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WD-40: San Diego’s Marketing Miracle

Iris H. W. Engstrand

WD-40 – the formula that is the dream of every person who brands a product.
WD-40 – the blue and yellow can of more than one thousand uses.
WD-40 – the product found worldwide in households of every description.

What was WD-40, a multi-use product, invented to do? Remove rust and prevent corrosion. It does that very well, but that was only the beginning of its rise to fame and, for some, fortune. What else can it do? Its uses range from taking the sting out of ant bites to removing telltale lipstick from collars. This article explains WD-40’s phenomenal history from near obscurity to one of the world’s best-known household products.

The history of WD-40 as a multi-use product is the incredible story of one man’s conviction that if he kept trying, he could eventually discover the chemical reaction he had imagined possible. Iver Norman Lawson, the person who devised the formula, finally achieved success after 39 tries with his water


Iris Engstrand, co-editor of The Journal of San Diego History and professor of history at the University of San Diego, has written extensively on the history of San Diego. Her recent publications include: “A Brief Sketch of San Diego’s Military Presence: 1542-1945,” The Journal of San Diego History, 60 (Winter/Spring 2014). She is currently curating the 1915 Centennial Exhibition at the History Center.
displacement experiment No. 40. Nevertheless, he not only failed to receive significant recognition for his discovery, but, according to his family, turned over the formula to team members at the Rocket Chemical Company for a $500 bonus. Lawson was acknowledged at the time, but his name later became confused with company president Norman B. Larsen.

Norm Lawson (not Larsen as the name is mistaken on the internet and in company materials) was born in Oak Park, Illinois, in 1892. He came to California with his parents at age six, growing up in the Bankers Hill area of San Diego. Lawson attended Stanford University but transferred to the California Institute of Technology, where he received a degree in mechanical engineering in 1918. He worked for San Diego Gas & Electric Company and then, in 1928, founded Airtech, a private flying service at Lindbergh Field. His flying school continued until World War II.

In the early 1950s, Lawson joined some colleagues, one of whom was Cyril E. (Cy) Irving, to form the Rocket Chemical Company. It was first located in Chula Vista and then in National City. One day a naval commander, who was a friend of the Lawson family, asked Norm if he could come up with something to help the US Navy prevent corrosion from ocean salts affecting the gears on the ships. They needed a lubricant—something stable, easy to store, transport and apply. Lawson experimented in the evenings after work in a makeshift laboratory over his garage at 1048 Myrtle Way. His house in San Diego’s Hillcrest suburb still stands, but the garage where he perfected the formula has been rebuilt. Lawson devised mixture after mixture, much to the dismay of his family, until finally— on the 40th try—it worked! He turned his formula over to Rocket Chemical for marketing and distribution.

House at 1048 Myrtle Way, San Diego, where WD-40 was developed. Editors’ collection.
During this period Lawson, who also studied chemistry, was a trustee of the San Diego Natural History Museum, serving fourteen terms as president of the Board from 1951 to 1965. He was instrumental in introducing the Foucault Pendulum into the museum foyer in 1957, where it has remained as one of the most popular exhibits. He also obtained a seismograph to illustrate earth movements in the local area. Norm Lawson died in 1967.8

After WD-40 was perfected as a rust preventative, Cy Irving, representing the Rocket Chemical Company, took it to the Union Oil Dock on San Diego’s embarcadero where the major tuna seiners were serviced. Sam Crivello, owner of Sun Europa, was one of the first to recognize WD-40’s value in preventing rust. His brother Jack Crivello owned the Sun Harbor Cannery and was also interested. Others involved in either the Rocket Chemical Company or the tuna industry at the time included Cy Irving, Louis de Falco and his son Eugene de Falco, and Norm Roulette and son Robert Roulette, husband of Cy Irving’s daughter Marge.

Julius Zolezzi, whose family owned several tuna boats, recalled that Cy Irving brought some WD-40 and a motor to the Union Oil Dock either owned or managed by Sam Crivello. Cy and Sam took the motor and lowered it into the salt water, left it for awhile, and then brought it back up and sprayed it with WD-40 and it started right up. Julius Zolezzi’s father John was on the dock and told Julius the story. He said the product was amazing. Cy said he was looking for an investor so apparently Sam said he would buy 50 percent of the company, which he did at the time.9

Lawson, Cy Irving and several others who had worked at the Rocket Chemical Company in
In the early 1950s, operated in Chula Vista and National City before moving to a site at 5805 Kearny Villa Road in Kearny Mesa in 1955. In October 1957, they entered the consumer products field and decided to expand into a new plant on Alvarado Canyon Road near Mission Gorge Road. Cy’s son Larry worked part time at the chemical company in Mission Valley while awaiting the results of the bar exam. He passed the bar and joined the law firm of Higgs, Fletcher and Mack.

The president of the Rocket Chemical Company in 1957 and 1958 was Norman B. Larsen, which explains the reason why he is often mistakenly credited with the invention of WD-40 instead of Norman Lawson. Norm Larsen did, in fact, expand the uses of the product by repackaging it in aerosol cans. According to The San Diego Union, Larsen saw “a big potential in the rust inhibitor.” WD-40 could be used to “protect auto chrome, free locks, and check rust on razor blades, guns and fishing reels. Uses are almost endless.”

According to Union reporter Carl Plain,

A dozen prominent San Diegans own stock in the chemical company formed...after Larsen moved here from the Seattle area where he engaged in the industrial coatings business. The firm supplies virtually every Western aircraft manufacturer, plus other customers, with protective coatings and storage of tools, dies, jigs and plaster molds, and a clear sprayed-on film to protect aluminum surfaces from corrosion and abrasion.

WD-40, according to the article, was used to protect the outer skin of the Atlas missile from rust and corrosion and the lubricant’s reputation was assured.

Rocket Chemical enlarged its Mission Valley plant by 5,000 square feet in January 1958. They had acquired 30 distributors and were expanding both
Cy Irving was elected to the post of executive vice president and Sam Crivello was elected treasurer, replacing Robert Roulette, who moved into the role of secretary. New directors were Ruel Liggett, Louis de Falco, Fred Brown Sr., Norman Roulette, and John Gregory along with the officers. By this time Larsen announced that the company had representatives in Puerto Rico, Peru, and Pakistan and that their products had “widespread domestic and commercial applications, including protection of metal parts of fishing vessels, and were used in two missiles, which he would not identify and in Remington Rand’s Univac computers.”

On September 20, 1958, Cy Irving, then president of Rocket Chemical Co., Inc., reported that the dollar volume of the company had more than quadrupled in the previous four months. Rocket was “turning out an average of 8,000 pushbutton spray cans of WD-40 multi-use product daily on a $20,000 aerosol can-packing line installed recently in the 3,500-square-foot plant at 4674 Alvarado Canyon Rd.” and the product was “handled by more than 500 San Diego County retail outlets.”

Irving told The San Diego Union that distribution programs were being introduced in Hawaii, the Pacific Northwest, and Alaska with some 15 sales representatives working throughout the United States. He said that new uses were being developed daily that inhibited moisture as well as controlling rust. “Popular uses are on auto chrome tools, marine equipment and metal objects in homes and yards” but surprisingly the demand was as great in the “dry Dakotas” as well as places near lakes and oceans. Owners of the company, which consisted of “about 20 prominent San Diegans” were “weighing offers for its purchase.”

By the end of 1960, Rocket Chemical had expanded into Latin America, Australia, and New Zealand. Irving reported that DeHavilland Aircraft would distribute their products in Australia and New Zealand while Diseños Industriales y Productores of Mexico City were nationally and internationally.
serving as distributors throughout Mexico. The company planned to ship WD-40 to Mexico in 55-gallon drums for repackaging in cans with Spanish language labels. Sample shipments were also going to Japan and sales were “practically double” from the previous year.19

Business at Rocket Chemical progressed at a normal pace through the early 1960s until the heavy rains brought by Hurricane Cindy in the Beaumont-Port Arthur area of Texas caused massive flood damage and created an immediate massive demand for WD-40. Previously, in 1961 the company had shipped 36,000 pounds of the rust preventative to communities from Houston to Galveston after Hurricane Carla soaked the area. Emergency supplies of WD-40 were shipped as fast as possible to combat the new damage caused by Cindy in 1963.20

The demand for WD-40 was growing so rapidly that Rocket Chemical began making plans to expand into a larger plant. In January 1964, Irving told The San Diego Union that the 40 drums holding 55 gallons each destined for Suntesters, Ltd. of London was “the largest overseas shipment ever made by the San Diego company.”21 Such international success led to the new 6,000 square foot facility at 5390 Napa Street extending to the corner of Riley Street. The reputation of the company’s success had become so well known that Rocket Chemical’s president Irving received the Try San Diego County First award from the Chamber of Commerce.22

After United States involvement in Vietnam escalated as a result of the Gulf of Tonkin incident in 1964, troops began to occupy jungle areas where rusting of metal was commonplace. One soldier, who used WD-40 to lubricate his gun, wrote that it saved his life. By 1966, production of WD-40 was up by 50 percent as a rust preventative. On July 7, Irving announced receipt of US government orders for 233,000 cans of the rust inhibitor and that the company had supplied about three hundred 55-gallon drums of liquid WD-40 since the Viet Nam conflict.
began. Reports of two offers to purchase the company were widespread but Irving assured Union financial columnist Frank Rhoades that they had accepted neither. Sales were expected to reach $5 million in 1966—quite a jump from the $3,500 when Irving took over as president in 1957.

The year 1969 saw some important changes in the management of Rocket Chemical. Oscar C. Palmer, a member of the Board of Directors since the early 1950s, took over as interim president and general manager in September, succeeding Irving who retired. Two newcomers—John S. Barry and Gerald (Jerry) Schleif—also joined the company in 1969 and both had a lasting influence on the company.

John S. (Jack) Barry was born August 31, 1924, in Minneapolis. He earned a bachelor’s degree from the University of Minnesota, enlisted in the NROTC, and was accepted at Harvard University for naval training. He later transferred to Columbia University and was preparing to ship out for Japan when World War II ended. Barry then earned a master’s degree in business from MIT and worked for 3M until recalled to serve in the Navy during the Korean War. After his service his ship returned to San Diego where he met and married Cy Irving’s daughter Marian. They moved to Minnesota where John continued at 3M until joining Solar Aircraft in San Diego.

Barry was selected as president and CEO of Rocket Chemical Company in October 1969. He brought his education and marketing experience to the company and increased sales revenue from $2,131,000 in 1969 to nearly $91 million in 1990. Retired federal judge Lawrence (Larry) Irving always believed his brother-in-law would have been “a great role model for the nation’s M.B.A. programs. He never took on debt and all profits were paid back to shareholders.” Current WD-40 Company CEO and president Garry Ridge characterized Barry as “straightforward and honest” and “instrumental in turning the company into what it is today.”

One of Barry’s first suggestions, after just a few weeks at the company, was to change the name to WD-40 Company since, as he commented, “We don’t make rockets.”

From the time that Jack Barry
took over presidency of the company, he continued to expand the plant and move forward with sales, especially overseas and in Latin America. By 1972, M.H. Golden Construction began building new company headquarters to occupy a 49,000 square foot site on Cudahy Place. Articles in *The San Diego Union* usually began with “WD-40 Co. San Diego-based manufacturer of a spray rust inhibitor-lubricant, yesterday reported sales and earnings increases for the three months and nine months ended May 31.” Earnings for each quarter had increased with the highest reaching 71 cents a share on sales of $5,218,000.

In 1973, WD-40 Company went public on the Nasdaq Exchange while revenue reached $7,372,000. Generally stock offerings were oversubscribed while WD-40, in its blue and yellow aerosol cans with red tops, continued to be its sole product. Barry told the shareholders at their annual meeting at the Town and Country Hotel that the company was poised to establish new sales and earnings records in 1974. The president modestly announced that they would “just keep on doing our thing with our one product” since they were “not interested in buying any company, nor in merging with any company.” By that time, however, the company began to hear from the 20-full time employees and random customers that WD-40 had other household uses. The company would need a nation-wide advertising campaign.

In the economically volatile years of the 1970s, the WD-40 Company continued to be strong. In 1975 *The San Diego Union* ran two stories on a single page: “Stocks Dip Dow Down 19 Points,” and “WD-40 Company Share Income up.” In October 1975 WD-40 Company added dividends and reported, “we have plenty of money. We don’t need the funds for growth so we decided we’d give it back to the people who own the company.”
Finally a difficult issue arose in this otherwise Cinderella story. Oscar Palmer, former WD-40 Company interim president for three months in 1969, surprised management at the firm’s annual meeting by voting his 80,000 shares in favor of his own election. Barry and the other eight board members called a recess to see if they had enough proxy votes to fight the challenge. They were successful and the meeting went on with Barry continuing in his position. He announced plans to ship the product by tank wagon to packagers in Los Angeles, Texas, Georgia, Wisconsin, and New Jersey. Georgia had been added the previous year with no additional capital expense necessary. WD-40 was still vital to lubricate the outer skin of Atlas Missiles.

By the mid-1970s, the uses of WD-40 multi-use product had expanded to areas not originally imagined by the company. These included removing road tar and grime from cars, removing crayon marks from walls and flooring, stopping squeaks in electric fans, lubricating prosthetic limbs, removing traces of duct tape and gum residue from all surfaces, loosening stuck zippers, protecting silver from tarnishing, and cleaning guitar strings. Other unconventional uses included keeping flies off cows, pigeons off balconies, removing a python from the undercarriage of a bus in Asia, and protecting the Statue of Liberty from the elements.

Customers continually tried to guess what could possibly be WD-40’s secret ingredients. They came up with all sorts of additives to a solvent naptha petroleum base. Solutions included baby oil, the goop inside lava lamps, Vaseline,
an alkane that was the major product of the red-banded stink bug’s scent gland, or one of the most common definitive guesses—fish oil. New multi uses of WD-40 were increasing almost as fast as the product distributors were expanding. Those in charge in May 1974 continued to be Jack Barry, President, with A.P. Schafer and Jerry Schleif as vice presidents in sales and marketing as company headquarters moved once again to its present location at 1061 Cudahy Place.

Even as the decade of the 1970s was plagued by an energy crisis that affected major industrial nations worldwide, WD-40 Company prospered. Propellants were switched from fluorocarbon to hydrocarbon in 1976, resulting in unit packaging reductions and increased margins. Between 1977 and 1979, company revenue increased from $20,495,000 to $35,215,000. Vice President Schleif welcomed the decade of the 1980s with optimism. In 1982 he announced:

The word is spreading. Four years ago in certain parts of the country, household awareness of WD-40 was under 50 percent. Today, the product developed several years ago to prevent corrosion of Atlas missile components is a household word to more than eighty percent of the nation’s consumers.38

The WD-40 formula has not been changed over the years—only the variety of uses for the slippery product has increased. As Jack Barry explained, “It is a numbers game—the more shelves we’re on, the better the chance a buyer will pick us up—whether it’s in hardware or sporting goods.”39 Despite falling demands following the energy crisis in the United States, WD-40 Company in 1983 had a 3 for 1 common stock split. The company
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had “no plans to change the vehicle that has brought it success and it has no plans to bring out any new products.”

In July 1985, WD-40 Company opened its own manufacturing plant in England. Marketing Vice President Jerry Schleif traveled across the Atlantic to look for distributors in Europe, Africa and the Middle East and line up wholesalers for the United Kingdom. The new 11,000 square-foot English plant was built in Milton Keynes, a new idea in suburban town building off the M1 highway north of London. The company manufactured WD-40 multi-use product concentrate at the new plant and had it packaged by a subcontractor.

By 1993, when WD-40 Company celebrated its 40\textsuperscript{th} anniversary, several key changes had taken place. Garry Ridge had been appointed to head Asia Pacific sales after joining the company as managing director in Australia in 1987. Jack Barry had stepped down in 1990 as company revenue reached $90,990,000. After successfully leading the company since 1969, Barry left the company in good hands. He had seen the United States sales force transition from a commissioned to a direct sales model in 1989. He had worked closely with Jerry Schleif who was named President and Chief Operating Officer in 1990. Company revenue broke the $100 million mark and had reached $108,964,000. Fortune magazine in 1991 named WD-40 Company among “100 of America’s Best Companies.”

WD-40 Company continued to expand under Schleif’s leadership. From a technical standpoint, the product’s propellant was changed from hydrocarbon to CO2 and the company added two new brands—the historic and ever-popular 3-IN-ONE Oil\textsuperscript{44} and T.A.L. 5, a triple additive lubricant designated as having “extra-strength.” By 1992, as a result of a new sales force in Europe, overseas sales in France, Spain, Italy and the Middle East had reached $175 million while revenue in Australia and the Pacific Rim also continued to climb. By 1997, Jerry Schleif, who had been with the company for nearly 30 years, chose to retire and leave the fast-paced life of a CEO behind.

Garry O. Ridge, a native of Sydney, Australia, was named president and CEO...
of WD-40 Company after a successful run as head of WD-40 Company’s Australian subsidiary. An innovative and dynamic leader, Ridge was soon placed in charge of all operations. Under his leadership, the company concentrated both on new product development and its pace of acquisitions. Ridge greatly expanded the firm’s portfolio of brands, widening it outside of lubricants; he eventually liked to tell people that WD-40 company was in the “squeak, smell, and dirt” business. The leader also conveyed the firm’s strategy during this period as expanding from a “brand fortress” focusing on one product to a “fortress of brands.”

Garry Ridge is not a typical CEO of an extremely successful publicly traded company with a product well known and appreciated around the world. In 1999, two years after becoming CEO, he enrolled in the University of San Diego’s Master of Science in Executive Leadership (MSEL) program. Even though his leadership skills had propelled him into a top job, Ridge confessed his reason for taking on the challenge of further education: “I wanted to confirm what I thought I knew and learn what I didn’t know.” He believes the USD program helped him make changes in the company. “I’d learn it on Sunday and use it on Monday…the model we use in the company now is what I developed through my final strategy class at USD. The model has carried us through the last 11-12 years and we’ve tripled the size of the company.”

Ridge’s success in earning a Master’s degree led him to co-author the book *Helping People Win at Work*, with MSEL professor Ken Blanchard. Ridge believed that “mutual trust and direct communication with employees helped WD-40 Company earn top marks in sales and earnings during a recession.” Ridge represents the kind of CEO who listens to suggestions and is not afraid to make changes.

In April 2001 WD-40 Company purchased Global Household Brands for a total of $72.9 million, including $66.8 million in cash. The company saw this as an effort to add both the “smell” and the “dirt” to the “squeak” and resulted in Ridge’s comment about WD-40 Company business. To fund this acquisition, WD-40 Company had to break with tradition. Known historically for paying out most of its earnings in dividends and for having a very low debt load, the company slashed its dividend by 20 percent while its long-term debt ballooned from $10.9 million to

---

Actor R. Lee Ermey posed for a WD-40 ad campaign to help veterans get hired. Photo courtesy WD-40 Company archives.
$76.6 million.\textsuperscript{50} Other purchases were made in 2002 that increased the debt load but despite cuts, WD-40 was still paying out about 50 percent of its earnings to shareholders in the form of dividends.\textsuperscript{51} Other significant improvements under Ridge’s leadership were the Smart Straw, which featured two spraying options and the No-Mess Pen that provided WD-40 in a small portable applicator that has the goal of appealing to women.

During 2007, WD-40 Company opened up a direct sales office in Shanghai and increased its efforts in China and Russia. Despite the Great Recession that lasted twenty months beginning in 2008, WD-40 multi-use product’s unbroken record of growth continued. Surprisingly in 2008, for the first time in the company’s history, over half its revenues were generated outside of the United States. As WD-40 Company continued to develop and expand its fortress of brands and pursue global growth, company leaders set ambitious financial goals for themselves, including reaching over $380 million in sales and more than $40 million in net income by fiscal 2014.\textsuperscript{52}

As CEO Garry Ridge points out, the company relies upon a set of strategic initiatives that have been developed and refined over the years. One of their main goals is to continue as a global leader by leveraging the recognized strengths of WD-40 cans lined up under an array of various multi-use products. Editors’ collection.
WD-40 Company and its multi-use product. Their philosophy of “continuous improvement by optimizing resources, systems, and processes” has kept them ahead of the competition and illustrates Ridge’s commitment to keeping the company in the enviable leadership position it has occupied through the years. In addition to successful marketing and distribution, the company’s employee retention rate is three times the national average.

The personal philosophy Ridge shares with and expects from his nearly 400 employees is the following: “We treat people with respect, we honor each other. We’re here to create memories together, we’re here to do good work, we’re here to keep promises...That’s why we’re here.” In a broader sense, for brand extension and border expansion in a global market, Ridge has put together a select group called “Team Tomorrow.” It is focused on making “tomorrow” as successful as the past in a company that has never been known to move any direction but up.

The history of WD-40 Company, formerly known as Rocket Chemical Company, started with one miraculous product that removed rust, prevented corrosion, and cleaned out residue. Since 1953 an additional thousand or more uses have propelled it into one of San Diego’s greatest business success stories. A group of local San Diegans, many of whom are descended from the first investors, are still involved in the WD-40 Company. Their original solvent and water displacing spray WD-40 was honored in 2014 by the San Diego Air and Space Museum.
for its use in the US space program beginning in the 1950s. The founders have continued to participate and have seen the company expand under the watchful eye of Australian-born Garry Ridge, who has adopted San Diego as his home. His successful leadership style is all about the people—especially the legions of customers around the world who benefit from the multi uses of WD-40.

NOTES


2. Another story about the invention of WD-40 gives credit to two men working at Consolidated Vultee Aircraft (later Convair) who were attempting to find a solution to rust on engine parts. A third “origin story” appeared in the *Costco Connection* explaining that Rocket Chemical gave its three staff members a challenge in 1954 to “create a solvent that would prevent rust, displace water and work as a degreaser, too.” See Eva Shaw, “WD-40 celebrates 60 years of slippery success,” *Costco Connection*, April 2014, p. 41. Facility manager Ken East, also listed as an “original founder” of the company on an internet article “WD-40 Myths, Legends & Fun Facts,” accessed February 28, 2014, insists that he wasn’t “that old.”

3. Norm’s father was listed as a rancher living at 3500 Fifth in San Diego in 1903 and later at 2405 First. Norm’s uncle, Victor Lawson, was editor and publisher of the *Chicago Daily News* and president of the Associated Press, which he helped organize.

4. Lawson designed a glider for Charles Lindbergh.


6. The Lawsons built the house in what was called Marston Hills in 1931.


8. Norm’s mother, Harriet Evelyn (Nichols) Lawson, was president of the Wednesday Club and a member of the Women’s 1915-1916 Exposition Board. He and his first wife Angelina [Marlow] were the parents of Nancy Lawson Gould, an eyewitness to the water displacement experiments. After Angelina’s accidental death, Norm married Orma Tackley Lawson, who was active in civic affairs, especially the San Diego Museum of Art, the Timken Gallery, and the Wednesday Club. She died in 1996 at the age of 103. *The San Diego Union*, May 14, 1996.

9. Julius Zolezzi heard his father tell the story many times. Apparently Sam Crivello lent Cy Irving $5,000 to make more of the product. Other investors were Norm Roulette and his son Bob Roulette (who was married to Cy’s daughter Marge) and Eugene de Falco.

10. *The San Diego Union*, August 25, 1958, noted that Rocket Chemical shared its new plant with Coast Packing Materials Co. and that its principal stockholders were Larsen, president; Robert Roulette, vice president; and Robert Farrar, secretary-treasurer.

11. Lawrence Irving, who was eventually appointed to the federal bench, retired from his judicial position in 1991, and became a mediator. His settlement of the resignation of Mayor Bob Filner of San Diego in 2013 made national headlines.
13. *The San Diego Union*, October 3, 1957, A18. Coincidentally both Norm Lawson and Norm Larsen were born in Chicago and were chemists.
14. The Atlas missile was designed in the late 1950s and produced by the Convair Division of General Dynamics to be used as an intercontinental ballistic missile.
17. Ibid.
26. Gerald Schleif received his BS degree from San Diego State College in 1957 and directed the marketing department of Upjohn Pharmaceutical Company’s agricultural products division before returning to San Diego.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid. Personal interview with Marian Barry, May 2014.
33. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
42. See pages 263-264 for biographical information on Garry Ridge.
44. Developed in 1894 by George W. Cole of Asbury Park, New Jersey, 3-IN ONE Oil serves as a lubricant, rust preventative, and a cleaner.
45. All did not always go smoothly, however, as 10 of the 12 distributors filed lawsuits claiming that
the Company had promised job security in exchange for company loyalty. In some complicated legal maneuverings through 1994, the original case plus an additional one were generally decided in favor of the distributors, costing the company $12.6 million. But profits still outweighed any losses.


48. Ibid.

49. The Company acquired X-14 brand mildew stain removers and bathroom cleaners, Carpet Fresh rug deodorizer, and 2000 Flushes, a long-duration automatic toilet bowl cleaner. Collectively, these brands were generating $70.5 million in revenues at the time they were purchased.


51. Ibid.

52. WD-40 Company 2013 Annual Report. The Annual Report gives an assessment of results in all international areas as well as the US market. For example, in some areas the multi-purpose maintenance products sales grew while household product sales declined. Asia Pacific sales were up by 7 percent while sales in Australia were flat.

53. Ibid., p. 5.

54. Quoted by Ryan Blystone in “Ridge’s Winning Formula: WD-40 MSEL.”


APPENDIX
CURRENT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giles Bateman</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor; retired CFO Price Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter D. Bewley</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor; retired General Counsel, The Clorox Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard A. Collato</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor, retired president and CEO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA of San Diego County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario L. Crivello</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor, retired Managing Owner and Master of Tuna Purse Seiners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda A. Lang</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Chairman and CEO, Jack in the Box, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry O. Ridge</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President and CEO, WD-40 Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory A. Sandfort</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President and CEO, Tractor Supply Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal E. Schmale</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Chair, WD-40 Company; retired President and COO, Sempra Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Tale of the Cabrillo Statues

John Martin

With the building of the replica of San Salvador by the San Diego Maritime Museum, the sixteenth-century flagship of Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo has created a flurry of renewed interest in its captain. Sailing under the flag of Spain on June 17, 1542, Cabrillo navigated his tiny fleet out of the bay at Navidad on the west coast of Mexico and sailed north on a voyage of discovery. His mission was to explore the coast of New Spain, map the Pacific Coast of California with its supposed amazons and riches, navigate the uncharted waters far to the north, and, it was hoped, locate the Strait of Anián, a northwest passage to the Atlantic Ocean. In September, Cabrillo made a landing in present-day Ensenada before pressing up the coast and into history as the first European to enter the bay of San Diego and anchor off today’s Ballast Point.¹

A statue of the navigator now stands at the Visitor Center in the Cabrillo National Monument on the Point Loma peninsula celebrating Cabrillo’s landfall in San Diego. The fourteen-foot tall Monument to Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo at the Cabrillo National Monument, Point Loma. Editors’ collection.

Sketch used to build the replica of San Salvador. Courtesy of the San Diego Maritime Museum.

John Martin, an independent scholar, received his BA and MA degrees in history from San Diego State University. Martin is the author of “The San Diego Chamber of Commerce establishes the U.S. Naval Coal Station, 1900-1912,” The Journal of San Diego History, 56 (Fall 2010). He thanks the staff of the Cabrillo National Monument for their assistance in preparing this article.
white stone effigy of the explorer is poised above the channel entry and the beach where it is believed Cabrillo anchored and came ashore more than four centuries ago. The statue’s conjectural visage imparts a tangible sense of determination and accomplishment. But this statue was not the first. As it turns out, there were four statues involved: two giant versions were proposed but unrealized, while two identical Cabrillo statues have served the Monument since 1949. The tale of these statues—real and imagined—contains almost as many twists and turns as Cabrillo’s voyage of exploration.²

Pursuing A Cabrillo Memorial

The idea to commemorate Cabrillo’s San Diego landing first came to light in 1892. Walter G. Smith, editor of the San Diego Sun, suggested that a festival celebrating the event might boost the city’s slumping economy. The city embraced the concept and Mayor Matthew Sherman opened three days of festivities that included parades, banquets, dances, horse races, and a reenactment of Cabrillo’s arrival. Aside from the flimsy wharf at the end of D Street (today’s Broadway) collapsing and dumping some celebrants into the bay, Discovery Day was a great success. The Sun suggested that it become an annual event, while The San Diego Union went a step further and proposed that the city create a monument to honor Cabrillo.³ The lack of money and organization unfortunately overcame civic enthusiasm. The city staged only one other festival and the support for a Cabrillo memorial likewise faded away.

The Order of Panama, a civic
group probably best known for marching in parades in their colorful, cockled feathered hats, revived the idea of a memorial in 1913. The Order’s ideas ranged from a colossal statue costing $1,500,000, which would exceed the Statue of Liberty in height, to a simple pile of rocks and a descriptive plaque. The organization settled on the grandiose scheme that would replace the abandoned Point Loma lighthouse with a 150-foot tall bronze statue of Cabrillo. Carl Heilbron, president of the organization, believed the colossal figure would attract tourists to San Diego for the coming Panama-California Exposition in 1915 and serve as fitting memorial to the explorer. The Order commissioned British sculptor Allen Hutchinson, then living in San Diego, to create a model of the statue and authorized journalist Charles F. Lummis to write a story describing Cabrillo’s historic arrival.

Over the next two years the Order of Panama’s Cabrillo Monument Committee sought funding for the memorial and worked to gain access to a site near the old lighthouse. The fundraising proved fruitless but the Order did successfully negotiate with the US Army and the War Department to create the Cabrillo National Monument through an Executive Order President Woodrow Wilson issued in 1913. The Order of Panama quietly disbanded at the end of the 1915 Exposition and again visions for a Cabrillo memorial disappeared.

The Native Sons of the Golden West revived the memorial concept in 1926. Like the Order of Panama, the organization petitioned the standing US president, then Calvin Coolidge, for approval to place a monument on the Point Loma Military Reservation. Coolidge, like Wilson, used his presidential power to create historic sites on government property and on May 12, 1926, approved the plan through another executive proclamation. The proclamation noted that because the Order of Panama had never exercised the right to construct a Cabrillo statue, and was now a “defunct organization,” the government could authorize the Native Sons to “erect a suitable monument.” Success seemed assured after the group acquired a $10,000 prize for constructing a 176-foot tall heroic effigy, which would “be to the Pacific coast what the Statue of Liberty is to the Atlantic.” But like the Order of Panama, the best hopes of Native Sons also faltered.

Despite the best intentions of the city, it was twenty-two years before a Cabrillo memorial appeared at the park. In 1933 President Franklin Roosevelt transferred
the Cabrillo National Monument to the War Department and into the care of the National Park Service. The Park Service renovated the old lighthouse and opened it to public viewing in 1936. In the meantime the government designed, funded, and placed an eight-foot bronze engraved plaque memorializing Cabrillo near the old lighthouse. Cabrillo had finally arrived.

**Ed Fletcher Steals A Statue**

In 1939 it appeared that a significant Cabrillo monument was finally coming to San Diego. The Portuguese Secretariat of National Propaganda commissioned sculptor Alvaro de Bree to create a statue of Cabrillo to be displayed at the New York City World’s Fair and then sent to San Diego. But the simple gesture turned into a major episode. Fortunately Ed Fletcher, then a California State Senator, and San Diego/Portuguese resident Lawrence Oliver, President of San Diego’s Portuguese-American Club, left detailed accounts of their roles in bringing the statue to San Diego.7

San Diego’s first claim to the statue came before it had arrived in the United States. In a chapter entitled “The Case of the Kidnapped Statue” in his autobiography, Oliver related that in March 1939 he received a letter from Mr. J. C. Valim, Secretary of the House Committee of Portugal, asking Oliver to raise funds to defray expenses for the House of Portugal at the coming international fairs. Oliver complied and along with funds sent a request that the statue eventually reside in San Diego. Valim and the Committee agreed and it appeared that San Diego had its memorial.

In 1940 the fourteen-foot tall, seven-ton statue made the trans-Atlantic voyage to New York City, but arrived too late to be
displayed. As it would happen, San Diego businessman Joe E. Dryer and US Navy Admirals William H. Standley and Thomas J. Senn attended the New York fair and met with the Portuguese Commissioner Antonio Ferro. Ferro graciously showed the San Diego contingent a replica of the de Bree figure and indicated that the Portuguese government intended the statue to eventually reside in San Diego. Ferro also explained that the tardy statue had already been sent on to the Golden Gate International Exposition opening at Treasure Island in San Francisco.

In the meantime, Dryer and Oliver immediately contacted Fletcher in Sacramento and asked him to see that the statue continued on to San Diego after the fair. Fletcher readily agreed, but had no idea where the statue was located. The statue had made the transcontinental trip but again was a late arrival and not displayed. Fletcher met with Oliver and started the hunt.

The first break came when Fletcher saw an article in a San Francisco newspaper noting that federal customs officials were demanding a $3,800 duty for the release of a statue of Cabrillo. The article also said the Portuguese Vice Consul in San Francisco had approved locating the work of art in a public park in an Oakland community where a large number of people of Portuguese descent resided. When Fletcher learned that Governor Culbert Olson was ready to fulfill that promise, he and Dryer agreed that the statue’s monetary and historic value made it a “prize worth fighting for,” and immediately set out to rescue the statue for San Diego.8

Fletcher’s first move was to mitigate California Governor Culbert Olson’s hold on the statue. When the governor deferred the customs payment, the statue tacitly became the property of the State of California and Fletcher had an opening. Working with the legislative counsel, Fletcher secured a legal opinion arguing that while the governor had the right to accept the statue for the state, only the legislative body had the power to dispose of it. As to the statue,
San Francisco Fair officials had passed the crated statue along to a private individual, apparently a Portuguese national, who stored it across the bay in a garage in Oakland. The second break came thirty days later. In the midst of the search, Oliver and his wife paid a visit to a family friend Mrs. Anna Gomez Lewis. In the course of conversation Oliver mentioned the statue, and Mrs. Lewis asked if he would like to see it. It was in her garage. When Oliver told Fletcher the news, Fletcher said, “leave it to me. We’ll get it.”

Fletcher immediately set out to reclaim San Diego’s statue. Fletcher, his wife Mary, and Senator and Mrs. George Biggar arrived unannounced at the home on a Sunday afternoon. They talked with Mrs. Lewis, a widow, who was more than willing to remove the statue from her garage. More importantly, they convinced her that the statue belonged in San Diego. Mrs. Lewis agreed, but requested additional proof that the disposition was valid.

Fletcher returned to Sacramento and introduced a bill in the State Senate that would send the statue to San Diego. With the support of fellow senators, the bill sailed through the Senate unopposed. But once in the House, Oakland assemblyman George P. Miller shunted the bill into committee where it died. It was a legislative deadlock and a win for the governor. Stymied in the state House, Fletcher convinced his friend Matthew Gleason, President of the State Park Commission, and a San Diego resident, to compose a letter—suitably embossed with the gold state seal—asking the Oakland woman to release the statue to Fletcher.

Armed with the letter and a copy of the Senate Journal showing the Senate’s earlier approval of the move to San Diego, Fletcher returned to Oakland. Sensing the immediacy of the situation and perhaps worried about his tactics, Fletcher had arranged to have transportation standing by to remove the figure at a “moment’s notice.” Mrs. Lewis perused the new documentation and agreed to relinquish the statue.
But as the workers struggled with the heavy crates, she summoned Fletcher into the house to take several telephone calls. Word of Fletcher’s scheme had leaked out.

Phone calls came from the Vice Consul of Portugal and an Oakland attorney, both demanding that Fletcher desist or face legal action. Fletcher reassured the weeping Mrs. Lewis, supervised the loading, and watched the statue transported to the Oakland Santa Fe Railway Station. Hiding crates containing seven-tons of stone was no easy task. But Fletcher had a plan and friends in high places. Fletcher arranged with Mr. E. J. Engle, the President of the Santa Fe Railroad, to have the statue, hidden under a pile of scrap lumber, shipped to San Diego free of charge. San Diego City Manager Fred Rhodes met the train and removed the statue to an undisclosed warehouse for safekeeping.

Oliver said it was kept in a shop downtown at 18th and A Streets. While in storage, the statue underwent repairs to correct the damage it had suffered through its thousands of miles of travel. When the northern California coterie accused Fletcher of “kidnapping” the statue he replied, “I didn’t steal it... but took quick action, and possession is nine points of the law.” San Diego finally had its statue. Or did it?

Fletcher’s deception did not go uncontested. Governor Olson, Oakland Mayor John F. Slavich, Oakland Assemblyman Miller, and the Oakland Portuguese Society launched public campaigns to reclaim their stolen statue. In May 1940, at the behest of the governor, the State Park Commission prepared a document to ask the State Attorney General to demand that the statue be returned to San Francisco. Fletcher deflected this attempt by reminding the commissioners that the State Senate had already passed a bill awarding the figure to San Diego. Fletcher also garnered the support of the Cabrillo Civic Clubs of California and San Diego
Mayor Percy Benbough. The San Diego contingent mostly just ignored the uproar. The controversy continued for years, but with the statue sequestered in San Diego on government property, the point was moot.14

Where to Put Cabrillo

The statue arrived in San Diego in 1940 and underwent a series of relocations. To consolidate the city’s claim, Fletcher encouraged the city to decide on a “final resting place” and lay a cornerstone to prevent the effigy from being “torn down and shipped away.”15 In the weeks after its arrival, the statue was superficially repaired and installed at the foot of Canyon Street and Harbor Drive at the Naval Training Center facing Ballast Point. As a pretense to ensure its safety from Governor Olson and his advocates, the navy posted guards around the figure. The navy moved the figure to the foot of Lowell Street near the Sonar School in 1942 and conducted a small invitation-only dedication ceremony on the 400th anniversary of Cabrillo’s landfall. The figure remained there nine years essentially hidden from public view.

The Portuguese Social and Civic Club revived the Cabrillo celebration in 1946 and immediately complained about the lack of public access to the statue. The Club and San Diego historian Winifred Davidson pressed the city and the government to relocate the statue. They repeatedly chided the city for allowing the sculpture to be “inappropriately” concealed on inaccessible government property away from the populace.16

Public pressure ensured the statue would eventually leave navy property, but where it might be relocated remained

---

Assembly Bill No. 2525 transferring the Cabrillo Statue to Oakland, January 25, 1941. It was not successful.
uncertain. Several groups wanted it placed at the Cabrillo National Monument while the city’s Portuguese community lobbied to locate it at the downtown civic center near the waterfront; one faction preferred the San Diego Yacht Club. A quick decision was needed because the city and the navy were also in the midst of a land exchange undertaking that included the plot where the statue sat. The navy wanted the statue gone and City Manager Rhodes wanted compliance to accommodate the navy. But a new location remained undetermined.17

The National Park Service had long favored moving the statue to the National Monument but thought the city should initiate any action. The army, which dominated the Park area, was the stumbling block. Army officials were reticent to cede any land with future military applications. After months of negotiations

![Governor Culbert Olson objects to removal of statue from Oakland. ©SDHC #LIT 3691.](image1)

![Dedication of Cabrillo statue at Old Spanish Lighthouse. ©SDHC #6653.](image2)
in 1948, the city finally appeased the army and formally requested the Park Service for permission to move the figure onto the Cabrillo National Monument grounds.\textsuperscript{18}

On September 29, 1949, \textit{The San Diego Union} announced that the “wandering” Cabrillo statue was finally at rest. The rededication ceremony took place before 700 attendees near the old lighthouse. With the statue again safely under government control on federal property, the ownership issues finally dissipated. In 1957 the city dedicated another Cabrillo plaque and, in 1966, paid to move the statue to a prominent position in front of the new Visitor Center.

The San Diego Colossus

The same year the de Bree statue was relocated to the Visitor Center, San Diego Mayor Frank Curran resurrected the idea of a colossal Cabrillo. The mayor proposed to replicate the de Bree statue as a monolithic concrete figure standing 168’ tall. The lighted figure would be positioned 1,200 feet north of the lighthouse and be visible from thirty miles at sea.\textsuperscript{19}

The project found immediate traction with the local Portuguese community but less so with the National Park Service until the Portuguese Consul in Los Angeles, Joseph Sigal, offered to assist in securing financing for the huge statue. But the size of the figure and the fact that it was lighted stunned Park Service officials. Internally Cabrillo National Monument Superintendent John Tucker hoped the cost of the project and the complications of dealing with the government would stymie the mayor’s proposal. Publicly the Park Service offered mild resistance through the parameters it placed on the plan. Specifically the project could not overwhelm the original lighthouse, considered the Cabrillo National Monument’s principal attraction, could only be located near the Visitor Center, and both the US government and the government of Portugal had to approve the design.\textsuperscript{20}
Mayor Curran and the committee proceeded under the assumption that the Park Service was in agreement, but unbeknownst to them, the addition of an elevator and observation platform caused the Park Service to intensify its internal campaign to derail the project.\textsuperscript{21}

The mayor appointed a citizen’s committee to pursue the scheme and named August Felando, president of the American Tuna Association, chairman. The committee was tasked to secure the support of Congress, appropriate government agencies, specifically the Federal Aviation Agency because of the height of the structure, and the government of Portugal.\textsuperscript{22} The committee based the legitimacy of the project on the precedent of the presidential proclamations of 1913 and 1926. To reaffirm the legality of the project, Felando’s group resurrected the proposal of the Native Sons, maintaining that it was still active because the organization had never acted on project.

Mayor Curran used his “State of the City” speech in January 1968 as a platform to promote the heroic statue. Curran saw the statue as a unique way to promote the city. During the speech Curran presented an architectural rendering of a figure he believed was comparable to the Statue of Liberty and would “set San Diego apart from most other port cities in the world.”\textsuperscript{23} Curran planned the unveiling to coincide with the 200th anniversary of the city in 1969. The mayor announced that selected members of the citizen’s committee would meet with Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall to solidify the plans and then travel to Portugal to promote the project.

Locally the committee forged ahead. The architectural firm of Hatch, Heimerdinger & Associates gathered the data and San Diego contractor L. J. Ninteman submitted a construction estimate of $1,144,279, for the 2175-ton reinforced concrete project. Curran believed the statue could be financed through private donations and the assistance of the Portuguese government. Tangentially, statue proponents proposed that the park impose a ten-cent fee to take the elevator to

\textit{August Felando, president of the American Tuna Boat Association. Internet photo.}

\textit{San Diego Mayor Frank Curran. Internet photo.}
the uppermost observation platform to offset the $15,000 annual maintenance expenses.

Despite the ground swell of publicity and the backing of the mayor, dissent arose. In the government sector, the Park Service maintained its low profile resistance. Internally Regional Director George Hartzog wrote Secretary of Interior Udall in an attempt to disrupt the project. Hartzog said he was dismayed at the size of the statue, felt it was not in accordance with the intent or scale of the earlier presidential proclamations, and noted that the Cabrillo Monument would require an increased operating budget and the number of personnel. Publicly, Park Service representatives tactfully reminded statue advocates that no government funding would be available for the project and the park had already memorialized Cabrillo.

Locals also began to register disapproval. Letters to newspapers criticized the project. The San Diego Sierra Club expressed its opposition saying the huge effigy would overwhelm the old lighthouse, the park’s principal attraction. Hamilton Marston, of the prominent local family, penned Curran a private note saying that the Cabrillo National Monument, as it stood, possessed a certain 1903 spirit that should be retained and personally did not want to see the larger statue erected.24 Curran and his committee largely ignored the dissent and remained committed to the project.

From this point the project started a slow spiral into implosion. The most pressing issue was funding. The campaign for local private funding lagged and
the Portuguese sources showed signs of hesitation. Then in April, the Portuguese Foundation Calouste Gulbenkian, which had earlier indicated support, suddenly rejected the committee’s application for financing. When the Portuguese government withdrew support, the Park Service and Department of Interior felt no obligation to continue their charade and likewise rejected the project.\(^{25}\) The mayor and his coterie had simply pursued the statue with more passion than pragmatism. By May the project was terminally stalled.

With the colossus in jeopardy, Curran frantically suggested a redesign. The Park Service agreed and the mayoral committee authorized a revised design. In December 1968 Director Hartzog requested that the Interior Department’s Advisory Board on National Parks appoint a subcommittee to study and make recommendations on Curran’s new proposal. The revised plans proposed to surround the existing statue with a reflecting pool and enclose it inside a thirty-five to forty-foot masonry shell faced with Portuguese native stone. Accent lights on top of the shell and at the base would project a beam of light upward into the night sky.

In February 1969 the National Park subcommittee arrived in San Diego, reviewed the plans, conducted a site investigation and offered its opinion. On the 17th the committee—Dr. Joe B. Franz, Mr. Nathaniel A. Owings, and Dr. Melvin Payne—met privately in Tucker’s office with Curran, Felando, and Carl Reupsch. Later that evening they attended a public gathering sponsored by the Cabrillo Historical Association. On both occasions the advisory group expressed some reservations, but agreed with the design in principle. But it was a temporary reprieve. The sluggish funding campaign, which had a $339,000 price tag, could not answer the lingering questions about the statue’s size and location. A generally lackadaisical reception doomed the new proposal.\(^{26}\)

Throughout the process Mayor Curran remained unaware of the Park Service’s internal strategy of suppression and was thoroughly shocked when the federal government withdrew support. Years later, Curran voiced his belief that the Park Service had sabotaged his colossal statue.

### The Duplicate Cabrillo

The city moved the de Bree statue from the Naval Training Center to its “permanent resting place” at the Cabrillo National Monument in 1949.\(^{27}\) But after standing unprotected on the Point Loma peninsula for thirty years, vandalism and exposure had taken a toll by the mid-1980s. “A piece of his tunic is clipped off, his nose is cracked along the bridge and a torso crack is acting up,” explained a visiting *Los Angeles Times* reporter. The porous stratified limestone image was slowly deteriorating.\(^{28}\) The Park Service considered moving the statue inside the
Visitor Center or enclosing it in a transparent case. But the figure was too heavy for the former and the latter might diminish the visitor’s visual experience. After a forty-year vigil the Park Service, San Diego citizen groups, and representatives of the Portuguese government, met and agreed to replace the de Bree with a duplicate Cabrillo. The Portuguese government authorized sculptor João Charters de Almeida e Silva to replicate the crumbling de Bree image from sturdier stone.29

With the approval of the Park Service, art specialist Scott Atthowe, ironically from Oakland, supervised the removal of the de Bree statue from the Visitor Center in November 1987. Ensconced within a protective metal framework a crane hoisted the decaying Cabrillo off the pedestal and away. According to current Park Superintendent Tom Workman, rather than storing it in a weatherproof shelter as planned, laborers hauled the de Bree to a spot under the eave of a maintenance building and sealed the metal frame with plywood. The Park was without Cabrillo for the next three months.

In late 1987 Almeida completed the replica in Portugal. Scott Atthowe accompanied the statue on the three-week 7,000-mile voyage aboard the Portuguese Navy Corvette NRP João Coutinho to the Broadway Pier. Workman recalled that the small corvette, with the crated statue strapped to the deck, encountered some rough seas along the way. The crate took on water, which sloshed out at each traffic stop en route to Point Loma. Park Superintendent Gary Cummins formally welcomed the figure at a dedication ceremony that included Almeida, National Park Director William Mott, Portuguese Ambassador João Pereira Bastos, and a host of local celebrities. Cabrillo was back.

Once the Almeida statue was
in place, the National Park Service considered the next step for the original icon. Via a bidding process, the Park Service commissioned art conservator Jason Jones to generate a report on the condition of the statue and a cost for repairs. Jones declared the statue in a “high state of neglect and degradation” and estimated $82,500 for restoration. With no budget for restoration or weatherproof shelter for a refurbished de Bree statue, it remained in the plywood case next to the maintenance building. Workman and Park Historian Robert Munson hoped to see the statue restored and returned to the public eye. They spent the next several years attempting to loan the figure to any public entity that would restore it and display it in a protected environment. They contacted the City of San Diego, the Port District, and the San Diego Portuguese community but found no takers. The de Bree appeared doomed to decay in storage. Then the people of Ensenada offered an alternative.

Cabrillo Returns to Ensenada

The city of Ensenada had a legitimate claim to honor Cabrillo. A week before entering San Diego Bay, the explorer anchored there and named the surrounding area San Mateo. Ensenada’s first true Cabrillo memorial came after Nicholas Saad, then the State Director of Tourism, accompanied a U.S. Department of the
The Park Service stored the crated original statue under the eave of a maintenance building. Photo courtesy of Claudia Turrent.

Interior delegation to Portugal in 1981. Saad met and presented Portuguese President General Antonio Ramalho Eanes with a plaque. Eanes in return sent the city a bronze bust of the explorer. The city displayed the bust at the Sullivan glorietta where it stood as the sole memorial for over forty years. But at Saad’s insistence, the quest for a monumental memorial continued.

Xavier Rivas, a former Director of Tourism in Ensenada, explained it was the determined efforts of Saad—President Emeritus of the Ensenada Festival—that brought the de Bree statue to Ensenada. Ensenada’s pursuit of a Cabrillo commemorative began in the early 1970s when Mary Giglitto of the San Diego Portuguese community invited Saad to attend the San Diego festivities. But forty years passed before Ensenada’s opportunity appeared. Saad’s persistence led Rivas, representing the mayor of Ensenada, to contact the San Diego Portuguese community to discuss the possibility of obtaining a Cabrillo memorial. Aware that the de Bree statue was in storage, in 2010 the Ensenada group met with Giglitto and Zé Duarte Garcia of the San Diego Cabrillo Festival. The ensuing letters, meetings, and negotiations culminated with a formal request from the mayor of Ensenada to the National Park Service to obtain the effigy. The Park Service responded with a proposal.

From the first meetings in 2011, Workman emphasized that the statue was the property of the U.S. Government, hence it could be loaned but not donated or sold. In accordance with the agreement, the Mexicans would pack, transport, and restore the statue, then display it in an appropriate setting. Qualified Mexican restorers were to evaluate the condition of the figure and send a preventative maintenance plan to the Park Service historical staff for review. The Park Service would also inspect the statue annually. The Americans could retrieve the statue at any time and the Mexicans could return it at any time. The parties reached
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A twenty-year loan agreement. Unless an American organization steps forward to reclaim the figure, Workman believes that at the end of the current term, the Park Service will undoubtedly reconfirm the loan.

With the arrangement concluded, Workman traveled to Ensenada to reconnoiter potential display venues. The parties agreed to a site Mayor Enrique Pelayo Torres recommended fronting Ensenada bay. In the meantime, the Mexican contingent had contacted Claudia Turrent, an associate of the Cuatro Cuartos Enterprise, a private development firm, who agreed to underwrite the removal and restoration of the statue.31

In late December 2012, a team of workers from Ensenada arrived on the Cabrillo National Monument grounds to prepare the seventy-year old de Bree Cabrillo for its next venture. After twenty years, the Park Service unsealed the confined statue. According to Munson, the bottom third of the wooden crate was so filled with rat and bird droppings that Atthowe had to wear a hazmat suit to clean it. Turrent recalled the tense moments when the workers detached the statue from the old metal frame, slid a wooden platform beneath the frame, then carefully lifted the statue away. From its degraded appearance, Mexican and American bystanders worried that any sudden movement might fracture and destroy the effigy.

Once disengaged from the frame, the team spent the next eight days preparing the statue for travel. They enclosed the stone work in layers of plastic wrap supported with spray foam, then applied multiple outer layers of heavier, protective material. They packaged the upper piece of the statue, the Pedrau, separately but could not locate the small cross that topped it. With the figure and the piece encased...
and stabilized, they constructed wooden crates and filled the space around the pieces with styrofoam popcorn packing. The Jones Report emphatically stated that the statue should only be moved by “expert haulers.” To the chagrin of the park people, on the morning of December 28, 2012, the Mexican workers strapped the crated statue vertically onto a pick-up truck drawn flatbed trailer and departed. The mini convoy maneuvered down the Point Loma Peninsula to Interstate 5 South, crossed the international border, and headed south on Highway 1 to Ensenada. Workman and Munson admitted they never thought it would survive the trip.

Following a nervous ride along the Baja California coast, workers off-loaded the crates that evening in the back lot of the Riviera Cultural Center. The statue remained enclosed until March while local artisans created an igloo shaped thatch pavilion where the restorers would work. When the statue was finally uncrated, Turrent recalled the anxiety that Cabrillo might have incurred further damage on the ninety-mile road trip. But amidst fanfare and celebration, the de Bree was revealed ready for repairs.

The restoration process began in mid-March under the direction of noted Arizona conservationist Erma Duran. The three-month restoration took place in the hut behind the Riviera Cultural Center. As a work of public art, Duran encouraged people to come, sit inside the hut, and watch the renovation. Working with the natural light leeching through the wood woven structure, the restoration team assembled a scaffold around the figure, cleaned and removed stains, and collected residue from the stone to recreate a perfect color match for the emulsion used to repair cracks. Duran also identified a natural product to coat the statue to protect it from the elements. As the dedication date approached, workers re-crated the renewed statue and moved it to a circular display area in front of the Riviera building.

There were unexpected issues. Even before the statue arrived in Ensenada, a dispute arose over the site that Mayor Pelayo had recommended and Workman approved. Officials in the Ensenada Port Commission unexpectedly questioned Erma Duran led the Mexican restoration team. Photo courtesy of Claudia Turrent.
the selected waterfront site. The Ensenada group suggested a site near a ship repair facility, which Workman rejected. Rather than debate and delay the installation, with the support of Saad and Turrent, Mayor Pelayo recommended a temporary location at the city-owned Riviera Cultural Center, a designated National Historical Monument site.

Workman, unaware of the site change until he arrived at the dedication, positively acknowledged the new location to Saad at the ceremony. The statue had also arrived without its cross. Turrent said it was not attached when they packed and removed the statue and they had no idea of its whereabouts. Saad and Turrent noted that another hitch came when the president of the Cabrillo Festival, Idalmiro da Rosa, bristled at the tacit acceptance of Cabrillo as a Spaniard. By agreement they attached a plaque on the statue pedestal indicating Cabrillo’s Portuguese heritage. Nevertheless, there is a body of evidence pointing to Cabrillo’s Spanish origins.

With only minor restoration details remaining, the city dedicated the statue on September 17, 2013, the 471st anniversary of Cabrillo’s landing. Speaking for the San Diego Portuguese community, Zé Garcia expressed pleasure that the statue, which he believes represents the soul of Cabrillo, now resides in Ensenada and is available to the public.33

After twenty-four years in storage, the original de Bree Cabrillo is in its first year of display in Ensenada. The cities of San Diego and Ensenada, which enjoy a shared legacy of Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo’s historic journey, now share a memorial.
Replica or original, in each city the statues celebrate Cabrillo’s heroic adventure and reflect the civic pride in his historic discovery.

The Quest To Celebrate Cabrillo

The efforts of the citizens of San Diego to memorialize Cabrillo have spanned over 120 years. The quest was a wild ride that involved the city, private citizens, civic organizations, state government, the federal government, the government and citizens of Portugal, and later the city government and private citizens of Ensenada, Mexico. The pursuit of a Cabrillo cenotaph has extended from the first public celebrations of the 1890s to the establishment of the Cabrillo National Monument, and the efforts to construct a heroic statue in 1913 and 1923. It continued through Ed Fletcher’s pursuit and apprehension of the de Bree statue in 1940, the dedication of the statue on Monument grounds in 1949, the effigy’s move to the new Visitor Center and Mayor Curran’s unsuccessful giant revised display in the late 1960s, to installing a replica Cabrillo in 1987, and finally moving the de Bree to Mexico. These episodes taken together reflect the civic passion to celebrate Cabrillo, whether Portuguese or Spaniard, and the transnational appeal to commemorate his memory.
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Lest We Forget: The San Diego Veterans War Memorial Building

Alexander D. Bevil

“No one is ever gone as long as someone still has memories of them.”

On the morning of June 24, 2000, a small group gathered on the brick terrace in front of the San Diego Veterans War Memorial Building. Among the group of elderly veterans, public officials, and other attendees were local community activists who were quietly celebrating a victory. They had successfully prevented the City of San Diego from demolishing the building to provide additional...
parking for the nearby San Diego Zoo. A key part of their campaign was to have the building listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a unique local example of a Living Memorial. One of hundreds of such buildings built across the nation during and immediately after World War II, it was dedicated to those San Diego servicemen and women who fought and died during the war. As a Living Memorial, it was not meant to be a static monument but a functional utilitarian building where veteran and other civic groups could meet, relax, and socialize so that “patriotism might be renewed and gratitude nourished.”

San Diego’s Veterans War Memorial Building’s origins begin late in 1942, during the height of the United States’ involvement in World War II. A local committee at that time lobbied the San Diego City Council to construct and dedicate a memorial to the city’s war dead, as well as to its returning veterans. Instead of a static memorial, the committee insisted that it be a utilitarian multi-use public facility. The committee also recommended that the proposed building be erected on Lane Field, a city-owned ballpark adjacent to a railroad freight yard at Pacific Highway and Broadway. Extending two blocks north from Broadway to B Street, the building would be an integral part of the planned development of San Diego’s downtown harbor district. The city commissioned local architects John S. Siebert and Samuel W. Hamill to design the new memorial building.

Both Siebert and Hamill had already contributed to San Diego’s built environment. German-born John Selmar Siebert had immigrated to the United States in 1873. An 1886 architectural and civil engineering graduate of Pennsylvania’s Lehigh University, Siebert relocated to San Diego in 1909, where he became a founding member of the San Diego Architectural Association. Siebert’s design of the monumental radio towers for the US Navy’s Chollas Heights Radio Station led to his appointment as a construction inspector for the Navy’s San Diego and San Francisco Public Works programs during World War I. From 1919 to 1923, he contributed to the design and construction of the San Diego Naval Destroyer Base, Fuel Depot, Air Station, and Marine Base. Siebert concurrently worked on projects for the City of San Diego, devoting much of his time improving San Diego’s uniform building code. It was probably due to his years of experience with military and local government projects that the City chose Siebert as the

proposed San Diego Veterans War Memorial Building project’s senior architect.\textsuperscript{6}

Siebert’s junior partner, Samuel Wood Hamill, had come to San Diego from his native Globe, Arizona, in 1908. After graduating with honors from UC Berkeley’s School of Architecture in 1927, Hamill immediately went to work for the architectural firm of Richard Requa and Herbert L. Jackson. Under Requa and Jackson’s direction, he and fellow staff architect Lilian Rice designed Rancho Santa Fe’s central business district and several impressive homes in the Mediterranean Revival, or, in what Requa termed, the “Southern California” style.\textsuperscript{7}

During the early 1930s, Hamill became a junior partner at Requa and Jackson, where he served as the lead architect in preparing a master plan for the San Diego County fairgrounds at Del Mar, and for remodeling the House of Hospitality for the 1935 California Pacific International Exposition in Balboa Park. Hamill was also responsible for designing the Exposition’s Casa de Tempo, a two-story Monterey Revival style model home that would be raffled away during the Exposition. In 1936, in a surprise move, the federal Works Project Administration (WPA) chose the then 32-year-old Hamill as the chief supervisory architect of the new Civic/County Administration Center Project over the more experienced and noteworthy design committee member architects, Requa, Templeton Johnson, and Louis Gill. Dedicated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938, the building’s design exhibits elements of a “stripped-down” Beaux-Art Classicism with hints of Spanish/Mediterranean Revival style details.\textsuperscript{8} In 1940, Hamill, who was no
longer affiliated with Requa and Jackson, formed a new partnership with John S. Siebert for the Veterans War Memorial Building’s proposal.¹⁰

Siebert and Hamill’s initial design of the Veterans Memorial Building was similar in scale, form, and materials to both the Civic/County Administration Center and Templeton Johnson’s earlier 1937 WPA-funded design for downtown San Diego’s U.S. Post Office.¹¹ Like the former, the Veterans War Memorial Building would feature a 100-foot diameter central rotunda surrounded by various veterans’ organizations’ offices and meeting halls. On the building’s south, or Broadway-facing exposure, would be a 2,500-seat theater, with a 100-foot-wide proscenium arch that “would rival that of the New York City’s famed Radio City Music Hall.” In addition, the building’s great hall and theater could serve as a convention center with an auditorium large enough for automobile and industrial shows. The basement would house several kitchens, dining rooms and other facilities for the veterans groups or the general public’s use.¹²

While San Diego’s proposed multi-use Veterans War Memorial Building was one of the earliest that any American city conceived of during World War II, the overall concept was based on an earlier nation-wide “Living Monument
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Sketch of Veterans War Memorial Building in The San Diego Union, January 7, 1948. ©SDHC Research Archives.
Movement” that originated during the latter stages of World War I. At this time, various American veterans organizations called for their local municipalities to build living memorials to perpetuate the memory of local servicemen and women who had served or been killed during the Great War. The result was a revolution in the spirit of American architectural expression and land use planning. Prior to 1920, an Egyptian style marble obelisk, or a monumental statue of a “bronze man on a bronze horse,” personified a town’s commemoration of its war dead.

After the carnage of World War I, Americans began to recognize that bravery and sacrifice were not matters of rank. The editors of American City promoted the idea that a true modern war memorial should not be a “monument to the conquering war hero, but to the anonymous soldiers, living and dead.” For the quarter of a century following the war, many American communities chose to erect useful multi-functional buildings that commemorated the collective spirit of those who fought while, at the same time, effectively serving the community’s needs. Local municipalities across the nation erected buildings, auditoriums, libraries, schools, playgrounds, parks, and other types of service structures dedicated to their veterans. Other communities suggested that they commemorate their veterans by planting trees, constructing highways or parkways, or, like San Diego, building convention centers in their honor.

Goldsboro, North Carolina, was one of the first American municipalities to build a “living” war memorial building. Dedicated on June 26, 1925, it provided office and meeting space for various community and charitable organizations, as well as for organized recreational activities. Soon other cities and towns followed Goldsboro’s lead. El Paso, Texas, Springfield, Illinois, and Honolulu, Hawaii built memorial pools and parks. Van Wert, Ohio, transformed an abandoned cemetery into a community park. Savannah, Georgia, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, constructed memorial drives. Circleville, Ohio, and Richmond, Virginia, built memorial carillon towers. The northern California community of Woodminster, overlooking San Francisco Bay, constructed a 3,000-seat outdoor theater that featured an illuminated cascading fountain. In southern California, Santa Monica constructed an outdoor theater flanked by newly planted native cypress trees and shrubs on the grounds of a high school. As the movement progressed, civic leaders and veterans groups decided that buildings of great community value were best suited as living memorials. As a result, two types of memorials began to dominate the urban landscape: large auditoriums or small community centers.

In San Diego, remembrance was limited to a privately donated bronze memorial plaque. Mounted in Balboa Park’s American Legion Building on November 15, 1926, it listed San Diego’s war dead.

With the United States’ entry into World War II in 1941, Americans were...
once again faced with commemorating the sacrifices made by a new generation of servicemen and women. Communities discussing the idea of designing and building fitting memorials to the patriotism, duty, and personal sacrifice of its local sons and daughters. This gave added impetus to the American Living Memorial Movement. In addition to commemorating their heroism, the new memorials would serve a community’s needs “while promoting democracy at the local level.”

By its very nature, a utilitarian multi-use war memorial building should be able to develop “an alert, satisfied, loyal, and expressive population,” according to an article written in the October 1944 issue of American City. A municipal war memorial as a community center is “a must…because such a center, well administered, is the best facility yet devised for promoting unity and individual growth among all the people.”

The promotion of a “living” war memorial during World War II soon spread to the United States’ allies. In 1944, Britain’s Minister of Town and Country Planning, the Rt. Hon. W. S. Morrison, wrote:

> We know that after the war we must build and rebuild not only for ourselves but for generations that will come after us. We shall, I think, build too with the sense that we are thus creating worthy memorials to the heroes and heroines of this war.

Likewise, the Dominion of Canada chose to make war memorials both useful and aesthetically pleasing, while contributing to the health and culture of the nation. Norman S. Dowd, executive secretary of the Canadian Congress of Labor, expressed these views by saying, “It is unquestionably the view of the workers of Canada…that war memorials should take the form of community halls, libraries, recreation and other community centers, rather than sculptured stone or bronze.”

Back in the United States, in 1944, the New York Herald Tribune published a letter stating that such monuments as London’s Trafalgar Square, Paris’ Arc de Triomphe, or New York City’s Columbus Circle “are monuments to the dead.” The article continued:
We are fighting for our lives, for peace and decency. These are not mock phrases, but simple matter-of-fact phrases which will inspire every architect, engineer, city planner, every citizen with a will to create a memorial worthy of those who died that others may live!20

By 1945, nearly every town in America was thinking of building some form of war memorial. Some people, however, questioned the advisability of erecting a veterans’ memorial while the nation was still at war. “Shouldn’t a community,” they asked, “wait until its fighting sons and daughters are all home again before they build a memorial in their honor?” In response, the *Service Men’s Weekly News Letter* conducted a survey of local servicemen and women and asked their thoughts on what constitutes a proper memorial and when should it be built. Of the 3,500 respondents, they stated unanimously, “No more stone cannons. No more stone statues. No more granite pillars. And no more parks with flowers.” The majority wanted their hometown to “build a community center, a real one..., which will answer all the needs of our town.” On the issue of when it should be built, they stated,
Start it now! Don’t wait until the war is over. The men at the front are fighting [and dying] for just such things as a community, which takes hold and works together to provide something useful and worthwhile for those who come back...And build it to last, build it for the future and build it for our sons and daughters, for their better health, for their better sportsmanship, for their better community living.

The people back home saw this as “a directive from the front lines.”

In an attempt to assist local communities in planning their war memorials, the National Recreation Association (NRA) published a pamphlet, “Community Recreation Buildings as War Memorials,” which recommended the following:

Beauty, through simplicity in design and utility through functional efficiency are two chief objectives in planning a memorial community building. The site should be as near as possible to the center of the city or neighborhood the building is to serve. It should be sufficiently large to provide an adequate and appropriate setting for the building.

It continued:

1. A memorial building should possess dignity, simplicity, and good taste, which helps to establish or maintain a high architectural standard for the community.
2. The building’s interior should be planned to provide an attractive, hospitable center where the people can enjoy the activities made possible by the building.
3. Through the use of sound planning practices, careful consideration should also be given to the size, shape, and arrangement of the individual rooms, because, these factors affect the efficiency of the building and the economy of its operation, maintenance and use.
4. A properly planned corridor and lobby space would direct pedestrian movement into and throughout the building. A large lobby, in turn, would facilitate ingress into the auditorium.
5. Large access doors would allow large numbers of people into the lobby from outside the building.
6. Conversely, narrow corridors leading from separate entrances, could lead to hobby or craft rooms. Designed to accommodate small groups, they could be placed farther from the entrance.
7. Interior doors should be arranged so that no one was required to pass through one room in order to reach another.
8. Coatrooms should be placed where people can check their wraps and move on to the activity room without retracing their steps.  
9. A war memorial building that offered multiple use possibilities was “highly desirable and is generally essential,” according to the NRA, “Few building facilities especially in small communities, can be devoted to a single purpose.” Most rooms should be planned for a variety of uses, the most frequent being a combined gymnasium and auditorium. In addition to athletic events, the auditorium and smaller rooms could be used for such widely divergent activities as square dancing, choral rehearsals, lectures, bridge parties, hobby activities, as well as group, club, and committee meetings.

Other sound planning principles that the NRA expounded included the placement of the building manager’s office close to the main lobby, where he or she could have a chance to greet and get acquainted with visitors. Economy of use and maintenance were other concerns. Throughout the building, construction
materials and equipment “should be selected with a view to the nature of the activities to be carried out in the respective units.”

Finally, the NRA recommended that a proposed war memorial building’s designers and builders should consult with local leaders “since they are most aware of the community’s interests and needs.” It also recommended that they consult or hire “people experienced in the field of recreation and in the operation of recreation facilities” in order to “prevent many mistakes in planning.” Their expertise would be invaluable in indicating, according to the NRA, “how the location, size, and equipment of the various features affect the problems of operating and maintaining the building.”

Most of these concepts were already in place in Siebert and Hamill’s proposed design. Political pressure, however, would delay San Diego’s war memorial building for the next seven years. In April 1944, City Planning Director Glenn A. Rick opposed the Lane Field site, claiming it was an inappropriate location. First, according to Rick, it lacked adequate parking space, which restricted its use as a convention hall or auditorium. Second, because of its size, it would take up valuable tideland, inhibiting the harbor area’s future development. Third, due to budgetary constraints, he felt that it would be best to downsize the proposed war memorial building from a large auditorium/convention center to a smaller community center.

As a result, the San Diego City Council considered nine alternative locations. Five of the proposed sites were in Balboa Park. Located midway between downtown San Diego and nearby suburban communities, the park already possessed a number of architecturally significant buildings adapted for public use. Many dated from two expositions held in 1915 and 1935. The 1915 Exposition buildings were designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style, while the majority of the 1935-built buildings were in the more modern Art Deco and Art Moderne styles. During World War II, the US government had taken over the park buildings for temporary use as adjunct naval
hospital facilities. By 1944, however, city planners were optimistic that the park would soon return to public use. They reasoned that the addition of a veterans war memorial building in the park would be an added attraction.29

The former Pueblo Village complex along Park Boulevard was proposed as a site for the memorial. Located north of the entrance to the San Diego Zoo, west of Park Boulevard and just south of Theodore Roosevelt Memorial High School, the Santa Fe Railway had built it during the 1915 Exposition to resemble a multi-level Southwestern Native American Pueblo. On July 18, 1946, the City Council ordered the San Diego Fire Department to burn down the then-vacant structure.30

Meanwhile, Director Glenn Rick, along with City Councilmen Ernest J. Boud and Walter Austin, wanted the veterans memorial building in the proposed Cedar Street Mall Project. Considered second in importance only to the development of Mission Bay Park as part of San Diego’s municipal post-war construction program, the mall would link the City/County Administration Center on Harbor Drive up along Cedar Street to Balboa Park. The mall’s chief disadvantage was its prohibitive cost, because most of the property would either have to be purchased or acquired from private owners through condemnation.31

San Diego’s veterans had conflicting views as to the memorial building’s location. Captain Homer Hacker, who had led a group of vociferous veterans that had lobbied for a Balboa Park site as early as 1943, supported the abandoned Pueblo Village site. Nevertheless, Carl Zahn, commander of American Legion Post 6, regarded the Hacker group as a splinter organization. Zahn, who favored...
the Cedar Street Mall site, agreed that it would be expensive to build but felt that local taxation and grants from the state and federal governments could meet the building’s proposed $3 million price tag. Both Zahn and Hacker did agree that the building’s ownership and control should go exclusively to veterans’ organizations. City Councilman Boud, a veteran of World War I, said that if the building was to be paid for by taxation, it should be regarded as a publicly owned building, the use of which should not be limited to veterans, but to all San Diegans. He was not, however, opposed to having veterans’ groups operate and occupy the building through a perpetual lease. 32

In 1948, the San Diego City Council agreed to locate the war memorial building on the Pueblo Village site. A sudden windfall had helped make the building a reality. The city had previously reacquired Camp Callan, a former U.S. Army Coastal Artillery training base built on land the federal government leased from the city. After selling the base’s barracks buildings for their lumber and fixtures, the city saw a $300,000 profit. The city would place the money in a special fund to meet the estimated $234,000 needed to design and erect the war memorial building. The city could also use an additional $18,500 from a war trust fund to furnish the building’s interior. This, in effect, resulted in the building being built and furnished as Mayor Harley E. Knox pointed out, “without one cent of cost to the taxpayers.” 33

The city asked Siebert and Hamill to submit a new set of plans for the building. Instead of a massive building that tried to be all things for all people, Siebert and Hamill’s design was scaled back to meet the restrictions of a relatively small site and reduced
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budget. Designed in a new modern style, the modular building would contain a central 500-seat auditorium and six smaller meeting rooms in two side wings.34

Hamill and Siebert based their new design on the two emerging Modern Contemporary styles of the late 1940s: the American International and California Ranch House. The former style influenced the building’s flat-roofed central auditorium with its box-like construction, undecorated stucco-clad walls, and metal-framed plate glass windows. The low-pitched, cross-gable roofs of the opposing side wings, as well as the bands of metal-framed awning windows, were common elements of the ranch house. They were rarely found on homes higher than two stories and almost never on commercial or municipal buildings over one story.35 This made the Veterans War Memorial Building unique and, quite possibly, the prototype for similar public schools, libraries, and administration centers built between 1950 and 1970.36

A few months before the building’s completion, all work stopped when Retired Navy Admiral William H. Standley, a former ambassador to Russia, complained to the City Council about the proposed inscription on one of the building’s two dedicatory bronze plaques. He objected to the phrase, “veterans who have fought for the Four Freedoms.” Popularized by Franklin D. Roosevelt and immortalized in a series of paintings by Norman Rockwell, the Four Freedoms—Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Religion, Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear—were considered to be basic human rights. Admiral Standley, however, regarded the Four Freedoms (particularly “Freedom from Want”) as having “Communistic connotations.”37

As a result, the City Council voted 4-3 to ask City Manager O. W. Campbell if the inscription could read:

DEDICATED BY THE CITIZENS OF SAN DIEGO AS A LIVING MEMORIAL TO OUR HONORED DEAD OF ALL WARS.38

The council’s decision made national headlines. Meanwhile, the majority of San Diego’s veterans and Central Labor Council objected, demanding that the Four Freedoms be reinstated. The council acquiesced, and recommended that the Four Freedoms plaque inscription should stay.39

On Thursday, June 24, 1950, a brief but impressive ceremony was held on the brick terrace in front of San Diego’s new Veterans War Memorial Building. Before a sizeable crowd, which included representatives from San Diego Council of Veterans Organizations, were Mayor Harley Knox, members of the City Council, a number of other public officials, and several military officials. Also in attendance were delegates from the California Disabled American Veterans Association, who
were attending their 29th Annual Convention in San Diego. Allan Lane, vice president of Veterans War Memorial Building, Inc., the non-profit corporation that would operate the building, was Master of Ceremonies. He introduced Mayor Knox, who gave a short history of the building’s development. Knox concluded by saying, “In this building San Diego has beaten swords into something better than plowshares.” The mayor then turned the keys over to Ambrose Redmond, president of Veterans War Memorial Building, Inc. All rose when Dr. Roy Campbell said a prayer, dedicating the building to the memory of San Diego’s war dead and to surviving veterans, from all wars, past, present, and future. Following Dr. Campbell’s prayer, the United States Marine Recruit Depot Band played the National Anthem as the Colors were raised up the new flagpole.

San Diego’s Veterans War Memorial Building was the first major public building erected in Balboa Park after World War II, continuing a 35-year tradition of placing such buildings in the park. On the national level, it was one of at least 365 living memorials planned or completed in this country at the time. Of these, 53 were used as community buildings and auditoriums; the remainder were parks, playgrounds, athletic stadiums, library, swimming pools, or other recreational civic improvement. More than half had a permanent maintenance fund. The majority also had dedicatory memorial bronze plaques so that, according to American City, “the living that will enjoy a better life through their community memorial may be reminded of those who sacrificed their lives for the greater good.”

San Diego’s Veterans War Memorial Building is a product of post-war America built by a generation that “fought the good war” and now sought to remember its local heroes. Not long after its completion, the concept of commemorating local veterans and war dead with “living” war memorials had already begun to phase out. After the Korean War (1950-1953), many communities felt less inclined...
to commemorate their soldiers in this way. Not until the completion of the 1982 National Vietnam Veterans War Memorial in Washington, D.C. did Americans, once again, begin to appreciate large public war memorials.42

The San Diego Veterans War Memorial Building remains an important part of people’s everyday lives. Besides serving as a meeting place for various local veterans’ organizations, it is used by local residents as an affordable meeting and recreational use center. Each time they enter the front foyer, the two bronze plaques and memorabilia in the foyer remind them that it is a “living memorial.” Through their continued use of the building, they commemorate the contribution and sacrifice made by San Diegans who fought and died so that democracy could be promoted at the local level.43

In 1999, the need for additional parking spaces in Balboa Park threatened the survival of the memorial. The San Diego Zoological Society, hoping to expand the San Diego Zoo toward Park Boulevard, asked the city to demolish and replace the Veterans War Memorial Building with a multilevel underground parking structure.44 The proposal, which would also have removed the historic Balboa Park Carousel and Miniature Railroad, produced an onslaught of criticism from local neighborhood and veterans groups. The former argued that the proposal would take away 24 acres of public parkland, leaving “more zoo and less grass to picnic and play on.” A representative member of the Uptown Community Planning Group admonished the Zoological Society, “No expansion, not one inch. Be creative with what you have!” Likewise, members of local veterans’ groups regarded the proposed demolition as being tantamount to desecration. Hadn’t Rev. Campbell, they argued, consecrated the building by prayer to the memory of San Diego’s war dead and surviving veterans during the building’s dedication?45

Rallying their forces, members of the ad hoc Balboa Park Preservationists group sought to derail the Zoological Society’s plan through a public awareness program. During one of its meetings, a member suggested that one of the best ways to prevent the Zoo’s expansion would be to nominate the Veterans War Memorial Building for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. With the group’s approval, he volunteered to prepare the nomination gratis in their name and submit it to the California Office of Historic Preservation for consideration by the California State Historical Resources Commission. Placement on the National Register would provide a degree of protection, mainly during the environmental review process if federal funds or licensing were necessary to demolish the building. More importantly, it would automatically place the building on the California Register of Historical Resources, which would garner its protection under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The latter would require careful consideration as to how the proposed Zoo expansion project might adversely
affect the historical resource. The Balboa Park Preservationists voted to accept the member’s proposal and wholeheartedly supported the nomination.46

With the unanimous support of San Diego’s local Historic Resources Board and the San Diego City Council, the Balboa Park Preservationists were successful in their efforts. On May 26, 2000, the California State Historical Resources Commission unanimously recommended that the San Diego Veterans War Memorial Building in Balboa Park be placed on the National Register of Historic Places. On September 28, 2000, three months after the building’s 50th anniversary rededication ceremonies, the Keeper of the National Register placed the building, as well as the triangular parkland surrounding it, on the National Register. By this act, the building was officially recognized for its association with national events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of San Diego’s history. As a result, the San Diego Zoological Society chose not to pursue its acquisition of the land occupied by San Diego’s Veterans War Memorial Building.47

Placement on the Register highlights the Veterans War Memorial Building’s historical significance as well as its role in the community. The historic building continues to serve as a “Living Memorial” where veterans and civilians are welcome to meet, recreate, and socialize so that “patriotism might be renewed and gratitude nourished.”48
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## War Memorials Listed on the National Register of Historic Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Listed</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Date Built</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97000554</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>Paragould</td>
<td>Paragould War Memorial</td>
<td>Jct. of 3rd and Court Sts.</td>
<td>1997_06_20</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89002065</td>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>Herschell--Spillman Carousel</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1989_12_01</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00001167</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego Veterans’ War Memorial Building - Balboa Park</td>
<td>3325 Zoo Dr.</td>
<td>2000_09_28</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80001283</td>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>War Memorial Natorium</td>
<td>Kalakaua Ave.</td>
<td>1980_08_11</td>
<td>STRUCTURE</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1st “Living War Memorial”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77000625</td>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Louisville War Memorial Auditorium</td>
<td>970 S. 4th St.</td>
<td>1977_12_27</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76002194</td>
<td>MARSHALL ISLANDS</td>
<td>Majuro</td>
<td>Majuro Atoll</td>
<td>Marshall Islands War Memorial Park</td>
<td>Kalap Island</td>
<td>1976_09_30</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>1940-1946</td>
<td>Living museum/par</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90000020</td>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Newton City Hall and War Memorial</td>
<td>1000 Common-wealth Ave.</td>
<td>1990_02_16</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08000445</td>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>West Bridge-water</td>
<td>War Memorial Park</td>
<td>River St.</td>
<td>2008_05_21</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72000632</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Lenawee</td>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Civil War Memorial</td>
<td>Monument Park</td>
<td>1972_0629</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86003480</td>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>Trenton and Mercer County War Memorial; Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Memorial Building</td>
<td>W. Lafayette St.</td>
<td>1986_12_11</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1930-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88002754</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Onondaga County War Memorial</td>
<td>200 Madison St.</td>
<td>1988_12_19</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1949-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95000361</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>Steuben</td>
<td>Corning</td>
<td>World War Memorial Library</td>
<td>149 Pine St.</td>
<td>1995_03_31</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1926-1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01000377</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>World War Memorial Stadium</td>
<td>510 Yanceyville St.</td>
<td>2001_04_12</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1926-1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95000637</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>World War Memorial Building</td>
<td>920 Sumter St., at jct. with Pendleton St.</td>
<td>1995_05_26</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8303011</td>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Soldiers &amp; Sailors World War Memorial</td>
<td>Capitol Ave.</td>
<td>1983_01_27</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99000365</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Dickson County War Memorial Building</td>
<td>225 Center Ave.</td>
<td>1999_03_18</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000979</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>Loudon</td>
<td>Lenoir City</td>
<td>War Memorial Building</td>
<td>103 N. B. St.</td>
<td>2011_12_29</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84000053</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Rich mond</td>
<td>Richmond (Independant City)</td>
<td>Virginia War Memorial Carillon</td>
<td>1300 Blanton Ave.</td>
<td>1984_10_04</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1928-1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79002554</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Community Center and War Memorial Building</td>
<td>1611 Everett Ave.</td>
<td>1979_02_26</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93000227</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>World War Memorial</td>
<td>US 52</td>
<td>1993_04_09</td>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>1928-1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97000787</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Wetzel</td>
<td>New Martinsville</td>
<td>War Memorial Building</td>
<td>501 N. Main St.</td>
<td>1997_07_09</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Balboa Park: The House of Pacific Relations

By James Vaughn

The House of Pacific Relations (HPR) resides in one of the world’s most beautiful venues. Located directly across from the Spreckels Organ Pavilion in Balboa Park, San Diego, the organization occupies nineteen different cottages rather than a single house. Although it is now best known for its Sunday afternoon lawn programs and festivities, this organization boasts a long and proud history of “international cooperation” dating back to 1935. Dignitaries and foreign ministers, most notably president and first lady Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, have toured its premises and been greeted on its lawn.¹

This article provides an overview of the organization’s rich history, beginning in 1935 with the California Pacific International Exposition from which the HPR arose and ending with the House of Palestine in 2003. From its founding, the HPR was an organization that was internationalist and diverse, looking to create a better world.

James M. Vaughn, a recent graduate of Point Loma Nazarene University, currently attends the University of Montana in pursuit of a Master’s degree in 20th-century American History. Work on this article is taken from his senior thesis at Point Loma Nazarene with Professor Kelli McCoy as adviser and Professors Bill Wood, Diana Cordileone, and Karl Martin on the review committee.
through understanding and tolerance. Underlying this framework, however, were American nationalist sentiments that revealed themselves through exhibitions of American cultural forms, displays of patriotism, and an inherent belief in American ideals. The HPR claimed to have global importance and fame but, after World War II, its most important work took place at the community level. The organization brought together people of different nationalities to share their cultures, doing so in a way that celebrated America as the ultimate purveyor of these ideals.

Background and Bylaws

The House of Pacific Relations (HPR), founded as part of the 1935 California Pacific International Exposition in Balboa Park, was intended to be an “experiment in international harmony” that drew together representatives of thirty-two nations. The word “Pacific” in the title meant peaceful. Frank Drugan, executive secretary of the exposition and a former field representative for the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain, served as the HPR’s first director. Fifteen Spanish-vernacular style cottages were constructed on the site of the Montana State Exhibition from the 1915 Panama-California Exposition. Over the course of the 1935 exposition, the organization produced over fifty major cultural programs featuring dancers and singers in their native costumes. Drugan believed that a successful exposition should “fascinate and instruct” the minds and imaginations of the audience and promoted “dramatized entertainment” rather than “beautiful symbolism.”

Drugan was enthusiastic about the potential of the HPR, particularly after hearing that President Franklin Roosevelt had praised the endeavor. Drugan initially imagined that the organization would become “a permanent Latin-American clearing house of vital economic, political, and social information,” and anticipated government funding. He told The San Diego Union, “The President enthusiastically indicated his wish that San Diego in this way would develop something lasting from the Exposition.” Drugan envisioned a perpetual exposition “for all nations of the hemisphere, subsidized by our own government as an...
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effective agency for the perpetuation of peace and profitable relationships among
cities. He and others thought it had the potential to make San Diego “a great
international city.” To that end, he formed an advisory committee of leading San
Diego businessmen that petitioned the city to continue the activities of the HPR.5

In 1936, civic leaders permitted the HPR to remain in Balboa Park under the
direction of Drugan. The organization was allowed to occupy the 15 cottages
already built, without charge. Elated, Drugan spoke in lofty terms about the
growing crisis in the world, the lackluster outcomes of the various disarmament
conferences, and the role the HPR could take in offering “a healthy distraction
from the quarrels now oppressing it.” Its aim would be to “provide a natural,
healthful means of keeping the international mind from going insane under the
sordid strain that world events are putting upon it.”6

In 1937, the first cottages belonged to the British Empire, China, Italy, Japan,
Latin America, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, and the
Irish Free State. Mexico and Sweden were slated to join shortly. By 1948, Denmark,
Germany, Russia, Sweden, Scotland, Poland, Finland, Hungary, Switzerland,
France, and the United States had joined.

The original bylaws of the HPR from 1937 provide valuable insight into the
flavor and spirit of the basis of the organization. Article II described how the
HPR served to “promote a better acquaintance with constitutional government,”
specifically aligning with the Constitution of the United States and its four
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guaranteed freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, and political belief. The bylaw further clarified this rule by stating that political beliefs shall be tolerated as long as they do not interfere with the first three freedoms. This hearkens to a distinctly American conceptualization of governance. In fact, the propagation of this type of government was one of the HPR’s primary functions.

Americanization was intrinsically tied to the organization’s desire to promote understanding among various nationalities. By citing freedoms of religion and political belief, the bylaw allowed for those from varying backgrounds, or different nations, to express themselves through cultural exhibitions as they saw fit. This conceptualization of tolerance and freedom, in some respects, fit neatly within the idea of the American “Melting Pot” that had been envisaged in response to the massive influx of immigrants during the preceding decades. Immigrants were supposed to “become American,” molding and reshaping their old ways to assimilate into a new society that was envisioned as hopeful, optimistic, and fair. Arthur Schlesinger described a “Melting Pot” as a society that viewed its ideal self as unilingual and primarily Anglo-Saxon in cultural form. Its citizens would become representatives of “a new race of man.”

The HPR did not seek to homogenize various peoples under one Anglo-Saxon banner, however. Instead, it saw itself as an organization that preserved and celebrated different cultures through education, song, and dance. Its membership included representatives from several different European countries, Latin America, China, and Japan. The original HPR statement of purpose stated that the cottages existed in order to “promote social and cultural education by the rendition of programs by members of the respective cottages typical of their native culture.”

The most notable example of this education remains the Sunday afternoon lawn program, produced by a different cottage every week to highlight its respective culture. Native languages were included as a part of their culture; the HPR housed speakers of a panoply of languages as opposed to only condoning those who spoke English.
Article III of the bylaws dealt with the membership and composition of the HPR. Of special note are the first two lines stating that a member of the HPR must be a citizen of the United States and be “of good character and reputation.”12 This section adds the resolve to have membership requirements irrespective of race, even though a person’s national origin was certainly a determining factor for membership in an individual house, as “the membership of the House of Pacific Relations [was to be divided] according to Nationality into groups called ‘Cottages.’”13 Becoming a member of a cottage automatically made one a member of the HPR as well. The authors of the bylaws implicitly stipulated a difference between race and nationality. The HPR sought to focus on people’s cultural differences and richness, educating the public at large about them, rather than to highlight differences in appearance or supposed mental capacity. In this, it was a progressive organization touting ideas that sound strikingly modern during a time when eugenics flourished, racism abounded, and a world war loomed.

**Americanization**

The bylaws of the HPR established a uniquely American framework for the organization that found expression in a variety of ways. In 1937, the HPR hosted a
“Festival and Dance” for Thanksgiving. While various countries and nationalities around the world had their own traditions for the giving of thanks, Thanksgiving was a uniquely American holiday. The festival included performances from each of the cottages of the HPR. They often took on a national flavor, such as the “Scottish National Dance” expounded by performers sponsored by the house of the British Empire. Others, such as the performance of “Nadie me Quiere” sponsored by the Latin American house, simply exhibited a popular cultural form rather than reflecting nationalistic sentiment. While each individual national group performed on its own, they all came together at the end of the show to lead the audience in singing “God Bless America” before the general dance began. The HPR symbolically sought to achieve a common ground among them via their new American homeland.

Likewise, the fourth annual Fiesta of Nations in 1942, sponsored by the HPR, had an overarching American theme. The program included traditional folk music and dances such as “Krakowiak,” a traditional Polish folk dance, and “When Irish Eyes are Smiling,” by the Irish cottage. The beginning and end of the program, meanwhile, reminded those present about the stars and stripes uniting the diverse performers. The opening ceremonies consisted of the singing of the Star Spangled Banner and the presentation of colors by a color guard from the ROTC at San Diego High School. The festivities were concluded with a speech given by Carl Joachim (C.J.) Hambro, who was president of the League of Nations at that time and also president of the Norwegian parliament, entitled “The Melting Pot.” The printed program provided the names of women, or “Queens,” who represented their cottages and nations. The very first name on the list, however, was “Uncle Sam” played by a male, Allan Davis.

After World War II, the HPR cooperated with other organizations that promoted American values. In 1952, the HPR assisted in a production, “This is America: An Evening of Brotherhood,” by the Race Relations Commission of the San Diego Council of Churches. The event featured cultural performances from various nations as well as displays of American nationalist sentiment. People at the time often used the terms “race,” “ethnicity,” and even “nationality” interchangeably in everyday speech, but there was a clear difference between the mission of the Race Relations Commission and the HPR as the latter specifically sought peace between nations. Nevertheless, the two groups shared common values.

The HPR was also an active proponent of Christmas, hosting an annual Christmas Pageant in which traditional Christmas carols were performed and sung. It recognized Christmas as both a universal celebration and one that represented an essential part of what it meant to be a twentieth-century American. There was pageantry, lights, glitter, and a Santa whose mission covered the whole
world in one night, bringing presents and joy to children of all nationalities and cultures. In 1943, members wrote, “The immediate program for this organization is to invite and assimilate all of the various nationalities of American citizens who live in San Diego.”

In the early 1940s, the HPR under President John Johnson began a relationship with the Adult Education Department of the San Diego School District. Lenore Panunzio, superintendent of the district’s Americanization work, discussed with Johnson joint activities such as a radio forum entitled “New Americans,” “I am an American,” or “We the People.” San Diego’s Americanization work was a part of a larger federal project called the National Citizenship Education Program that appropriated $14 million for the education of those born in other countries, in conjunction with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. While the Americanization Department was especially interested in the education of foreign-born Americans, it also sought to educate those born in the United States and to bring the two groups closer together. It viewed HPR as an ideal partner as the latter could represent and gather together representatives from San Diego’s various immigrant and ethnic groups. Both organizations sought to educate “all foreign-born groups” in American symbolism, values, and culture while allowing them to preserve their own traditions.

The HPR also began a tradition of close interaction and involvement with the US military. In 1952, Ruth Pearson, the president of the HPR, asked the Marine
Corps for their usual assistance in providing a color guard for the annual Fiesta of Nations. In her letter, she stated, “We usually have a number which is representative of the thought that the US is a melting pot for various nationalities, and the color guard is symbolic of the US, with the statue of liberty against a background of the costumed people in our organization.”

It is interesting to note that these requests were made less than a decade after the Navy’s wartime occupation of the cottages during which, notoriously, the Russian cottage had been ransacked. Old qualms were quickly forgotten, however, as the HPR needed something to provide a very American flair to ground the festivities of the Fiesta of Nations within a traditional American context. Singing the National Anthem and the presentation of colors by a military color guard served as salient reminders for the audience and diverse participants that, despite their various differences, they were now all Americans, first and foremost.

Despite the HPR’s broad commitment to preserving immigrant cultures within an American context, not all San Diegans approved of their activities. In 1950, Mrs. Fred Kleimann criticized the HPR in a letter to the editor of The San Diego Union. She wrote, “It would be a safeguard to our young Americans to do away with those cliques and foreign flags and clinging to old-country traditions. They were glad to leave their native lands. Let them teach young Americans the beauty of the U.S.A.” She continued, “We are a new nation. People should spread out and mix. Some of those old-country races need new blood mixtures to clean up a one-track mind. There should be but one flag in Balboa Park.”

Ruth Pearson, vice president of the HPR, responded, “This local organization has long been recognized by people from many parts of the United States, and even from across the waters, as a small United Nations,” assuming that most people saw the UN as a beneficial organization with positive ideals. She described HPR as a club where foreign speakers could communicate in their own language and a venue in which young people could learn about the arts and culture of “the old country.” She emphasized that members of the HPR, if questioned, would all reply “I am an American,” and that most were US citizens. Kleimann, who had attended activities at the HPR, responded that she, too, was a foreign-born citizen who
had “worked side by side with many races of people.” She insisted, “And if a person becomes a citizen, he renounces the old for the new. He can be but a son of America.”

Kleimann was not alone in emphasizing the importance of embracing American culture at a time when it appeared to be challenged by Communist ideals. The period between 1950 and 1956 experienced what has been called the Second Red Scare, marked by fear that American institutions were being undermined by Soviet agents. US Senator Joseph McCarthy led an anti-Communist political campaign that targeted thousands of Americans suspected of being sympathetic to the Soviet Union. Kleimann’s opinions were indicative of a deeper societal tendency during the early 1950s to combat anything that seemed foreign or “un-American.”

As an organization dedicated to internationalism, the HPR likely attracted the attention of The House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC). In 1954, it responded to social pressures calling for national solidarity and uniformity by voting that each cottage could decide whether or not to display its national flag. Instead of backing down in the face of external pressure, the organization continued to encourage the display of flags from other nations but it allowed the cottages to act as semi-autonomous units. If the HPR was analogous to the
The federal government of the United States, and its cottages to American states, then the HPR made a bold statement about the nature of freedom in politics and society that flew in the face of an expanded Cold War government of the 1950s that tolerated and encouraged censorship and conformity.

In 1963, Balboa Park celebrated its annual Pageant of the Patriots with a 17-nation re-dedication of the House of Pacific Relations to America. The “queen” of each cottage marched to the stage of Spreckels Pavilion, along with a flag and a representative patriot, to greet Rear Admiral Leslie Gehrnes, USN, ret., then President of the HPR. Hungary’s cottage used George Udvary to represent Hungary’s 1956 Freedom Fighters. Udvary had participated in the nationwide revolt against the government of the Hungarian People’s Republic and its Soviet-imposed policies. He told The San Diego Union, “I was in the revolt...I just plain had to leave.”

American citizenship and the American flag found very prominent places at the HPR during the 1950s and 1960s. The letterhead of the House of Denmark showed the flag of the United States and the flag of Denmark, side by side. The recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance became a common occurrence at HPR functions and festivals like the Autumn Festival in 1968. In 1971, the HPR’s letterhead listed the nationalities represented by the organization in alphabetical order, with the exception of the United States which was placed first. Beginning in 1969, the HPR even hosted its own naturalization ceremonies for newly arrived immigrants seeking to become citizens.

In the 1970s, HPR began to emphasize “ethnicity” rather than “nationality.” On
July 4, 1976, HPR celebrated the bicentennial anniversary of America’s Declaration of Independence from Great Britain. A portion of a speech given at that ceremony read:

This organization incorporates and includes many of this country’s virtues and ideals; it brings people of various ethnic groups to its membership, fostering and cultivating a spirit of understanding among peoples of diverse cultures and backgrounds. It strives to promote tolerance and goodwill among groups who have differing social and cultural backgrounds, while promoting and encouraging the retention and recognition of the contributions these various groups have made to our society and way of American life [emphasis added].

Members of the HPR continued to believe that there should be unity among the nationalities living under the American banner, but they adopted new language in the 1970s. The tone of this document sounds more modern, with its discussion of “differing social and cultural backgrounds,” “tolerance,” and “fostering and cultivating a spirit of understanding.” The HPR was not isolated from the world. By 1976 “ethnicity” was in vogue, not “nationality.” While the HPR remained essentially nationalistic, it adopted new language to maintain a progressive appearance in a world with modified terminologies and labels. This response represented a more nuanced form of Americanization as the HPR fell into line with the prevailing language used in American society.
Community Involvement and Notable Guests

The HPR participated in a variety of events hosted by the San Diego community, particularly those involving music and dance. An important cultural form, music historically held a special place in the functions of the HPR. In May 1949, the HPR offered a musical concert and folk dance as part of National Music Week. They also participated in the musical “Music of California through the Years,” showing the organization’s commitment to the history of California and its musical traditions. In 1951, the HPR participated in “This is America,” a presentation sponsored by the San Diego Civic Light Opera Association. While it is unclear what exactly the program entailed, it is likely that the HPR sent people from various cottages who were talented musicians or dancers.

The HPR also established ties with local youth organizations, particularly the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) and the Girl Scouts. These two groups dispensed a typically “American” formulation of the ideal young woman who was active and involved in her community. In 1950, the HPR assisted the YWCA with an event it hosted. In 1953, the HPR began providing educational programs for Girl Scout troops. The HPR lent the scouts flags intended to be used at their annual meeting. The HPR was invited by the local YWCA to provide a luncheon speaker to discuss the activities undertaken by the YWCA in its World Fellowship Activities. In 1962, a local Brownie troop asked to become associated with the HPR,
stating that the “interfaith and interracial composition [of their group made] unity with [the HPR] fascinating in its potential.” Finally, in 1966, the YWCA established a relationship specifically with the House of Finland, demonstrating the autonomy of individual houses to act apart from the HPR mainframe.29

In 1950, the “Orchestra of the House of Pacific Relations” was formed under the directorship of Boris Picaizen. In addition to making music, the orchestra dedicated itself to the education of orphaned children, particularly who had lost parents in the Korean War, and who were “deprived of a musical education.” The Orchestra sought to collect funds to organize a school for these children, ages 6-14. It went to the Del Mar Fair and purchased government bonds as one way of building the fund. The presence and activities of the orchestra demonstrated the HPR’s commitment to both to music and a specifically “American” agenda.30

HPR became locally renowned as an excellent source of multicultural dancers and musicians. In the late 1950s, both the San Diego Women’s Association and the Musical Merit Foundation of Greater San Diego asked the HPR to send dancers to perform at its monthly meeting. The Red Cross requested entertainment for its naval hospital in San Diego. Likewise, the National Federation of Music Clubs was grateful to the HPR for its fine provision of dancers at its annual meeting in San Diego. Most prominent among the organization’s performances in 1959 was its provision of entertainment for the Twelfth Session of the International Civil Aviation Organization, at the request of the city of San Diego. The meeting hosted people at the apex of the aviation industry from 74 different nations.31

The HPR participated in more eclectic community events as well. In 1957, Autorama asked the HPR to provide authentic European singers to perform at an exhibition of European cars. In 1963, the group was invited to the First Annual Fallbrook Avocado Festival. It also provided Crawford High School with costumed performers.32 In 1967, the South Bay Travel Center invited the HPR to participate in its International Fair.
an era in the HPR’s history when it occasionally sent members on group flights and tours to Europe to visit their homelands. In that same year, the HPR participated in Hi Deber Varsity’s teen event “Hi Deber Varsity Around the World” and began participating in the annual “Trek to the Serra Cross,” a yearly hike to the monument in San Diego.

The HPR also hosted a number of foreign dignitaries during their visits to San Diego. In 1941, the League of Nations President C.J. Hambro became the first notable person to visit the organization. He returned in 1942 to attend the Fourth Fiesta of Nations mentioned above. The San Diego Union reported that Hambro presented John Johnson a gold medal from the members of the HPR in honor of the latter’s work as president of the organization. Crowned heads of Europe also came to Balboa Park. In 1939, the HPR hosted a luncheon “honoring their royal highnesses crown prince Olav and crown princess Martha of Norway.” Twenty years later, in 1959, the House of Sweden hosted a reception on the lawn of the HPR for the ambassador of Sweden with Princess Margaretha. HPR also sent ambassadors to foreign nations. In 1962, a “Mrs. Landry” went to England and France where she served as the “ambassador” of the HPR and the City of San Diego. While in England and Ireland she met with the mayors of York and Dublin and persuaded an English newspaper to mention the HPR. When HPR president Paul Dugan invited US President John F. Kennedy and others to be guests of honor at the 1962 Fiesta of Nations, the American Consulate General in Tijuana accepted the invitation.

Media outlets were also aware of, and interested in, the HPR. In 1952, the Gene Norman Show in Hollywood requested that the HPR send a representative to do a television interview about its annual Fiesta of Nations. In 1955, the Authenticated News in New York City requested that the HPR send photographs so they could do a picture story on the houses. In 1969, The San Diego Union ran a special series on each international cottage, drawing attention to the various lawn parties. To some degree, the HPR was San Diego’s “go-to” organization for multicultural events and education.
The “Anti-Pacific” House of Pacific Relations

HPR was established to promote peaceful cooperation and educational activities, not debates about the merits of particular governments. In 1936, Drugan envisioned the HPR as “a practical test of brotherly love,” that would show the nations of the world how “to live together and play together more closely than disarmament conferences or other types of peace-societies that use the form of debate to provoke not agreement but disagreement.” In its bylaws, HPR committed to acting as a strictly non-politically oriented organization.

During the Cold War, however, the HPR could not help but engage in political discussions. In 1955, Lieutenant Liang Tien-chia, a member of the House of China, gave a speech for an event at the HPR detailing a rosy view of China’s national past and an oppressed, degraded one of its communist present. He stated that “throughout our 5000 years of history, China [has] always been a peaceful nation” that treated its neighbors with kindness rather than force. He described Japan’s invasion in 1937 as a year the Chinese would forever remember with a heavy heart, and held up Chiang Kai-Shek as the hero who saved China from foreign imperialists. He also lauded Chiang Kai-Shek’s enlightened battle against communism, as the force of evil, in China. This was clearly a political speech in which the author praised nationalists and condemned communists but, given the anti-Communist fervor in the US, members of the audience might have viewed this distinction in moral categories rather than political ones.

The rules were bent again in 1969 when members of the House of Ukraine spoke out against the Soviet Union. An article in The San Diego Union provided a brief history of Ukraine and its short-lived independence from Russia after World War I before mentioning the House of Ukraine and its upcoming lawn program. The house’s very existence, celebrating a nation that technically did not exist, revealed HPR’s hostility towards the Soviet Union’s domination of Ukraine. The article reported, “The members of the Cottage… have set aside Sunday as a day to remember that event and to rejoice at the independence of their country, even if it was short-lived.” Many HPC members, including Wasyl Trochoda who had spent ten years in a Soviet concentration camp, had fled
Ukraine to find a new life in the United States. “For many of our members, life in the United States has given them the first opportunity to share their customs freely and practice the religion of the Orthodox church,” according to Alex Skop, vice-president of the cottage. He continued, “Increasingly now, the young people are following a strong trend of defiance toward the Soviets.” Ukrainian nationalist sentiment and American nationalism are both presented in *The San Diego Union*, which provides an example of the unique, fluid, and dynamic nature of HPR’s relationship with the world they sought to represent and improve. Anti-Soviet discourse was not defined as “political” within the context of the Cold War period in America.42

The Cold War took its toll upon relations within the HPR. In February 1947 Benjamin Vogonov, the president of the House of Russia, sent a letter to both the mayor of San Diego and the board of the HPR, detailing the destruction of murals and paintings on the walls of the cottage during the Navy’s wartime occupation. He asked for reimbursement to be made for the damages. Shortly afterwards, A.F. Keddy, the secretary of the HPR, sent a letter to Vogonov chastising him for “overstepping [his] authority” and writing that he should have brought the matter to the attention of the board rather than approaching the mayor on his own. Keddy implied that the Russians were not the only victims and that the city was not to blame for their misfortune. He later apologized to the mayor and the city for the cottage’s apparent belligerence.43

Two days after Keddy sent the letter to the city, HPR’s board of directors passed a resolution to accept the association’s formation of a House of Poland. The Polish-American Association had long wanted to have a place in the HPR, particularly now that their country was dominated by the Soviet Union. The fact that the board held a special meeting to vote the House of Poland into existence suggests that this may have been a move to spite the Russian cottage, given the current political situation in Eastern Europe at the time.44

In 1950, the House of England asked the HPR board of directors to combine the houses of Scotland, Canada, and England to form a Cottage of the British Commonwealth. The House of Scotland quickly sent a letter stating that it wished for the cottages to remain separate. It stated, “at this time in history, Scotland is standing on the verge of political separation from England, and it does not seem a very propitious time to change our status… it is the peoples and their cultures and not governments of nations which should be stressed.” Scotland later offered a compromise: let the respective nationalities keep their own cottages while allowing for a British club.45

In 1969, the Irish cottage wrote a letter addressed to all the cottages detailing how the president of the HPR and his vice-president had “invaded” the House
of Ireland and criticized the process used to expel some of its members, calling the president of the Irish cottage “a Hitler.” The letter used strong language to condemn the HPR president, stating that he had arrived unannounced and “berat[ed], condemn[ed], and malign[ed]” the board of directors of the cottage. The letter referenced HPR rules that allowed it to take the actions the HPR president had opposed. It also described questions posed to the “invader,” asking whether his actions represented “true democratic procedure.” In fact, the HPR president likely acted within the parameters of HPR’s democratic tradition. Democracies are inherently loud, messy, and prone to argumentative strife. The HPR, as a microcosmic representation of the greater world of nations, also embodied America’s democratic tradition.46

Conclusion

The HPR blended American attitudes and patriotism with its international mission in a unique and dynamic way. Today, some organizations promote diversity and tolerance while others promote traditional American values; few promote both simultaneously. The HPR continues to promote international peace and goodwill among nations and to break with its nationalist tradition. In 2003, the organization accepted the House of Palestine under its international umbrella, despite the fact that Palestinians are a people rather than a sovereign nation. The House of Israel cast the first and most enthusiastic vote.47 More than ever, the
HPR exists to engage people through art, music, and culture rather than war and politics. It has been asserted that the HPR is the only organization of its kind in the world; this is not an unfounded claim. The House of Pacific Relations holds an important place in the history of San Diego and the chronicle of ethnic interactions in the United States.
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1. The San Diego Union, March 19, 1937, MS 158 Richard Amero Collection, SDHC Research Library.
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7. House of Pacific Relations and International Cottages Collection, San Diego History Center, Scrapbook, 1937-1967 (hereafter HPR Scrapbooks, 1937-1967). All non-newspaper archival sources come from an unsorted collection currently titled “Scrapbook 68.” The scrapbooks dealing with the HPR must be specifically asked for. They are very large and unwieldy brown notebooks containing all manner of paraphernalia, including letters, records, notes, programs, and the like, arranged semi-chronologically. The largest scrapbook contains almost 900 sources, the next largest almost 300. The same box also contains scrapbooks with pictures and one portfolio with sources detailing trips members of the HPR took to Europe.
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11. Today little has changed. Walk into any of the various houses and one is likely to hear all manner of languages being spoken, both by those in charge of the house as well as by residents of San Diego or those from abroad who have wandered in.

12. HPR Scrapbooks, 1937-1967. While the citizenship requirement seems benign enough, at this time it was legally impossible for East Asian immigrants living in the US to become citizens. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 severely restricted immigration from East Asia and made it nearly impossible for those from that region who were not already citizens to attain citizenship. While the law was originally a temporary one, it was made permanent in 1902. The law would remain in effect until 1943 when the Magnusson Act was passed. It cannot be said for certain whether the framers of the HPR bylaws intended the citizenship requirement as exclusionary toward Asian immigrants or not. However, in 1937 there were cottages for Japan and China, suggesting that the bylaw framers were probably not aware of the various citizenship laws in place, or simply chose to ignore them.

14. “Nadie me Quiere” means “Nobody Loves Me.” It is interesting to note that the early HPR had the house of the British Empire and the Latin American House, despite the fact that neither of these was a “nationality.” The HPR often bent its own rules in its history: this is one example of such. However, while the British Empire was not one nation, the Scottish National Dance performed by members of that cottage was representative of a single nation.
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24. HPR Scrapbooks, 1937-1967. During this time the House of Russia remained associated with Russia, despite that country’s membership and dominance of the Soviet Union. While there is no information available dealing with the specific flags flown by the countries, it is highly likely that the Russian cottage flew a Russian nationalist flag of some sort rather than the flag of the Soviet Union, especially given the anti-Communist climate in America at the time.
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33. House of Pacific Relations and International Cottages Collection, San Diego History Center, Scrapbook, 1937-1967. The history of the flights of the HPR can currently be found under: “House of Pacific Relations and International Cottages Collection, San Diego History Center, Flights of the House of Pacific relations” although under the new organization of the HPR materials at the archive it is likely they will be under “Tours.” These large, organized trips began in 1958 and continued until 1975.

34. HPR Scrapbooks, 1937-1967, and HPR Programs.

36. HPR Programs.
37. HPR Scrapbooks, 1937-1967. These notes are somewhat vaguely written. Although it does appear that Mrs. Landry was indeed sent to these various officials as a sort of “ambassador,”
it cannot be said for certain that she was not simply travelling on her own and happened to
know these officials.

38. Ibid.

Library. There is a series of newspaper articles throughout the year, all under B-1.

40. “Keep Pacific Relations Unit at Expo, Civic Leaders’ Plan,” A3.

41. HPR Scrapbooks, 1937-1967. The speech was originally written in Chinese and then translated.
While the source only says that Tien-chia was a “member” of the cottage, it can be assumed that
he was either an elected leader in the cottage or one of its long-standing, influential members
if he was giving a speech. If membership functioned in the same way in the 1950s as it does
today at the HPR, then a cottage’s membership would have consisted of a core “elite” group
that did most of the work and was the most knowledgeable about the nation’s history and
culture, and a “tertiary” group that consisted of all others who were associated with the cottage
by paying a very small fee ($5 today) and volunteering a small amount of time in the cottage.
Today there is ostensibly a great deal of crossover regarding nationalities and cottages. One
can be of Polish descent, but also be an active member of the House of Ireland, for example.
However, the core members of each cottage are still representative of that cottage’s nationality.

42. Tina Qualls, “Ukrainians Recall Freedom,” *The San Diego Union*, June 6, 1969, B1. See also MS
158 Richard Amero Collection, SDHC Research Library.


44. Ibid.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid. Member cottages of the HPR send two delegates apiece to form the central body that votes
to make decisions, much like American states send two senators apiece or like the member
nations of the UN send delegates to represent them in the General Council and vote on pertinent
issues. In this way, then, the form of the HPR is democratic. In practice the functioning of this
body also looks like a democracy. One recent meeting featured a vibrant and vigorous debate
that took place over whether the HPR should procure new chairs. Many people weighed in
on the issue, some passionately, yet it remained respectful and ordered.

47. A parallel can be drawn between the House of Palestine and the House of Ukraine because both
had a house at the HPR during times when their people did not have their own nation state.
However, Ukraine was independent at one point, even if its independence was tenuous and
constituted a somewhat Potemkin façade. The areas that are currently claimed by Palestinians
(Gaza and the West Bank) have not yet comprised their own state.

Reviewed by Kyle Iwasaki, Independent Scholar.

In his fascinating work, An Aristocracy of Color, D. Michael Bottoms contends that in order to understand fully the implications of Reconstruction in the post-bellum United States, it is necessary to divorce this issue from its commonly accepted southern context and consider the legal actions occurring in California and the West during this period. Through his analysis of a variety of legal documents, court cases, and federal, state, and municipal ordinances, Bottoms argues that California’s unique context of racial diversity during the late nineteenth century not only challenged certain concepts connected to Reconstruction, but also helped define Reconstruction legislation for the rest of the country. This book examines the racial relationships among whites, blacks, Chinese, and Native Americans, and Bottoms exposes how these groups interacted with each other and within the hierarchy created by the state’s white inhabitants. While California’s white population worked to maintain this hierarchy, which placed them at the pinnacle, the state’s minority groups, specifically black Californians and the Chinese, pulled Reconstruction west, as they attempted to chip away at white privilege.

By analyzing the legal challenges brought to the state’s courts by California’s non-white populations, Bottoms reveals the constantly evolving racial landscape present in California during this time and shows how Reconstruction expanded beyond a white/black racial binary. The state in the post-Gold Rush years not only had a significant, albeit rapidly decreasing, population of Native Americans, but numerous Chinese immigrants settled in the region as well. Legal and social ideas connected with Reconstruction that worked in the eastern and southern United States failed to provide workable solutions to the state’s diverse population. This context allowed segments of the state’s non-white population to challenge discriminatory legal codes, whites’ domination and control over access to schools, and a narrow definition of equal protection. Black Californians and the Chinese won victories in several of these areas; however, these triumphs often came at the expense of other minority groups.

In order to justify the reasons why they warranted access to certain rights, various non-white groups contrasted themselves against each other. This would weaken the position of the minority group serving as a comparison, and it would
simultaneously strengthen the overall position of the white population. In his examination of black Californians’ quest to have their testimony be admissible in a court of law, Bottoms argues that black Californians intentionally differentiated themselves in the racial hierarchy from the state’s Chinese population in order to be accepted in a judicial setting. Through appeals to a common religion and civic culture, black Californians emphasized their shared traits with the state’s white population in addition to affirming white views of supposed Chinese cultural stagnation and decay. This strategy, although successful for black Californians, further reified the construction of white superiority present in the state during the late nineteenth century.

Two ethnic groups, while present in California, that are almost non-existent in An Aristocracy of Color are Californios and Mexican immigrants. Bottoms does address these groups in a few passing remarks. He states that since they were legally defined as “white” many of the laws and conflicts did not directly apply to or affect them. These groups did, however, occupy a key portion of the state’s legal landscape, specifically related to the California Land Act of 1851 and the Foreign Miners Tax, even if they were not directly linked to Reconstruction. By incorporating these groups into his examination of race and Reconstruction in California, Bottoms’ contribution would have been even more robust and nuanced.

Such criticism notwithstanding, Bottoms’ work provides an insightful analysis of California’s unique racial climate and the national ramifications of California’s relationship with Reconstruction. By providing a new lens through which to view the shifting landscape of nineteenth-century racial politics and law, An Aristocracy of Color serves not only as an interesting addition to Reconstruction historiography but also as an important analysis of race in California.


Reviewed by Theodore A. Strathman, Lecturer, Department of History, California State University San Marcos.

John W. Robinson’s Los Angeles in Civil War Days, originally published in 1977 and now reissued by the University of Oklahoma Press, is a well-written account of political, economic, and social developments that took place during the secession crisis and war years. Drawing extensively on local newspapers as well
as several memoirs, official records of the Union and Confederate Armies, and an array of secondary sources, the book vividly depicts a town marked by divided loyalties, political dissent and repression, and economic difficulties related to the war. Historians of California and readers interested in the Civil War will find fascinating anecdotes and an engaging account of little-known developments in what was then a remote corner of a nation at war. The republication of Robinson's book may also point scholars in some promising directions, as it hints at issues critical in the historiography of California and the West.

Robinson begins by providing a sketch of Los Angeles in 1860. While the town of fewer than 5,000 was predominantly Spanish-speaking, incoming Anglo-Americans were fast remaking its physical culture and economic and social practices. Los Angeles was also a Democratic stronghold with southern sympathies derived in part from the slave-state origins of many local elites as well as transportation links to the South via the Butterfield Stage and federal patronage from Democratic politicians. Also promoting the southern cause was Henry Hamilton, the staunchly pro-slavery editor of the Los Angeles Star. Once the war began, the pro-secession sentiments of many locals became a point of considerable concern for Lincoln supporters as well as U.S. Army officers stationed in Los Angeles. The town witnessed the kinds of political conflict that played out elsewhere in the nation: Union Army officers attempted to suppress pro-southern sentiment, Hamilton faced charges of treason for his anti-Lincoln tirades, and pro-Confederate secret societies tried to help southern Californians flee the state and join the Confederate Army.

One of the book’s strengths is Robinson’s ability to relate interesting and sometimes poignant vignettes that enliven the narrative. For instance, Robinson discusses several secessionists who resigned their U.S. Army commissions in various parts of the West and decided to lay low in Los Angeles. Captain Winfield Scott Hancock, the only U.S. Army officer stationed in Los Angeles at the beginning of the war, invited six of these former comrades to dinner, suspecting that they would soon attempt to make their way to Richmond to join the Confederate cause. Four of the six would die in the war: Albert Sidney Johnston (at Shiloh) and three others who would fall at Gettysburg, where Hancock himself commanded the Union Army’s II Corps. Also present at the farewell dinner was George Pickett, who “would forever relive the agony of watching his splendid troops cut to pieces by soldiers of Hancock’s army corps” (p. 63).

Such anecdotes make the book an engaging read, and Robinson’s work on a little-known topic may inspire scholars to investigate more fully some paths he has not thoroughly explored. For instance, Robinson notes that Hancock informed his superiors that secessionists posed a significant threat in Los Angeles, as did
some elements of the Spanish-speaking population, who were discontented and might rebel against the government. Some fifty or sixty secessionists also planned to raise a Bear Flag—a “symbol of resistance to the federal government” (p. 55) and ride into Los Angeles. This group was linked to the “Monte Boys,” vigilantes who had perpetrated a number of lynchings, especially against ethnic Mexicans. Robinson also relates the story of Francisco P. Ramírez, former editor of *El Clamor Público* (a Spanish-language newspaper that spoke out against Anglo-American discrimination towards Hispanics and the Chinese), who challenged Henry Hamilton’s election to the state senate on the grounds that Hamilton (an Irish immigrant) was disloyal and not a citizen of the United States. Robinson himself provides relatively little commentary on the larger significance of such stories, but these episodes—which suggest the intersection of war, loyalty, citizenship, and racial and ethnic identity—could provide fertile fields for future scholarship. Following the lead of Elliott West, who has suggested the concept of a “Greater Reconstruction” in which questions of citizenship and government power played out not just in the South but in the West as well, future studies of Los Angeles during the Civil War may delve into questions of how the war figured in Californios’ conceptions of identity or how pro-slavery figures viewed the diversity of southern California through the lens of war and white supremacy. Such explorations could connect Los Angeles’s Civil War experience to the kinds of patterns observed by historians like D. Michael Bottoms (discussed in the preceding review). For lay readers and academics alike, then, Robinson has performed a valuable service in bringing to light a topic worthy of future consideration while telling an engaging tale.


Reviewed by Garner A. Palenske, Western Historian.

Since the 1930s there have been over 1,000 books and dozens of movies about Wyatt Earp’s controversial life. Still, however, the intrigue of this American icon draws historians and writers of all types to explore, research, and reanalyze his exploits. Many works have been published in the last two years, which is odd given that the primary source material on the topic has remained relatively unchanged, with some minor exceptions. The continued interest in Wyatt Earp could be due to the increased digitalization of historical material, which has
improved the efficiency of researching. But more likely, it is the fact that when it comes to Wyatt Earp, everyone has an opinion.

Andrew Isenberg’s book Wyatt Earp: A Vigilante Life is one of several Wyatt Earp books recently published. Isenberg is an accomplished history professor at Temple University where he teaches courses on the West, environmental history, and the nineteenth-century United States. Of special note, Isenberg spent two years of his career on staff at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, which is generally recognized as one of the premier depositories of Earpiana.

The book begins with background regarding the wanderings of the Earp family in 1845, three years prior to Wyatt’s birth. Isenberg’s discussion about the social and cultural nature of Americans of this period is interesting and informative. It is a theme that is carried throughout the book and clearly shows Isenberg’s strength as a well-rounded historian of the period. These interjections are, it seems, intended as an explanation for the future actions of Wyatt Earp.

The book leads the reader through the well-known adventures of Earp’s life, starting with his youth growing up on a farm in Pella, Iowa, where, according to Isenberg, Earp developed an aversion to farm work. Then the author writes about the cow town years and of course his time in Tombstone, Arizona. The highlight of this period – or lowlight, depending on your point of view – is his involvement in the Fremont Street Gun Battle, or as Hollywood has termed it, the Gun Fight at the OK Corral.

The concluding chapters of the book relive the period from the late 1890s until Earp’s death in 1929. During this time Earp became a sporting man, spending his time running gambling operations, racing horses, and prize fighting. The majority of his time was spent in California, from San Diego to San Francisco. Isenberg’s thesis is that Earp “led a life of impulsive law-breaking and shifting identities. When he wasn’t wearing a badge, he was variously a thief, a brothel bouncer, a gambler, and a confidence man” (pp. 5-6). Isenberg believes Wyatt was a man who reinvented himself as needed to gain an edge, whether in a business opportunity or during a gun fight. The book’s subtitle, A Vigilante Life, seems to be inaccurate given the common definition of a vigilante, which is a person who takes the law into his or her own hands to avenge a crime. An alternate definition, however, is one who acts without recourse to lawful procedures, which is consistent with the opinion of Earp expressed by the author.

Some portions of the book contain dated sources that have been found to be less than accurate. Isenberg’s treatment of Wyatt’s time in San Diego and the story regarding Wyatt’s appearance in the silent movie, The Half Breed, are examples. In addition, Isenberg in some instances relies too heavily on other secondary sources.

Overall, this is an enjoyable academically written book, and after reading it
one will know much more about the bigger picture of Americans and their lives during this extraordinary period of history. To accurately characterize a person who lived when America was a much different place is a daunting task, especially given the differences in contemporary social conventions and attitudes. Isenberg’s academic treatment of the subject is commendable; however, the book paints Wyatt Earp as a more complex person than he might have been.

Wyatt Earp is best described by Mabel Earp Cason, who was a relative of Wyatt and co-author of the Cason Manuscript, the unpublished biography of Josephine “Josie” Marcus Earp, Wyatt’s common-law wife of some 40 years. Josie lived with the Cason family for many years after Wyatt’s death in 1929. Referring to Wyatt and other Tombstonians of the period, Mabel states, “These old-timers who lived lives that were in no way above reproach, but who are being represented to a growing generation as super-men should be presented as they were, men of their generation with all the shortcomings as well as virtues, of ordinary men.”


Reviewed by Jane Kenealy, Archivist, San Diego History Center.

San Diego has much to be proud of, and Balboa Park is one of its finest achievements. Although its roots can be traced back to 1870, its birth as the Park we know today was conceived in the Panama-California Exposition of 1915. Richard Amero spent almost seventy years researching the history of Balboa Park and he chose to start with the Panama-California Exposition, a pivotal event at a time when San Diego announced its intention to be a major player in the race to invite the world to celebrate the completion of the Panama Canal. For a city so small to aim so high was implausible at the time, and in retrospect what the city accomplished is impressive indeed.

Amero conducted vast amounts of research that allowed him to produce in-depth narratives pertaining to the park and the exposition. He died in 2012, and Michael Kelly edited his writings into this posthumous book. The initial chapter covers the events from the exposition’s conception in July 1909 to the opening on January 1, 1915, and is followed by chapters that detail both the 1915 and 1916 Expositions, as well as what the author titles the “mop-up” in 1917. The path to the Exposition was not easy, and Amero’s opening chapter takes the
reader on a breathtaking rollercoaster ride through its conception, planning, and implementation. This complex trail through five years of civic intrigue, posturing, and planning provides a wealth of information that should be welcomed by all researchers. This information allows Amero to address all the pertinent issues, although unfortunately none is examined with any great depth. Amero does revisit this time later in the book when he expands on the involvement of the Olmsted Brothers who eventually resigned as landscape architects due to disagreements over the plans for the Park. Amero’s discussion of these kinds of issues allows the reader to appreciate more fully the intricate negotiations it took for the event to come to fruition.

There is a welcome change of pace in the chapters that detail the events that took place and the attractions on display during the exposition. Amero continues to present the reader with a wealth of information as we hear about “three hundred Indians” living in a Pueblo Village, multiple military maneuvers, exhibitions of art, agriculture, anthropology and archeology, the “Isthmus” with its replica of the Panama Canal, and the “War of the Worlds” depicting the destruction of New York City in the year 2000.

The final chapters are devoted to the other aspect of Amero’s work where he uses his research “to tell the real story of the park and the exposition” (p. 8). Here we can appreciate the true extent of his knowledge as he examines the representation of both the Indians and the Japanese at the Expositions. His knowledge of their cultures extends beyond their presence in San Diego and he appears genuinely concerned with any misrepresentation of these cultures. We are also treated to a chapter on the most abiding of his interests, that of the architecture of the Exposition, which is perhaps the subject he wrote about most extensively.

There could be a case for the first chapter on the planning phase of the Exposition being lengthened into several chapters to enable a more detailed examination of the intricacies of the events. Comparison with the chapter on the architectural origins presented later in the book leaves a desire to hear more of the author’s views on the other events leading up to the Exposition. Given Amero’s remarkable store of knowledge about the planning leading up to 1915, he could have provided more discussion of the political wrangling and negotiations of this period.

In consideration of the extensive amount of work Amero completed in his lifetime, this book is only a minor representation of what he achieved. The extent of information it contains, however, and the span of knowledge it represents should encourage readers to seek out further examples of his work. It is unfortunate that this book was produced posthumously as there is a wealth of material that could
have spawned several more. Amero’s dedication to discovering the facts behind the history and his extensive research and literary material are an impressive legacy that will be hard to equal. Mike Kelly’s comprehensive notes and addition of numerous photos make the book even more impressive.


Reviewed by James W. Ingram III, Ph.D., Lecturer, Department of Political Science, San Diego State University.

Chuck McFadden’s *Trailblazer* resembles a campaign biography, intended to market Jerry Brown for yet another of his endless bids for the presidency. The book spins Brown’s career, such that the exploits that earned him the moniker “Governor Moonbeam” demonstrate that he has always been willing to think outside the box—clearly a virtue for anyone who desires to face the challenges the Oval Office now poses.

McFadden’s inability to secure an interview with Brown creates the appearance that the book is (like its subject) neutral and nonpartisan, written by an author independent of any connection to and influence from Brown himself. McFadden never explains the biography’s title: is it ironic, indicating that Brown is on the cutting (or falling) edge, or is it serious, implying that Brown is an intrepid pioneer, perennially setting out into the undiscovered country of innovative policies and political strategies? In his choice of title and themes, McFadden’s bio ultimately mimics Brown’s 1992 presidential campaign, which was not disorganized, according to Brown ally Jacques Barzaghi, but merely transcended understanding (p. 109).

The book is written in engaging prose, so it is more accessible to a popular audience than an academic treatment would have been. This is a plus, in the sense that it is free of the jargon that plagues *ex cathedra* pronouncements from the ivory tower. But this is also a tradeoff: the book’s bibliography is only two pages long and misses some good sources on Brown’s career. The author does provide the reader with endnotes, but they are unfortunately sparse.

*Trailblazer* follows Jerry Brown from his birth up to the present day, providing details of Brown’s development from his quixotic quest for enlightenment as a young seminarian and midlife crisis Zen learner. The book recounts his use
of such unlikely positions as community college trustee and Secretary of State as springboards for his 1975-83 governorship, and of the similarly improbable launching pad of state party chair and Oakland Mayor for his post-2010 stint as California’s CEO. His interactions with such interesting characters as B.T. Collins, Jacques Barzaghi, and Ivan Illich aid McFadden in illustrating the way in which Brown developed his style of a “mosaic of leadership” (as apt an oxymoron as one could find for Brown, coined by Gray Davis, appropriately) (p. 115).

Besides the secondary literature on Brown, McFadden consulted the existing archives and library collections. Such sources are limited, however, and thus McFadden conducted a number of interviews. His informants included journalists who have covered Brown over the years, political operatives who have assisted and opposed Brown in the past, and academics specializing in California politics. His qualitative data are thus useful, although he made less use of his sources than he could have. Steve Glazer, the consultant who ran Brown’s 2010 gubernatorial campaign, has delivered lectures offering more insight on Brown’s rebirth than this biography provides.

Still, Trailblazer is thorough, with such insider details as the fact that former Governor Gray Davis recently attended an event where the hosts misspelled his first name. Yet the biography is occasionally cryptic: McFadden notes that during state budget delays shoe stores lost business (p. 159). Are these now the canary-in-the-coal-mine indices of financial instability? Unfortunately, the book’s details do more to explain Brown’s personal quirks than they do to provide the reader with historical and political context. Surely, Prop 13 was one of the most important legacies of Brown’s followership, but one can better understand the measure by reading Peter Schrag’s Paradise Lost.

McFadden cites Kevin Starr’s work, but Jackson Putnam would have provided a better handle on the liberal-conservative fusion that Brown personifies. Putnam’s neo-progressive concept would help readers make sense of the political chameleon and ideological hybrid that is Brown. According to Putnam, California’s governors have often been neo-progressives, who may have been elected to the office from the right or left, but ultimately ended up being pulled to the center of the political spectrum by the demands of the job and the challenge of retaining their popularity and thus political influence in such a diverse state. Jerry Brown’s combination of Prop 13-enforcing fiscal conservatism with pro-farm labor and minority cause-related social liberalism is intelligible in the context of California’s neo-progressive tradition of governors. While the book shows Brown rediscovering his father’s future-oriented policies (p. 168), such an eventuality can be more fruitfully understood with reference to neo-progressivism.

The book’s contribution is to dispel the unfairly flaky Moonbeam image that
became conventional wisdom on Jerry Brown during the Malathion-Medfly years. From one angle, Jerry Brown apparently fits the comment on Pierce Patchett by the Sid Hudgens character in *L.A. Confidential*, “All in all a powerful behind-the-scenes strange-o.” Perhaps no one would ever accuse Brown of being a behind-the-scenes kind of guy, with his nearly obsessive-compulsive need for the limelight, but his eccentricity reflects the state where he has made his career.

The central irony of *Trailblazer* as a title for a Jerry Brown biography is that unlike Edmund G. Brown, Sr., Junior has been the practitioner of a form of leadership that is less about vision and leading than it is about running to the front of an existing parade and taking the baton from the drum major. If one wants to understand how the Golden State lost its glitter, and its status as a national bellwether, this book is ideal. California went from building freeways to the future when it was led by Brown the Elder to marking trails to nowhere under his less pioneering progeny.


Reviewed by Matthew G. Schiff, Marketing Director, San Diego History Center.

San Diego historian and author, Richard W. Crawford, has published two titles that should be considered amongst the “must-read” books exploring the historic fabric of San Diego and its surrounding region. Both books are quick and rewarding reads, each around 160 pages, and summarize many stories of San Diego's past that are both well known and little told. Taken together, these titles broadly explain San Diego's past in a way that a reader with even a mild interest in the subject would come away satisfied by the ease and accessibility of the text and the richness of information without being daunting. More discerning students of San Diego's history will largely be satisfied with the breadth of research—drawn from a fairly strong variety of primary and secondary documentation—and will come away better informed about subjects and stories which they formerly considered themselves well-versed.

The author’s research is well documented and the writing is succinct yet descriptive. Both books are a compilation of articles written by Crawford in and around 2008 as a weekly submission to the Metro Edition of *The San Diego Union-Tribune*. This concise format is present throughout both titles and is the reason
for the easily accessible narrative, making them attractive to a wide audience.

For example, today, if a newly transplanted resident to the Ocean Beach neighborhood of San Diego picked up a copy of *San Diego Yesterday*, he or she would probably be surprised to learn that a large amusement park, Wonderland, once dominated their new surrounding’s landscape. It was thriving for two years before competition from the Panama-California Exposition and a flood put it out of business. The newcomer would be further surprised to learn that the zoo animals at the newly shuddered Wonderland would be some of the first attractions at the Exposition and also at the newly created San Diego Zoo six years later.

With each story only three to four pages long, one could read either book for 10 minutes each night at bedtime and in less than a month have been exposed to a multitude of San Diego’s key events, characters, and outcomes. Both new and long-time residents could gain a greater appreciation and fondness for the region’s character.

Crawford weaves all kinds of these connections throughout both books and, when read together, do cover a large swath of San Diego’s history during the American period. What is noticeably lacking are stories that explore the three other important periods of San Diego “occupation:” Kumeyaay, Spanish, and Mexican. While understandably more difficult, at times, to study given language barriers and the comparative rarity of sources, a new transplant to San Diego should have some explanation about San Diego’s formative beginnings. The opportunity lost is the ability to showcase for readers that San Diego’s story is not only an American one.

In a span of seventy-nine years—from Junípero Serra’s arrival on today’s Presidio Hill, to the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo—possession of San Diego changed hands four times. The outcomes of those culture clashes have indeed helped to shape the region and would have provided greater context for many of Crawford’s topics. This addition would have been a delight for readers to learn through this format, since Crawford masterfully sheds light on San Diego’s past in concise, digestible, yet information-laden narratives. Perhaps the *Union-Tribune* requested historical retrospectives on only a particular period, or perhaps there is a third book on the horizon. One can only earnestly wish.
BOOK NOTES


Dolores del Río: Beauty in Light and Shade. By Linda B. Hall. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, and index. xiii + 358 pp. $30.00 cloth. Historian Linda Hall of the University of New Mexico explores the life of Dolores del Río from her affluent upbringing in Mexico to her rise to stardom in Hollywood in the 1920s and 1930s, and finally to her return to her native country in the 1940s. One theme of the book is the complicated terrain of race and ethnicity, as movie producers granted white status to del Río even as the actor herself asserted a Mexican identity.

From Coveralls to Zoot Suits: The Lives of Mexican American Women on the World War II Home Front. By Elizabeth R. Escobedo. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, and index. xviii + 229 pp. $34.95 cloth. This monograph studies the ways Mexican American women took advantage of employment opportunities created by the Second World War to pursue various goals, from staking out positions vis à vis their families and the broader society to serving their country and enhancing their economic standing.

The Great Ocean: Pacific Worlds from Captain Cook to the Gold Rush. By David Igler. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Illustrations, map, notes, bibliography, and index. xi + 255 pp. $29.95 cloth. At the time of James Cook’s first voyage in 1768, the Pacific Ocean encompassed countless territories, peoples, and ecosystems. The Great Ocean reveals how by the time of the California gold rush, the Pacific region had become a site of imperial contest and conflict while its disparate parts were drawn into increasingly intertwined networks of commerce.

the East Los Angeles Community Corporation purchased the “Mariachi Hotel” in the hope of preserving a low-income housing property that had long served as home to mariachi musicians. This volume brings together photographs and two essays that tell the story of both the hotel itself and the place of Los Angeles in the mariachi tradition.

*J. Edgar Hoover Goes to the Movies: The FBI and the Origins of Hollywood’s Cold War.* By John Sbardellati. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012. Photographs, appendix, notes. viii + 256 pp. $27.95 cloth. *J. Edgar Hoover Goes to the Movies* discusses the struggle over the content of Hollywood films in the 1940s and 1950s, as the FBI attempted to identify Hollywood films (including classics such as *It’s a Wonderful Life* and *On the Waterfront*) that the Bureau believed subverted American ideals.
THE DAVIES AWARD

The Davies Award was established at the University of San Diego in 1984 by Mrs. Darlene Davies in memory of her husband, R. Lowell Davies, a beloved member of the Dean’s Council who died April 29, 1983, and by Dr. Joe Pusateri, former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Author Hughes was president of USD at the time. The first Davies Award recipient was Dr. Iris Engstrand, Professor of History, in May 1984. The second was Professor of Art Therese Whitcomb in 1985.

The Davies Award was originally given for Faculty Achievement within the College of Arts and Sciences, but its focus was changed in 1995 to recognize teaching excellence as seen through the following five criteria: 1) commitment to the values of a liberal arts education; 2) a demanding intellectual presence in the classroom; 3) accessibility to students; 4) impact on student lives beyond the classroom experience; and 5) contributions to the growth of colleagues as effective teachers.

Dean Patrick Drinan suggested the renaming of the award to focus on teaching excellence in the College of Arts and Sciences, where teaching excellence is expected of all faculty. A set of plaques on the wall in the College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office recognizes both versions of the Davies award over the years - Faculty Achievement and Teaching Excellence. The Honors Convocation, which takes place toward the end of each spring semester, includes the Davies Award.

On April 30, 2014, the College of Arts and Sciences recognized 30 years of the Davies Award for Teaching Excellence, the most prestigious faculty award given in USD’s College of Arts and Sciences. Twenty-three of the past Davies awardees attended the reception, hosted by the College, the USD Honors Program, and Mrs. Darlene Davies. Only a few days later, the 31st recipient was honored at the annual USD Honors Convocation on the stage of Shiley Theatre. Dr. Veronica Galvan, Psychological Sciences, received the distinction on May 4, 2014.

The current Dean of the College, Dr. Noelle Norton, Professor of Political Science, was the 2005 recipient of the Davies Award. At the 30-year reception, Dean Norton remarked that receiving the Davies award was her most significant academic achievement. “To be recognized by my peers, students, and alumni as being a great teacher means more to me than any other achievement, even more than becoming Dean.” Dean Norton added that she looks forward to reading the nominations for the 32nd Davies Award honoree in 2015.
One fine day in 1929...

there was a hard-fought wheelbarrow race on a sunny beach in Del Mar.

San Diego History Center’s Photograph Collection contains over 2.5 million images that connect the past with the present through you!

Visit the Research Library or purchase prints online.
www.sandiegohistory.org / www.photossandiego.org
Historic weddings happen in historic venues...

The Junípero Serra Museum is an ideal setting for a stunning and upscale wedding. The striking mission-style building located in Presidio Park above San Diego’s historic Old Town, boasts spectacular views overlooking the City and the Pacific Ocean. Offering beautiful upper and lower terraces and an indoor gallery, the museum is perfect for both an outdoor or indoor event.

MUSEUM INFO
Junípero Serra Museum
2727 Presidio Drive
San Diego, CA 92103

CONTACT
619-232-6203 x109
events@sandieghistory.org
sandieghistory.org/rentals
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Your contribution will help to create an endowment for

*The Journal of San Diego History*
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