land and a total cost of $518,000.[85]

The city was not particularly interested in obligating hundreds of thousands of dollars for embellishing the area surrounding the tomb.

Duncan's proposed river approach and Collis' plan were ignored. The Department of Parks reneged on a pledge it had made to remove the stables connected with the Claremont Inn. However, in the summer of 1896 the Department did agree to spend $120,000 to install a plaza in front of and around the tomb, and to landscape the area from 120th Street to the northern terminus of Riverside Park. In order to show the tomb off to its best advantage, the Times announced:

> The monument will not be hidden in anywise (sic) by trees or shrubs close to it.[86]

No benches were installed in the area directly adjoining the tomb since it already had a granite bench built into its base for the convenience of visitors.

Duncan ended up making a fairly tidy sum on the overall project. As of spring of 1896, his 5% commission on the cost of materials and contracts came to the vast sum of $25,588.24. Of this, the architect generously rebated $5,000 to the Association as his contribution to the project.[87] The total cost of building the tomb and raising the funds cannot be exactly determined. Most sources put it at $600,000.[88] But as of the early part of 1897, $572,154.70 had been let in contracts. If Duncan's commissions as of a year earlier were added to this sum along with the $17,960.26 it cost to run the 1892 fund raising campaign, this alone would come to considerably more than $600,000. A more reasonable figure would be at least $625,000.

By February 1896, the officers of The Grant Monument Association

were able to accurately predict that the tomb and surrounding grounds would be completed in time for dedication ceremonies on the 75th anniversary of Grant's birth, April 27, 1897.[89] By then, construction would have taken six years to complete. At times there were as many as 600 men working on the job, and it was reported that one man had lost his life in the process.[90] But Porter was proud of the organization's track record under his stewardship. It had taken 17 years to complete Bunker Hill Monument and 37 years to complete the Washington Monument after their cornerstones were laid. He did much better.[91]

CHAPTER XI - DEDICATION OF THE GRANT MONUMENT

At the end of 1896, the Board of Estimate made a $50,000 appropriation to defray any and all expenses connected with the dedication, or "inaugural," of the Grant Monument on April 27, 1897 (Fig. 127).[1] In February, Mayor William L. Strong appointed over 300 gentlemen to the "Grant Monument Municipal Inaugural Committee," to organize the event.[2] The group was later referred to as the "Municipal Grant Monument Committee,[3] and included everyone who was anyone in New York. George F. Baker, Chauncey Depew, Charles Dana, Abraham Hewitt, Joseph Pulitizer, Theodore Roosevelt, V. Henry Rothschild, and many others were all members. There were what seemed to be an endless number of subcommittees, including ones dealing with: Expenditures, Plan and Scope, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Decorations and Platforms, Transportation, Press, Public Safety and Order, Badges and Reception.

April 27th was to be declared a full holiday by the State of New York and everyone referred to it as "Grant Day." It was generally agreed that the dedication ceremonies would be like a "second funeral," and that in many ways they would constitute Grant's "final canonization.[4]" But it was, of course, the Hero of Appomattox that was being honored primarily, and not the ex-president.[5] The Times predicted that the dedication would be the "most impressive display within memory.[6]" A giant parade was to be the principal attraction and a naval flotilla

was to be deployed on the Hudson for added interest.

Everyone wondered just when Grant's remains would be removed from the twelve year old temporary vault. At the request of Fred Grant the transfer was to be carried out in a "quiet and simple" manner, so the actual date of the move was kept secret. Duncan made arrangments to have a duplicate coffin on hand in case the old one had deteriorated.[8] He also made an agreement with a boiler maker who promised to completely destroy the outer steel case that surround the coffin once Grant's remains were removed. This was to prevent its falling into the hands of souvenir hunters.[9] On April 17th, the transfer was made quickly and quietly (Fig. 128).[10] The temporary vault was then torn down on April 26th, and in May the former Chinese Minister Yang Yu planted a ginko tree on its site.[11]

The bricks from the vault were all placed under guard and then hauled down to City Hall where they were deposited in an old basement jail cell for safekeeping. The Mayor intended to distribute them as souvenirs to all public schools, G.A.R. posts and veteran organizations in the greater New York area. They were each to be given a label with a facsimile of his signature on it.[12] At least two of the unlabeled bricks found their way into the hands of the Grant family. On March 26, 1903, they deposited them with the Smithsonian Institution,

and in 1979 the Smithsonian transferred the bricks to the collections of the General Grant National Memorial (Fig. 129).[13] They were made by Ingham and Sons, Wortley, Leeds, England. Each has a single white enamel face and they were obviously used to line the temporary vault. Another of the bricks was recently acquired by the National Park Service. It is identical to the other two, but is boxed and bears a printed identifying label with a facsimile of Mayor Strong's signature.[14] Evidently this is one of the bricks that the Mayor planned to distribute

There were a thousand and one last minute details to attend to up at Grant's Tomb. A flock of sparrows - long ensconsed in the rotunda dome - had to be cleared, and the marble polishers were busily at work cleaning the interior. Unfortunately, they were sealed behind the great bronze doors one day when the lock jammed.[15] Outside, just to the north of the tomb, the Daughters of the American Revolution were in the process of erecting an enormous wooden flagpole that was two feet in diameter and 150' high. It was meant to display the largest flag ever flown from a pole - a giant measuring 35 x 50'.[16]

In front of the tomb and to either side, John T. Brady was constructing the official grandstands and a temporary triumphal arch to span the eastern branch of Riverside Drive, all for a hefty $20,250.00.[17] Stretching down Riverside Drive and Broadway all the way to 59th Street,

church groups, clubs and entrepeneurs were erecting bleechers of their own. The sweet smell of pine boards filled the air with the pounding of hammers and the shouts of barkers who were trying to sell seats to the hundreds of thousands who milled about the area in the days before the dedication.[18] Seats ranged in price anywhere from $1 to $10 and boxes were $20 to $50. People recalled that at Grant's funeral bleechers were also built and that the asking prices began in the $2 to $5 before plummeting to 50¢.[19] History repeated itself in that just too many seats were built and they were just too expensive. Prices ultimately ended up falling to 25¢ and 50¢, and many seats went unsold.[20]

Vendors, or fakirs as they were called, prowled up and down Riverside Drive hawking everything imaginable. Their wares included supposed chips of marble from the tomb, buttons, badges (Fig. 130), souvenir that programs that rivaled the official ones (Fig. 131) and other items relating to the tomb, Grant and the Civil War.[21] Department stores were mobbed and many such as Bloomingdale's were selling a wide variety of Grant souvenirs.[22] The American Numismatic Society issued a special medal. Struck by Tiffany and Company it had a profile of Grant on one side and a representation of the tomb on the other. It was available in bronze at $2.50, and a special gold version was produced for presentation to Horace Porter.[23]

The city was full of excitement. Crowds congregated in and around Grand Central Terminal to watch the various dignitaries arrive. The hotel rapidly filled up and it became as difficult to obtain a room as it had been nine years earlier during the Blizzard of 1888. Locals were amused by the soldiers who good naturedly wandered over the lawns in Central Park - totally unaware that it was against the rules. They also looked after the young boys in uniform who had a little too much to drink. One pair in this predicament were lifted off a curb in the Bowery and loaded into a cab by a good samaritan and sent back to their headquarters. Large numbers of pickpockets and other criminals attempted to sneak into town with everyone else. So the police department was forced to post officers at all points of entry to arrest suspicious looking people as they stepped off the trains and ferries. These were summarily incarcerated until after the dedication was over.[24]

Unfortunately, the weather on the 27th turned out to be terrible. Beginning the previous evening, a terrible northwest wind began to blow. During the day it reached a grueling 57 miles per hour and brought with freezing temperatures and great clouds of dust and dirt. It minimized the crowds to a certain extent, especially along Riverside Drive which was, and continues to be, generally colder than any other area in Manhattan because of its elevated and exposed position on the banks of the Hudson.[25]

Back in March, Porter and Duncan agreed that the decorations for the dedication would be funerary rather than gay, and so the grandstands surrounding the tomb were ornamented with purple and black bunting.[26] The high winds ripped much of this to shreds. The canopies that were to shelter the President's speaking and reviewing stands were totally blown away and at one point there was great concern that the V.I.P. luncheon tent behind the tomb might be blown away, too. It was not and the great sheaves of cypress leaves secured to the columns of the portico by purple silk sashes and 100 dozen American Beauty roses ornamenting the speaker's stand all admirably braved the winds too.[27]

Probably most disappointed of all by the weather was photographer William A. Eddy, who had the novel idea of catching the ceremonies in a series of aerial views. To that end he stationed men on either bank of the Hudson Rivers with dozens of gigantic kites fitted with cameras! He and his assistants sent kite after kite into the air, but each was either torn to shreds, had its ropes snapped or was simply forced crashing to the ground. A total of 18 were lost on the New York side and 16 over in New Jersey.[28]

The land parade began at 9:30 and proceeded from Madison Square (still the heart of the City), up Madison Avenue to 55th Street and then across to Fifth Avenue. Mrs. Grant and her party joined the

procession at 31st Street. The parade would have ordinarily proceeded directly up Fifth Avenue from the Square, but that fashionable thoroughfare had been torn up to allow for construction of some kind. From Fifth Avenue and 55th Street the parade proceeded to 59th Street, then across to Broadway, or the Boulevard as it was called. From Broadway it went north to 72nd Street, then across to Riverside Drive and up to the Tomb. The procession was to pass the Grant Monument on the west, circle around north of it and pass it a second time on the east (Fig. 132), before heading via 119th Street for the termination point at Broadway and 117th Street. Some 50,000-55,000 marchers participated - approximately the same number that had taken part in the funeral procession almost twelve years earlier. And the weather notwithstanding, as at the funeral 1 million spectators looked on.[29]

The crowds that rode north to the tomb broke all records on the elevated railway lines. The trains were jammed up back to back, and some passengers found they were able to make better time by getting off the trains and hiking along the side of the tracks.[30] At the tomb site stout wooden rails had been set along the crown of Riverside Park to prevent people from being pushed down the hill.[31] Some of the more ambitious spectators climbed up on top of walls (Fig. 133) or into trees in order to get a good view of the proceedings (Fig. 134). Many of them tossed fruit, sandwiches and other edibles to the marchers as they passed.

The President, who was staying at the Windsor Hotel, left for Riverside Drive at 10:00 A.M. After his arrival the official ceremonies began. At noon, the prominent guests retired to the tent behind the tomb for lunch. The parade arrived at the site at 12:40 and was kept waiting for 20 minutes until McKinley finished eating. Then at 1:00 P.M. he took up his place on the reviewing stand and the procession moved forward (Figs. 135 and 136). Mrs. Grant was at the President's side and began to weep when a band passed by playing Adeste Fidelis. The marchers continued to file by until 7:00 P.M. McKinley left well before that and was wisked away by a launch on the Hudson. The river was filled with foreign and domestic warships at anchor that stretched from 72nd Street up to 140th Street.[33]

Because of the crowds, the tomb was not opened to the general public on "Grant Day," though of course the dignitaries visited it. Duncan requested heavy police presence at the site during the days following the dedication, since he wanted to make sure there would be no tragedies such as the one that took place on the Brooklyn Bridge one week after it was opened on May 31, 1883. The bridge had been so crowded that a panic broke out in which twelve people were trampled to death and scores were injured. Some 10,000 to 15,000 pilgrims did visit the tomb on April 28th, and the visitation figures

for the next few weeks were equally impressive. The grandstands and the triumphal arch were left in place until Memorial Day, but the speculatively built bleechers were removed immediately.[34]

The tomb site was praised as being superior to that of Napoleon's, Hadrian's or Theoderoic's mausoleums. The building itself was described as:

> ...remarkably white and marble-like in appearance, and in the clear atmosphere of a sunny New York day is readily mistaken for the latter stone.[35]

Duncan's careful attention to the purity of the building stone had paid off. Elsewhere this "Dazzling" white effect was described as a product of the direct influence of the famous "White City" - the American Renaissance dominated World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 at Chicago.[36]

Aside from observations on its chromatic quality, the finished tomb cannot be said to have been as complete a critical success as it was an emotional one. A periodical observed:

> Perhaps no edifice has ever been erected in the City of New York that has appealed so strongly and so generally to popular interest and sympathy as the Grant Monument. It is to be our one great memorial of the struggle for union; a monument not only to the foremost of our generals, but to the cause of "liberty and union" and, in a sense, to all who fought and died for that sentiment.

It considered the facade to be "imposing, well proportioned and

dignified," but declared the side elevations to be "lacking in interest," and the upper portion to be out of scale with the massive square base. The interior was thought to be quite wonderful.[37]

The English journal, The Builder noted that "the proportions are not altogether happy" on the exterior of the structure, and that it sorely needed sculptural adornment to unify its severe geometic forms:

> As a building the tomb is large enough and important enough to serve its purpose satisfactorily; but it fails of complete success as a work of art because its designer was unable to avail himself of the lavish decorations the Romans, on whose tombs he was modeled his own, would have employed...

The "motif of the interior," it observed, was inspired by Les Invalides but it lacked the grand effect of the latter, principally because of the use of plaster, rather than masonry, vaults. However, The Builder had to concede that:

> ...a more elaborate monument could have been erected; but without that liberal state aid which no country in the world save France knows how to advance, it is difficult to see how a more imposing one could have been built...it is entitled to rank among the most notable monuments in America...[38]

America's prominent architectural critic Montgomery Schuyler was generally more enthusiastic:

> There was no question among those who saw the designs submitted for the Grant Monument, that the accepted design was by far the best of them, the only one, in fact, that could be seriously considered. The others were either unduly wild or unduly tame.

He found only one weakness in the exterior design, the "baldness

of the drum of the dome." He also felt, as did The Builder, that on the interior:

> ...the plaster work is not worthy of what is below it. The figures of the pendentives look huddled and awkward and the whole effect of the ceiling is to cheapen what is beneath.

But he endorsed the overall effect, and had the distinction of being the only one to identify the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus as one of Duncan's principle sources of design.[39]

The only truly sad note connected with the dedication ceremony was that James C. Reed, dedicated Secretary of The Grant Monument Association for five years, died just a few days before the event and was buried on April 26th.[40]

CHAPTER XII - THE YEARS FOLLOWING THE OPENING OF THE GRANT MONUMENT

On Grant Day, General Horace Porter officially turned the Grant Monument over to the City of New York and its Mayor.[1] Actually, the ceremony was only symbolic. The Grant Monument Association retained title to the building and was responsible for its maintenance and day to day operation. But under a cooperating agreement the city was to provide the Association with the necessary funds to carry out is mission. The authorizing legislation for this arrangement was passed by the state and entitled "An Act to Authorized the Board of Commissioners of the Department of Public Parks of the City of New York to Enter into a Contract with the Grant Monument Association for the Care and Preservation of the Tomb of General Grant at Riverside Park." The contract took effect on November 5, 1897, and allowed the Grant Monument Association $7,000 per annum. It was renewed in 1908 for a 21 year period and again in 1934 for another 21 years, always the same rate of $7,000 per annum.[2] During the 1950s, however, more than $7,000 was appropriated by the city each year, since the Association's expenditures had naturally gone up over a period of half a century. And even though the 1934 contract expired in 1955, the city continued to finance the Grant Monument Association until it turned Grant's Tomb over to the National Park Service in 1959.[3]

When the Tomb opened to the public in 1897, The Grant Monument

Association retained the former superintendent of construction, George D. Burnside, as curator of Grant's Tomb - meaning that he was the man who greeted the public, supervised the janitors and generally represented the Association on the site. Burnside and his assistants wore Civil War-like uniforms supplied by Brooks Brothers and ornamented by epulets bearing the initials "GMA" for The Grant Monument Association.[4]

In accordance with his original design for the tomb, Duncan had installed two spiral staircases in the southeast and southwest piers of the building to permit visitor access to the drum of the dome. The handrails of the iron stairs were supported by decorative cast-iron swords, and quarter dome skylights were set over the stairwells to provide light.[5] Unfortunately, even before the tomb was opened to the public Duncan changed his mind and expressed concern about allowing visitors to climb these stairs:

> ...there is no gain by admitting the public to (the gallery), and a large risk involved by the long spiral flights.

The galleries were, as it turned out, permanently closed to the public. In the same letter, however, he implied that visitors were routinely admitted to the crypt. George D. Burnside's son, George G. Burnside, claimed years later that the public had never been allowed anywhere but on the main floor, and he would appear to have been in error.[6]

During the eight months or so that the tomb was open to the public in 1897, an estimated 560,000 visitors passed through the doors of the monument.[7] The rules were very strict: gentlemen were required to remove their hats and no loud talking was permitted. A twenty four hour a day police guard was stationed at the monument, one man being placed inside the structure and another on the outside.[8]

From the very beginning Sunday was the biggest visiting day at the tomb. Flocks of New Yorkers and tourists from out of town made their way to the upper reaches of Riverside Drive to admire Duncan's enormous structure. Some came on foot, but most either rode bicycles, took the elevated railways, one of the horse drawn stages, or came by excursion boat and docked at 129th Street, Manhattanville (Figs. 137, 138 and 139). During the early years after the tomb opened, the visitation remained heavy - around 500,000 people per year. And these large figures were totaling up, it must be recalled, at a time when the population of the country was much smaller than it is today. In 1906, visitation peaked at 587,484.[9] Without a doubt the structure was one of the major tourist attractions in the city and one of the best known buildings nationwide.

Although a substantial number of institutional structures were

erected within a few blocks of Grant's Tomb in the 1890s, the area immediately adjoining the tomb remained quite barren for some time (Fig. 140). As apartment buildings began to fill the area around the time of the First World War, The Grant Monument Association began to see some reverses in their fortunes and those of the tomb. As mentioned above, visitation peaked in 1906 and began to gradually decline thereafter. One obvious cause for this trend was that those Americans who had actually fought in the Civil War, or who had relatives such as a brother or father or uncle who did, were slowly dying off. Younger generations of Americans had no immediate, first hand experience of living with General Grant as a national figure, and the Civil War itself was fast becoming something encountered in history books alone. Fewer people were thus inspired to seek out the former commander's final resting place. Either George D. Burnside or one of his assistants was to note in the tomb's attendance book for 1917, that even on Sundays attendance was beginning to taper off. He attributed the decline to the public's fondness for "Boat excursions, low price music and dancing.[10]"

Police protection soon became a problem. The old twenty-four hour a day guard had been withdrawn and General Horace Porter, still president of the Association, complained that in the warm weather months people were gathering on the front steps at night and lying down. He also noted, "An unruly class sometimes enter who refuse

to remove their hats, insist upon smoking their cigars and using offensive language." Children were also caught at night zipping back and forth across the platform at the top of the steps on roller skates and were known to draw charcoal figures on the granite. And finally, there were the relic hunters who chipped away pieces of the building for souvenirs.[11] Periodically, the complaints of The Grant Monument Association were heard and a policeman would be stationed at the tomb, but it was a losing battle. And by World War II, the building was only checked periodically during a policeman's rounds - as it is today.

Commemorative ceremonies were held at the tomb both on Grant's Birthday and on Memorial Day from the very beginning. The U.S. Grant Post #327 of the Grand Army of the Republic, State of New York, was in charge of most of the programs for years, and only gave way to the Sons of Union Veterans in 1929.[12] The Veterans of Foreign Wars favored the tomb with their exercises from time to time, and to this day the army and various Civil War groups hold ceremonies on the site each April 27.

In the early years there were few physical changes in and about the tomb. The earliest photographs of the building show that a wooden

storm door had been installed by Duncan almost immediately.[13] Inside, the two reliquaries in the northwest and northeast piers were at first left empty.[14] Shortly thereafter a collection of Civil War battle flags were placed on display in both rooms inside impressive bronze and glass airtight cases.[15] Mrs. Grant passed away in Washington, D.C., on December 14, 1902, and she was interred in her sarcophagi on December 20.[16] After her death Col. Fred Grant carried out an old family plan and turned over to The Grant Monument Association a positively enormous number of get well and commemorative letters, scrolls and testimonials that the Grants had received during the General's illness and immediately following his death. The collection contained over 3000 items, and the most impressive were hung on the walls of the reliquary rooms.[17]

Because of the large crowds that visited the tomb, in 1909-1910, the city erected a permanent rest room facility directly to the west of the building as a replacement for a wooden structure that appears in photographs at least as early as 1900 (Fig. 141). It was a handsome little building designed to stylistically match the Grant Monument. It was the work of the Department of Parks architect Theodore E. Videto and cost $45,000. Built of Clemsford granite, its doric columned terrace was visible at street level. To either side were staircases that descended below grade to the rest rooms.[18]

In the early part of 1913, the Louis Comfort Tiffany studios were commissioned to install a set of nine purple stained glass windows in the lower portion of the rotunda. They were to replace the clear glass windows with their purple silk shades that had initially been placed in the monument. Apparently by that time the shades were becoming rather ragged. The other six windows in the lower portion of the tomb, none of which were visible from the rotunda, were not included in this $975.00 project.[19] The installation was completed by February, and everyone was very pleased by the new effect. General Porter noted that the purple glass:

> ...produced a light effect vastly superior to the purple silk curtains which had formerly been in use to produce a proper tone of color in the Tomb...[20]

The only other changes made in these early years included the construction of a small wooden shelter or office in 1915 just to the right of the entranceway as one entered. This was necessitated by the freezing temperatures inside the tomb during the winter which were adversely effecting George D. Burnside and his assistants.[23] A few years later in 1923, Grant's Tomb finally caught up with the 20th Century when its gas jets were capped and it was wired for electricity.[24] And in 1927, the plaza immediately surrounding the tomb was repaved by the city. This was done because

poor drainage from the original plaza had caused the structure to settle as much as 2" at its southwest corner by 1925. The Association feared that if the situation were allowed to go uncorrected, the entire building might in time collapse.[25]

The possibility of carrying out more of the sculptural ornamentation Duncan had originally intended for the monument was much discussed over the years, possibly because of the lack of it had been criticized in some quarters. Various solutions were proposed as to how to proceed, but the architect himself regularly changed his mind in regard to what was required, and the Association never seemed to have enough money, or willpower to do anything.

Duncan recalled towards the end of 1925 that his original competition design for the monument included a "group of statuary," actually a quadriga, on the summit of the building, "but the reduction in size of the monument, necessitated by cost, reduced the scale so that it would prohibit using a group; and the only finial possible would be a single figure - that of peace...[26] It seems that Duncan himself attempted to secure funding for this figure in 1897, just before the tomb was completed, from the "Municipal Art Association," now known as the Municipal Art Society.[27] Apparently everyone was confident

that the crowning figure would be supplied shortly after the dedication. It was drawn in on the cover of the program for the dedication ceremony, and General Porter made reference to it in his speech on that day.[28]

Still later, in 1928, Duncan claimed that the crowning figure was to have been a "Victory," rather than a figure of "Peace." He went on to say:

> This question was brought up several times with General Porter, and the Committee of about the year 1900, but eventually it was decided that it would be less liable to arouse criticism if a bronze (pine) cone, similar to the one formerly on top of the Pantheon at Rome, and which is now in the Vatican Gardens (Fig. 142), were used instead, but all propositions were finally abandoned.[29]

Thus figures of "Peace," "Victory" and even a giant pine cone had been proposed to cap the monument. In regard to the last suggestion, it is interesting to note that Julius Schweinfurth's competition design for Grant's Tomb submitted in 1889 - the design that so resembled Duncan's - was crowned by a pine cone! Perhaps Duncan found some inspiration there. In any event, he seemed to like the idea enough to have produced a drawing, now lost, showing the pine cone in place at the apex of the tomb.[30]

In reply to an inquiry from General Porter in 1912, Duncan suggested that the most essential ornament that the tomb needed was not something for the cap, but an equestrian statue of Grant for the front steps. Next in importance he recommended "the placing of...four non-portrait equestrian guardian figures...over the four central columns of the entrance.[31]" This, too, was a change since his

original design proposal had called for equestrian portraits of four of General Grant's comrades in arms over the portico, and not simply four abstract guardian figures.

The Association did nothing about this particular recommendation. The subject of statuary again came up in 1919, when Duncan was elected a Vice President of the organization.[32] The architect went to the trouble of getting in touch with J. Massey Rhind who gave him prices for a statue of "Victory," an equestrian Grant and four subsidiary equestrian figures.[33] Again, nothing came of this. In 1921, the Secretary of the Association was instructed to look into having a figure of "Peace" made for the apex of the Tomb. Nothing was done.[34] Then in 1925 the subject was raised yet again. Duncan now thought that it would be more important to place the four equestrian figures over the portico than to set the equestrian figure of Grant on the front steps, because the "equestrian statues were necessary to complete the design," whereas, "the portrait statue of General Grant...is really no part of the structure and could be placed there at any time.[35]" Thomas Denny, Secretary of the Association, then sent out letters of inquiry to the various trustees to determine what they thought the possibility was of raising $125,000 to supply the four equestrian figures for the portico and a figure for the crown of the pyramid.[36] The general reply must not have been terribly encouraging since the matter was dropped.

In early 1928, the matter was still under discussion. On March 13, Duncan wrote to General J.G. Harbord, President of the Association, that he had spoken to a number of sculptors about the possibility of their doing work for the monument, D.C. French and J.M. Rhind among them, but that they were all too expensive. Therefore, he was going to ask prices of one Allen G. Newman.[37] It seems, however, that Duncan was promoting Newman's career, since he only wrote to Rhind a week after telling Harbord how high his prices were.[38] Newman was willing to execute the four "equestrian guardian statues" for $112,000.[39] Harbord looked into the possibility of having the statues cast from melted civil war cannons, but he was told there were simply not enough around for the purpose.[40] Duncan's final comment on the matter was delivered in April when he advised against placing "pedestrian" statues over the portico as opposed to equestrian, and that if there were not enough money available to do the four, then the Association should place the equestrian Grant on the steps of the monument and execute three wall plaques in bas-relief for the panels above the colonades on the east, north and west sides of the monument.[41] In sum, the architect continued to change his mind on the subject of statuary each time he was asked.

The real possibility that something might actually be done to

embellish the tomb arose when William Rhinelander Stewart took an interest in the matter. Stewart had led an earlier, and very successful drive in March 1918 to raise the money necessary to place statuary on the Washington Arch in Greenwich Village. At the annual meeting of 1927, Stewart urged the members of The Grant Monument Association on to action.[42] After asking around, William R. Mead of the famous firm of McKim, Mead and White, recommended that Stewart hire John Russell Pope (4/24/74 to 8/27/37) as architect in order to "undertake the difficult task of completing and enriching" the tomb.[43] Duncan was, presumably, getting too old for the job. Pope was, of course, the distinguished designer of the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, among other famous structures. He had also designed a Temple of the Scottish Rite for the masons in the same city, a building was inspired by the Tomb of Halicarnassus just as the Grant Monument had been. In April and May 1928 Stewart and Pope engaged in an extensive correspondence concerning Grant's Tomb. And finally Pope recommended to Stewart that some landscape work would be required in addition to sculpture if the project was to be a real success.[44]

At the same time Pope put Stewart in contact with sculptor Paul Manship (12/24/84 to 1/30/66) to get his advice on the project. Manship examined a set of blueprints Duncan had prepared around the turn-of-the-century, and the sculptor essentially recommended that the architect's original decorative scheme be executed at a cost

of $250,000 to $300,000. This was to include bronze bas-reliefs in the panels above the colonades on the east, north and west facades. Manship felt that flying figures would be most appropriate in these spots and that they might represent "the triumph of Genius or Fame, or such qualities as Courage, Preserverance, Righteousness, etc." He thought that a figure of "Victory," approximately 10' high would be best for a crowning motif. And he recommended the use of equestrian figures, tripods and other ornaments in accordance with Duncan's drawings. The only departure from the architect's original plans that he proposed was to place an equestrian statue of Grant on the plaza in front of the tomb rather than on the landing in the front steps. Stewart had apparently already discussed this point with the sculptor.[45]

After spending a considerable amount of time studying the tomb, John Russell Pope drew up a set of recommendations on December 4, 1928, and then made an oral presentation of them before a Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees on December 10, 1928.[46] Pope had evidently had John Duncan's full cooperation, since Duncan had placed at his disposal the original drawings for the project and, in Pope's own words, he was eager "to keep Mr. Duncan happy...[47]" Pope disliked the exposed nature of the tomb - the way it almost seemed to shoot up into the air. Therefore, one of his primary recommendations was to provide the monument with a more substantial footing. This

could be achieved by ringing it with walkways and retaining walls on two levels. In addition, he suggested that large trees be planted around the building to provide a transition between the structure and its surroundings. This was, of course, totally at odds with the original plan for the site, which aimed at avoiding any dense planning in the area so that the tomb might be shown to its best advantage.[48] And again in 1912 when the Japanese government offered some cherry trees to the City of New York, Porter and Duncan had advised against their being planted anywhere near the tomb least they obscure the structure.[49]

In terms of ornament, Pope said:

> The handling of the sculpture necessary to complete the picture is a comparatively simple matter. The sound principle that one main sculptural motif should command, rather than that several equally important motifs should compete among themselves for attention, is the basis of the suggestion submitted.

He, therefore, rejected Manship's advice that the Association carry out Duncan's original sculptural program. Instead he proposed that an equestrian statue of Grant be placed on the plaza and that this serve as the ensemble's "one main sculptural motif." He then came up with a novel idea of building an ornamental pediment over the portico in lieu of the four equestrian statues Duncan intended to place there. He himself would design it. For the three panels on the east, north and west facades, he proposed grey

marble plaques with inscriptions and some architectural sculpture. This same stone would be for a pair of candelabra that would flank the front steps. And finally, the granite cap on top of the stepped pyramid that was intended to serve as a base for a piece of statuary was to be removed. The total cost of this project was to be in the area of $400,000.[50]

Otto R. Eggers of J.R. Pope's shop executed a set of what must have been presentation drawings prepared for examination by the Grant Monument Association in 1928 (Figs. 143, 144, 145, and 146).[51] These drawings show that it was probably very fortunate that Pope's plans never came to fruition. The sculptural pediment Pope proposed would have been an absolute disaster - unnecessary and out of scale. The addition of the long awaited equestrian statue in front of the building was a good idea; but the selection of Paul Manship as the sculptor was again, less than inspired. The model for the piece which Manship was ultimately to produce was interesting, but in a striking art deco style.[52] If it had been executed in full scale and placed in front of the monument, it would have been hopelessly out of keeping with Duncan's structure. In fact, all of Pope's proposed embellishments, down to and including the two candelabra he recommended for either side of the steps would have resulted in a modernization of the tomb rather than its "completion."

In the early part of February 1929, a fund raising campaign was inaugurated for the completion of Grant's Tomb in accordance with the plans of

John R. Pope.[53] The project received a favorable reception, especially since the Tomb had "been open to the criticism of possessing too cumbrous and gloomy an effect...[54]" and was "regarded by most people as a good deal of an aesthetic eyesore.[55]" In order to handle the fund raising campaign the Association set up a special office in the Chamber of Commerce building, where it had been given free space. The office was placed in charge of one Thomas Hotchkiss, who in the course of his career had helped to compile information for the monumental Stokes Iconography of Manhattan Island. Stationary for the "Special Committee to Complete the Monument" was printed up and, of course, William R. Stewart was in overall charge of the effort. He was to complain that the other trustees were not pulling their weight in the campaign. Contributions were not coming in at the anticipated rate and many members of the Association were not only failing to solicit contributions, but neglected to give themselves.[56]

By June $106,375 was in the Association's hands - a sum considered disappointing.[57] Nevertheless, its members were determined to go ahead with the project, largely because of the unflagging support and enthusiasm of William Rhindlander Stewart. He convinced the Association to sign the necessary contracts to get the work underway, and he announced that he would personally guarantee payment if the necessary funds were not forthcoming from other sources. Therefore,

a contract for $35,000 was signed with John Russell Pope on June 11, 1929.[58] The sum represented the then standard 10% architect's fee on what was then estimated to be a $350,000 project (fees had gone up since Duncan's day). A second contract in the amount of $75,000 was drawn up on the same day for Paul Manship's signature, but there is some question as to whether or not the Association signed it.[59] The contract specified that Manship was to produce an equestrian statue "with (a) secondary symbolical figure in direct connection with the equestrian figure." The whole was to be 14 feet high and Manship estimated it would take three years to execute.[60] Just before leaving for a European trip, Manship stated that the commission required "a severe and tranquil type of figure, not the Grant in full movement or action, but the Grant of the last review..." He also suggested that perhaps two, rather than one, supporting figures would be most appropriate.[61] This was the formula suggested by Otto R. Eggers in his drawing of the proposed equestrian statue (Fig. 146).

From what seemed like rather promising beginnings, the movement to complete the monument tumbled into total disarray. The primary cause of this was the crash of the New York Stock Market in October 1929. This put a quick end to the fund raising effort. A number of people had trouble fulfilling the pledges they had made earlier in the year, and certainly no new pledges were coming in. In addition to the crash,

William Rhinelander Stewart - the would-be guarantor of the contracts with Pope and Manship - died on September 4. Duncan followed soon after on October 18.[62] For at least a year or so the Association still maintained plans to go ahead with the entire project. Progress reports on the planning end of the project continued to be received at least through the fall of 1930.[63] But sometime shortly thereafter it must have been clear to everyone that they could not go on. At the annual meeting in 1932, it was announced that in all $122,515.76 had been taken in during the fund raising campaign.[64] Of that sum approximately half had been spent on expenses connected with the Association's office, architectural fees and Paul Manship's contract. Of what was left, much of the money was invested in stocks and bonds, the market value of which was substantially below what had been paid for them. The contracts with Pope and Manship were, therefore, "suspended.[65]" The following year the Association completely closed down the office it had opened at the outset of the fund raising campaign.[66]

Stocks and bonds were not the only things that were down. Visitation at the Tomb plummeted to levels never before experienced, essentially because people no longer had the money to travel for leisure. In 1933, only 95,584 people walked through the door.[67] Also, vandalism - as

opposed to childhood mischief - became a problem. In 1932, two glass doors were broken and the policeman's sentry box was destroyed by arson.[68] During that summer the first case of graffiti at the tomb was reported. A man took red paint and on the night of August 27 and smeared the following on the side of the building:

> The good but starve;
> The order of the day
> Is Prey on others
> Or become a prey.

The event was considered sufficiently unusual, even shocking, for it to have been picked up in most of the major dailies (Fig. 147). And surprisingly the perpetrator was caught! His name was Louis Gangl, and he was an unemployed painter. He was caught up in the Bronx while painting another line or two of poetry on a walkway, at which point he confessed to the Grant's Tomb caper. He was sentenced to five days in jail.[69] Times have changed.

CHAPTER XIII - REHABILITATION IN THE LATER 1930s

The Grant Monument Association's old Special Committee for the Completion of the Monument never disbanded, and during the mid and later 1930s, the tomb was finally rehabilitated and newly embellished, though not precisely along the lines envisioned and recommended by John Russell Pope in 1928/1929. Some of the work was commissioned directly by the Association. But the vast majority of it was carried out by the group in cooperation with either the Department of Parks, the Works Progress Administration, or both.

The first projects began in December 1935 and were undertaken by the Department of Parks, probably using WPA labor. The marble flooring in the center of the crypt - broken and discolored for years - was taken up and relayed.[1] The rest of the marble in the crypt was then cleaned by hand with pumice, and the ceilings were vacuumed and cleaned with steel wool. Some marble work was repaired, though it was not specified just where, and stained marble panels in the entranceways to the two trophy rooms were switched with marble slabs from less conspicuous portions of the interior. Electric cables that were strung in plain site in 1923 were hidden away in the walls. This work seems to have taken close to a year, and towards the end of 1936 the Association's secretary inquired whether or not Park Commissioner Robert Moses would continue the work by having the floors and wainscotting in the rotunda attended to.[2]

Moses apparently agreed to continue the project, and using WPA labor he had the remaining marble on the interior of the tomb cleaned in the summer of 1937. Another important project accomplished that summer involved the replacement of the "roof" and the repointing of all of the upper masonry. It is not clear whether there already were built up roofs in place at this time on the upper portion of the tomb and that these were replaced; or whether built up roofs were simply added at this time on top of the original roof surfaces. In any event, there is evidence on both the upper and lower roofs today of built up surfaces with considerably higher profiles than those now in place. The total cost for this work was $22,500. Some new electric lighting was installed inside of the tomb, as was a heating system designed to cut down on condensation during the winter. The press began to take notice of all this activity in the fall.[3]

During 1938 and the early months of 1939, work on the interior and exterior of the tomb continued. In January 1938, scaffolding was erected in the rotunda to permit the cleaning of the plaster dome and arches with steel wool. It was decided that the curator's booth that stood just to the east of the doorway was unsightly and had to be removed. Yet the curator still needed an office. The solution arrived at was to remove the stairway from the southeast corner of the building and create a small office in there that could accommodate the caretaker and provide room for the Association's files. The stairway was thought to be expendable since the public was not admitted to the upper gallery anyway.[4]

The purple stained glass windows installed by Tiffany early in the century were condemned as being too gloomy, so they were too slated for removal. A number of multicolored designs were considered as was the possibility of completely changing the leading (Fig. 148), but in the end the Tiffany design was left in tact and only the lights were replaced with amber glass. The choice of color was evidently inspired by the fact that the trustees were told the sash at Les Invalides were glazed with amber lights. The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company was given a $3,750 contract in early 1939 for the job, which was only to include the nine windows that admitted light to the rotunda and the transom lights in the storm door.[5] These windows were apparently protected by outside sheets of glass, similar to the plexiglass panels today, although there is no way of telling when these sheets were first installed.[6] Samples of the purple Tiffany glass were retained and are mentioned by National Park Service officials in 1959.[7] Unfortunately, between then and now the samples have disappeared. A quotation was also solicited from the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company for installing amber glass in the twelve windows of the gallery. An estimate of $1,500 was rendered, but it is not clear whether or not a contract was awarded for the job.[8]

The walls and the domes in the two reliquary rooms were originally left by Duncan in a natural white plaster state with no applied finishes.[9] By the early 1930s the surfaces were probably quite dirty so the walls

were painted grey and the domes blue.[10] When the rehabilitation got underway in the mid and later 1930s, the rooms were still dominated by the large bronze and glass display cases filled with Civil War battle flags and other momentos, and their walls were covered with some of the testimonials the Grants deposited at the tomb in 1904.

As early as 1935, the then President of the Association, Herbert Satterlee, suggested that the rooms could be made more attractive if the testimonials were removed from the walls and replaced by murals.[11] In 1937, his recommendation was adopted. Two artists, brothers Lynn and (William) Dean Fausett, were invited to complete with one another for the project. No written records survive to state whether or not the subject of the murals was specified, but it would seem likely that both artists were requested to design maps featuring the battlefields of the Civil War, and especially those where Grant fought. In June, after designs had been submitted, the Association awarded the commission to Dean Fausett (b. 7/4/13), the younger of the two.[12] In the fall the Association sent him a letter defining the scope of the job:

> In the two northerly corners of Grant's Tomb are two circular Trophy Rooms (sic). It is our intent to commission you to decorate the walls of both rooms from floor to cornice with suitable mural paintings executed on canvas. These paintings are to include a frieze, wall maps, suitably lettered, an ornamental classic clair board and an architectural dado. Your preliminary sketches have been tentatively accepted subject to various revisions as to color and design.

He was to receive $3,000 for his work.[13] By the end of the year

"canvas with white lead" was hung on the walls of the two rooms for $300. The following February, Duncan's original ornamental plaster friezes that were set below the cornices in two rooms were removed at a cost of $200 because they interfered with Fausett's design.[14] Painting began in the spring and was largely completed by fall. As a final touch the murals were varnished to protect them from the many visitors to the tomb, and as a further precaution bronze railings were installed at the base of the maps to keep the visitors at a distance.[15] In the east reliquary room the area from Florida to North Carolina was represented (Figs. 149 and 150), while the mural in the west reliquary room covered the region from North Carolina to Pennsylvania (Figs. 151 and 152).[16] The overall length of each of the murals was 38'6" and they were 11'6" high. The basic color of the maps was a "blonde but quiet flesh-amber," as was the dado. The frieze was in tones of grey. The various battles of the Civil War were marked on the maps with crossed sabers, and those in which played a leading role were additionally emphasized with stars. In the words of the artist:

> The full effect is one of calm dignity, simplicity, and general warmth to compliment the general coolness of the marble. (The murals) also make an effective yet simple background for the flags which are the centers of interest in the rooms.[17]

In 1937 a set of swinging racks was installed for $1,100 just to the west of the entranceway to display the testimonials that formerly hung on the trophy room walls. A number of artifacts formerly housed

with the flags inside the bronze cases were also placed here, and a lamp was installed overhead to facilitate visitors' pursual of the materials.[18] Bronze markers on wooden bases were then made up for each of the flags in the trophy rooms, and provided with black-lettered vellum labels - all of which added a new touch of elegance to the exhibits.[19] And a handsome brass lecturn was added to the tomb's interior furnishings.[20] Herbert Satterlee also recommended in 1935 that bronze busts be placed in the niches of the tomb's crypt, and he offered to take the matter up with officials of the WPA.[21] The possibility was raised from time to time over the next two years,[22] and finally in 1938 something was done about it. "High military authorities" suggested the installation of busts of Generals William T. Sherman, Philip H. Sheridan, George H. Thomas, James B. MacPherson and Edward Ord in the crypt. They were chosen "as being those who were most closely associated with General Grant's victorious campaigns." By June 1938, a Mr. Piccoli of the Federal Art Project had the project for the five busts underway, even though he did not have explicit authorization from The Grant Monument Association to proceed. Apparently there were large numbers of artists on Piccoli's staff, all of whom had to be paid and kept busy. Piccoli initiated the project with the thought in mind that if the Association decided not to go ahead with it, he could always place the statues in schools.[24] The artists selected for the job were William Mues (8/28/77-?) and Jeno Juszko (1880-1954). Both, it seems were refugees from the Nazis.[25] Mues was assigned the statue of Sherman and Sheridan, while

Juszko was given Thomas, MacPherson and Ord. In the summer, plaster models of these statues were shipped up to the tomb and set in place so that all interested parties could examine them and determine whether or not they were suitable (Fig. 153). Both The Grant Monument Association and the city's Art Commission were requested to give their approval. The Association's only financial obligation would be to supply $350 for materials and casting. The plaster models were removed in November 1938, and the finished bronzes were presumably supplied shortly thereafter (Figs. 154-158).[26] The incised letters spelling out the names of the various generals on the bases of the busts were gilded a number of years later, although they were originally left in their natural bronze state.[27]

Work on the exterior of the building was just as ambitious. The tomb was cleaned with chemical solvents and steam by Nicholson and Galloway. The same firm screened all of the openings on the colonade level to prevent birds from nesting between the plaster dome and the inner roof.[28] John Russell Pope's plans for embellishing the structure with a pediment, marble plaques and other details were largely abandoned for lack of funds. However, just as the rehabilitation project got underway, New York's Old Post Office (1869-1875) in City Hall Park was being demolished (Fig. 159). Two of the eagles that decorated the upper portion of the building were offered to the Association (Fig. 160). They were accepted and at first were to be placed at the southeast and southwest corners of the building's paraphet.

"Pedestals" adorned with swags and Grant's four stars were to go on the plinths at either side of the staircase. The "pedestals" were never excuted and the eagles ended up being placed where they were to have gone.[29]

Pope's earlier plan to enlarge the plaza surrounding the tomb and to relandscape the area was adopted in most of its details by landscape architect Gilmore D. Clarke, and architect Aymar Embury, III, and became the centerpiece of the exterior rehabilitation (Fig. 161). The idea of installing two tiered walkways around the tomb was dropped. Yet there were some interesting features added to the plan. The parkland was increased by ten feet to both the east and west at the expense of the two branches of Riverside Drive. A $51,850 contract was signed by the Association with the H.E. Fletcher Co. of West Chelmsford, Massachusetts, to supply the necessary granite for the stairs and retaining walls.[31] Chelmsford granite had been used, it will be recalled, in the construction of the nearby rest room facility in 1909-1910. The Association also supplied $6,841.50 for new trees, shrubs and sod for the area,[32] and a new fence was erected around the memorial tree area to the north of the tomb. All of the labor was supplied by the W.P.A. (Fig. 162). Floodlights may also have been installed on the upper part of the tomb.[33]

As early as 1921, Duncan had suggested that there ought to have been two flagpoles in front of the tomb.[34] When the building was dedicated there was a single huge wooden pole to the north of the structure, but later on it was unclear as to just what kind of flagpole, if any, was in the area. In accordance with Duncan's suggestion two poles were ordered as part of the rehabilitation project. Contracts were let to the Penn Brass and Bronze Works and Ernest Cappelle to supply the bases and poles respectively for the ensembles.[35] The flagpole to the east of the tomb was dedicated to the memory of Horace Porter and Grant's four star General's flag was to fly from it. The flagpole to the west was dedicated to the memory of Col. Fred Grant, and the American flag was to fly there. Both poles were appropriately marked with brass plaques.[36]

The Association also maintained high hope of securing an equestrian statue of Grant for the plaza in front of the tomb. The subject was under discussion in 1936 and 1938,[37] and when the plaza was rebuilt foundations to support the weight of such a statue were laid below grade.[38] There are no indications that Paul Manship was contacted. This was probably due to the fact that he would have expected to have been paid the princely sum he originally bargained for almost a decade earlier. What the Association had in mind was getting a WPA artist to design the bronze so all it would have to do would be to supply funding for materials and casting, as in the case of the five busts for the crypt.

The WPA agreed to help and a sculptor named Finta was assigned to the project. His work was a disaster. U.S. Grant 3rd went to examine it in the spring of 1939 and announced that the:

> ...model is entirely unacceptable...The figure seemed to me very stiff and, except from one view, far from a good likeness. Although Mr. Finta intends it to be quiet and thoughtful, the impression I got was that it expressed distress and sadness.[39]

The President of the Association, Satterlee, agreed with this assessment. At that point Piccoli of the WPA stated that both Finta and Mues would make further studies for the project.[70]

Nothing more was heard of Finta. Over a year later, Satterlee reported to U.S. Grant 3rd that he and William Mather had:

> ...seen a one third size model of the General on horseback made by a German sculptor named Mues who made one (sic) of the busts in the crypt. It is very good but we made some suggestions that I think will make it better...[41]

What is probably a photograph of this model is in the New York Public Library (Fig. 163). Mues' statue did not come up again until the summer of 1941 when Satterlee again wrote to Grant telling him that the W.P.A. was eager to have the Association:

> ...accept a model made by Prof. Mues, the older German sculptor. I think they want to get him off the WPA payroll... naturally he does not want to get off...[42]

But in the end Mues' design was not well enough liked. Writing to Grant on the situation Satterlee stated:

> Of course we can get (Mues' statue) for the cost of the bronze and casting and pedestal but no one seems to want a statue of the General made by a German under the supervision of a Russian![43]

A Russian named Sobolski had by this time replaced Mr. Piccoli as head of the WPA artists project.

Some thought was given to having the statue of Grant by William Ordway Partridge moved from its site at the intersection of Bedford Avenue and Bergen Street in Brooklyn to the tomb site. But U.S. Grant 3rd did not like the 1896 statue very much and Brooklynites were enraged by the suggestion so it was abandoned - at least temporarily. Over the next twenty years, however, the Association took up the possibility of relocating Partridges' work time after time, though it was, of course, left in its original place.[44]

The newspapers welcomed the rehabilitation project, the New York Times remarking that the tomb had "long been the target of aesthetic criticism.[45]" In January 1939, most of the WPA laborers had largely completed their work and a ceremony was held at the tomb during which they were given certificates of commendation by the Association (Fig. 164). A formal rededication of the tomb, attended by a few Civil War veterans among others, was then held on April 27, 1939 (Fig. 165).[46] The entire project had cost some $300,000 of which The Grant Monument Association had supplied over $80,000 left over from the fund raising campaign of 1929.[47] The tomb looked fresher inside and out than it had in years (Figs. 166, 167 and 168).

CHAPTER XIV - THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE GENERAL GRANT NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The years following the rehabilitation of the later 1930s, were rather uneventful. During World War II, sandbags were piled in front of the trophy rooms to serve in some unfathomable way as protection in case of an air raid (Fig. 169). Tarpulin covers were also thrown over the sarcophagi at night for the same purpose. Installed in 1942, these materials were removed in September 1945.[1] The only "casualty" of the war was a piece of Japanese embroidery which had been sent to Grant's family from the people of Nagasaki as a memorial after the General's death.[2] It was on display in the swinging racks by the door and became the subject of criticism from visitors to Grant's Tomb. Therefore, it was ordered removed in the early part of 1944 along with an accompanying photograph or two.[3]

In the years following the war, the trustees of The Grant Monument Association became uneasy about their long range ability to finance and administer the tomb. At a meeting of the Association held in the spring of 1953, someone suggested that it be turned over to the Federal Government.[4] The matter was allowed to pass with no decision being made one way or another. It came up again the following year during a discussion in which the merits of having either the city, state or federal government take over the structure were raised. A consensus emerged that the tomb would be best off in the hands of the federal government, and a special committee was appointed to look

into the matter. By the end of the year, contact had been made with the Department of the Interior and various members of the Executive Committee decided to write to the president concerning the matter. There was some opposition within the Association to the move, as at least one member considered the potential transfer to be a shirking of responsibility.[5]

In early 1955, President Eisenhower's private secretary wrote to the Association telling it that sites similar to Grant's Tomb were ordinarily run by cities and states and that he did not foresee federal involvement in its administration.[6] Nor was there any "warmth on the part of the National Park Service towards the proposal.[7]"

However, the members of the Association were influential enough to press the matter with personal approaches to President Eisenhower. Their efforts were successful. A delegation of Park Service officials headed by George A. Palmer visited the tomb on October 26, 1955.[8] The results of this preliminary inspection were recorded in Palmer's and J. Carlisle Crouch's "Historic Site Survey, Grant Monument New York City, New York" dated February 20, 1956. That reported included a thumbnail sketch of the Grant Monument's history. It recommended the structure be declared a National Memorial, but that the City of New York be encouraged to continue appropriating funds for its maintenance - perhaps on a matching basis with the National Park

Service. Another aspect of the report that had great significance for the future came in the statement:

> ...the monument now gives the definite impression that it is only a tomb. There should be additional development to give the visitor a more pointed feeling that this structure is a memorial.

This sentiment was to be translated into official policy several years later when the National Park Service formally took over the tomb. And it was to have a number of unfortunate and unforeseen results.

As a further indication of thinking within the Park Service, Regional Director Tobin wrote to the Director in early March 1956 that the Grant Monument probably could be transformed from a tomb into a memorial:

> But relocation of and subordination of the sarcophagi are essential to accomplish this.[9]

Although improving interpretive programs at the site would undoubtedly have been desirable, Park Service officials were quite evidently considering drastic physical changes as well in order to promote their vision of its potential memorial role.

Evidently confident that the federal government would indeed assume responsibility for Grant's Tomb, The Grant Monument Association had two pieces of legislation passed by the state in 1956 to facilitate

the transfer. Chapter 44 of the Laws of 1956 amended the charter of the Association to permit the organization to donate Grant's Tomb to the federal government. In addition, Chapter 263 of the Laws of 1956 authorized the City of New York to transfer to the government the property on which the monument stood extending up to and including the granite retaining walls built in the 1930s.[10]

It was not, however, until the following year that the President's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments decided that:

> Grant's Tomb was of national importance, but that it was a memorial rather than a historic site or national monument and that, therefore, it considers the preservation of the Tomb a matter for specific legislation by Congress.[11]

Shortly thereafter Representative Zelenko, in whose district the Grant Monument lay, introduced HR 6274 on March 21, 1957, to authorize the transfer of the Grant Monument to the Department of the Interior. The resolution eventually became P.L. 659 of the 85th Congress, and was finally signed by President Eisenhower on August 4, 1958. It read as follows:

> 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 is authorized and directed to accept, as a gift to the United States, title to the real property known as Grant's Tomb at Riverside Drive and West One Hundred and Twenty-Second Street in New York, New York, and thereafter to administer and maintain such real property as the General Grant National Memorial.

Even before the President signed the bill, The Grant Monument Association

had signed a quitclaim deed in favor of the United States government on February 17, 1958.[12] The Association made some attempts to round up the President, Mayor or Governor to be present for an official ceremony transferring the monument to federal control, but none of the parties were interested in making an appearance.[13] So very quietly, without fanfare, the National Park Service assumed responsibility for the site on May 1, 1959. Interestingly enough, in 1885 Richard T. Greener mentioned that suggestions had been made that the plot where Grant was interred should be given to the national government to emphasize the national importance of the General's final resting place.[14] It took almost 75 years, but it finally happened.

After the transfer, the National Park Service sought out General Ulysses S. Grant 3rd to ask his opinion of how the government might best administer his grandfather's final resting place. Grant had been present at Mt. McGregor when his namesake died, and he also attended the funeral, the transfer of the General's body to the permanent tomb and the dedication of the Grant Monument. In his own right he was an important figure in conservation circles in Washington, D.C. Grant wrote to the Park Service:

> The Grant Monument Association has always resisted making of the tomb any sort of general Civil War museum, and I agree that this would be inconsistent with the purpose for which the American public donated the funds to build it. In other words, I hope the National Park Service will adhere to the basic idea that this is the tomb of General and Mrs. Grant...[15]

In reply to this, the then Regional Director Tobin stated:

> I think we can safely assure General Grant that the policy of the National Park Service is, and will continue to be, that the Grant Memorial has the sole purpose of commemorating his grandfather's life and service to the Nation...[16]

Thus the purpose of the General Grant National Memorial was well established at a fairly early date. What this meant in practical terms remained to be worked out.

Dr. Thomas Pitkin was placed in charge of research and development at Grant's Tomb while attached officially to the Statue of Liberty National Monument. In a letter written in June 1959, Pitkin took up Palmer's train of thought from three years before in discussing how to orchestrate a "shift" from the structure's being a mere tomb to its becoming a memorial.[17] In November, Pitkin issued a formal report "General Grant National Memorial: Its History and Possible Development." There he reviewed the history of both Grant's Tomb and The Grant Monument Association in some detail and again took up the question of "a shift of emphasis from the mortuary to the interpretive." Pitkin's rationale was that the National Park Service

was:

> Charged with the administration of a national memorial...It is not administering Grant's Tomb but General Grant National Memorial.[18]

It is not entirely clear why Pitkin and so many others within the Service apparently found the two roles - tomb and national memorial - so incompatible. But in practice their attitude meant two things. One, interpretative programs, exhibits in particular, were to be renovated and made a more important part of the visitor's experience. Two, the building itself was going to be made to accommodate this new activity "to moderate the prevailing atmosphere of a tomb.[19]" Masses of brightly colored flags were suggested for this purpose along with murals. The possible renovation of the murals in the trophy rooms was also recommended.[20]

In regard to the exterior of the structure, Pitkin suggested that the missing components of Pope's master plan be carried out. Specifically, that meant the erection of an equestrian statue on the plaza in front of the tomb, setting a classical pediment over the portico and shaving the high cap off the apex of the stepped pyramid.[21] These goals had continued to be listed in The Grant Monument Association's Annual Reports throughout the 1940s and 1950s. Thus Pitkin in effect was implementing Association policy. He further recommended a general modernization of the structure,

including the installation of a telephone and an improved heating system. As part of this modernization, he also endorsed the removal of Duncan's wooden storm doors (Fig. 170), and their replacement with a modern bronze revolving door. An entrance to the basement storage area other than the marble trap door to the west of the crypt was to be established and rest room facilities for the staff were to be supplied on the crypt level.[22]

A number of Pitkin's suggestions were adopted by management. In 1961, Pitkin reported to The Grant Monument Association that a telephone had been installed, new labels had been provided for the flags in the reliquary rooms, the swinging panel exhibits had been rematted and a number of other minor chores accomplished. He estimated that the pediment would probably cost $250,000 and that it was, therefore, impractical to consider having it built. He did, however, hold out hope that the equestrian statue for the plaza might be executed with funds raised by the New York State Civil War Centennial Committee.[23]

In fact, having the equestrian statue executed for the plaza in front of the tomb had been on everyone's mind since the tomb was turned over to the government. Park Service officials gave The Grant Monument Association permission to raise money for the project

as early as June 1959.[24] Surprisingly enough, Paul Manship was approached once again and asked if he would execute a full scale version of what was identified as a model he had prepared around 1937 while under contract with the Association (Fig. 171).[25] The estimates for the statue came in at $100,000 in 1959, and double that sum two years later.[26] The New York State Civil War Centennial Committee tried to raise money for the statue, but by 1962 the group had to admit that the project was going badly and that the necessary money just did not seem to be available.[27]

At the Grant Monument Association's annual meeting in 1962, Pitkin began to actively push for another project - the installation of murals in the lunettes of the rotunda.[28] He included this proposal in an "Interpretive Prospectus" he wrote for the site in November. Most of the other recommendations he made in his earlier "General Grant National Memorial: Its History and Possible Development" were also included in the prospectus along with a new suggestion to inlay the names of Grant's major battles in brass on the floor of the crypt.[29]

In 1963, the Historic American Buildings Survey recorded Grant's Tomb.[30] Pitkin at the same time continued to promote his mural project. He presented historical evidence to The Grant Monument Association in support of his thesis that Duncan had intended to ornament the lunettes with representations of Grant's "special victories.[31]" Unfortunately,

Pitkin does not seem to have been particularly familiar with architectural vocabulary. In Duncan's original statement which he submitted with his competition drawings in September 1890, he wrote:

> The dome is supported on the interior by pendentives...These would be capable of the highest ornamentation with figure subjects formed from Marble Mosaics.[32]

Pendentives and lunettes are two quite different architectural features and Duncan said nothing at all about lunettes. True to his plans, the architect did, indeed, have the pendentives of the rotunda ornamented by J. Massey Rhind with the series of allegorical groups representing Grant's Birth, Military Life, Civilian Life and Death. Pitkin's only other "source" of information on this subject was a letter from George G. Burnside, which stated General Porter and Duncan had both told his father that the lunettes "were to be used for battle scenes which the General took part in. No substantiating evidence for this remark exists.[33]

Nevertheless, Pitkin convinced the Association, and in early 1964 it transferred the bulk of its remaining funds, $20,000, to the National Park Service to pay for two of the three murals. The third was to be paid for by the Park Service itself.[34] Allyn Cox was awarded a contract for the project on August 31, 1964.[35] Each mural was to measure 18 x 9'. They were executed by the Venetian Art Mosaics Studio in the Bronx. The first of them, representing

Appomattox (Fig. 172) was installed on the north wall by April 1, 1965. Others representing Vicksburg on the east wall (Fig. 173) and Chattanooga on the west (Fig. 174) were installed by April 1, 1966. They were all dedicated with appropriate ceremonies on May 26, 1966.

Cox felt that in order to be effective his principal figures had to be at least seven feet high:

> In each lunette behind the principal action there is vignetted a bit of background related to and explaining what we see in the front. A snapshot view of a piece of history, as it might have looked from a fixed point in time and space is ruled out from the beginning.[26]

Cox's work cannot be called altogether successful. His figures are stiff, the compositions dry and uninteresting. The men in combat look like rows of toy soldiers. The general feeling of the mosaics is modern and not quite in keeping with the architecture of the tomb. Perhaps most disturbing of all is their intense chromatic range which clashes with general austerity of the interior.

In 1965, a "Historic Structures Report, General Grant National Memorial, Part I" was written by Louis Torres. It contained no new information and was simply a summary of material contained in Pitkin's "General Grant National Memorial: Its History and Possible Development." A Master Plan also approved that year, although drafts had appeared

as early as 1960. The Master Plan clearly stated:

> The purpose of the General Grant National Memorial is to inculcate in its visitors respect for the memory of the great soldier there entombed, an understanding of the basic facts of his career, and an awareness of the meaning of the decisions achieved under his leadership.

Development was to be limited:

> To insure that (it) is in keeping with the Memorial character of this tomb.

And:

> To insure that the pattern of public use will not detract from the visitor's experience of the Memorial character of the area...An atmosphere conductive to meditation will be maintained.[37]

The Park Service's intentions for the site as outlined in this key management document were clearly to maintain the building's quiet dignity in the tradition of The Grant Monument Association.

A most unfortunate event took place in 1965. Since Grant's Tomb had been taken over by the National Park Service, there had been recurring discussions within The Grant Monument Association as to whether or not it should continue. The Association managed to limp along for a number of years, but finally it just could not continue for lack of new members. At a Special Meeting in March, a formal decision was made to dissolve the Association and to turn over any

remaining funds to the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society for use at the tomb.[38] A Certificate of Dissolution of the Corporation was granted by the Secretary of the State of New York on April 7, 1965. Approximately a year later, the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society used the Association's remaining $9,095.50 to purchase from Paul Manship's estate a bronze version of the artist's model for the ill fated equestrian statue (Fig. 175).[39] It was given to the National Park Service and placed on display at the tomb.

Preliminary studies were also made in 1965 to provide an alternative entrance to the crypt storage room in accordance with Pitkin's suggestion. Architect Newton P. Bevin proposed extending the south-west staircase to the crypt level and then hollowing out a passageway from there to the storage facility. Plans were also formulated for installing a new storm door - again following up on Pitkin's recommendation.[40] The plan for gaining access to the storage area was deemed either too costly or too complicated or both, and an alternative was instead carried out which involved cutting through from the crypt and providing marble door on a pivoting axis. This work, the removal of Duncan's storm door and its replacement with a modern fixture were carried out sometime in the latter part of 1965 or early 1966.[41]

Some of Pitkin's other recommendations were finally carried out in 1969/1970 by Harper's Ferry Center. Another plan dated June 1969 was prepared by David McLean and included a sales desk, garbage receptacle, a plexiglass covered base for Paul Manship's model equestrian statue, a sign for the north wall of the rotunda and new displays for reliquary rooms.[42] McLean, along with Ralph Harrig and Keath Trexler also drafted an Exhibit Plan in July 1969 to further document their ideas. In their study they expressed extreme hesitation in regard to altering the tomb-like character of the building. "(It) is, after all, a tomb...," they declared in their introduction.[43] For this reason they decided against the use of audio visual devices anywhere in the building and limited the placement of exhibition materials in the rotunda of the tomb. They even recommended that a recent park level decision to open the crypt to visitation be reversed.[44]

Although the planning team counseled the use of discretion, the additions and alterations they made were totally modern and out of keeping with the design of the building. For instance, a large bright blue sign was placed on the north wall although the color appears nowhere else in the tomb; and it was set in an indented marble panel which it does not quite fill. The result is that it seems both out of character and temporary.

Perhaps the most tragic feature of the exhibit plan was that it decreed for the reliquary rooms and their contents (Fig. 176). It called for painting out the 1930s murals by Dean Fausett. A Park Service employee who was on site at the time recalled that the murals "were just beautiful, and in perfect condition except for a little surface dirt.[45]" After they were obliterated with raspberry paint in the case of the east reliquary room and blue paint in the west Trophy Room, photo murals were mounted on the walls along with texts, all detailing highlights of Grant's military and civilian life (Figs. 177 and 178). Two of the panels were changed at a later date to add black Americans to the story.[46]

The flags in the rooms were referred to in 1959 as being:

> ...in need of varying degrees of preservation. Most are in tatters, but some may only require cleaning.[47]

The Master Plan later called for "the most effective available curatorial techniques (for) the preservation of the...flags.[48]" But on the advice of Harper's Ferry Center they were summarily bundled up in newspapers and eventually shipped off to the Springfield Clearing House for what was euphemistically referred to as "storage.[49]" One exception was made, the Battle Flag of the 11th Indiana Volunteer Infantry was spared and mounted on the wall in the east reliquary room.[50] In 1979 the other flags were all returned to New York City and are now awaiting

conservation treatment and possible display at the tomb.[51]

The bronze flag cases - in all probability designed by Duncan - fared even worse than the flag themselves. Two employees still on the staff of Federal Hall National Memorial in 1969 recall having been sent up to the tomb with sledge hammers to smash the historic and irreplaceable cases to pieces.[52] All of this work was completed by March 1970.[53] The Harper's Ferry Exhibit Plan also called for the removal of the bronze busts from the crypt since they were:

> ...of WPA or similar origin and not of historic value.[54]

For some reason this recommendation was not carried out. The exhibit panels that hung to the west of the doorway and were filled with memorial resolutions,prints, etc., were probably also removed at this time. Pitkin in his 1962 Interpretative Prospectus had called them "repetitious.[55]" The resolutions and other materials were crammed into a broken down map case which lay under a hot water tank in the tomb's storage area. These were all removed to Federal Hall in 1977, although quite a bit of damage had already been sustained by a large number of pieces. Hopefully some of them will again be placed on display at the tomb.[56] In 1970, floodlights were installed by the City of New York to illuminate the tomb at night.[57] Otherwise there were no further changes at the site until the summer of 1972. Then, the Superintendent in charge of the General Grant National Memorial decided to sponsor a mosaic project in cooperation with a

public arts group. It was intended, among other things, to commemorate the establishment of Yellowstone as the first National Park in 1872 by then President Grant. On a more practical level, it was thought that if community residents could be involved in the project, graffiti vandalism at the site would decline. Instead of laying a flat mosaic plaza as originally intended, the project director erected a series of three dimensional free flowing mosaic covered benches that have been quite controversial. The project was intended to cost approximately $20,000 in funds from combined sources, and was to have been completed at the end of the summer. It ended up costing approximately $50,000 and was not finished until fall 1974 (Fig. 179). Clearance for the project under the terms of the 1966 Historic Preservation Act was neither solicited nor received.[58]

In 1973 and early 1974 the steel framing of the tomb's stepped pyramid was reinforced and fans were installed beneath it for ventilation.[59] In the fall of 1974, the dome and arches in the rotunda were painted for the first time.[60] Clearly there was a need for this as the plaster work was badly cracked in addition to being streaked with dirt (Fig. 180). A simple cleaning such as the one carried out by the WPA probably would not have significantly improved the interior's shabby appearance. In 1962, George G. Burnside

told Pitkin that sometime prior to 1910, John H. Duncan and Horace Porter had decided to paint the dome of Grant's Tomb and J. Massey Rhind's allegorical figures a "light sky blue." This information was supposedly passed on to Burnside by his father.[61] If Duncan had indeed recommended such treatment, it would have been very much at odds with his original intentions for the rotunda. In 1896, it will be recalled he recommended that "the entire interior of the tomb should be as near white as possible." He had even made the building strong enough to permit the replacement of the plaster dome and arches with marble.[62] But on the strength of Burnside's 1962 statement and his own conviction that the tomb needed to be brightened up, Pitkin recommended in his 1962 Interpretative Prospectus that the ceiling be painted "azure" with gilded accents.[63] There were objections to this plan within the Washington Office of the Park Service.[64] Yet contract documents were drawn up in 1974 to carry out Pitkin's recommendation. It was only after the Historic Architect for the North Atlantic Region intervened that the color scheme was shifted to white,[65] which was far more appropriate since it was closer to the original natural plaster finish.

In general, many of the National Park Service alterations and additions to the tomb and its site - the removal of Duncan's storm door, destruction of the bronze flag cases, obliteration of wall murals and the installation of the mosaic benches - should be considered as part of a larger picture. Classically designed buildings had

fewer and fewer admirers in America from the 1930s on, and the influence of the Bauhaus and a number of other modern currents crystallized after World War II in a new, sleek International Style of architecture that was accepted by the public and critics alike as the standard against which all buildings were to be judged. When the mosaic bench project was underway in 1973, the New York Times referred disparagingly (and characteristically for the period) to the "drabness" of Grant's Tomb, and the need "to liven it up[66]"- sentiments Pitkin and other National Park Service officials obviously shared to some degree. Another periodical went so far as to state:

> ...the memorial is far from being an artistic creation. As a matter of fact, it is clumsy, tasteless and, surely, needs something to make it look better.[67]

The preservation movement, on the other hand, has been a relatively new force on the American scene. It was only in the mid 1960s that landmark statutes began to be passed in municipalities all across the nation. And it was, of course, in 1966 that Congress passed the Historic Preservation Act - the provisions of which today would block the sort of alterations and additions to Grant's Tomb that the Park Service has carried out over the past 20 years. The preservation movement has dramatically altered public perception of, and appreciation for, all styles of architecture in America. "Old" is no longer automatically perceived to be bad. The official seal of critical approval was stamped on the movement in 1975/1976 when the nation's foremost bastion of contemporary art, the Museum of Modern Art, staged its unforgettable exhibition "The Architecture of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.[68]"

As has been demonstrated, John Duncan's design for Grant's Tomb evolved out of the Beaux-Arts movement. Another, more recent exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum " The American Renaissance," has also heightened public awareness of turn-of-the-century architecture.[69] This is all to say that previous Park Service actions at Grant's Tomb were largely products of the time in which they were carried out. The reassessment nationwide that is now going on with regard to American Renaissance or Beaux-Art architecture similarly now calls for a Park Service reassessment of its treatment of the tomb.

Collection management at the tomb has generally suffered the same vicissitudes as the building itself. In 1959, for instance, Thomas Pitkin called to his aid a National Park Service curator from Philadelphia, Horace Wilcox, to survey and help catalogue the collections at the tomb. In his correspondence, Wilcox made reference to what was probably a fairly large number of architectural drawings that had been submitted in competition for Grant's Tomb. Today these drawings would be viewed as an invaluable resource both for study and display purposes. Wilcox, however, urged that they be disposed of because of "their poor condition and the expense involved" in saving them.[70] Three of these drawings somehow managed to survive this purge - one in shreds and the other two with tears and footprints.[71]

Aside from the drawings, a number of collection items have vanished during Park Service tenure. During the fund raising drive in 1892, it will be recalled, Horace Porter planned to collect the names of all living members of the Union Army and Navy, and deposit them in a "library" within the tomb. No 19th-century records indicate how this was done - or if it was done for that matter. But in the early 1950s a member of the Grant Monument Association reported at a meeting that he had visited Grant's Tomb and "that while there...had discovered in a recess off the crypt where the names of the original contributors are stored in copper boxes, two of said boxes are empty.[72]" In 1959, sixteen of these rectangular boxes were catalogued and listed as having been empty.[73] By the later 1970s, these boxes had disappeared altogether without a trace, along with all but one of another set of large cylindrical copper boxes that originally held the archives of The Grant Monument Association. The surviving example, marked with the number "18" in raised numerals, was discovered in a corner of the boiler room at the tomb.[74] Aside from the purple Tiffany glass samples mentioned above, a number of other collection items catalogued in 1959 and later have disappeared.

It is only hoped that this lengthy report will have documented for future Park Service managers of the site the long and storied history of Grant's Tomb, and that it will have demonstrated the structure's important place in American history. In the twenty years that the National Park Service has administered the site, a variety of cultural

forces have pulled succeeding administrations in a variety of directions with very mixed - not to say very questionable - results. At its earliest possible convenience the National Park Service should draft a Cultural Resource Management Plan that once and for all will define its purpose in administering the General Grant National Memorial and how that purpose is to be achieved. It is hoped that the conclusion of such a plan will be in harmony with the objectives of the thousands of Americans who were in one way or another involved in the building of Grant's Tomb.

A great many abbreviations have been employed in the footnotes and a few appear in the captions to the illustrations as well. A complete list of these abbreviations follows this section.

A NOTE ON SOURCES

The footnotes for each chapter in this Study are numbered separately. Thus a reference to "footnote IX-26," should be interpreted as "Chapter IX, footnote 26."

Much of the information in this Study is based on correspondence and other materials in The Grant Monument Association Archives, now stored in the library at the Federal Hall National Memorial. The Archives have been indexed in: David M. Kahn, "Inventory of The Grant Monument Association Archives," June - August 1979. Citations in this study to materials in the Archives are made using the "Inventory's" indexing system. Thus the following citation, "GMAA, VII-3, letter G.Ehret to W.R.Grace, 8/7/85," should, after consulting the "Inventory," be translated as, "The Grant Monument Association Archives, Storage Box VIII, Folder 3, letter G.Ehret to W.R.Grace, August 7, 1885." Similarly, the citation, "GMAA, XXI-2, minutes Annual Meeting GMA, 2/26/13," should be translated as, "The Grant Monument Association Archives, Storage Box XXI, Volume 2, minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Grant Monument Association for February 26, 1913." All other citations should be self explanatory.

Many newspaper articles are referred to throughout this Study. Most of the citations are quite exact, such as the following, "NYT, 9/14/85, 4/3," which translates as, "New York Times, September 14, 1885, page 4,

column 3." However, a substantial number of newspaper articles consulted for this study were seen only in clipping form in various collections. Sometimes these had only a date and page number, and sometimes a date alone indicated on them. No effort has been made to supply the missing specifics in regard to these references as the interested reader should be able to locate them with little difficulty.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AABN	American Architect and Building News
AIA	American Institute of Architects
AL	Avery Library, Columbia University, John H. Duncan Material
BDE	Brooklyn Daily Eagle
BDG	Boston Daily Globe
BM	Berlin and Montello Granite Company
CAC	City Art Commission, New York City, Grant Monument Material
CHTCC	Charles H.T.C. Collis
CIMM	Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine
CO'R	Cornelius O'Reilly
DAB	Dictionary of American Biography (New York 1928-1936)
FL	Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly
GEGR	General Grant National Memorial Museum Item
GEGRMC	General Grant National Memorial Map Case (at Federal Hall)
GEGRVF	General Grant National Memorial Vertical Files (at Federal Hall)
GMA	The Grant Monument Association
GMAA	The Grant Monument Association Archives (at Federal Hall)
HP	General Horace Porter
HW	Harper's Weekly
JCR	James C. Reed
JHD	John H. Duncan
JTB	John T. Brady
MCNY	Museum of the City of New York
MNH	Maine and New Hampshire Granite Company
NPS	National Park Service
NYCCA	New York Chamber of Commerce Archives, Grant Monument Material

NYH	New York Herald
NYHT	New York Herald Tribune
NYP	New York Post
NYPL	New York Public Library
NYS	New York Sun
NYT	New York Times
NYTR	New York Tribune
NYW	New York World
RTG	Richard T. Greener
SA	Scientific American
SAABE	Scientific American - Architects and Builders Edition
USGAA	Ulysses S. Grant Association Archives, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
WRG	William R. Grace

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

1

Said to have originated on Marx's television quiz show in late 1940s. The question was reportedly put to dull witted contestants who were unable to answer any of the other questions asked of them.

2

Museum Collection, uncatalogued. The verso is illustrated in the upper left hand corner of Fig. 130.

3

Resolution passed at Annual Encampment held in New York City, 12/12/89.

4

GMAA, IV-1, typescript, n.d.

5

NYT, 8/16/79, C 10/4.

6

The mystery of why Thomas Pitkin, the National Park Service historian who did most of the research on the tomb, never examined the archives more closely will probably never be explained. His note cards on the history of the building which are now stored at Federal Hall, demonstrate that he was a careful, dedicated scholar. It may be that he put too much faith in George G. Burnside, a long time employee at Grant's Tomb, who told him that The Grant Monument Association's records for the period prior to 1912 had all been destroyed by fire along with the Association's copies of the original architectural drawings (GEGR VF, memorandum T. Pitkin to Files, 4/14/59). It is true that a fire in January 1912 wiped out some papers of the Association (GMAA, XXI-2, minutes Annual Meeting, 2/8/12), but these were for the period 1897-1912. The earlier papers for the period 1885-1897 had been carefully stored in the tomb by architect John H. Duncan in 1897 (AL, letter JHD to H.W. Hayden, 3/14/22).

CHAPTER II

1 Thomas M. Pitkin, The Captain Departs (Southern Ill. University Press 1973), pp. 1-4.

2 Ibid, p.23.

3 Ibid, pp. 24-27.

4 Ibid, pp. 34-35.

5 NYTR, 3/1/04, 14.

6 GMAA, XIII.

7 CIMM, 4/97, p. 839.

8 Pitkin, p. 112.

9 Ibid, pp. 55-57.

10 Ibid, pp. 48, 60 and 61.

11 Ibid, p. 68.

12 Ibid, pp. 86 and 91.

1 NYT, 9/7/85, 4/3.

2 CIMM, 4/97, p. 839.

3 NYW, 9/29/89, 1.

4 See Chapter VII below.

5 GMAA, X-7, letter J.D. Grant to WRG, 10/29/85. At least the possibility exists that this letter was drafted by a member of The Grant Monument Association, see GMAA, XXV-11, letter RTG to H.Hayden, 2/26/12.

6 NYTR, 7/24/85, 2/1.

7 GMAA, X-7, telegram F.D.Grant to WRG, 7/23/85.

8 Ibid, telegram WRG to W.L.Turner, 7/24/85.

9 NYTR, 7/25/85, 1/1.

10 GMAA, X-7, letter Park Commissioners to F.D.Grant, 7/25/85.

11 Ibid, letter WRG to J.D.Grant, 7/23/85.

12 NYT, 7/25/85, 1/1.

13 NYT, 7/29/85, 1/1.

14 Magazine of American History, 9/85, p. 225.

15 NYT, 7/28/85, 1/3.

16 NYTR, 7/25/85, 4/2.

17 E.g. The Record and Guide, 7/25/85, p. 831.

18 NYTR, 7/26/85, 5/1.

19 GMAA, X-7, telegram WRG to F.D.Grant, 7/25/85.

20 NYTR, 7/28/85, 1/1.

21 NYT, 7/29/85, 1/1 and 1/4-5.

22

GEGR #s 6 and 7.

23

Fig. 29, a photograph taken on the morning of 8/8/85, shows the roof of the temporary tomb had not yet been sheathed with bricks nor had its limestone trim been applied. This work was only completed after the funeral. For general information on the temporary vault see NYT, 7/29/85, 1/4-5; HW, 8/8/85 p512; GEGR #218 ("Offical Programe, Last Tribute to Our Dead Hero, Saturday August 8th,1885"). NYT, 6/1/86, 1/7; NYP, 4/27/97, 6/1 and GMAA V-17, Garnett and Whileman (Publishers), "Sketch of the Life of Gen. U.S.Grant...(New York 1897)." For the "gas retort" remark made by General Egbert Viele see NYT, 9/27/89, 1/7.

24

NYT, 2/21/97, 20/1.

25

Magazine of American History, 9/85, p. 243 and HW, 8/8/85, p. 519.

26

Hopper Striker Mott, The New York of Yesterday: A descriptive Narrative of Old Bloomingdale (New York 1908), p. 26.

27

Isaac Newton Phelps Stokes, Iconography of Manhattan Island (New York 1915-1928), III, p. 977.

28

NYT, 7/28/85, 1/4-5 and NYTR, 7/29/85, 1/1.

29

NYW, 4/24/92.

30

HW, 8/8/85, p. 519.

31

A Guide for Strangers to General Grant's Tomb in Riverside, Park, New York (New York 1886). Copy in NYHS.

32

NYT, 8/8/85, 8/1 and 8/27/85, 5/3.

33

AABN, 8/1/85, p. 49. Also see Chapter V for a full discussion of anti-New York sentiment.

34

AABN, 8/15/85, pp. 73-74.

35

The construction of the temporary tomb was validated by Chapter 338, Laws of the State of New York for 1886.

CHAPTER IV

1

For general information on the funeral preparations see NYT, 8/3/85, 4/4; HW, 8/8/85, p. 519 and The Record and Guide, 7/25/85, p. 831. One entrepeneur laid plans to produce a special book of engravings reproducing the rich decorations that were mounted for Grant's funeral. It was to have been called New York in Mourning, but nothing seems to have come of the proposition, see GMAA, VII-6, letter J.P.Coffin to RTG, 10/22/85.

2

GMAA, X-12, letter Unexcelled Fireworks to A.B.Cornell, 10/8/85.

3

NYT, 8/11/85, 5/5.

4

GEGR #244.

5

NYS, 7/27/85, 1/2 and 7/28/85.

6

GMAA, IV-9, letter W.Lummis to WRG, 7/25/85.

7

GMAA, VII-3, letter G. Ehret to WRG, 8/7/85.

8

HW, 8/1/85, p. 492 and 8/15/85, p. 538; The Record and Guide, 8/8/85, p. 879 and Pitkin, p. 110.

9

NYT, 8/8/85, 1 (map).

10

HW, 8/15/85, p. 529 and GEGR #218.

11

GEGR #241, pamphlet entitled "Within are the Names of the Guests of the Fifth Avenue Hotel on the Occasion of the Obsequies of General U.S.Grant, August 8th, 1885."

12

Pitkin, p. 110.

13

The key is now in the collections of the U.S.Grant Home State Historic Site, Galena, Illinois, and was donated by Col. Fred Grant who had inherited the key from his mother (personal communication from T.A.Campbell, Jr., Superintendent of the U.S.Grant Home).

14

For general information on the funeral see HW, 8/15/85, p. 538; J.C.Derby (publisher), The Riverside Souvenir (New York 1886); U.S.Instantaneous Photographic Company (publisher), The Seven Mile Funeral Cortege of General Grant (Boston 1886) and all New York City newspapers for August 8 and 9, 1885. The total cost of the funeral came to $14,162.75, and was born by the federal government, see NYT, 9/3/85, 5/1.

15

Pitkin, p. 102.

16

Program, Mt. McGregor Funeral Service, 8/4/85, with attached letter signed by Kate H. Gwillim whose husband stood guard outside the cottage. A piece of fern her husband obtained from the commemorative flower displays is also attached to the program, which is in the NYHS.

17

See Garnett and Whiteman, op. cit.

18

GMAA, XXV-13, letter C.H.Burnett to GMA, 2/1/44, reporting on his uncle's transgression.

19

GMAA, X-22, letter A.Schippert to S.Merritt, 8/15/85; letter C.H.Robinson to S.Merritt, 8/14/85 and letter Mrs. D.H.Hurdley to S.Merritt, 8/14/85.

20

GEGR #448. Also see GMAA, XXV-11, letter RTG to H.W.Hayden, 2/19/13.

21

GEGR #187. See NYT, 3/31/86, 8/3.

22

As will be noted below in Chapters XII-XIV, many of these resolutions were at one time on display at the tomb.

CHAPTER V

1 GMAA, VII-1, letter C.R.Parsons to WRG, 7/28/85.

2 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 1.

3 Ibid, pp. 4-6.

4 Ibid, pp. 7-12. A later source mentions that The Grant Monument Association had 600 members, but this figure is not cited elsewhere, see NYT, 2/19/86, 8.

5 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 10.

6 GMAA, VII-1, letter M.M.O'Brien to RTG, 7/30/85.

7 Ibid, letter "Johny" to Mr. Mayor," 7/30/85. Also see GMAA, IV-4, Annual Report for 1885.

8 GMAA, VII-5, letter G.Sadding to C.A.Arthur, 9/17/85.

9 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 12 and VII-1, letter Mutual Life Insurance Co. to C.A.Arthur, 7/30/85.

10 Winston Weisman, "A New View of Skyscraper History," in Edgar Kaufmann, Jr., The Rise of an American Architecture (New York 1970), p. 124.

11 GMAA, X-11. The Association occupied Room 304 until 5/1/87, when it moved to Room 503. After 5/1/86 the group was charged 50% of the regular rent for the space, of $250.00 per annum, payable quarterly.

12 GMAA, XXV-11, letter RTG to H.W.Hayden, 2/26/12; AL, letter H.W.Hayden to JHD, 3/22/22 and DAB, VII, pp. 578-579.

13 GEGR #389.

14 GMAA, XXI-1, pp. 25-26.

15 GMAA, VII-1, circular addressed to Norwich National Bank, Norwich, Conn., August 1885 and IV-10, letter Postmaster N.D.Sperry of New Haven to O.Hoyt, 9/26/85.

16 GMAA, IV-9, letter to C.P.Pierce to C.M.Vail, 8/15/85 and VII-5, circular to Insurance Companies, 9/25/85.

17 GMAA, IV-9, letter A.R.Whitney to RTG, 8/27/85.

18 Ibid, telegram L.Stewart to A.B.Cornell, 8/12/85.

19 GMAA, VII-2, letter Consumers Coal Co. to RTG, 8/7/85.

20 GMAA, VII-5, letter E.A.Adams to C.A.Arthur, 9/26/85.

21 GMAA, VII-2, letter S.Vos to S.L.M.Barlow, 8/4/85.

22 GMAA, VII-4, letter D.F.Adams to RTG, 8/21/85.

23 GMAA, VII-1, letter A.A.Esdra to WRG, 7/30/85.

24 NYT, 9/14/85, 4/3.

25 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 22.

26 GMAA, VII-4, letter B.S.Pardee to RTG, 8/19/85.

27 Ibid, letter S.H.Hurd to RTG, 8/27/85.

28 Quoted in NYT, 9/27/85, 4/3.

29 GMAA, VII-5, clipping dated 9/2/85 contained in letter L.Morrill to RTG, 9/11/85.

30 Ibid, letter R.L.Olds to RTG, 9/4/85.

31 GMAA, VII-7, postcard S.S.Weatherby to Drexel Morgan & Co., 12/2/85.

32 GMAA, VII-6, letter E.J.Crossett to GMA, 10/7/85.

33 VII-5, quoted in letter S.W.Thompson to A.B.Cornell, 9/12/85.

34 Ibid, letter M.M.White to RTG, 9/26/85.

35 GMAA, VII-6, letter E.Hammond to RTG, 10/6/85.

36 GMAA, VII-1, letter E.Doughty to RTG, 8/1/85.

37 GMAA, VII-5, letter A.S.Cushman to GMA, 9/8/85 and VIII-9, letter R.B.Hayes to JCR, 5/25/92.

38 Footnote III-5.

39 I.e., NYT, 10/30/85, 1/7 and The Riverside Souvenir, op. cit.

40 GMAA, VII-4, letter B.S.Pardee to RTG, 8/19/85; VII-5, letter S.W.Thompson to A.B.Cornell, 9/12/85 and VII-7 letter "A Contributor" to GMA, 11/23/85.

41 Remark by Representative Farquhar of New York on House Floor, see Congressional Record, Vol. XXII, #8, 12/10/90, p. 245.

42 NYT, 10/17/85, 4/2.

43 GMAA, XXV-11, letter H.L.Hotchkiss (n.d.) in reply to T.Denny letter of 12/23/25. It seems that Democrats in general were frequently reluctant to give money to the fund raising effort, see GMAA, VII-10, letter C.Fielder to RTG, 9/3/86.

44 GMAA, XXI-1, pp. 51 ff.

45 E.g. NYT, 10/23/85, 4/6. The Times continued its criticism in the following years, see 4/1/87, 8.

46 GMAA, VII-4, letter W.D.Sloane to C.A.Arthur, 8/25/85.

47 GMAA, IV-10, letter W.Lummis to RTG, 12/24/85.

48 DAB, p. 579. Also see Chapter IX below for the controversy over Greener's salary.

49 GMAA, VII-6, letter S.W.Thompson to RTG, 10/10/85; VI-14, W.Jeuson to RTG, 12/9/85; IV-4, Annual Report for 1885-1886.

50 GMAA, X-21.

51 GMAA, X-12, letter Sisson and Hyatt to A.B.Cornell, 10/8/85; and letter S.Low to A.B.Cornell, 10/13/85.

52 GEGR #334.

53 I.e. GMAA, VII-7, circular 12/7/85; and letter J.Studer to RTG, 11/27/85.

54 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 58.

55 GMAA, IV-8, telegram RTG to A.B.Cornell, 1/28/86, etc., and Chapter 7 Laws of the State of New York for 1886 "An Act to Incorporate The Grant Monument Association."

56 GMAA, IV-4 and 5, Annual Reports and IV-10, letter F.R.Courdert to RTG, 3/30/86.

57 NYTR, 1/28/86, 3; GMAA, V-6, letters A.Dowdney to RTG, 2/2/86 and 2/6/86; circular letter RTG to Member of Congress, 7/20/86; letter E.Viele to RTG, 7/25/86 and NYT, 7/22/86, 5/6 and 7/23/86, 4/2.

58 NYTR, 1/11/86, 2/3.

59 GMAA, X-18, letter W.C.Bryant to GMA, 3/5/90, refers to Association's right to limit photography from 116th Street north. Another source (letter R.B.Williams to R.T.Greener, 10/6/91), mentions a more restricted area under Association control from 122nd to 125th Streets.

60 GMAA, VII-9, letter GMA to St. Luke's Hospital, 5/19/86.

61 NYT, 6/1/86, 7/1 and The Seven Mile Funeral Cortege of General Grant, op. cit.

62 GMAA, VII-9, letter Head of Pharmacy Committee (signature illegible) to RTG, 6/15/86.

63 GMAA, IV-17, Statement of Accounts H.Newcomb to GMA, 10/7/86, and letter Lord, Day and Lord to RTG, 10/13/86.

64 GMAA, VII-10, letter G.W.daCunha to GMA, 12/6/86.

65 GEGR #338 and NYT 12/11/86, 4/7. A second Judge contest was held as well, see NYT 2/24/87, 5/5.

66 NYT, 1/16/87, 7/3.

67 GMAA, IX-9, letter "Two Hungry Jews" to Star, 6/25/87.

68 Ibid, letter "Rothschild" to Star, 6/20/87.

69 Ibid, letter L.J.N.Stark to W.Dorsheimer, 6/9/87 and XIX-5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, passim.

1 NYTR, 7/26/85, 6/2.

2 GMAA, VI-1, letter G.F.Ditson to GMA, 8/5/85, etc. Also see AABN, XXII, 10/22/87, p. 197 for a plan similar to Ditson's.

3 GMAA, VI-1, C.A.Sheafor to GMA, 8/21/85.

4 AABN, 8/8/85, pp. 66-67, and 9/26/85, p. 145.

5 AABN, 9/26/85, pp. 150 ff.

6 Moniteur des Architects, 1885, Plates 65-66, titled "Etats-Unis D'Amerique Concours Pour Le Project D'un Monument Funebre a la Memoire du General Grant."

7 AABN, 10/3/85, pp. 176-177.

8 NYT, 10/11/85, 8/4.

9 See Fig. 87.

10 Brooklyn Magazine, 9/5/85, pp. 9-11.

11 NYTR, 9/6/85, 6.

12 North American Review, 11/1885, pp. 443-453.

13 In response to the article thw GMA advised not to "dictate what style an architect should adopt," see GMAA VI-1, letter G.B.Keller to RTG, 11/27/85.

14 GMAA, VI-1, letter F. Withers to RTG, 9/10/85; NYT, 9/13/85, 9/1 and AABN, 9/15/85, pp. 134 and 138.

15 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 42; NYT 11/10/85, 4/1.

16 GMAA, XXI-1, p. 53; VI-1, Draft Invitation by RTG, 1/86.

17 NYT, 12/16/86, 4/2.

18 AABN, 1/23/86, p. 37.

19 NYT, 12/3/86, 8/1.

20 NYT, 7/25/86, 3/4 and 12/26/86, 7/4. A pamphlet containing DaCunha's design is in Avery Library.

21 SAABE, 2/87, p. 31; 4/87, p. 85 and 5/87, p. 101. As of February, the GMA had 16 designs in hand.

22 Etchler was something of a character. He attempted to bribe RTG into promoting his design (GMAA, VI-3, letter J.Etchler to RTG, 9/3/87) and later took a model of his design to Munich where he fraudently displayed it as the winning design for the Grant Monument (GMAA, VI-7, letter J.Lauber to RTG, 7/6/88).

23 GMAA, VI-2, letter J.H.Rhodes to RTG, 4/11/87; letter J.N.Randolf to RTG, 4/23/87 and letter W.E.Strong to RTG, 5/4/87.

24 GMAA, IV-11, letter W.Lummis to A.B.Cornell 4/18/87.

25 GMAA, VI-2, Competition Announcement, 6/9/87 and NYT, 6/10/87, 8/6.

26 GMAA, VI-2, letter W.Lummis to RTG, 6/24/87.

27 AABN, 8/6/87, p. 58.

28 NYT, 11/1/87, 9/3.

29 NYT, 11/27/87, 9/3.

30 GMAA, VI-7, letter N.Lebrun to RTG, 12/17/88. Draft copies of the competition invitation in VI-3. Seealso NYT, 1/27/88, 8/3.

31 E.g. NYT, 2/5/88, 16/6. Printed copies of the announcement can be found in GMAA, VI-4.

32 GMAA, VI-5, letter Associated Press to GMA, 2/28/88, with London Times clipping.

33 E.g. Le Journal des Arts, 3/30/88, 2/4.

34 GMAA, VI-6, letter AIA to A.B.Cornell and RTG, 3/15/88; letter Architectural League to A.B.Cornell and Executive Committee GMA, (received) 3/30/88; letter Western Association of Architects to A.B.Cornell and Executive Committee GMA, 3/30/88 and VI-7, letter Illinois Association of Architects to A.B.Cornell, 4/88. For press coverage see NYT 3/16/88, 8/6 and AABN, 3/24/88, pp. 142-143.

35 GMAA, VI-7, letter A.Noerr to RTG, 7/2/88. One competitor ended up sending in ten drawings measuring 6x4' each, see NYT, 3/5/89, 9/4.

36 GMAA, VI-5, letter J.H.Kent to RTG, 2/28/88 and VI-6, letter C.C.Yost to RTG, 3/21/88.

37 GMAA, VI-6, letter C.F.Osborne to RTG, 3/22/88.

38 NYT, 2/24/88, 8.

39 NYT, 2/21/90, 2/4 and GMAA, VI-5, 6 and 7.

40 NYT, 11/11/88, 16/7.

41 GMAA, VI-8, letter L.P.Twyeffort to RTG, 3/25/89.

42 Ibid, Report of Committee of Experts, 4/23/89 and NYT 12/12/89, 5/2.

43 GMAA, VI-7, letter M.Schroff to RTG, 10/30/88 and VI-8, letter E.T.Schoonmaker to RTG, 1/4/89.

44 GMAA, VI-7, letter C.O'Reilly to RTG, 12/21/88; IV-5, Annual Report 1888-1889 and NYT 3/5/89, 9/4.

45 According to one source (Building, 10/19/89, p. 131) the GMA sold the privilege to publish a number of the designs in the first competition "to a firm of publishers." This firm in turn resold the rights to publish 15 of the drawings for a $12 fee. The Boston Daily Globe (5/21/89, 4/3) reproduced the drawings along with an unknown number of other periodicals. Later, HW (10/5/89, pp. 801 and 803) and NYW (10/2/89, 5/2) published what were proported to be the winning designs in the first competition (see below). Scattered examples of other entries also exist, such as Russell Thayer's (GMAA, VI-11, #36), Henry O. Avery's (Fig. 87) and a few unidentified designs (e.g. GMAA, VI-11, #53 and GEGR #310). Out of 65 entrants in the competition, names can only be assigned to 43 since all designs were submitted under the cypher system. Thus the architects of all of the known designs cannot be positively identified.

46 Boston Daily Globe, 5/21/89, 4/3 and GMAA, VI-11, #29.

47 GMAA, VI-10, #22.

48 GMAA, VI-8, letter J.E.Ware to RTG, 4/3/89.

49 Ibid, letter Committee of Experts to RTG, 4/25/89.

50 NYT, 5/20/89, 2; Architecture and Building, 3/1/90, p. 104.

51 GMAA, VI-8, report Committee of Experts to GMA, 6/10/89.

52 GMAA, VI-9, report CO'R to A.B.Cornell, 12/16/89.

53 See footnote 45.

54 Entry #52, Motto: Sword and Laurel; NYT 2/21/90, 2/4. For history of firm see Henry F. Withey and Elsie R. Withey, Biographical Dictionary of American Architects (Los Angeles 1956), pp. 128 and 542.

55 GMAA, VI-9, report CO'R to A.B.Cornell, 12/16/89.

56 HW, 10/5/89, p. 803.

57 HW, 9/12/68, p. 578 and 10/24/74, p. 880; also see William J. Hosking, "Lincoln's Tomb," in Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, 1957, pp. 51-61.

58 GEGR #s 311 and 312.

59 Entry #37, Motto: Pro Patria; AABN, 3/8/90, p. 145.

60 HW, 10/5/89, p. 803.

61 Entry #19, Motto: 1822. The spelling of the firm's name varies from one source to another; i.e. Haran and Werkelmann (AABN, 3/8/90, p. 145) and Harsu and Werkelman (Architecture and Building, 3/1/90, p. 104).

62 HW, 10/5/89, p. 803.

63 Marvin Trachtenberg, The Statue of Liberty (New York 1976), p. 178.

64 Entry #1, Motto: Let Us Have Peace.

65 HW, 10/5/89, p. 803.

66 GMAA, VI-10, #1.

67 NYT, 10/13/86, 7/1.

68 GMAA, VI-1, letter G.B.Keller to RTG and C.A.Arthur, 9/12/85. For general history of the Garfield Memorial see pamphlet "Historic and Descriptive Sketch of the Garfield Memorial at Lake View Cemetary (Cleveland 1889)," in GMAA, VI-2. For dedication see HW, 5/30/90, pp. 422-425.

69 Withey, op. cit., p. 543.

70 Quoted in GMAA, VI-9, letter G.B.Keller to C.Collis, 9/8/90.

71 Ibid, letter J.B.Schweinfurth to GMA, 10/8/89.

72 Entry #27, Motto: D.O.M.; see AABN, 3/8/90, p. 145.

73 GMAA, VI-10, #27 and VI-9, report CO'R to A.B.Cornell, 12/16/89.

74 HW, 10/5/89, p. 803 and NYW, 10/2/89, 4/2.

75 GMAA, VI-9, letter J.W.Yost to RTG, 11/8/89 and letter J.B.Schweinfurth to RTG, 11/30/89.

76 GMAA, 8-1, letter S.Parsons to RTG, 10/29/90.

77 GMAA, VI-9, form letter RTG to winners of first competition, 3/18/90.

78 Ibid, letter J.Erwin to RTG, 3/24/90.

79 NYT, 2/21/90, 2/4.

80 HW, 3/22/90, p. 45.

CHAPTER VII

1 NYT, 3/9/90, 4/5.

2 NYT, 3/28/90, 4/7.

3 GMAA, VI-9, report CO'R to A.B.Cornell, 12/16/89.

4 NYT, 4/1/90, 8/2.

5 Copies of this letter do not exist, but it is referred to in GMAA, VI-9, letter J.Ord to C.H.Collis, 4/10/90.

6 GMAA, VI-9, letters RTG to each of five architects, 4/12/90.

7 Ibid, letter five architects to Executive Committee GMA, 4/17/90.

8 Ibid, letter RTG to C.Clinton, 4/26/90. It is interesting to note that much later, General Horace Porter was in the habit of telling reporters that John H. Duncan's design had been selected by a committee of experts (e.g. New York Evening Telegram, 4/2/92). This may have been because he confused the details of the first and second competitions which were both carried out before he joined the Association or he may have intentionally bent the truth a bit in order to add authority to the choice of Duncan's design.

9 GMAA, VI-9, letter M.Schroff to WRG, 4/3/90.

10 GMAA, VI-13, letters J.Schweinfurth to RTG, 5/11/90 and 5/18/90.

11 E.g. GMAA, VI-9, letter Withers and Dickson to RTG, 7/11/90.

12 E.g. GMAA, VI-9, letter J.P.Rinn to RTG, 9/1/90, and letter G.Keller to C.H.Collis, 9/8/90.

13 GMAA, VI-9, letter five architects to Executive Committee, GMA, 8/7/90.

14 Quoted in Grand Army Gazette, 3/88, 3/3.

15 NYT, 9/27/89, 1/7; 10/5/89, 3/2 and 2/21/90, 2/4.

16 Congressional Record, Vol XXI, p. 8307, 8/8/90.

17 GMAA, VI-9, letter C.Clinton to C.Collis, 8/19/90.

18 NYT, 9/3/90, 4/7.

19 NYT, 9/6/90, 8/3; GMAA, VI-9, letter J.Ord to C.Collis, 9/6/90 and letter N.LeBrun to C.Collis, 9/8/90.

20 NYT, 9/3/90, 4/7.

21 See AABN, 10/18/90, plates and GEGR #s 341-344, 380-383.

22 The original typescript statements by all the architects with the exception of N.LeBrun are found in GMAA, VI-9. LeBrun's statement was published in the NYP, 9/12/90, 8/2.

23 See footnote #4.

24 HW, 9/20/90, p. 743.

25 NYT, 9/10/90, 8/1.

26 In all instances, the descriptions of the architects' designs are taken from the sources mentioned in footnote #22 above, except as noted. For LeBrun's reference to concrete see GMAA, VI-9, letter N.LeBrun to C.Collis, 9/8/90.

27 The Nation, 10/2/90, p. 274.

28 NYH, 9/13/90, 3/1.

29 NYW, 9/13/90, 1/6.

30 Quoted in Architecture and Building, 9/20/90, p. 135.

31 The Nation, 10/2/90, p. 274.

32 Quoted in Architecture and Building, 9/20/90, p. 135.

33 The Nation, 10/2/90, p. 274.

34 NYH, 9/13/90, 3/1.

35 Idem.

36 Quoted in Architecture and Building, 9/20/90, p. 135.

37 The Nation, 10/2/90, p. 274.

38 NYP, 9/9/90, 1/2 and NYS, 9/10/90, 1/6.

39 NYS, 9/10/90, 1/6.