THE SEVENTH REGIMENT ARMORY COMMISSION AND DESIGN: ELITE IDENTITY, AESTHETIC PATRONAGE AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE IN GILDED AGE NEW YORK

by

CHELSEA BRUNER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the City University of New York

2013

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Kevin Murphy

Date — Chair of Examining Committee

Kevin Murphy

Date — Executive Officer

Katherine Manthorne

Sally Webster

Richard Guy Wilson
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

THE SEVENTH REGIMENT ARMORY COMMISSION AND DESIGN:
ELITE IDENTITY, AESTHETIC PATRONAGE AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
IN GILDED AGE NEW YORK

by

CHELSEA BRUNER

Adviser: Professor Kevin Murphy

This dissertation is an exploration and analysis of the Seventh Regiment Armory, a privately funded, purpose-built headquarters for the nineteenth century's most elite volunteer militia. This project demonstrates how the conception and funding of the building were a direct response to Gilded Age labor-capital conflict—a means by which even non-member elites could participate in the most contentious socio-political debates of the day. Simultaneously, the Armory's commission and design reflected a new level of professionalization in the design profession(s) and specialization in architectural typology, and I argue that transformations in politics and professional practice were not discrete phenomena, but were manifestations of elite class consolidation in the face of unprecedented social change.

This study tracks the evolution of the Seventh, establishing a connection between military proficiency and elite identity as reflected in a series of facilities used over the years. I connect the Seventh's policing duties with other elite initiatives to compel fiscal and social "reform" while establishing Aestheticism as a visual and stylistic corollary to

those endeavors. Implemented by the first generation of American design professionals—architects, engineers and even artists—the class-based component of professionalism was brought to the fore in the late 1870s by the nascent labor movement, and this project explores the heretofore unexamined role that striking workers played in further catalyzing class consolidation among elite patrons and their peers in the design professions.

The Armory was an exemplar of these professional and stylistic transformations. This analysis illuminates the continuity between the Seventh's interiors and other contemporaneous projects that are united (to a remarkable degree) stylistically, but otherwise typologically and geographically varied, further linking Aestheticism to the broader project of class consolidation and identity formation. By the mid-1880s, the style had fallen out of favor, thus the Armory is significant as a rare, extant example. It was the precedent for a subsequent boom in armory construction and inspired a number of imitators locally and across the country, but its sumptuous interiors were never matched. The Armory is an important and heretofore unexplored monument to a moment of incredible transformation in the country and city's history.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The realization of this project is a testament to the support, guidance and encouragement I have received from a number of people. My committee at the Graduate Center was chaired by Kevin D. Murphy. I am enormously grateful for his patience, insight and support all along the way. Professor Katherine Manthorne provided invaluable suggestions for the dissertation, and for future directions it may take as a publication. I am appreciative of her keen eye and thoughtfulness. I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Sally Webster who shared her passion for American Art with all of her students. Professor Webster helped me uncover to the Armory as a dissertation topic, and contributed significantly to the work at-hand. Richard Guy Wilson has also indelibly shaped this project both as a reader, and as leader of the Victorian Society in America's summer school program in Newport, Rhode Island, which I attended thanks to the generosity of two donors. His depth of knowledge and expertise has enriched the present study enormously, and I count it a great privilege to have first encountered the architecture of Newport under his tutelage.

This dissertation relied extensively on the Seventh's archives, and I am grateful to Library staffs at the New-York Historical Society who were helpful and accommodating through the Library's renovation and reorganization. At the Armory, Kirsten Reoch, Senior Project Director and Historian, and Registrar David Burnhauser provided access to the on-site holdings. I also benefitted enormously from two Graduate Center fellowships which sustained my research and writing through the final semesters of my candidacy. The Martin E. Segal Dissertation Fellowship was a valuable affirmation of the project's

relevance and strength as well as a substantial source of financial support. I was likewise the recipient of the Catherine Hoover Voorsanger fellowship for studies in American decorative arts. Voorsanger's work in this field has been central to my understanding of this topic, and I was honored to receive an award in her name.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their untiring support and encouragement. Richard and Cecille Diez and Dan and Lynn Bruner have always been and continue to be the best cheerleaders I could ever hope for, and it is to them that this project is dedicated.

PREFACE

Armories occupy a curious position in American architectural history. Holdovers from a bygone era when both policing and military duties were fulfilled by the nation's volunteer militias, they can be found in many cities and towns, particularly in the Northeast. In the five boroughs of New York City alone, a number of armories remain as impressively fortified monuments to the significance of those volunteers. Yet, even within the rich and increasingly well-documented history of nineteenth-century American architecture, the building type has received minimal attention from scholars and remains little understood. Armories thus present an enigma of sorts, and Manhattan's Seventh Regiment Armory—arguably the best known of this building type—all the more so, as the imposing, fortified character of many American armories is paired here with opulently-outfitted Aesthetic Movement interiors designed by the premiere decorating firms of the day including Herter Brothers, Pottier & Stymus, and Louis C. Tiffany & Co., Associated Artists.

The starting point of this dissertation was an interest in the armory's interiors, and the certainty that a scholarly analysis of these extant but heretofore unexplored spaces would shed light on American Aestheticism and its role in the evolution of design as a professional practice in the late nineteenth century. Indeed, it was in this period that professionalization truly took hold—in architecture and design certainly, but also in other fields like law, medicine and finance. Design historians in particular have established the late nineteenth century as a starting point for professional practice and a moment of transition when furniture-makers, who had been the arbiters of taste for a previous generation (and who, through the mid-to-late 1870s tackled increasingly complex and

comprehensive projects) were gradually replaced by artist-decorators, and eventually by architects. The ascendance of these new professionals is often credited to the post-Centennial craze for all things "artistic," and though this shift has been well-documented in the field, it is taken as a matter of course. It was my belief that there was more to the story, and that by more deeply mining this pivotal transformation, a fuller picture of Aestheticism and its key practitioners would emerge.

I was fortunate in this endeavor to have access to two important primary resources, one of which is the building itself. Surviving interiors from this period are rare; rarer still is the opportunity to experience and analyze the work of rival firms within the same overall commission. As a first step in uncovering material from this important period in American material culture, historians have necessarily been engaged in a recuperative project to re-create now-lost spaces, or attribute furnishings and decorative arts that survive from them. Thus, the lack of extant spaces and structures has generated a body of scholarship that has largely been documentary in nature, and overwhelmingly focused on domestic projects. Here again, it was my desire to offer a fuller picture by investigating a non-residential commission, and, freed from the project of re-creation, to engage in a more thorough-going contextualization that situates this commission within the broader framework outlined above.

The Seventh Regiment's archives also survive at two local repositories, and this resource was essential to the project. The bulk of these extensive holdings (97 boxes; 445 volumes) are housed at the New-York Historical Society, while a small number of bound volumes, photographs and ephemera remain at the armory. The archives offer a wealth of information on the regiment's management and administration, including detailed

accounts of the men's military and policing duties, as well as their participation in parades and other ceremonies. The correspondence of Colonel Emmons Clark, the Seventh's commanding officer from 1864 to 1889, was a vital component of this research, as Clark was intimately involved with armory project from its conception. His letters detail the inner-workings of the nearly ten-year-long initiative to find a site, establish a design (and find designers), raise funds for the building, and finally, to oversee and manage its construction. Financial documents and committee reports likewise illuminate the lengthy and often complex process by which this remarkable building came to be. For scholars of nineteenth-century architecture and interiors, this kind of archival repository is a rarity. Many firm records have been lost or destroyed by fire; indeed, of those primarily responsible for the Armory commission—Herter Brothers, Pottier & Stymus, and Louis C. Tiffany & Co., Associated Artists—no archival records or documentation survive.

As a historian of American architecture and design (and not of American politics or military history), I initially understood the armory to be a showplace—a clubhouse of sorts for the elite members of the Seventh—the so-called "Silk Stocking Regiment" long considered the country's premiere corps of volunteers—whose activities, like the building itself, were little understood. Over the course of this investigation, I learned a great deal about the duties of nineteenth-century militia and particularly the significance of the Seventh, who served in the Civil War and were credited with restoring order in some of the city's most violent urban riots and uprisings. It became clear that the building and its notable interiors were more than a lavishly-outfitted clubhouse for wealthy businessmen interested in occasional soldiering. In fact, the commission and design of

this armory played a primary role in shaping the political and economic debates in New York City during the turbulent years of the Gilded Age. Members and leaders of the Seventh were called out to the front lines to quell uprisings and riots, and the building functioned as a corollary to these and other efforts aimed at ordering and reforming the urban environment. The pages that follow demonstrate how the conception and funding of the armory were a direct response to labor-capital conflict—a means by which even non-member elites could participate in the most contentious political and social debates of the day. Simultaneously, the armory's commission and design reflected a new level of professionalization and specialization in the design profession(s), based as much on international travel as on a newly codified educational system. These prerequisites for professional standing required social and financial capital, and thus essentially excluded all but a select few. I argue that transformations in politics and professional practice were not discrete phenomena, but were manifestations of elite class consolidation in the face of unprecedented social change. Historian Sven Beckert has documented the social and institutional networks through which New York's economic elites coalesced into a coherent social class during the Gilded Age. I demonstrate that elite class consolidation can be understood spatially, as well.

The first chapter of this study tracks the evolution and development of the Seventh, establishing a connection between military proficiency and elite identity as reflected in a series of facilities used over the years—an identity most powerfully communicated by the new armory project of the late 1870s. This part of my analysis connects the Seventh's policing duties with other elite initiatives to compel fiscal and social "reform," while suggesting Aestheticism as a visual and stylistic corollary to those

endeavors. Aestheticism's broad popularity with the public was largely thanks to the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, which brought the tenets of order and artistic harmony to middle-class householders and elites alike. Through the 1870s, wealthy patrons like the Seventh called on the first generation of American design professionals—architects, engineers and even artists—to implement the new style, and Chapter Two foregrounds the distinction between the trades and these emerging fields. Though education and international travel were central to claims of professional standing, the class-based component of professionalism was brought glaringly to the fore in the late 1870s by the nascent labor movement. Through the early 1880s, architects and artists usurped the taste-making role formerly played by the cabinet-makers and others in the furniture-making trades and this chapter explores the heretofore unexamined role that striking furniture-makers played in further catalyzing class consolidation among elite patrons and their peers in the design professions.

Chapter Three looks to the armory as an exemplar of these professional and stylistic transformations. This analysis illuminates the continuity between the Seventh's extant Aesthetic Movement interiors and other contemporaneous projects that are united (to a remarkable degree) stylistically, but otherwise typologically and geographically varied, further linking Aestheticism to the broader project of class consolidation and identity formation. By the mid-1880s, the style had fallen out of favor, and the concluding chapter explores the armory's significance as a rare, extant example. It was the precedent for a subsequent boom in Gilded Age armory construction and inspired a number of imitators locally and across the country, but was never matched. In fact, this has as much to do with the changing nature of military service in the early twentieth

century as it does with the Seventh's incomparable standing and wealth in the late 1870s. Thus, the armory remains an important and heretofore unexplored monument to a moment of incredible transformation in the country and city's history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

INTRODUCTION

> I say as far as possible: just as all roads lead to Rome, so the life, habits, and aspirations of all groups and classes of the community are founded on the economical conditions under which the masses of people live, and it is impossible to exclude socio-political questions from the consideration of aesthetics. —John Ruskin[1]

In the roughly twenty-year period following the Civil War, the entire urban landscape of New York City was remarkably transformed. New building types such as museums, railway stations and clubhouses evolved to accommodate new functions and new types of institutions. Housing for the working classes and poor became its own specific type—the tenement.[2] The far side of the socio-economic spectrum saw change as well, as elite housing evolved from identical rows of attached brownstones to freestanding urban palaces of unprecedented proportion.[3] Architectural expression was likewise transformed from the classical revivals of mid-century to a muscular language of masonry that often included Gothicizing elements. Shifts in typological specificity, scale and style played out across entirely new geographies established in a post-war frenzy of real estate speculation that heightened the city's increasing physical segregation

---

[1] John Ruskin, "The Revival of Handicraft," *The Fortnightly Review*, November, 1888; quoted in Isabelle Frank, ed., *The Theory of Decorative Art: An Anthology of European and American Writings, 1750-1940* (New Haven, CT: Published for the Bard Graduate Center Studies in the Decorative Arts, and New York: Yale University Press, 2000), 169.

[2] Tenements and their inhabitants were most famously documented by photographer Jacob Riis. Others—both reformers and those espousing social Darwinist views—similarly published on tenement dwellers. See Matthew Hale Smith, *Sunshine and Shadow in New York* (Hartford, CT: J.B. Burr and Co., 1871); Charles Loring Brace, *Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, 1879); and Jacob A. Riis, *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889).

[3] Wayne Craven, *Gilded Mansions: Grand Architecture and High Society* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2009); Michael C. Cathrens, *Great Houses of New York, 1880-1930* (New York: Acanthus, 2005).

according to wealth and class.[4] At the same time, the education and training of the men (and in some cases, women) who oversaw this transformation—decorators, artists, architects and engineers—advanced to an unprecedented level of professionalization and specialization, the same process of "incorporation" that according to one foundational study of the Gilded Age similarly shaped business, finance, law and medicine.[5] This focus on the built environment—the siting and design of buildings; the furnishing and decoration of their interiors—was not just the concern of professionals and the elites that patronized them. Particularly in the wake of the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, middle-class householders fueled a veritable craze for domestic decoration that, as a corrective to the overstuffed, cluttered Victorian interior, emphasized unity, harmony and the "artistic"—a philosophy and style we now call Aesthetic.

This period of flourishing artistic and architectural expression was also one of the most turbulent eras in the city's (and the country's) history, marked by political discord, strikes and often violent riots, and the chapters that follow are an attempt at synthesizing the tumult of post-bellum New York with concurrent developments in architectural style and practice. Indeed, reuniting these seemingly opposed strands sheds new light on the city's evolution and development during the Gilded Age, foregrounding the role that the built environment played in communicating and affirming a shared identity among New York's elites.

---

[4] See David M. Scobey, *Empire City: The Making and Meaning of the New York City Landscape* (Philadelphia: Temple University, 2002); and Keith D. Revell, *Building Gotham: Civic Culture and Public Policy in New York City 1898-1938* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2003).

[5] Alan Trachtenberg, *Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1960); also see T.J. Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America 1877-1920* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009).

As a case study of this transformation, this dissertation examines Manhattan's Seventh Regiment, arguably the country's most highly regarded volunteer militia, and uses the Seventh's commission for a new headquarters during the 1870s as a lens through which to view and analyze these interrelated shifts. The Seventh's members and supporters were part of New York's class of wealthy, well-connected business leaders. Through the pivotal years of the 1860s, these prominent men had been bitterly divided over the political and economic issues that led to (and lingered after) the Civil War. Yet, by the early 1870s, the differences between elite Republicans and Democrats were subsumed in larger tensions over immigration and industrialization. The two groups united in support of civic reform and a number of institutions—public and private—that undergirded their longstanding hegemony.

The Seventh Regiment was one such institution that straddled the divide between public and private. This corps and others like it served a public function in policing New York's streets and enforcing the rule of law when called, but the Seventh was self-selecting and highly exclusive. An elegantly appointed fortress, the building reflects this inherent tension. Privately funded and inhabited exclusively by this regiment, it is a monument to a particular moment in New York history when elites came together, united against the menacing threat of urban violence and class warfare. Members and supporters who funded the project were drawn from the city's elite class of merchants and financiers who aimed to maintain order and privilege by imposing their vision of "citizenship" and "culture" on a wildly heterogeneous metropolis. Particularly during the 1860s and 1870s, this legitimacy was challenged by laborers and recent immigrants who defined such key concepts in radically different terms.

The Seventh was founded in 1806 and throughout its long history, had been instrumental in maintaining order during New York's many riots and civil disturbances. The regiment restored order in the Election Riots of 1834, when arms were stolen from the state arsenal but peacefully returned upon the Seventh's arrival. Its role in the 1849 Astor Place Riots marked a turning point as the first time the militia openly fired into a crowd. That same year, when New York's two rival police forces held City Hall siege, it was the Seventh that intervened, and it was famously the first volunteer regiment to answer President Lincoln's call for troops to defend Washington, D.C., in April of 1861. Two years later, its members were among the first ordered back to defend Manhattan from the riotous mobs of the Draft Riots, and well after the Civil War, it remained the country's most celebrated volunteer corps.[6]

From its early history through the 1850s, the Seventh made use of rented facilities and drilled outside in open fields or parks designated for occasional use by the city's various militias. This was common practice for all such volunteer units. The Seventh successfully negotiated to share a facility with a consortium of butchers in the late 1850s (the building was completed in 1860), and according to Robert Koch, "the Seventh Regiment was the only unit in New York that owned even part of a building."[7] Yet in name, the Tompkins Market Armory reflected the multi-purpose structure's lack of specificity and in its style, too, the Italianate cast iron façade was more in keeping with

[6] On these episodes in the Seventh's history, see Col. Emmons Clark, *History of the Seventh Regiment of New York, 1806-1889*, vol. I (New York: Privately Printed, 1890), 44, 220, 342-349, 470; and vol. II, 109-115.

[7] Robert Koch, "The Medieval Castle Revival: New York Armories" *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 14, no.3 (October 1955): 23.

other commercial buildings and spoke very little of the military inhabitants on the upper floors.

The Seventh's Civil War fame, coupled with tension over immigration and labor unrest in the immediate post-bellum years, spurred enrollment in the ranks and it quickly outgrew the shared facility. Civic disturbances in which arsenals and armories were targeted and in some cases destroyed, led to new design strategies for siting and defensibility of such structures. The uptick in violence necessitated year-round drills (rather than weather-permitting) and thus indoor facilities were required specifically for this purpose. Further, the downtown location of Tompkins Market had become inconvenient for the Seventh's members who primarily resided uptown, and the neighborhood had become "unsavory." According to the Seventh's then-leader, Colonel Emmons Clark (1827-1905), the large private residences once surrounding Tompkins Square Park had gradually been supplanted by tenement houses, "the Commune boldly displayed its red banner in the neighborhood," and on occasion of military drill or march "the place swarmed with idle men, women and children," presumably hostile to the presence of the soldiers.[8]

These and other factors prompted the Seventh to erect a large purpose-built, stand-alone armory in the burgeoning elite enclave uptown. Prominent volunteer militias in other cities (including neighboring Brooklyn) had raised funds and built headquarters exclusively for themselves prior to the Seventh's initiative, and when conceptualizing their project, this regiment clearly looked to those earlier precedents. Yet in style and design, in the amenities it afforded the men, and certainly in its prime Park Avenue location, this building set the standard for the armory as a newly emergent building type,

[8] Clark, *History* II, 265.

and served as a model in a subsequent wave of armory construction that swept the country in the traumatic years of labor-capital conflict.

The 1863 Draft Riots provide a clear illustration of the exact circumstances in which physical safety, architectural legibility and elite identity came together in the post-bellum era. For those five days in mid-July, New York City experienced the most severe outbreak of urban violence in American post-Revolutionary history. Initially spurred by local Democratic opposition to the federal Conscription Act, the Draft Riots escalated almost immediately into widespread destruction and brutality as thousands of men, women and children—predominantly poor and working-class Irish immigrants—targeted institutions and individuals associated with the federal government and civic authority, as well as abolitionist and Republican causes. Mobs raided weapons stockpiles intended for Union forces, burned down draft offices, police stations and a state arsenal before moving on to homes and businesses of prominent Republicans, or those accused of being such, in some cases mistakenly. A *New York Times* headline of July 14th attempted to summarize the previous days' horror:

> The mob in New-York; Resistance to the Draft—Rioting and Bloodshed. Conscription Offices Sacked and Burned. Private Dwellings Pillaged and Fired. An Armory and a Hotel Destroyed. Colored People Assaulted—An Unoffending Black Man Hung. The *Tribune* Office Attacked—the Colored Orphan Asylum Ransacked and Burned—Other Outrages and Incidents. A Day of Infamy and Disgrace.[9]

Indeed, the most brutal violence was reserved for the city's black population, unwittingly foregrounded in debates over the War of the Rebellion and its economic and political

[9] "The Mob in New York," *The New York Times,* July 14, 1863.

implications locally and nationally. Men caught by the mob were lynched, their bodies mutilated and dragged through the streets.[10]

The riots raged for three days largely unchecked, as most of the city's volunteer militia were otherwise engaged in and around Gettysburg. Though the rioters were for the most part crudely armed, they dramatically outnumbered and overwhelmed attempts to enforce order and maintain the rule of law.[11] As diarist George Templeton Strong feverishly recalled, "We telegraphed. . . . to the President, begging that troops be sent. The great misfortune is that nearly all our militia regiments have been dispatched to Pennsylvania."[12] Those regiments were ordered back to New York, and as of July 17th, more than 6,000 were stationed in Manhattan. By the 18th, peace had largely been restored in the city, but the devastation of the riots was severe: the death toll numbered over one hundred. That the exact figure is still debated speaks to the chaos and disorder of these events, though the final tab for destruction of property totaled over $1.5 million.[13]

---

[10] "The Riot Subsiding. A Last Desperate Struggle." *The New York Times,* July 17, 1863.

[11] New York's was the first "professional" police force in the country, but it had only been established in the mid-1840s and had been implicated in the same political struggles that fueled the riots. In fact, New York's Democratic governor had been at work dismantling the department's Republican leadership, leaving the force in a state of disarray when its services were most needed. See Adrian Cook, *Armies of the Streets: The New York City Draft Riots of 1863* (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1974), 54.

[12] Allan Nevins and Milton Halsey Thomas, eds., *Diary of the Civil War, 1860-1865* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), 337.

[13] Iver Bernstein extensively documented the riots, but lists the number as "at least one hundred and five." Similarly, Mary Ryan counts "more than one hundred." Iver Bernstiein, *The New York City Draft Riots: Their Significance for American Society and Politics in the Age of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University, 1991), 5; Mary Ryan, *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City during the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California, 1997), 170. Cook points to the irony that under state law, municipalities were responsible for damage to

Nineteenth-century Americans were well acquainted with street violence. After all, mob action had been central to the Republic's founding, and New York's early nineteenth-century history is peppered with references to riots. Adrian Cook's thoroughgoing study confirms that such events "were endemic in nineteenth-century New York" with "sixteen major civil disturbances and innumerable minor disorders" occurring between the mid-1830s and 1874.[14] However, such "riots" were typically benign. In the 1834 Election Riots, one political faction captured the state arsenal and brandished stolen muskets, but laid down the arms and "quietly retired" when militiamen appeared.[15] Further, as Mary Ryan argues, the principle of public dissent was more precious than civic peace through the 1840s.[16] Yet by the end of that decade, "a new style of social and political resistance" began to be engaged that was more violent and destructive, tipping the balance in favor of civic peace (vs. public dissent), necessitating new methods and strategies to enforce order in the metropolis.[17] The Astor Place Riot had set a new record in 1849 with twenty-two casualties; nearly five times as many, however, were killed in 1863, and the shock of the death toll was compounded by the wantonness and brutality of the violence.

While shocking, the events of July 1863 provide unique insight into the racial and class-based tensions in New York's inter-war years, foreshadowing the dark underside of

---

property destroyed in a "popular commotion." New York issued bonds for the Draft Riots destruction totaling $1,516,423.99. Cook, *Armies of the Streets,* 176.

[14] Adrian Cook, *Armies of the Streets,* 19.

[15] Clark, *History* I, 214-215.

[16] Ryan, *Civic Wars,* 131.

[17] Bernstein, *Draft Riots,* 3, 5.

America's subsequent Gilded Age, an era widely recognized as having laid the foundations for modern capitalist society. Thus the riots and similar civic uprisings have been investigated from a number of vantage points, yet the violent upheaval that characterized the post-bellum era has rarely been fully integrated into the art and architectural history of this formative period in American material culture. Recent studies in these inter-related fields have gone far towards broader contextualization, but a more thorough-going picture—one that situates Gilded Age institutional formation, artistic patronage and professional practice within these transformative events—is still needed. Certainly the Draft Riots and the labor-capital conflict of the 1870s and 80s they presaged provide abundant insight into the economic and socio-political machinations of late nineteenth-century New York, but they also illuminate issues central to transformations of the built environment within a rapidly shifting and highly contentious milieu.

One of the Draft Riots' most significant departures from past events was a new focus on the built environment. Even the most violent conflicts of the antebellum era (such as the Astor Place Riots of 1849, in which twelve were killed)[18] were primarily acted out between groups on city streets and sidewalks. In 1863 to this was added raiding and destruction of factories, businesses, and symbols of state authority such as police and draft offices. In some cases, the targets were strategic—telegraph poles were downed limiting the authorities' coordination; arms factories and gun stores were plundered—but private residences were likewise targeted, sometimes arbitrarily. The sculptor John Rogers (1829-1904) reported that "rioters tore through expensive Republican homes on

[18] Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 5.

Lexington Avenue."[19] The house of James and Abby Gibbons (close friends of noted abolitionist and *Tribune* editor Horace Greeley) was destroyed by a gang of rioters who, after having stolen or destroyed most of the Gibbons' possessions, lit the house on fire. Their daughters barely escaped out of the attic, running across neighboring roofs. In a subsequent report to the city, witnesses recounted:

> […] a great deal of furniture was thrown out of the windows, most of it having been previously injured . . . many of the books and papers in the library were used to kindle the fires, placed under the furniture collected for that purpose; the pictures and works of art were mostly defaced or injured in the house. The carpets and oil cloths were greatly injured, and after having been nearly destroyed, were mostly carried away.[20]

Meanwhile, the Union League Club headquarters was not attacked. The Club was founded in 1862 and was explicitly Republican from the outset.[21] A member speculated that the Club was spared because rioters "probably didn't know the purpose of the house."[22] In one curious exchange uptown, the mob demanded to know whose house they were threatening only to be informed they were not at a residence at all, but on the campus of Columbia College.[23]

While other targets were clear to attackers either because of geography (expensive homes on Lexington Avenue) or notoriety (addresses of the draft offices had been

---

[19] Ibid., 21.

[20] On the Gibbonses, see Margaret Hope Bacon, *Abby Hopper Gibbons: Prison Reformer and Social Activist* (Albany: State University of New York, 2000), 115-116.

[21] According to one history, the single, defining aim of the Union League was to unite the various ranks of the Republican Party behind Abraham Lincoln. See Francis Gerry Fairfield, *The Clubs of New York* (New York: H.L. Hinton, 1873), 106.

[22] Will Irwin, Karl Chapin May and Joseph Hotchkiss, *A History of the Union League Club of New York City* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1952), 31.

[23] Cook, *Armies of the Streets*, 72.

advertised in the press), the university and the clubhouse were ambiguous on both counts. From an architectural standpoint, both were illegible, yet other indicators of elite status were readily perceptible to poor and working class rioters. The "three-hundred-dollar-man" was a rallying cry during the riots, a phrase that referred to the fee draftees could pay for a replacement to serve in their steads.[24] That individuals were targeted based on the quality and style of their dress points to the fact that distinctions could be made on a personal level, but not between building types. Importantly, Columbia and the Union League Club were not alone in their ambiguity. The Seventh Regiment's tactical manual required officers to familiarize themselves beforehand with the structures they might be called on to defend, further suggesting that specificity was not readily apparent from the buildings themselves. The lack of architectural differentiation applied even to the Seventh's then-headquarters, Tompkins Market Armory. According to a clipping preserved in the regiment's archive, visitors to the city often mistook the building for the nearby Astor Library.[25]

The new armory that would replace Tompkins Market as the Seventh's headquarters in 1880 was undeniably militaristic in character. In fact, it was a dramatic departure from the earlier facility in location, design, and in the improved amenities it afforded. The new armory was situated on an entire block site bound by Park (then called Fourth) and Lexington Avenues between East 66th and 67th Streets. Essentially two conjoined structures, the building consists of a three-story administration wing backed by a single-floor, 55,000 square-foot, column-free drill hall designed to accommodate all of

[24] As Adrian Cook analyzed the commutation fee was far beyond means of most laborers and thus became a flashpoint in the class outlines of the ensuing violence. Cook, *Armies of the Streets,* 117.

[25] Recounted in Robert M. Fogelson, *America's Armories: Architecture, Society and Public Order* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1989), 12.

the regiment's 1,000 members marching in formation with heavy artillery. Both components contained a basement level for services: beneath the administration building were the boiler and other mechanical systems; a three-hundred-foot-long rifle range sat below the drill hall. The first floor of the administration building consisted of regimental rooms: a Reception Room; rooms for meetings of the Board of Officers, the Adjutant, and non-commissioned staff. A small library was also included with a capacity of 30,000 volumes. In the northeast corner of the building adjoining the Library was a room to be used exclusively by veteran members of the corps. The Veteran Room and its pendant at the far corner, the Board of Officers Room, are the grandest spaces—the corner offices, so to speak—in the building. The administration wing's rectangular plan is bisected by broad corridors that divide the space into quadrants. A main corridor runs directly from the entry to the drill hall, passing underneath a monumental oak-clad iron stair that leads to areas for each of the ten individual companies on the floor above. These smaller rooms were used by company members for meetings and social gatherings (many originally contained a piano), though their primary function was as secure storage and changing rooms as evidenced by the lockers that are a principal feature of these interiors. The remainders of the second and third floors are given to space for the regimental armorer, the Seventh's band and drum corps, a kitchen, and other service functions, as well as smaller drill rooms for company-level drill.

The structure was the result of a collaborative design process between the regiment's then-commander, Colonel Emmons Clark, architect Charles W. Clinton (a member of the veteran corps), and a number of other specialists who consulted on structural and engineering issues. The armory's interiors were likewise carried out by a

variety of firms. Herter Brothers, Pottier & Stymus, and Alexander Roux & Co. were primarily responsible for the execution of first-floor regimental rooms and a number of the second-floor company rooms as well. Their businesses started in furniture-making and Herter and Pottier were considered to be at the top of their field in this regard. Louis Comfort Tiffany shared credit for the design of the first-floor Veteran Room and adjoining library with a loosely organized group of collaborators, including the architect Stanford White (1853-1906); Candace Wheeler (1827-1923), a textiles specialist; Samuel Colman (1832-1920), who was, like Tiffany, an artist by training and a specialist in color; and the artists Francis D. Millet (1846-1912) and George H. Yewell (1830-1923).

My research uncovers new points of connection between the members of the Seventh who acted as patrons of Tiffany's fledgling decorating venture. Yet, the larger point is that these men—Tiffany, his circle of artists, and the members and leaders of the Seventh—were, as social and economic elites, peers. Their status thus stood in direct contrast to the furniture-makers like Pottier & Stymus and Herter Brothers who, while successful, had risen through the ranks of the factory system. Importantly, both types of firms—furniture-makers and artist-decorators like Tiffany—were vying for the same commissions. By emphasizing his training as an artist, Tiffany was not only capitalizing on the post-Centennial craze for all things "artistic," but was implicitly advertising his elite status to like-minded peers and potential clients. The interior was thus a site of contention that mirrored the competitive and often-turbulent world outside; as such, the commissioning and design of Gilded Age interiors should be more fully incorporated into the *architectural* history of this period, as the two—architecture and interiors—necessarily worked in concert.

Resituating the Interior

Writing in the early twentieth century, designer Eileen Gray (1878-1976) similarly argued for a fuller consideration of interiors from the standpoint of professional practice, asserting that inhabited space should be conceived from the inside out rather than as "the incidental result of the façade."[26] Her commentary was directed at the Modernist privileging of external qualities of built form at the expense of the interior, and though focused on practice and methodological approach, Gray's observations could easily be applied to the field's scholarship and historiography as well. That this argument was made by a woman places Gray squarely within a set of long-standing tropes still deeply imbedded within the design profession(s). Though significant inroads have been made in upending this pattern, the study and professional practice of architecture have long been dominated by men.

Interior design and its relative, interior decoration, have historically been the province of women, and until the mid-twentieth century, focused on the home. However constrained, these overlapping fields of decoration and design may certainly claim their fair share of notable female practitioners and writers. As early as the 1840s, Catherine Beecher (1800-1878) advised young ladies on the arrangement of their parlors as part of an all-encompassing program to reform the domestic environment and American home life by extension. Her 1842 *Treatise on Domestic Economy* has been recognized as a foundational effort in this regard.[27] Candace Wheeler, too, connected a woman's role in

[26] Quoted in Caroline Constant, "E.1027: The Nonheroic Modernism of Eileen Gray," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 3 (September 1994): 269.

[27] Catherine E. Beecher, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School* (Boston: T.H. Webb, 1842). For contemporary analysis, see Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catherine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity*, (New Haven: Yale University, 1973); Joan

shaping the home to broader issues of nationalism and reform. She capitalized on the near obsession late in the century with domestic decoration and design, publishing prolifically. Her "how-to" articles and books (including *How to Make Rugs; Principles of Home Decoration;* and "Decoration of Walls") were geared towards a female readership and she has been rightly acknowledged by twentieth-century scholars as a pioneer businesswoman and professional.[28]

Indeed, Wheeler herself asserted the importance of having a profession and wrote movingly about the impact training, independence and self-sufficiency could have on a young woman's life. In an 1895 edition of *The Decorator and Furnisher,* Wheeler recognized that it seemed natural for a woman to pursue interior decoration—underscoring an assumed conflation of woman with domestic interior—but held that success in the field required more than good taste and a good eye. Repeatedly, Wheeler emphasized the specific training and comprehensive education necessary for good work—in her words, "real excellence, of decoration as an *art* and not as a pretty arrangement of curtains, carpets and furniture" which "any ordinary clever woman" could accomplish—and importantly, drew both parallels and distinctions between the designer

---

N. Burstyn, "Catherine Beecher and the Education of American Women," *The New England Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (September 1974): 386-403; and Thomas Allen, "Clockwork Nation: Modern Time, Moral Perfectionism and American Identity in Catherine Beecher and Henry Thoreau," *Journal of American Studies* 39, no. 1 (April 2005): 65-86.

[28] Candace Wheeler, "Decoration of Walls," *The Decorator and Furnisher* 27, no. 3 (December 1895): 73-76; *Corticelli Home Needlework: A Manual of Art Needlework, Embroidery and Crochet* (Florence, Mass.: Nonotuck Silk Co., 1899); *Principles of Home Decoration with Practical Examples* (New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1903); *How to Make Rugs* (New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1908). For contemporary scholarship, see Mary W. Blanchard, "Anglo-American Aesthetes and Native Indian Corn: Candace Wheeler and the Revision of American Nationalism" *Journal of American Studies* 27, no. 3 (December 1993): 377-397; Amelia Peck and Carol Irish, *Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2001); and most recently, Catherine W. Zipf, *Professional Pursuits: Women and the American Arts and Crafts Movement* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 2007).

and architect. According to the author, the decorator not only followed but was part of the work of the "educated architect" and sympathy between the two was essential to a project's aesthetic and functional cohesion. And yet this outcome was seriously challenged on several fronts.[29] First and foremost, women had to overcome societal aversion to receiving "serious preparation for professions of any kind." Wheeler lamented the choice between family and career (rather than having both), and urged that the topic needed to be reconsidered by girls and their parents. Second, even if young women were inclined to embark on a career path, their prospects were further hampered by a lack of educational options. She again recalled the gender divide and bemoaned the lack of comprehensive college-level training for women:

> […] it is as if a boy who had chosen architecture as a profession could study only certain parts of his profession under competent teachers . . . and was obliged to bring them all together . . . by experiments . . . for want of the master-teaching which is really so happily within his reach. And yet this is the way in which at the present time a woman must study decoration."[30]

Wheeler is most closely associated with the Aesthetic Movement, popular in America beginning in the mid-1870s, but just four years after her lament above, a new publication signaled a stylistic and generational turning-of-the-tide. Edith Wharton (1862-1937), the privileged daughter of an old-line New England family had spent her childhood in an environment not too dissimilar from that advocated by Wheeler, and according to historian Richard Guy Wilson, the brownstone of her youth "was a virtual

[29] Candace Wheeler, "Interior Decoration as a Profession for Women," *The Decorator and Furnisher* 26, no. 3 (June 1895): 87-88.

[30] Ibid., 88-89.

archive of everything Edith would dismiss."[31] Co-authored with architect Ogden Codman, Jr. (1863-1951), *The Decoration of Houses* advocated the visual lightness and decorative simplicity of Louis XV and XVI styles. In one way, Wharton hewed closely to the sympathetic working relationship between decorator and architect that had been outlined earlier by Wheeler. Codman, himself a son of privilege, trained sporadically and in fact started as a decorator, but evolved a professional persona and practice as an architect.[32] Like Wheeler (and indeed, like Gray later), Wharton and Codman argued that interiors should be considered inseparable from the architectural shells in which they were enclosed.[33] Wharton's course of study was necessarily self-styled (as Wheeler lamented), based on books and her early mentor in French revival styles, Egerton Winthrop, but like Codman, Wharton's primary education was European travel—instruction open to her because of her family's wealth and social position. According to Wilson, their publication and the philosophy it espoused "reflects both Edith's and Ogden's extensive European travel and study."[34]

---

[31] Richard Guy Wilson, "Edith and Ogden: Writing, Decoration and Architecture," in Pauline Metcalf, ed., *Ogden Codman and the Decoration of Houses* (Boston: The Boston Athenaeum, 1988), 136.

[32] Edith Wharton and Ogden Codman, Jr., *The Decoration of Houses* (Boston: B.T. Batsford, 1898). According to Metcalf's biography, Codman's interest in art and architecture were sparked by his deep New England roots—that is, he understood his prominent ancestors through the objects and artifacts surrounding him in the Codman family home. He spent just a year at what would become the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but the rest of his early "training" came through decorating firms and interiors commissions. In truth, his primary education was travel. See Metcalf, "From Lincoln to Leopolda," in Metcalf, ed., *Ogden Codman,* 1-40. Codman's ancestral home, "The Grange," is now owned by Historic New England; an entire issue of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities was devoted to its historiography. See *Old-Time New England* 62, no. 71 (1981): 1-159.

[33] Wilson, "Edith and Ogden," 153-154.

[34] According to Wilson, Wharton's father supplied her with Ruskin's *The Stones of Venice* and Walter Pater's *Renaissance Studies.* See John Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice. Volume the First.*

Wharton established a precedent of sorts—the wealthy taste-maker-cum-decorator—that held for many of the decorators who followed her. These included the actress/socialite Elsie de Wolfe (later, Lady Mendl, 1865-1950), often called the first interior *designer*, a term that typically confers a greater degree of professionalism than "decorator." In fact, Wolfe's initial publication was an autobiography that celebrated her status as a famous woman of the American stage. She went on to update the genre established by Beecher nearly a century earlier with *The House in Good Taste*, published in 1913 and repeatedly reissued.[35] Heiress Dorothy Draper (1889-1969) is credited with further professionalizing the field by incorporating her firm in 1923, and through her work for non-residential clients. Like her predecessors, Draper's publications were decidedly approachable and perhaps sought to compensate for her unconventional status (in the 1920s) as a professional woman, encouraging readers with titles like *Decorating is Fun!* and *Entertaining is Fun!*[36] Most recently, Martha Stewart (b. 1941) fashioned a

---

The Foundations (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1851); *Volume the Second. The Sea-stories; Volume the First. The Fall* (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1853); and Walter Pater, *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1873). Winthrop's Louis XVI parlor was completely incongruous in the early 1880s, but its simplicity relative to the eclecticism characteristic of Aesthetic Movement interiors was a revelation for Wharton. In her words, "educated taste had replaced stuffy upholstery and rubbishy 'ornaments' with objects of real beauty in a simply designed setting." Wilson, "Edith and Ogden," 136-138,148.

[35] Elsie de Wolfe, *Stray Leaves from My Book of Life: A Little Autobiography and Some Fleeting Thoughts by a Famous Woman of the American Stage* (New York: Privately Printed, 1901); *The House in Good Taste* (New York: The Century Co., 1913). Also see Jane S. Smith, *Elsie de Wolfe: a Life in the High Style* (New York: Athenaeum, 1982); and Penny Sparke, *Elsie de Wolfe: The Birth of Modern Interior Decoration* (New York: Acanthus, 2005).

[36] De Wolfe similarly published on entertaining. See *Elsie de Wolfe's Recipes for Successful Dining* (New York: D. Appleton and the Century Company, 1934); Dorothy Draper, *Decorating is Fun! How to be Your Own Decorator* (New York: Art & Decoration Book Society, 1939); *Entertaining is Fun! How to be a Popular Hostess* (New York: Doubleday Duran & Co., 1941); also see Carleton Varney, *Draper Touch: The High Life and High Style of Dorothy Draper* (New York: Shannongrove, 1988).

global brand of domesticity (whose products range from cookbooks to house paint) and though her sphere of influence and expertise transcends decoration, and though her projects turn Beecher's dual emphases on efficiency and frugality on end, Stewart has amassed a multi-million-dollar fortune dispensing advice on the home much in the mold of her predecessors.[37]

Eileen Gray's reference to the façade brings to light the irony that all of the female figures noted above endeavored to craft a professional identity that was often in conflict with societal norms of gender, sexuality and/or class.[38] As the architect Joel Sanders insightfully highlights in "Curtain Wars," interior design, like fashion and theater, "is a discipline invested in the notion of self-fashioning through artifice."[39] His analysis builds on theories of gender identity as an enacted performance in which the stage (the interior) with its costumes (fashion) and props (decorative arts) plays a central role. While the performative interior may thus act as a place of escape from such constraints, the witty title "Curtain Wars" speaks to it also as a place of contention. Sanders

---

[37] Sarah A. Leavitt, *From Catherine Beecher to Martha Stewart: A Cultural History of Domestic Advice* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina, 2002); also see Adam Lewis, *The Great Lady Decorators: The Women Who Defined Interior Design* (New York: Rizzoli, 2010).

[38] For insightful research on this topic, see Alla Myzelev and John Potvin, *Fashion, Interior Design, and the Contours of Modern Identity* (Surrey, England and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2010); Kevin Murphy, "'Secure from All Intrusion': Heterotopia, Queer Space, and the Turn-of-the-Century American Resort," *Winterthur Portfolio* 43, no. 2/3 (Summer/Autumn 2009): 185-228; Kim Marra and Robert A. Schanke, *Passing Performances: Queer Readings of Leading Players in American Theater History* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1998); Roger Streitmatter, *Outlaw Marriages: The Hidden Histories of Fifteen Extraordinary Same-Sex Couples* (Boston: Beacon, 2012); Alfred Allan Lewis, *Ladies and Not-So- Gentle Women* (New York: Viking, 2000).

[39] Joel Sanders, "Curtain Wars: Architects, Decorators and the Twentieth-Century Domestic Interior," *Harvard Design Magazine* 16 (2002); reprinted in Mark Taylor and Julieanna Preston, eds., *Imtimus: Interior Design Theory Reader* (West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 2006), 305.

foregrounds the curtain as both a bridge and divide: it is the element where decoration and architecture come into contact and the metaphorical juxtaposition of architecture as a conceptual practice borne out by the solidity of durable materials, with decoration as ephemeral and intuitive. Indeed, it is this disparity that accounts for the latter's "inferior status."[40]

This second-rate standing in many ways echoes Wheeler's earlier exhortation, and for both the twenty-first century architect and the nineteenth-century decorator, the issues of design, its legitimacy and its practice are bound up with overlapping issues of gender, education and a sense of intellectual rigor—with seriousness. Wheeler held that professionalism required "serious" preparation but decoration has historically *not* been viewed as serious work, and *domestic* decoration, doubly so. Ogden Codman attempted entry into the American Institute of Architects, the organization that conferred professional standing and would have advanced his prospects, but was rebuffed. Writing in 1897, Charles McKim informed Codman, "execution of interior decoration work alone would not be considered a sufficient qualification for membership."[41] Dorothy Draper was famously disparaged by Frank Lloyd Wright as an "inferior desecrator," and the tropes of seriousness and amateurism persist even today.[42]

Indeed, the interwoven histories of decoration and design exist *outside* the "serious" study of architecture. Mary Warner Blanchard, a scholar of American

---

[40] Ibid., 303, 307.

[41] Quoted in Metcalf, "From Lincoln to Leopolda," 15.

[42] In an October 2012 article in the *The New York Times*, interior stylist Hilary Robertson, whose home was being profiled, rejected her nine-year-old son's desire to follow in her footsteps, saying "No, you don't. You want to be an architect. Styling is a silly job." "Staple-Gun Decorating in Fort Greene," *The New York Times*, October 10, 2012.

decorative arts, acknowledged the hierarchy of scholarly "seriousness" in which decorative arts are ranked below fine (and certainly below architecture, I would argue); within the field, furniture is prioritized over more ephemeral textiles.[43] History survey texts used by architecture education programs elide interiors almost entirely, just as design history surveys typically feature interiors as disembodied shells divorced from site or context.[44] This division may be explained at least in part (today) by the hyper-specialization of the design professions and the academic departments that support them. But there are a series of interwoven undercurrents that have persisted in both practice and scholarship, a lurking sense that the interior is somehow less "serious" than the building in which it is contained.

Christy Anderson's insightful study tracks a conceptual division between architecture and interiors as far back as Leon Battista Alberti, but it was the seventeenth-century English architect Inigo Jones (1573-1652) who explicitly folded gender into the equation of study and practice. Anderson's analysis shows how fluency in the language of Classical antiquity dovetailed with shifting notions of elite masculinity during the period so that for Jones, architecture powerfully embodied then-current ideals in built

[43] Mary Warner Blanchard, "Embroidery, Enterprise and the Modernist Vision in Gilded Age America," Review of Amelia Peck and Carol Irish, *Candace Wheeler: the Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900,* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2006); and *Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900,* Curated by Amelia Peck and Carol Irish, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, October 10, 2001 – January 6, 2002 in *American Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (December 2002): 661.

[44] For example, see Spiro Kostof, *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* (New York: Oxford University, 1995); John Pile, *A History of Interior Design,* 2nd ed. (London: Laurence King Publishing, 2003); and Stanley Abercrombie and Sherrill Whiton, *Interior Design & Decoration,* 6th ed., (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson, 2006).

form.[45] Education and travel were crucial components of this project, but it was undergirded by notions of seriousness and scholarship. According to Anderson, Jones's architecture and his theoretical studies "intersected with ideas of masculinity and succeeded in establishing a "serious" language . . . whose pedigree is irreproachable."[46]

The study that follows is an attempt to re-situate one group of nineteenth-century interiors through the lens of these related and overlapping perspectives. While it is not my goal to delve deeply into theoretical discourses of gender and identity, these are unavoidable components of the work at hand. Certainly for the Seventh Regiment and for the figures responsible for the architectural design and interior decoration of the Seventh's facility, the armory project was inextricably bound to issues of an elite masculine identity that was very much in transition. In many ways, that identity straddled the divide between an older chivalric model rooted in Jeffersonian notions of individualism and engaged citizenship and a new corporate ideal that emphasized education and expertise. For twenty-first century observers, this dichotomy may be read into the building itself, in the disparity between a muscularly fortified exterior and lavishly sumptuous interiors but this was not contradictory in the 1880s. Indeed, like Inigo Jones and his eighteenth-century patrons, the Seventh both modeled and shaped new outward expressions of eliteness and, for these men, that included mastery of the high-style interior. Here, too, that space was performative, but rather than functioning as an escape from societal norms, it served as an emphatic assertion of traditional cultural

[45] Christy Anderson, "Masculine and Unaffected: Inigo Jones and the Classical Ideal," *Art Journal* 56, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 52.

[46] Ibid., 54.

values—at least as defined by elites themselves—at a moment when those values were felt to be under attack.

The objective here is not to turn decades of feminist scholarship on end by claiming marginalized status for these privileged white males, but it is important to properly re-situate *these* interiors as non-domestic spaces designed by and for men. One result is to disentangle the persistent conflation of the interior with domesticity and thus femininity (and the obverse: architecture as masculine/public/serious). It is also my desire to show how "seriousness" as analyzed by Anderson (recourse to study and travel) shaped the late nineteenth-century practice of architecture *and interiors* alongside the development of professionalism—ideas that, like elite identity itself, were in transition. In fact, because of its performative capacity, it was the high-style interior that symbolized and expressed elite male identity. Shifts in professional practice and indeed in the makeup of the practitioners themselves were key components in defining and mobilizing this status. As Candace Wheeler's text shows, this was not an effort to marginalize women *per se.* Wheeler herself employed the language of rigor and seriousness to define her own standing as a professional. Yet even beyond the transgression of normative gender roles, her comments point to the economic resources on which professionalism depends: Wheeler singled out the "man decorator" who was "a mere man of trade" for disparagement, bringing issues of class and socio-economic standing to the fore.[47]

In the late 1870s these contentions over the built environment played out on the edges—the spaces of overlap between architecture and decoration symbolized in Joel Sanders's text by the curtain. The Aesthetic Movement was thus both a vehicle for the

[47] Wheeler, "Interior Decoration as a Profession for Women," 88.

transformation of stylistic expression and of evolving professional practice. In its emphasis on "artistic" interiors and décor, Aestheticism implicitly opened the interior as a potential field of practice for artists so that here again, socio-economic privilege, education and travel dovetail in defining elite identity.

Scholarly study on the Aesthetic Movement and its key participants has only very recently begun to entertain such questions. Overwhelmingly, this research has been domestic in focus, and since so few houses are extant, these studies often endeavor to reconstruct them. A prime example is James Yarnall's 1994 "Souvenirs of Splendor," which describes John La Farge's (1835-1910) decorative work in the now-demolished Cornelius Vanderbilt II house.[48] A similar undertaking is by Henry La Farge, who documents his ancestor's work in several of the Vanderbilt homes.[49] Mary Dutton Boehm's Master's thesis deals with the Herter Brothers' design of William H. Vanderbilt's palatial Fifth Avenue home, outlining the firm's abandonment of pure cabinetmaking for decorating, tracing the development of this trend in the 1860s and early 70s, and analyzing this project, the firm's first and only architectural commission.[50] Diana Stradzes's insightful study of Leland Stanford's San Francisco mansion contrasts the project with earlier and contemporaneous East Coast examples, recovering the significance of this now-forgotten work. Stradzes's analysis of the decorative program, in particular, illustrates the firm's increasingly sophisticated grasp of whole-house interiors,

---

[48] James Yarnall, "Souvenirs of Splendor: John La Farge and the Patronage of Cornelius Vanderbilt II," *American Art Journal* 26 (1994): 66-105.

[49] Henry La Farge, "John La Farge's Work in the Vanderbilt Houses" *American Art Journal* 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1984): 30-70.

[50] Mary Dutton Boehm, *Herter Brothers and the William H. Vanderbilt House* (M.A. thesis, Cooper-Hewitt Museum and Parsons School of Design, 1991).

and the development of complex iconographic programs within them.[51] Edna Kimbro master's thesis similarly investigates West Coast work done by a New York firm, in this case, the Herter Brothers.[52]

The Aesthetic Movement itself has received renewed interest since the 1980s, though again, the scarcity of extant interiors has yielded studies almost exclusively focused on the work of individual firms, or on seeking to attribute furniture and decorative arts to them. The Metropolitan Museum of Art's 1986 exhibition and related publication, *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement* remains a thorough overview.[53] Roger B. Stein's essay makes clear the impact of the Philadelphia Centennial, and provides a philosophical framework for the movement. The Bard Graduate Center monograph on E.W. Godwin is perhaps the most successful in synthesizing its subject within a broader international framework, outlining the complex interplay between early British reformers and artists and their influence in the United States.[54] A more recent study, Mary Warner Blanchard's 1998 publication provides a thought-provoking exploration of the movement's "subversive underside" and informs my analysis of the Seventh Regiment Armory, yet this text is admittedly not focused on interiors.[55] Katherine Howe's 1994

---

[51] Diana Stradzes, "The Millionaire's Palace: Leland Stanford's Commission for Pottier & Stymus in San Francisco," *Winterthur Portfolio* 6, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 213-243.

[52] Edna E. Kimbro, *The California Commissions of the Herter Brothers, Decorators, New York City* (M.A. thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz, 1986).

[53] Doreen Bolger Burke, ed., *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986).

[54] Susan Weber Soros, ed., *E.W. Godwin: Aesthetic Movement Architect and Designer* (New Haven: Yale University, 1999).

[55] Mary Warner Blanchard, *Oscar Wilde's America: Counterculture in the Gilded Age* (New Haven: Yale University, 1998), xiv.

Herter Brothers text is an essential monograph, outlining the broad scope of the firm's furniture and interiors work.[56] Her essay, "An Introduction to the Herter Brothers," details numerous points of contact and collaboration among New York firms, including those who worked on the armory, though it is only mentioned briefly. Similar connections are made in Catherine Hoover Voorsanger's contribution to The Metropolitan Museum exhibition and publication, *Art and the Empire City: New York 1825-1861,* which places furniture production in the larger context of mid-century business practice.[57] Firms employed at the armory are mentioned, but the commission is not. David Hanks's 1982 *Magazine Antiques* article analyzes the stylistic development of Pottier & Stymus through the 1870s and 80s,[58] while Kristen Herron attributes recently discovered furniture to the firm.[59]

Several publications have dealt with the development of the armory as a building type. Robert Koch documented the use of medieval elements in several New York armories.[60] Nancy Todd's book on the subject provides a thorough chronology of every armory built in New York State, but is documentary in nature and lacks significant

---

[56] Katherine S. Howe, ed., *Herter Brothers: Furniture and Interiors for a Gilded Age* (New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 1994).

[57] Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, "Gorgeous Articles of Furniture: Cabinetmaking in the Empire City," in *Art and the Empire City: New York, 1825-1961,* Catherine Hoover Voorsanger and John K. Howat, eds. (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000).

[58] David Hanks, "Pottier & Stymus Manufacturing Company: Artistic Furniture and Decorations," *Art and Antiques* 5 (September-October 1982): 84-90.

[59] Kristen Herron, "The Modern Gothic Furniture of Pottier & Stymus," *The Magazine Antiques* (May 1999): 762-767.

[60] Koch, "The Medieval Castle Revival."

analysis.[61] Robert M. Fogelson's more comprehensive text rightly connects an upswing in nineteenth-century armory construction to heightened labor-capital tensions, though as a historian of domestic political violence, the author's treatment of architecture has been critiqued by historians in that field.[62]

Finally, several texts have addressed the Seventh Regiment Armory specifically. Victoria Esterlis's recent master's thesis focuses on what she calls the "social history" of the armory.[63] Like Fogelson, Esterlis ties the building's construction to civic upheaval, but the study does not contain original research. Sophia Duckworth's Schacter's 1985 thesis deals more specifically with the construction and furnishing of the interiors, while Paul Ballard Haydon's addresses the Herter Brothers' work at the armory.[64] Schacter's and Haydon's studies were undertaken in the context of Columbia University's Historic Preservation program and both offer art historical synthesis and contextualization. Yet, Schacter's analysis is focused primarily on the second floor rooms, while Haydon's

---

[61] Nancy Todd, *New York's Historic Armories: An Illustrated History* (Albany: State University of New York, 2006.)

[62] Fogelson, *America's Armories.* Rebecca Zurier reviewed the publication, praising much of the author's contextual analysis, while critiquing his avoidance of "larger ideas on the relationship of built form to social control," and questions left "unanswered (or unasked)." Rebecca Zurier, "American Architecture" [book review] *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 50, no. 3 (September 1991): 330. James O'Gorman similarly praised Fogelson's treatment of social and urban issues, but was much more critical of the author's grasp of architectural history, which O'Gorman called "barely adequate." James O'Gorman, "Review," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 115, no. 1 (January 1991): 134.

[63] Victoria Esterlis, "The Seventh Regiment Armory: A Social History of a New York Landmark" (M.A. thesis, Bard Graduate Center, 2008).

[64] Sophia Duckworth Schacter, "The Seventh Regiment Armory of New York City: A History of Its construction and Decoration" (Master's thesis, Columbia University, 1985); Paul Ballard Haydon, "The Seventh Regiment Armory: An Investigation and Analysis of a Herter Brothers Interior" (M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1991).

attempts to establish, through scientific analysis (of paint layers, for example), what the Herter Brothers-designed rooms may have originally looked like.

A substantial foundation had thus been laid—for Aestheticism and some of its most notable figures, for armories generally, and even for this specific example. And yet the documentary thrust of much of the scholarship outlined above—re-creating now-lost structures and spaces; attributing furniture and decorative arts; and importantly, Aestheticism as a *domestic* style—suggests that much work remains to be done in *fully* contextualizing this multifaceted commission within this period in American material culture. The present study builds on the groundwork laid by these authors, synthesizing new findings within a broader framework that unhinges the interior from a heretofore domestic focus, while acknowledging the impact class tension had on cultural expression and professional practice during the Gilded Age. As an extant structure that is remarkably well-preserved, the Seventh Regiment Armory commission offers fertile and heretofore unexplored ground for such a synthesis.

The primary goal of this dissertation is to explore how the armory as an American building type was developed here and why. What informed this seemingly unprecedented building? To what examples did its designers and patrons look? What accounts for the inclusion of a newly formed firm, and what was the impact of Associated Artists' subsequent high praise for the other, more established companies? By starting with these fundamental questions about the commission and design, and contextualizing this history, this study significantly enlarges our understanding of the building and the complex interplay between its patrons and designers. In addition, the project serves as a case study of increasing professionalization in the architectural field. This shift was both artistic and

technical, and was fostered by European travel and study. In asserting their status as artist-decorators or architect-designers, practitioners distinguished themselves as professionals, increasingly distanced from the furniture-making trade.

This dissertation thus redresses scholarly neglect of the Seventh Regiment Armory, exploring and analyzing its spaces, while situating the building within larger socio-cultural climate that led to its commission and funded its construction. As examples of Aesthetic Movement design, the interiors are placed in the broader framework of that American style, which rose to popularity after the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. Building on earlier models of English design reform, its proponents sought to replace Victorian clutter with artistically conceived, unified spaces. Through the 1870s and 1880s, this transformation was overseen by the first generation of decorators and professionally trained architects who gradually replaced furniture-makers as arbiters of taste. Additionally, I connect the armory's architecture and design with the building's function as a military facility for the most elite militia unit in the country. A comparison with contemporary armories reveals the exceptional character of the regiment's home, yet examining how the type proliferated uncovers larger societal anxieties over immigrant labor and urbanization.

Chapter One, "New York's Seventh: The Silk Stocking Regiment and Civil Order" traces the history of this storied group from its founding in 1806 to the campaign for a new armory in the late 1870s, and connects the regiment's engagement with military events and the political and economic debates that surrounded them with its ongoing efforts to acquire new and better headquarters. This chapter establishes the central role the Seventh played in the changing metropolis and tracks the group's transformation over

the course of the nineteenth century from an organization rooted in a Jeffersonian model of engaged citizenship to a hierarchical and highly skilled corporate body. Facilities for the militia evolved alongside changing duties, and this investigation connects the increasing specialization and military proficiency of the volunteers with the evolution of their headquarters. In its fundraising campaign for the new armory, the Seventh skillfully referenced its long history of service as justification for what was an enormous expenditure, but also called on coded language in its appeals, utilizing the new building as a tool by which even non-member elites could directly shape ongoing debates over civic and fiscal reform.

The Seventh Regiment Armory project was finally realized nearly ten years after it was first conceived and Chapter Two, "The Commission and Design," utilizes a series of design proposals to illuminate the project's transformation during that period. Though the documentation that survives is scant and inconsistent, my investigation offers a new analysis of the roles played by its architect and designers by looking to the extant building and interiors. Scholars have rightly linked Gilded Age architectural professionalization to socio-economic prestige. Yet these studies have overlooked the role of artist-decorators and the emerging field of interior design as well as the nascent eight-hour movement and its impact on interiors commissions during this period. This chapter connects changes in architectural practice outlined by Mary Woods and others to larger debates about immigration—issues central to the Seventh's rationale for the building.[65]

[65] Mary N. Woods, *From Craft to Profession: the Practice of Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Berkeley: University of California, 1999).

The third chapter, "Influences and Assessment," investigates some of the architectural precedents that informed the design of this new building type and unpacks the relationships between them. This analysis further highlights architectural specialization in terms of building type and professional practice, and points to the armory's varied ancestry in form and style. This part of my study is similarly concerned with re-situating the interior within a fuller framework of late-nineteenth-century patronage and professional practice. I argue that just as new building types like museums, libraries, railway stations and hotels evolved towards greater specificity and proliferated in the urban landscape, there was a concomitant desire to stabilize novelty through a degree of continuity on the interior. Building on Katherine Grier's concept of the "commercial parlor," I trace the fluidity of parlors and parlor-type spaces that transcended the poles of public and private.[66] These high-style spaces also functioned as communicators of elite status. This chapter shows that the armory interiors were one in a small, cohesive group of contemporaneous projects that collectively established a stylistic vocabulary of forms and materials. The remarkable similarity of these projects suggests that Aestheticism was more than merely a decorative style, but communicated shared values at the exact moment of class consolidation by elite patrons.

The final chapter, "The Armory's Impact," deals with the building's legacy from a number of perspectives, including its long afterlife and the careers of its architect and designers. This armory project was an important exemplar—in fact, it was arguably *the* model—for a subsequent wave of American armory construction. Its fundraising, commission and design served as inspiration and a template for other groups in New

[66] Katherine C. Grier, *Culture and Comfort: Parlor Making and Middle-Class Identity, 1850-1930* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1998).

York and across the country and armories were soon built that were much larger and more heavily fortified; yet for a number of reasons its interiors were never replicated, rendering it a singular monument to the socio-economic prestige of this well connected Regiment. It was likewise an anomaly for the design team. None had been involved with an armory project before and only the Seventh's architect worked on another. In subsequent years, he was primarily occupied with large-scale apartment houses and tall office buildings. In fact, within a few years, all but one of the firms instrumental to the interiors commission were significantly reorganized or disbanded and the one whose practice continued did so in an entirely different style. Again, paradoxically, the Seventh was significant *and* singular in that it launched some careers and was a final chapter for others, but was not repeated. In this way, too, the building's commission and design illuminates generational, stylistic and professional shifts in the practice of architectural design in the late nineteenth century.

While this armory project offers fertile and as-yet unexplored ground, the scope of this investigation must necessarily be limited. The regiment's history and military exploits have been well documented by a succession of its leaders and members, and are not recounted exhaustively here.[67] I rely on these primary accounts inasmuch as they relate to events surrounding the commission and construction of the Seventh Regiment Armory. The issues of immigration and class strife that are so much a part of this discussion have also been thoroughly analyzed elsewhere, and while those events are

[67] In fact, providing a detailed written historical record seems to have been one of the responsibilities of regimental commanders. Histories were written by members and non-members as well, including William Swinton's *History of the New York Seventh Regiment during the War of the Rebellion* (New York: C.T. Dillingham, 1886); see also veteran members Asher Taylor and John Mason's co-authored early history, *Recollections of the Early Days of the National Guard* (New York: J.M. Bradstreet & Son, 1868).

central to this study, they are dealt with to the extent that they inform the building at hand. Finally, in seeking to contextualize this commission within the careers of its designers and architect, my project builds on the earlier efforts of art and architectural historians, yet I do not retrace their steps. Earlier and later buildings and/or interiors are analyzed as they shed light on the work undertaken at the Seventh, and the development of the profession as uniquely evidenced here.

Two important aspects of this armory are dealt with only briefly. One is the 55,000 square foot drill hall, which is worthy of a full-length study on its own. At the time of its completion, it was one of the largest unobstructed interiors in the city, and today is the oldest extant balloon shed in the country—that is, a barrel-vaulted roof supported by exposed arch trusses.[68] The drill hall figured prominently in the regiment's campaign for a new facility, and in many ways it was the building's *raison d'être.* It merits analysis in the context of early metallic architecture and the new building typologies of the nineteenth century. Yet, as my study focuses primarily on other components of the building, this element is not dealt with exhaustively. The individual company rooms are also not extensively covered here. Essentially small locker rooms for the regiment's ten companies, the second floor spaces were designed by many of the firms who worked on the first floor. However, only two rooms remain substantially intact. The rest have been altered, and in some cases, radically so.[69] For this reason, I do not focus on these spaces.

---

[68] New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, *Seventh Regiment Armory: Landmarks Preservation Commission Designation Report* (New York: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1994), 19.

[69] The rooms of Company C, designed by Herter Brothers, and Company K, the Queen Anne interior designed by Sydney V. Stratton, remain intact. The others have been altered to varying

Finally, the Seventh's contemporary history, while interesting, is not central to this discussion. Current restoration and renovation of the building has yielded, and will continue to yield, numerous insights for restorers and preservationists. Its use as a site for innovative performances and art installations suggests viable possibilities for the adaptive reuse of landmarked buildings. However, these aspects fall outside my investigation of the Seventh's original purpose and intent and are only discussed as they relate to my analysis.

---

degrees. Many of the ceilings were re-worked or completely redone when the building was electrified; others have been substantially altered throughout. Company I's room, for example (originally designed by Pottier & Stymus), was redecorated, possibly in the 1890s in the Art Nouveau style. See "Second Floor Rooms," *Park Avenue Armory Drill Hall and Interiors Guide* available at http://www.armoryonpark.org/index.php/photo_gallery/building/ (accessed May 1, 2010).

CHAPTER ONE

New York's Seventh: The Silk Stocking Regiment and Civil Order

"Democracy is a politics not of unity but of opposition."—Mary Ryan[1]

To historian Lisa Keller, "a city preparing for siege is not the typical view of Gilded Age New York, whose history is rooted in the mansions of Fifth Avenue, the tenements of the Lower East Side, and the buildings of Wall Street."[2] And yet "siege"—a foreboding militaristic term—is an apt characterization of this period, as the 1863 Draft Riots make clear. Another view confirms that "political and cultural life was everywhere threatened, and many Victorian elite men developed a siege mentality."[3] Interestingly, Keller anchors an observation of Gilded Age disparity in the built environment—in varying building types (especially mansions and tenements) and settings. In fact, sites of contention were much more diffuse than Fifth Avenue, the Lower East Side and Wall Street—as the quote above suggests, an imminent threat was "everywhere"—however, these place terms tidily encapsulate long-simmering tensions of great complexity that boiled to the surface in the metropolis with escalating severity in the second half of the nineteenth century.

During this period New York became "the American metropolis"—a place where nationhood was remade by "linked processes of capitalist, cultural, territorial, and

---

[1] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 311.

[2] Lisa Keller, *Triumph of Order: Democracy and Public Space in New York and London* (New York: Columbia University, 2009), 190.

[3] Larry Isaac, "To Counter "The Very Devil" and More: The Making of Independent Capitalist Militia in the Gilded Age," *The American Journal of Sociology* 108, no. 2 (September 2002): 370.

political-military expansion and unification."[4] Alan Trachtenberg's classic study likewise presents the Gilded Age as a period of "incorporation" when American society became both more structured and stratified, and the essential outlines of twentieth-century corporate capitalism were established.[5] Particularly in the post-bellum context of immigration and urbanization, New York's high society—well established, intimate and deferential—was violently shaken. According to Trachtenberg, "economic incorporation wrenched American society from the moorings of familiar values" and was a process "that proceeded by contradiction and conflict."[6]

For historian Mary Ryan, this transformation was anchored in "radical revisions" of political processes that occurred in the wake of New York City's violent upheaval in the 1860s. For the city's old elite—its aristocracy of ancestry—democracy had been conducted in the open via public discourse and heterogeneous civic display. Visionary and far-reaching public projects—the Croton water system of the 1830s and 40s; the establishment of Central Park in 1859, for example—were physical manifestations of a benevolent, if patronizing, sense of *noblesse oblige*.[7] In contrast, the "best men" of the 1870s and 80s largely operated *outside* official channels, in private committees that met behind closed doors. The period witnessed a series of complex, interrelated events that included Civil War and Reconstruction, economic collapse, political scandal and, of

[4] Scobey, *Empire City,* 23.

[5] Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America.*

[6] Ibid., 7.

[7] According to Ryan, these projects were the work of an older order of elites, the "historic stewards of the public welfare," who organized their efforts through civic, neighborhood and business associations based on "direct and sustained relations" among social and economic peers. Ryan, *Civic Wars,* 106.

course, violent civic strife. In fact, civil disobedience had a long and hallowed history in American politics. According to Ryan, riots historically represented not so much the breakdown of the democratic process, but "its conduct by other means." A citizens' right to actively participate in the Republic was more precious than civic peace through the 1840s.[8]

However, the nature and scale of conflicts in the 1860s and 70s was entirely unprecedented, necessitating an equally exceptional response from elites who held onto their slipping hegemony with an increasingly tight grasp. The 1871 exposure of the Tweed Ring's malfeasance illuminated breathtaking corruption in city government, while that year's Orange Riots highlighted the danger that by then seemed inherent to any public event occurring out-of-doors. Though up to that point, New York's ruling class had been internally divided, these events spurred even the most entrenched partisans to cast their differences aside, and the two most powerful forces of elite hegemony—Belmont-circle Democrats and Radical Republicans of the Union League Club—united against the common menace of urban disorder. Members from both factions organized the Committee of Seventy in 1871 and staged their own rebellion, the "Insurrection of the Capitalists," mobilizing considerable power and influence to achieve fiscal responsibility and governmental reform. According to Sven Beckert, the events of this period catalyzed "bourgeois New Yorkers [who] self-consciously advanced their solidarity, with their numerous organizational efforts transcending . . . the particularist identities of different segments of the city's economic elite."[9]

---

[8] Ryan, *Civic Wars,* 131.

[9] Sven Beckert, *The Moneyed Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University, 2001), 211.

Just as it had in the antebellum era, the built environment both mirrored and shaped this conceptual transformation. As civic parades and public celebrations lessened and government became the province of boards and committees, a long history of shared discourse and ceremony withdrew to a private setting "just offstage of the public sphere."[10] Beckert holds that social activities—"balls, children's parties, dinners, musicales, receptions, and . . . weddings"—furthered the process of class consolidation for New York elites, cementing a dense, interconnected web of familial, social, professional and institutional networks. For Ryan, too, architecture was implicated as both site and symbol, "shift[ing] the balance from public space to private, interior zones." The structures and spaces that formed a backdrop for these rituals and the men and women who enacted them played an equally significant role in mobilizing the economic and cultural capital of this privileged class and in this sense, architecture and interiors patronized and inhabited by New York's Gilded Age elites—the spaces that sheltered and facilitated their indoor activities—communicated a language of shared values and shared identity.[11]

The militia was one institution that offered a specific mode of *direct* participation in the Gilded Age. According to the sociologist Larry Isaac, "at a time when not only a nascent labor movement, but growing streams of ethnic immigrants, women and the culture of modern urban industrial life threatened white male Victorian elite manliness,

---

[10] Ryan, *Civic Wars,* 280. Beckert holds that many historians have misunderstood the role extra-governmental channels played. Elites readily recognized "that office holding was not the only form of political influence." Beckert, *Monied Metropolis,* 81.

[11] Ryan, *Civic Wars,* 105, 204, 202; Beckert, *Moneyed Metropolis,* 264-5.

[militia] formation provided a powerful antidote."[12] Marcus Cunliffe affirms that militia duty liberated elite men, at least temporarily, from commercial and domestic constraints while allowing them to indulge in romanticized notions of heroism and masculinity: "they could feel patriotic, and therefore democratic, and yet [be] elevated into a romantic-genteel realm where one might talk without embarrassment of nobility, honor, chivalry, gallantry."[13] In an era before college sports existed, service also provided an appropriately civilized outlet for physical exertion, shaping male minds and bodies.[14]

The companies that would later become the Seventh were first organized in 1806 and were rooted in an older, Jeffersonian model of "provincial republican systems."[15] In fact, much like the gentleman-architect, the citizen-soldiers' amateur status was one of the militia's most prized characteristics from the early period. Though members policed the city and on more than one occasion were mustered into federal service, the primary duty of the volunteers was to parade or provide escort to dignitaries, conferring a sense of ceremony to the public events and celebrations that were central to urban life early in the century. The Seventh and other groups like it were thus public institutions—certainly in terms of their policing and military duties—but also and importantly in that their activities took place outside in the public sphere. Militias (including the elite Seventh) lacked privately owned or purpose-built facilities, instead making use of open fields and

[12] Isaac, "To Counter the Very Devil," 393.

[13] Marcus Cunliffe, *Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865* (New York: Free Press, 1973), 230.

[14] In fact, the author draws parallels between volunteers and later college athletes. Both could alternate "between buffoonery and an almost fanatical absorption in the details of training and equipment." Ibid.

[15] Isaac, "To Counter the Very Devil," 369.

rented rooms that were shared. Yet as the nature and frequency of civic disturbances increased starting mid-century, militia duty evolved in response. Increasingly, military training and proficiency would be emphasized and specialized facilities required.

There was a close relationship between spaces used by the Seventh over the years and its intervention in moments of civic unrest, as this chapter outlines. From drilling outside and meeting in rented rooms, the regiment was successful in securing its own space for the first time just after the Astor Place Riots of 1849. Similarly, in the wake of its heroics in the Civil War and Draft Riots, agitation began for a newer, larger, stand-alone building to be used exclusively by the corps. Indeed, tracing the regiment's evolution and development through the nineteenth century illuminates not only this organization's history, but larger transformations in the city's various overlapping geographies—economic, political, cultural and spatial—that were undergoing a process of radical change.

The Seventh was revised and reinvented through the 1800s in ways that both responded to and actively shaped this complex dialogue. Enrollment in this group offered New York's socio-economic elites a direct mode of participation, training and physically engaging in conflict on the front lines. Long before specialized education in business, law or finance, young men had access to mentors through social and institutional connections the Seventh provided so that for those with the skills and inclination, service also afforded opportunities in administration, management and leadership. As the Seventh's members and leaders navigated the complexities associated with an architectural commission—including finding a site, negotiating the lease, hiring an architect, funding

and managing construction, selecting furniture and décor—they honed important skills transferrable to their personal and professional lives outside of the regiment.

Origins of the Volunteer Militia

The notion of a self-organized group of armed citizens is problematic for twenty-first century readers. In the United States, the term "militia" has become associated with ideological extremists or rural anti-government factions; the Seventh's designation "the Silk Stocking Regiment" further clouds understanding of this particular group, perhaps conjuring the image of Civil War re-enactors meticulously clad in period garb. The Oxford English Dictionary defines the institution as a civilian force of volunteers—distinguishing "citizen-soldiers" as they were often called, from professionals.[16] It was precisely because, and not despite, of this non-professional status that the militia was valued. Indeed, volunteer organizations like the Seventh Regiment played a central role throughout this country's history, even before the republic was established as such.

According to historian Russell F. Weigley, America's military tradition dates back to the British sovereign King Henry II's 1181 Assize of Arms, which required all free men to arm themselves and train periodically under a local officer. This system thrived into the Elizabethan Age when it was imported to the American colonies, though there its primary activity was defense against Native Americans. In 1631, Massachusetts Bay passed the earliest colonial militia legislation requiring the participation of all males

[16] The term "militia" is defined thus: "Originally: the body of soldiers in the service of a sovereign or a state (*obs.*). Subsequently: a military force raised from the civilian population of a country or region, [especially] to supplement a regular army in an emergency, frequently as distinguished from mercenaries or professional soldiers." The contemporary association is also referenced in the entry, which states, "Since the early 1990s in the U.S., the term has been applied to a number of right-wing groups opposed to gun control and distrustful of the federal government." See OED online entry for "militia" at http://www.oed.com (internet); accessed January 27, 2012.

between sixteen and sixty, with Maryland and New York soon instituting similar laws.[17] Despite the near universality of required participation, certain groups acquired elite status. As early as the mid-seventeenth century, a distinction existed between the "common militia" who served on a compulsory basis, and the "volunteer militia"—organizations whose members *chose* to join and who typically operated under the assumption that they would be the first to respond when called into duty. Among volunteers, cavalry and artillery were considered elite units and military "eliteness often became social as well" with groups choosing recruits based on their prominent social standing.[18] In their selectivity, elite volunteer militias reflected wider class divisions, and were staffed with men "who had the affluence, time and social prestige to devote to 'soldiering.'"[19] This should not be surprising, as it was yet another aspect of the system imported from England. In fact, British officership was only open to men of title who often bought their posts for large sums—a strategy intended to insure allegiance to the well established class structure.[20]

An army of sorts was first established in the American colonies in June 1775. Led by George Washington, Colonel of the Virginia militia, the First Continental Regiment was organized by a Continental Congress mindful of the corrupting potential of concentrated power; of the part overly strong militaries had played throughout history; and most pointedly, of the British military's role in inciting colonists to seek political

[17] Russell F. Weigley, *History of the United States Army* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1984), 3-4, 6; See also Robert Reinders, "Militia and Public Order in Nineteenth-Century America," *Journal of American Studies* 11, no. 1 (April 1977): 82-83.

[18] Weigley, *History of the U.S. Army*, 8.

[19] Reinders, "Militia and Public Order," 87.

[20] Weigley, *History of the U.S. Army*, 20-21.

independence. Washington's experience in the war convinced him that a large standing army based on the British model was the only way the United States would ever stand its ground against organized professional forces like the British and the Hessian mercenaries they hired during the Revolution. Yet the opposition—not only to a federal army but to a strong federal government that would fund and control it—was intense enough to defeat any such plans. Instead, the nation would primarily rely on its militia. According to Robert Reinders, the militia was the one issue that most consumed the 1788 Virginia ratifying convention, out of which came the Bill of Rights. Article II states, "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."[21] Just as the Constitution granted Congress the power to raise and fund an army but checked this authority by vesting the military's control in the executive branch, so the state militias were viewed as a safeguard against potential despotism by a federal army.[22] The Militia Act of 1792 further strengthened the militia as an institution by requiring every free, white, able-bodied male between eighteen and forty-five to enroll in a state militia and equip himself as outlined in the legislation. And though the Constitution granted Congress the power to call the militia out "to

[21] Reinders, "Militia and Public Order," 86.

[22] While this analysis focuses on the militia, perceptions of the regular army are worth noting in more detail. The military historian Marcus Cunliffe asserts that a federal army was historically considered un-American. The fact that in the early 1800s it was staffed mainly with immigrants only fueled this belief. In fact, until mid-century, as the army's immigrant enrollment increased, its status dropped. Admittedly, there was a divide between the enlisted men and their officers, many of whom were native-born and from prominent families. Yet even these men were disparaged: an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy (West Point) was viewed as a reward for political loyalty, and the school was criticized for turning out gentleman-soldiers at taxpayer's expense. See Cunliffe, *Soldiers and Civilians,* 101-126.

execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions," the Militia Act was amended in 1795, granting the President these powers as well.[23]

The Seventh, 1806-1849

Though the Seventh Regiment saw itself in the illustrious tradition of colonial militias like the Minutemen and Sons of Liberty, the few volunteer companies that were its *true* ancestors were established in 1806. At that time, British ships were stationed in New York harbor insisting to board and search American vessels ostensibly to seize British subjects on board. However on April 25th, a British ship fired on a Delaware-based sloop, killing the helmsman, John Pierce, brother of the ship's captain. Pierce's body was publicly displayed near the waterfront where tensions over the British practice had long been mounting. General foment encouraged by the local press precipitated much debate over the undefended harbor, and the patriotic young men of New York were stirred to organize militarily.[24] Volunteer militias already in existence saw their ranks fill, and four new artillery companies—the First, Second, Third, and Fourth of what would become the Seventh Regiment—were formed. In light of the federal government's inability to broker peace with England through diplomatic channels, Manhattan's merchants resorted to a strategy with long-standing precedent, even in the relatively young republic: the formation of a militia for defense of property and livelihood.

The group's first leaders were chosen because of their active role in forming the regiment, but their elite status is also emphasized in the Seventh's history. These men, "whose ability, energy, and social standing would be likely to secure their continued

[23] In fact, when President Lincoln called for volunteers in the spring of 1861, he was authorized to do so under the original Act of 1792. Weigley, *History of the U.S. Army,* 93, 125.

[24] Clark, *History* I, 46.

prosperity" were also those who "could contribute most liberally in time and money to [the regiment's] support."[25] This pattern would hold throughout the Seventh's nineteenth-century history. Its commanding officers were socially prominent, successful in business and in administration, though not necessarily decorated military men.

The Seventh was mustered into federal service for the first time during the War of 1812, but the most significant event from this early era occurred in 1824. In fact, the events of that year may be considered central to the Seventh's founding as its actual establishment in 1806, for it was then that the *identity* of the Seventh took shape. That year the nation prepared to welcome the Marquis de Lafayette (1757-1834), a hero of the Revolutionary War and a central figure in the country's formation. At the invitation of President James Monroe (1758-1831), Lafayette's thirteen-month tour was intended to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the nation's founding, and to instill a sense of patriotic unity in a generation of Americans increasingly divided over the economic and geographic implications of slavery**.** The United States was overcome with Lafayette fever, and as a volunteer militia keen on emphasizing its prominent lineage, the Seventh was not exempt. Lafayette was a particularly appropriate hero for a militia manned with elites. As a wealthy French noble with ties to the king, he came to the aid of the United States as a volunteer, serving without pay, and even purchasing supplies in France with which to equip his men. After returning to France a hero, Lafayette was given command of the French National Guard, and his troop was instrumental in saving the royal family from the attack of a mob.[26]

---

[25] Ibid., 46-7.

[26] It is estimated that Lafayette spent about $200,000 to aid the American Revolutionary cause. He was later reimbursed for that amount by Congress. See Noel B. Gerson, *Statue in Search of a*

For the Seventh, Lafayette's visit corresponded with the realization of a plan to divide the existing regiment into separate infantry and artillery battalions. Talk of the split had been ongoing for some time, but the effort was finally realized in 1823-24 under the direction of regimental leaders, Major John D. Wilson and Captain Prosper M. Wetmore (1799-1876). A number of key features central to the Seventh's identity were adopted at this time, including the regiment's signature gray uniform and the name "National Guard." Chosen in honor of Lafayette, "National Guard" would remain the appellation of the Seventh exclusively, until it was appropriated for all state militias during the Civil War.[27] The group was officially recognized as an artillery battalion by Governor De Witt Clinton (1769-1828) in 1825, and with the addition of an eighth company in 1826, achieved full autonomy as a regiment. Colonel Wetmore, who had been so instrumental in the group's formation, and in championing its autonomy, was designated its first commander.[28]

Though not yet designated the Seventh in 1824—and in fact not yet a stand-alone regiment—the organization's characteristic identity as an artillery unit of elite New

---

Pedestal: A Biography of the Marquis de Lafayette (New York: Dodd and Mead, 1976); Pierre Horn, *Marquis de Lafayette* (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1989); and Gonzague Saint Bris, *Lafayette: Hero of the American Revolution* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2010).

[27] Other names under consideration were the New York City Guard, Independence Battalion, and Washington Guards. The Fourth Company had been selected as Guard of Honor for the General's first day in New York. As several of the Fourth's leaders stood waiting for Lafayette to disembark at Castle Garden, one made the connection between Lafayette's visit and his home corps, the *Garde National de Paris*, and suggested the adoption of "National Guard." The New York men also served as escort for Lafayette's departure. Upon hearing of the group's new title, Lafayette stopped and exited his carriage mid-procession to shake the hand of every officer of the group, establishing an even more direct connection between himself and the New York Guard. In 1844, New York's Sixth regiment began using the title in its official correspondence, but was forced to abandon the practice after the Seventh's leaders launched a public campaign attacking the other unit for doing so. Clark, *History* I, 308.

[28] Ibid., 123, 128.

Yorkers was fully established. As its first commander, Wetmore was a central figure in the group's history and served as a model for the men who would fill the position in subsequent years. Wetmore was a skilled and capable leader and administrator who held prominent posts in a number of organizations and was well connected socially, professionally and politically. First published at the age of seventeen, an 1830 volume of poetry was called "a collection of considerable merit" by the reviewer, Edgar Allen Poe, whose biography of Wetmore appeared in an 1846 *Godey's Magazine* series entitled "The Literati of New York." While noting his learned accomplishments, Poe praised Wetmore's personal character as "an exhaustless fund of vitality. His energy, activity and indefatigability are proverbial, not less than his peculiar sociability."[29] These qualities, according to Poe, set Wetmore apart as a particularly influential citizen, and rendered him an authority on "a certain class of city affairs," such as organizing benefits or civic ceremonies and celebrations.[30] Wetmore served as Regent of the University of the City of New York (later New York University) and chaired the State Legislative Committee on Colleges and Academies. He was the Director of the Institute of the Deaf and Dumb, President of the Art-Union, a Naval Officer for the Port of New York, a member of the Chamber of Commerce and of the Corresponding Committee of the New-York Historical

[29] Poe's series appeared from May to October 1846; Wetmore's biography was number four in the series. "The Literati of New York," *Godey's Magazine* (August 1846): 75.

[30] Similarly, the 1856 *Cyclopedia of American Literature* noted Wetmore's writing, but asserted that he was primarily known "as a man of literary influence in society" who had been "prominently connected with the most liberal interests of the city—both utilitarian and refined." Without noting the Seventh Regiment, the *Cyclopedia* entry ends with a brief reference to his military service in the state militia and his role as Paymaster General. Evert Augustus Duyckinck and George Long Duyckinck, *Cyclopedia of American Literature: Embracing Personal and Critical Notices of Authors, and Selections from their Writings. From the Earliest Period to the Present Day; with Portraits, Autographs, and Other Illustrations* vol. 2 (New York: C. Scriber, 1856), 279. Poe, too, noted the General's military bearing, stating he "looks especially well on horseback*." Godey's Magazine*, 75.

Society. Much like the original men of 1806, Wetmore was an influential and successful citizen with considerable "ability, energy, and social standing" and much like the expectation laid out earlier, he contributed liberally his own substantial wealth to the regiment.[31]

Through the 1830s and 40s, the group focused concertedly on improving its military proficiency, and demonstrated particular aptitude in self-promotion. In addition to outdoor drills and maneuvers the Seventh undertook various outings in and around the city for target practice or trials of marksmanship, always inviting newspaper editors and important military officers. Frequent out-of-town excursions that would become typical in later decades were not yet the norm, though the Seventh did host the Philadelphia Grays in 1828, Boston's City Guards in 1831, and the Boston Grays in 1844. In 1843, the regiment would travel to Boston itself to help inaugurate the Bunker Hill monument.[32]

During these first decades of its existence, the Seventh was very much a "public" organization, in the sense that its activities primarily took place outside. Its primary occupation was imparting a sense of pageantry to innumerable civic ceremonies and parades that were a hallmark of life in the city, and attest to New York's growing size and importance during this period. The men drilled in open fields or at grounds designated for the purpose and held meetings in rented halls or above taverns in plain rooms that could serve business or social gatherings equally. This regiment utilized dozens of rented

[31] Clark, *History* I, 149-151.

[32] Ibid., 163- 306.

spaces—some were even considered "headquarters"—but the Seventh could in fact claim none of these as its own.[33]

The lack of geographic and architectural specificity corresponds to antebellum notions of security and defensibility. During the 1820s and 30s, state-owned munitions were stored in sheds on the grounds of the State Arsenal and were protected only by a wooden fence. In the same period, members of the Seventh stored their weapons at home. By the mid-1830s, the men abandoned that practice in favor of more secure "armories," though the term at that time described a rack or storage case located in a rented drill room.[34] A relatively lax approach to defensibility must also be attributed to the nature of civic unrest in the period. The Seventh's history is peppered with references to "riots" but the use of this term, particularly when compared to the violence of post-Civil War years, seems a gross overstatement. As with the Election Riots in 1834, the appearance of the militia was usually enough to disperse a crowd, and it was not until the 1849 Astor Place Riots that mortal force would be used.[35] In 1836, the regiment quickly dispersed the

[33] St. John's Hall and Harmony Hall are two examples. Tammany Hall is described as the Seventh's de-facto headquarters in 1819; three years later, this distinction goes to Dooley's Long Room at Duane and Centre Streets. At eighty by forty feet, it was the largest drill room in the city, and "exceedingly plain." Presumably because of the drill hall's location on the second floor of an old timber structure, a wooden cannon was used as stand-in for the real item during indoor artillery maneuvers. The Long Room was significantly diminished with the widening of Centre Street, and in 1857, totally burned down. In 1822, Shakespeare Tavern expanded to accommodate military drills and balls, making that location "the acknowledged military headquarters of all the leading organizations of the city." With the Tavern's demolition in 1836 due to the widening of Fulton Street, drills moved outside to the State Arsenal Yard, and meetings to Drew's Second Ward Hotel. Ibid., 86-253.

[34] Ibid., 86, 176-7, 227.

[35] According to Mary Ryan, Astor Place "provoked the first municipal recourse to outside military force in order to quell a riot—complete with heavy pieces of artillery, a squadron of infantry and twenty-two fatalities." Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 136.

Stevedore Riot, and similarly restored order during the Flour Riot of the following year, after which the group was treated to dinner by the city's grateful flour merchants.[36]

However, unrest began to occur with increasing frequency through the late 1830s, and in a pattern that would hold throughout the nineteenth century, after the Seventh served in what was at that point a new level of martial activity, agitation began for an improved facility to be funded at city expense. In this case, the Seventh joined with other regiments in petitioning the Common Council, and by 1839, three rooms over the recently completed Centre Market were designated for their use (Fig. 1.1).[38] Described as large and commodious, the Seventh was assigned every Monday, though since most companies met more frequently, they still had to rent space. In fact, the early 1840s saw an increase in frequency of drills as well as an upswing in social gatherings, and friendly rivalries developed between individual companies for distinction in both spheres.[39] In 1842, the Fourth Company became the subject of "admiration if not envy" for space it

---

[36] Clark, *History* I, 243, 255.

[38] The letter, addressed to city leaders and citizens, established a format that would be used in subsequent initiatives. As petitioners, regimental members referenced their commitment to serve in a uniformed militia, whose charge was to be ready to aid city authorities when called. Deficiencies in current facilities were noted ("the drill-rooms about the city are generally too limited in size to admit any but the most common maneuvers to be executed"), rationale for new headquarters outlined ("improvement in tactics and discipline"), and a potential remedy suggested ("It has been generally reported that the State Arsenal is about to be removed from its present location … Your petitioners would respectfully suggest the appropriating of these premises for military use"). The combined regiments referenced their increased activity over the previous four years, "in which period they have been called out a number of times for the preservation of the peace of the city and to protect public and private property," and went so far as to remind the addressees that the firemen had already been provided rooms for their meetings. A full transcript of the petition is included in Clark, *History* I, 259.

[39] In 1843, the Eighth Company increased required drills to four times per month, and other companies soon followed. Clark also recalls that in the same period, the tradition of company "soirees" began. Niblo's, the Apollo, and City Assembly Rooms were rented for this purpose and paid for by subscription. Ibid., 297, 309-10.

leased above the Arcade Baths, which was "fitted up and furnished with taste and elegance, and at large expense."[40] This period, then, marked a turning point in the regiment's evolution. Much greater emphasis was given to accommodations, and the spaces used by the various militias not only furthered their military proficiency, but stylishly outfitting and furnishing them became a source of pride (and competition) among the men.

Plans for an Armory

Though it would not be realized for several years, the Seventh's plans for an armory building began shortly after the victory of Centre Market. As early as 1843, an initial plan emerged for the lease of a site. Building costs were estimated at $5,000, and the Seventh's wealthy commander, Colonel Washington R. Vermilye (1810-1887), even offered to pay for the endeavor, though his proposition was not accepted for unknown reasons.[41] The Seventh similarly refused exclusive use of the entire third floor in the City Assembly Rooms building at Broadway and Grand Street.[42] Given the location and scale

[40] Just as it had pre-Centre Market, the Seventh rented rooms in a variety of downtown establishments. Tompson's National Hall at Canal and Elm was engaged in 1842, as was the Apollo, primarily known as the "headquarters of the dancing public." St. John's Hall near City Hall Park, and Mercer House (at Mercer and Broome), were also used. Broadway House, at Broadway and Grand, was known as the ostensible headquarters of the Whig party. Lafayette Hall had a drill hall on the second floor, and a bar room and billiard saloon on the ground floor, along with several rooms for arms and uniform storage and company meetings. Ibid., 275-360.

[41] In October of that year, a plot of land on Elizabeth Street was found which could be leased for twenty-one years at $300 per year. Other potential sites were on Greene, Chrystie, and Mulberry Streets. Vermilye suggested each company put up $250 as collateral, and offered to personally fund the construction as long as the regiment agreed to pay the rent. Reasons for the regiment's refusal are not made known. Ibid., 296-297.

[42] The building's owner must have been attempting to secure the entire regiment as a more permanent tenant, since individual companies had already rented space in the building for their "soirees." The floor was offered at a rate of $1,250 per year, but as with Vermilye's offer, was declined. Ibid., 310.

of the facility it would next occupy, these sites were most likely too small and too far downtown. The Elizabeth Street lot, at 57 x 85 feet, was only slightly larger than Lafayette Hall's 50- x 70-foot drill room, which the Seventh had been renting.[43] Limited access to Centre Market had become problematic. In 1844, a scheduling mix-up between Captain Abram Duryee's Sixth Company and a German company of the Thirty-Eighth Regiment escalated into an armed showdown for use of the space.[44] The group undoubtedly decided to wait for more optimal quarters, and may have been encouraged by the authorities' liberality toward the militia during these years.

There were other factors at work that motivated this initiative which were triggered by the increasingly bureaucratic management of volunteer militias. This particular group's response to these changes highlight the ways the Seventh's elite status was continually renegotiated and reasserted in contradistinction to other units. Militiamen had previously been responsible for purchasing their own weapons, but in 1843 New York State agreed to supply its volunteers with arms at public expense. Since weapons were now state property rather than the personal property of volunteers, they were no longer to be stored in the men's homes. This change necessitated the universal adoption of "armories" or gun racks, as well as the added expense of an armorer to maintain them; both had previously been used by the Seventh, though both were considered a luxury. Moreover, in an effort to further professionalize the city's various volunteer units, the militia law was amended in 1847. One consequence of the city-wide reorganization was

[43] Ibid., 297, 309.

[44] The rather humorous tale of Duryee's mistake and eventual withdrawal from the fray is recounted in Clark, *History* I, 304.

to re-number its corps. This regiment, long the Twenty-seventh (and despite vociferous fuming) was re-designated the Seventh.[45]

Other less affluent regiments were now to use "armories" and armorers—assets that previously distinguished the Seventh as a wealthy corps. The Seventh responded by redefining the term "armory" from a piece of furniture—a cabinet—to a space exclusively for military purposes, occupied by this regiment and no other. The change reflected not only the group's elite socio-economic status, but its commitment to martial improvement as would be evidenced by a larger, more commodious facility. The time and terms of its drill and use would no longer be dictated or limited and the men could assume greater autonomy within the city and state's expanding military bureaucracy. That the acquisitive impulse developed just as the corps's long-established designation was changed should not be surprising. In 1824 when the artillery battalion was reorganized, a distinctive name and uniform were selected to commemorate the occasion. Thus, the desire for a single-occupant space coincided with the Seventh's reconstituting themselves in both name and dress.

From Astor Place to Gettysburg: 1849-1863

Though the Seventh had long been considered an elite corps, the Astor Place Riot of 1849 cemented the regiment's role as defender of upper-class New York. Establishing whether Edwin Forrest or William Macready was the superior Shakespearian actor was merely a flashpoint for growing class hostility between elite nativists and New York's rapidly expanding population of Irish immigrants, and according to historian Nigel Cliff,

[45] The revised militia law was intended to improve the groups' efficiency, increasing drills and instituting various policies to enforce the new regulations. The regiment vociferously opposed the change in number, but finally relented, since the Seventh was close to its original number, and had never been used by another group. Ibid., 299-300, 327-329.

the Astor Place Riots only furthered the process of class alienation and segregation.[46] The city's police chief had earlier informed the mayor that his forces were of insufficient number to control the anticipated mob, and the Seventh Regiment was called out in anticipation of a clash. The men arrived around 9 pm and were immediately pelted with rocks and granite pavers by the large angry crowd. After forming a line in front of the theater, the Seventh was ordered to wedge through the crush, but only succeeded in inciting anger and more assaults. Finally, the unit was ordered to issue a warning shot over the heads of those assembled, but this tactic was interpreted as evidence of poor marksmanship and inflamed further hostility.[47] The second volley, fired point-blank, initiated the mob's retreat; the third essentially ended the riot. The unit patrolled through night but there was no further violence.

Accounts vary as to the number of fatalities on both sides, but whatever the final tally, the riot at Astor Place was, to that date, the most violent single event in New York's history of civic unrest since the American Revolution.[48] The significance was two-fold: first, in its new level of brutality; and second, in the way it clarified elite authority in the changing metropolis. According to Iver Bernstein, "what made Astor Place different from

[46] In fact, the Astor Place Opera House had been established by elite theatergoers as an alternative to working-class entertainment venues near the Bowery. Nigel Cliff, *The Shakespeare Riots: Revenge, Drama and Death in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Random House, 2007), xiv-xvi.

[47] According to Clark, "…a shower of stones was the response to the efforts of the regiment to save the lives of the rabble." Clark, *History* I, 32.

[48] Clark places the number of crowd fatalities at "about thirty," lamenting that some were innocent by-standers. One hundred and forty-one militia were injured, fifty-three seriously so. Ibid., 342; other accounts hold that between twenty and thirty rioters were killed, and forty-eight wounded, while close to two hundred militia and police were wounded. See Paul A. Gilge, "Riots" in Kenneth T. Jackson, ed., *The Encyclopedia of New York City* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995), 1006-8; Both Mary Ryan and Iver Bernstein assert that crowd fatalities numbered twenty-two. See Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 136; and Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 149.

preceding riots then was the merchants' new determination to reclaim the public spaces of the city . . . and assert the dominance of their own standards and institutions."[49] The Seventh was scorned by those who opposed the response and praised by those who approved of the uncompromising stance its actions represented.[50] Indeed, its official history states with pride that the regiment was the object of "bitterness and hostility" from the "reckless and disorderly classes," but among "respectable citizens" it "gained reputation and popularity by its connection with the Astor Place Riot and its character for discipline and bravery was firmly established." From that day on, it received favor and attendant privileges from the New York's businesses and leading citizens.[51]

Historian Mary Ryan holds that Astor Place prefigured the violence yet to come. To the Seventh, the event portended good fortune. It had been the heroic savior of law-abiding New York, and was rewarded with increased recruits from that class of citizens. In fact, the regiment set a new record in 1850—its muster rolls totaled 428 men—and that record was broken each subsequent year. By 1859, the regiment was 519 strong.[52] So many new recruits intensified the strain on existing quarters, as did the Seventh's increased emphasis on training. In the wake of Astor Place, the Seventh's commander,

---

[49] Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 149.

[50] In fact, the Seventh was the only regiment then training in tactics specific to urban riots. As early as 1842, it had begun drills in "street firing." Manhattan's division commander praised all the corps ordered to duty, but singled out the Seventh "for their steadfastness, firmness and forbearance under the most trying circumstances." Similarly, the city's brigade commander recognized the unit for its service in "the most trying [duty] our citizen soldiers have ever been called upon to perform." See Clark, *History* I, 288,349.

[51] Ibid., 349.

[52] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 136; Clark, *History* I, 355. In fact, in 1850, the Seventh mustered 428, a new record. By 1851, it counted 470; the following year, 501; and in 1853, 519.

Colonel Duryee, initiated evening battalion drills. These were considered an innovation in 1849, but became central to military preparation in subsequent years.[53]

The regiment was meeting more frequently in an effort to further its military proficiency but because its enlistments were larger than they had ever been, it was no longer accommodated by its facilities and was forced to compromise, drilling with battalions of four companies rather than with the entire unit. It was against this problematic backdrop that the subject of a new armory was taken up with vigor.[54] This effort followed much the same pattern as that of the 1840s: again there were abortive attempts to find a site and a rejected rental; and an interim period was spent at the new City Arsenal (Fig. 1.2). For the first time in several years the entire regiment could be accommodated, but by 1856 a new armory was forthcoming.[55]

The Project Realized: Tompkins Market Armory

In its acquisition of Tompkins Market Armory (Fig.1.3), the Seventh Regiment was afforded a dress rehearsal of sorts for the uptown armory project of the late 1870s. Realizing an opportunity, the Seventh partnered with a consortium of butchers seeking to renovate the existing building, and in late 1854 it began a campaign to petition the

[53] Clark, *History* I, 355.

[54] Ibid., 355, 368.

[55] Several sites were considered including one at Broadway near Grace Church, and one at Broadway and Fourth Street, but both were abandoned as it was deemed "inexpedient . . . to assume any large pecuniary obligations." A plot at Astor Place, Lafayette Place and Fourth Street was considered for a ninety-nine year lease at $1,200 a year, and architectural plans were even drawn up, but a misunderstanding about the lease resulted in abandonment of this possibility. In a final parallel to the 1840s, the Metropolitan Hall Association offered to rent two floors of a building then under construction for $2,500 a year, but this proposal was declined. The new City Arsenal of 1853, at the corner of Elm and White Streets, was at last large enough for the group, but characterized as "cold and cheerless, dimly lighted and destitute of the most common ornamentation." Ibid., 364, 385, 391-2.

Common Council and secure a legislative resolution approving the issuance of finance bonds. The process was highly secretive and skillfully undertaken. The corps did not want to draw attention to its effort, and in much the same tone as the 1839 petition, referenced its recent service, outlining expenses the regiment shouldered, calculating payment for its riot duty at the rate of laborers' wages. The Common Council resolution was passed; an emissary of officers were successful in Albany; and companies immediately began raising funds through assessment to "fit up and furnish" the building.[56]

By March of 1860, several committees had been organized; two would oversee furnishing and decorating. Uniformity in style was sought for company rooms, and five of them adopted plans presented by Charles W. Clinton, an architect and member of the regiment. Companies were allotted $885 each for gun cases, desks and lockers, though some adopted more elaborate and expensive plans funded by their own subscriptions. On September 5th, the Seventh took possession of a facility Mayor Fernando Wood (1812-1881) described as "the most splendid structure of the kind in the country."[57] The top two floors contained ten large company rooms, as well as those for officers, the band, non-

[56] The Seventh's attempts at secrecy were not entirely successful. In 1857 the commander of the Twelfth Regiment attempted to obtain space in Tompkins Market Armory. The regiment wasted "neither time nor labor" in defeating what was characterized as an "unexpected attack and unwarrantable intrusion." The city's Board of Aldermen were petitioned, colonels of all the city's other regiments (except the Second, Tenth and Twelfth) wrote supporting the Seventh's exclusive claim, and a consulting architect testified that building would have to be altered to be used by more than one group. The Twelfth's efforts were summarily defeated. Ibid., 395-403.

[57] Wood praised the Seventh, stating "The lives, the property, and the peace of the city can be in no danger from enemies either within or without while we possess a protective power of this character." His admiration is actually quite remarkable, as the Seventh was instrumental in securing Wood's arrest during what was essentially a siege at City Hall over control of competing police forces in the late 1950s. See Clark, History I, 458. For more on Wood's controversial political career, see Jerome Mushkat, *Fernando Wood: A Political Biography* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, 1990).

commissioned staff, and a drill room (Fig. 1.4). The basement was also used for drills and rifle practice. By its own account, the Seventh expended more than $50,000 to furnish the Tompkins Market Armory.[58]

The Seventh ushered in 1861 with what was described as a public opening of the new armory, though in this case "public" was limited to "immediate friends and acquaintances" admitted with a ticket. A small library had been donated by the regiment's former commander Colonel Morgan L. Smith (1822-1874), D. Appleton & Co., and Henry Grinnell (1799-1874), a generous supporter.[59] The commander, Abram Duryee (1815-1890) retired and was replaced by Marshall Lefferts (1821-1876), but the unit was looking to the future with great confidence, even in the face of current events, asserting as it had in the past that political upheaval worked in its favor, bringing "the most intelligent and patriotic young men of the city to its ranks." In 1859, its rolls counted 910 members.[60]

This optimism would soon be tested along with the group's patriotism and proficiency. In early 1861, as federal forts and arsenals were seized by southern rebels, Colonel Lefferts's initial offer of service was declined by Union General-in-Chief,

---

[58] Clark, *History* I, 449-460. Given the time period and Clark's description, the interior was likely in a Greek Revival mode. Six of the company rooms were done in black walnut, with desks, chairs, lockers and revolving musket racks of the same. "French style" draperies and valances were green; the five-light chandeliers were ornamented with Roman and heraldic patterns, and the walls were "elegantly and tastefully" frescoed.

[59] Daniel Appleton was a member, and would become the Seventh's commander in 1890. Leaders had earlier declined an offer by Rembrandt Peale's heirs to buy a copy of that artist's portrait of Washington. Though the regiment declined, a similar act of generosity was proffered by Grinnell, Isaac Bell, Jr., Edward Minturn, and George F. Tallman, who stepped in to make the purchase. Ibid. 465-7.

[60] Ibid., 439-441, 467.

Winfield Scott (1786-1866).[61] However after the fall of Ft. Sumter on April 15th, President Lincoln issued a general call for 75,000 troops, and a request for 800 men to head for Washington D.C. immediately.[62] Lefferts was informed by New York's governor that Scott had now requested the Seventh specifically, and received word from Major-General Charles W. Stanford (1796-1878), the senior militia officer for New York State, that the Seventh had the distinct honor of being the first unit called into service. When this became widely known, the city's Chamber of Commerce met and immediately raised $6,140 for the Seventh's equipment.[63] The regiment settled on a departure date of Friday the 19th—a decision soon regretted as the men learned that the Sixth Massachusetts had beaten them to Baltimore and engaged enemy forces that very day, which was also the anniversary of the historic battle of Lexington. A line formed in Lafayette Place about 4 pm, and all 991 men that mustered that day marched to

[61] Scott responded that he would not accept troops from so far afield, for fear of insulting the local militia and arousing jealousy over the presence of outsiders in the capital city. He undoubtedly held the New Yorkers in high regard, stating, "If there be an exception it is the Seventh Regiment of the City of New York, which has become somewhat national, and is held deservedly in the highest respect." Still, Scott waited until a request was made by Lincoln to call for the Seventh. Ibid., 468-9.

[62] The nation's fate hung in the balance. Surrounded by slave states Maryland and Virginia, Washington, D.C. was the prime target of Confederates, and Lincoln was unsure whether Northern or Southern forces would reach the city first. See John Lockwood and Charles Lockwood, *The Siege of Washington: The Untold Story of the Twelve Days that Shook the Union* (New York: Oxford University, 2011).

[63] Not surprisingly, a number of the city's most important businessmen are listed as having donated to equip the Seventh: Moses Grinnell, Royal Phelps, Robert B. Minturn, Moses Taylor, William M. Evarts, August Belmont and W.W. de Forest. In the late 1870s, many of the same names would re-appear as subscribers to the regiment's new armory fund. For the Chamber of Commerce gathering, see Clark, *History* I, 471.

Courtlandt Street where they would board a ferry for Jersey City and begin the long journey to the nation's capital.[64]

New York was awash in enthusiasm for its volunteers. Women waved and cheered as did the men, who rushed from sidewalks to shake members hands, stuffing their pockets with food or cigars.[65] One image of the Seventh's famous departure (Fig. 1.5) conveys the patriotic fervor of flags unfurled along Broadway, onlookers crowding the sidewalks and windows, and bunting draped from commercial buildings. The scene so inspired Walt Whitman that he composed a poem praising the volunteers' response:

> O superb! O Manhattan, my own, my peerless!
> O strongest you in the hour of danger, in crisis! O truer than steel!
> How you sprang—how you threw off the costumes of peace with indifferent hand,
> How your soft opera-music changed, and the drum and fife were heard in their stead.
> How you led to the war, (that shall serve for our prelude, songs of soldiers,)
> How Manhattan drum-taps led.[66]

The Seventh mustered three times into United States service, in 1861, 62 and 63. Much to the regiment's consternation (and to its occasional derision back home), the men never saw actual combat. Ironically, the group's urban riot duty had been more consequential from the standpoint of deadly force. However, the Seventh had been

---

[64] Much would be made of the Seventh's departure. It was championed for the large number of "real members" (rather than recent recruits) it mustered, and for the financial hardships its prominent members and leaders had suffered in leaving their businesses with such haste. See "Seventh Regiment" *New York Herald,* May 26, 1861. An undated article from the New York *Evening Post* reprinted in the Seventh's history similarly notes that other regiments waited for recruits and thus had time to get their affairs in order: "In fact, the Seventh being the most perfectly drilled and equipped regiment, hurried off to hold the ground until others could get ready to relieve them; and it is only right that they should now come home to arrange *their* affairs as others did *before they went."* (emphasis original) Ibid., 472-475.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Walt Whitman, "How Manhattan Drum-taps Led" *Leaves of Grass* "Deathbed" edition, 2nd Annex (Philadelphia: David McKay, 1891-92), 219.

instrumental in immediately re-establishing the rail line between Annapolis and Washington. The men erected forts, built or repaired critical lines of communication, and fulfilled the original charge of guarding Washington from Confederate attack. As John and Charles Lockwood detail, the regiment was understood to be the savior of the nation's capital.[67] Indeed, according to one Lincoln biography, "the presence of this single Regiment seemed to turn the scales of fate."[68]

In fact, the corps' most valuable contribution to the war effort would come in other, non-combat ways. The Seventh's members back home organized a "reserve" group of veterans, led by the wealthy businessman Aaron Kemp who continually raised funds and sent supplies to the men who were serving.[69] Members and leaders were also instrumental in other benefit initiatives like the Sanitary Fair. Perhaps most significantly, by war's end, the Seventh would send 662 men from its ranks to serve in the Union Army and Navy, sixty of whom were killed.[70] Many enlisted in the regular army, while others

---

[67] According to their account, "the presence of the Seventh marked not only the immediate salvation of Washington but an open route for the floods of Northern regiments to follow, ensuring that the city would remain secure regardless of how many troops the Confederates could raise in the coming days." Lockwood, *Siege of Washington,237.*

[68] John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History* (New York: The Century Company, 1889); quoted in Lockwood, *The Siege of Washington,* 231.

[69] In fact, the active duty men were so overwhelmed by the support they received—from friends, ladies' societies and other relief organizations—that the Seventh's quartermaster had to insist the Adams Express Company in New York only accept clothing and letters. The shipping tycoon William Henry Aspinwall sent gray wool jackets for the entire regiment (christened "Aspinwalls" in his honor), while the real estate developer Rutherford Stuyvesant sent two howitzers with equipment and ammunition. According to Clark, "every train brought boxes and bundles of clothing, and every variety of luxury that the market could afford or the grocer supply." Even the quartermaster's remonstrance was not successful, and individual members had to petition their families to stop sending items. Clark, *History* II, 10, 19-20; quote on 20.

[70] The "Roll of Honor," a complete list of officers and members who served, organized by company is included in Ibid., 479-487. Those who were killed or died of disease or wounds are listed on 488-89.

formed or joined newly organized volunteer militias. Such was the case with Jacob Duryee (1839-1918), who served in Duryee's Zouaves, the volunteer regiment organized by his father, the Seventh's former commander Abram Duryee. Jacob rose to the rank of general, commanding Maryland's Second Regiment in the Battle of Antietam.[71] Another member of Duryee's company, the Sixth, is perhaps one of the most famous figures in the conflict, and his name is recounted with great pride in the regiment's annals. The young Robert Gould Shaw (1837-1863) marched off to Washington with the Seventh in April of 1861, joining the Second Massachusetts as a lieutenant after his initial muster, and eventually leading the Fifty-Fourth Massachusetts, an all-black regiment, with whom he was killed in an ill-fated charge on Charleston's Battery Wagner.[72]

Even though its members came to great fame under other banners, their glories and accomplishments were claimed and celebrated by the home corps. The Seventh was rightfully proud of these associations, but in one sense, it needed to emphasize them because it did not enlist as a regiment for "three years or the war" as long-term commitment was then designated. The Seventh responded to Lincoln's initial 1861 call with impressive rapidity. Yet in their haste, its men left many of their important business matters unresolved, and their financial security was put in a precarious state by extended absence. Members were unanimously in support of the Union cause, but divided as to how the Seventh's interests were best served. Indeed, as soon as the Seventh had secured

---

[71] "General Jacob Duryee," *The New York Times*, May 30, 1918.

[72] Shaw corresponded with his family continually during the war and his letters, now housed at Harvard's Houghton Library, offer fascinating insight into Shaw's experience as a young man of enormous privilege living in such extraordinary circumstances. Nearly all of his letters are reprinted in Russell Duncan, ed., *Blue-Eyed Child of Fortune: The Civil War Letters of Robert Gould Shaw* (Athens: University of Georgia, 1992).

Washington, debate began. A central issue was the elite status of the regiment and of the prominent men who made up its ranks. According to Clark,

> Men with families, in the higher walks of life, could not support them upon the paltry pittance allowed the common soldier; men of extensive business and large means could not afford to enlist "for three years or the war"; and even those who had no domestic or business ties would not consent to serve as privates, when their talents, influence, and military accomplishments would surely secure them commissions.[73]

In the end, it was decided that the Seventh would serve its initial term—just over thirty days—and return to New York, where its members could decide on an individual basis how they would support the Union effort.

The Seventh would muster into U.S. service again in 1862. The previous year had been spent training intensely in anticipation of another call, and as the regiment's primary activity would again be guard duty, it further increased proficiency in drill and tactics during its ninety-day term making use of the heavy artillery at its post, Ft. Federal Hill.[74] A final muster occurred in 1863, when the Seventh was again the first militia to respond—in this case, organizing its men and leaving the city in the course of a single

---

[73] Everyone believed the regiment should be a visible presence until the war's end, and some advocated for readying some type of sub-set of the group as a field unit, with those who would return to New York forming a support network of sorts, sending new recruits to the field. Always selective with its membership, the new men would be those who, "from their position in society, would not care to volunteer as privates in any ordinary regiment." This plan was opposed on the grounds that any separation would weaken the Seventh's position within the state militia system, or (perhaps more importantly) would endanger its "identity and individuality." Clark, *History* II, 21-22; extended quote on 22.

[74] The Seventh actually helped to construct Ft. Federal Hill during its first muster, and was disgusted to see the facility's rundown state after just a year. Having secured a team of cleaning women, it proceeded to place the Fort's rooms in "complete order," "tastefully arranging" the furniture, arms and equipment. The regiment did actually contribute more than tasteful furniture arrangement. The men also guarded the Baltimore & Ohio line's main depot, Mont Clare Station. Though disappointed they would not have the opportunity to win military glory on the front lines, the Seventh's members were nevertheless satisfied that the depot was considered one of the most important posts in the country. Ibid., 40, 63-68, 75.

day. During this final tour, the regiment oversaw the transfer of Confederate prisoners, guarded a number of bridges throughout Baltimore, escorted wounded soldiers from Gettysburg, and, after a transfer to Frederick, Maryland, guarded that city along with Monocacy, which was the supply station for the army of the Potomac.

On July 14th, the regiment was posted at its encampment in Frederick when news arrived of a "terrible riot" at home, and it immediately left on orders of New York's Governor Horatio Seymour (1810-1886). Because of travel delays, the Seventh did not reach the city until the early morning hours of the 16th, and was mustered out of U.S. service days later.[75] Ironically, the regiment had always lamented that it had not served as a unit on the battlefields of the Civil War. The Seventh was called away from the country's bloodiest conflict (in which it saw little action) to the front lines in its home city for what would be its most violent urban battle. While the men did not have extensive combat experience on which they could call, they were at their most highly trained, and had gained invaluable administrative and organizational experience that was perhaps even more beneficial in preparing them for the postwar economic boom that was yet to come.

The Draft Riots and Post-bellum New York

In many ways, the issues that fueled the Astor Place Riot back in 1849 had not been resolved. In fact, the class divide and the struggle to define the meanings of "culture" and "citizenship" in New York City had only become more heated in the intervening decades. Just as the Shakespearian debate stood in for larger issues in the late 40s, Lincoln's Conscription Act of 1863 was similarly a flashpoint for much wider

[75] Ibid., 109-190.

contentions in the 1860s. As Iver Bernstein thoroughly outlines, this "wasn't about fielding an army but about Republican legitimacy and the Republican vision for a strong federal government that was evinced in conscription, black emancipation, federal taxation, the Legal Tender Act." The social and political order of the city was at stake, and the riots gave focus to major national issues at a critical moment.[76] Though started in protest of the federal draft, they became a referendum on class and race relations in the unstable political context of a city intensely divided. Indeed, this time sides were not simply drawn on economic lines as elites now constituted at least two distinct camps. According to Bernstein, "By that year [1863], assertive workers faced an elite profoundly divided over the most basic questions of social and political rule."[77]

The Conscription Act was poorly timed. Lists of those drafted were published not long after images from Gettysburg began reaching city papers, and while the act's "commutation fee" allowed for exemptions, the $300 price tag put it far out of reach of poor laborers. Together the draft and the high price of exemption inspired widespread anger among poor Irish workers who already had to compete with blacks for the lowest-rung jobs, and were totally opposed to fighting for their emancipation. Their resentment may have been further fueled by the city's Democrats, centered on the powerful banker August Belmont (1813-1890), who had become increasingly vocal in opposing Lincoln's policies.[78] As owner of the New York *World*, Belmont had a ready mouthpiece to

[76] Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 8.

[77] Ibid., 191.

[78] Anti-Republican sentiment had long been festering in New York. The state's Governor, Horatio Seymour, had been increasingly critical of Lincoln's policies during the 1860s, and even earlier, New York City's Mayor, Fernando Wood suggested that the city secede from the Union in solidarity with the Southern states it was allied with financially. See Stewart Mitchell, *Horatio*

promote his views, and a number of equally powerful allies in his circle, including Samuel Tilden, Edwards Pierrepont, Royal Phelps, William Watts Sherman and John Dix. The Republican opposition was represented primarily by elite members of the Union League Club, according to Bernstein, "an established class in social terms but an emerging group in cultural and political terms." Union Leaguers were radical for their views on race relations: they perceived a value system, shared with blacks, that was based on Christianity, and envisioned a model for race relations based on paternalism and deference.[79]

Mary Ryan christened this event "the urban Appomattox," and with over 100 deaths, it represented a new level of civic violence.[80] Rioters were successful in immediately halting the draft by burning down the draft office, then moving on to government and civic buildings, bridges, and factories, and eventually (to the horror of many), to individuals known or suspected of supporting the Union cause, government officials, police and military men (Fig. 1.6). As Bernstein's account makes clear, the week started with specific targets, but quickly devolved into total chaos. Violence against blacks increased as the riots wore on, particularly by those laborers most threatened by their emancipation, while the presence of rioting women and children underscored that

---

Seymour of New York (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, 1938); Sidney David Brummer, *Political History of New York State during the Period of the Civil War* (New York: AMS, 1967).

[79] Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 57, 130

[80] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 180.

grievances acted out were not merely about the right to work, but larger economic and ethnic problems as well.[81]

The draft was initiated on Sunday, July 11th, though riots did not start in earnest until Monday. On that first day, business had been halted uptown. By the second day, Mayor George Opdyke (1805-1880) requested of Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton (1814-1869) that military force be sent to the city. By July 16th, the Seventh had reached New York and set up command posts in two police precincts. Colonel Lefferts's purview stretched from 7th Street to 65th and companies of the Seventh split up to patrol the area where they engaged in firefights through the night, killing an undetermined number of armed rioters. By the 16th, the affair was essentially over, and New Yorkers went back to work the following day. The Seventh remained on duty until the 25th, patrolling the 18th ward (near the East River) to recover guns and other property stolen by rioters.[82]

Today it is nearly impossible to imagine the city in the state of chaotic violence it experienced in 1863. Even to nineteenth-century citizens accustomed to a much more volatile brand of democracy, the Draft Riots seem to have shaken the foundations of civil society to a greater extent than even the Civil War had, undoubtedly because they did not play out on rural battlefields, but in the streets—indeed, in the private dwellings—of the country's great metropolis. The destruction was both targeted and diffuse and exceptionally gruesome. With the city's militia engaged far afield and the police

---

[81] In fact, the author states that many Irish male rioters were too young to work. Future job prospects may have played a role, but their acts of aggression were more significantly attempts "to restore not just community but the social and sexual order in their mutilation of black male bodies." Bernstein, *Draft Riots,* 27, 37.

[82] Mob members were not surprisingly characterized as poor marksmen, in contrast to the Seventh, whose men were highly trained in just such combat. Members of then-Captain Clark's company in particular were fired upon during the night, but none of his troops were seriously injured. Clark, *History* II, 112-114.

department totally overwhelmed, citizens were left completely undefended. Some armed and organized themselves. Volunteers were also accepted at Tompkins Market Armory by veterans of the Seventh Regiment. Men were quickly trained, rudimentarily armed and sent into the streets to face a terrifying reality—the worst-case scenario predicted in the New York press—of unchecked, uncontrollable violence. Only when the militia finally arrived was order restored and their presence clarified in newly explicit ways the importance of volunteers in maintaining order in the city.

The Seventh acted together with the police and other regiments to bring New York back from a state of anarchy. Its men were not alone in putting down the uprising, but they were openly singled out for distinction in ways that reflected the heightened state of ethnic antagonism. Always considered economically and socially elite, the makeup of its membership was now openly acknowledged as key to its efficacy in circumstances like the Draft Riots. As the federal government prepared to send troops back to Manhattan, Army General-in-Chief Henry Wagner Halleck was advised "among the New York militia only the native-born and Protestant Seventh Regiment could be trusted with riot duty."[83] In fact, this was part of the regiment's own narrative. While asserting that politics and religion were of no consequence in its ranks, the only test of membership being "character," the group's official history offered that "at least nine-tenths of the members have at all times been of American birth and of the Protestant faith."[84]

The Seventh's native Protestant makeup would be especially significant in the post-Draft Riot context, in which the issues central to both sides were still not settled. As

[83] Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 52.

[84] Clark, *History* II, 397.

Bernstein states, "instead of outright winners and losers, the Draft Riots produced a complicated set of unresolved conflicts." Neither Democrats nor Republicans emerged victorious from the fray, but in the later 1860s and early 70s, would overcome their political differences, finding common ground in their own affluence and in their distaste for the growing immigrant masses. The Irish, in turn, found a voice and willing ally in William M. "Boss" Tweed's (1823-1878) Tammany machine, "the creation—and ultimately the casualty—of this lingering disequilibrium in politics."[85]

The Seventh emerged from the Civil War significantly changed. Its men were at their most well trained and highly proficient. They had gone straight from guard duty in Maryland to riot duty back home and would not muster again. Perhaps more significantly, the Seventh's men individually and collectively gained invaluable administrative experience on a scale that would prepare them to enter the booming economy of the postwar years. Historian Richard Slotkin holds that in many ways, the Civil War raged on in the economic expansion of the Gilded Age industrial/financial boom.[86] In this new landscape,

> The agents of progress would be corporate combinations, chiefly the railroads and the United States Army; and the heroic leaders . . . would be of the soldier-aristocrat type—wealthy, culturally elite, professionally expert, charismatically managerial.

This generation also continued a war mentality in an increasingly combative engagement with immigrants, fueling a greater class conflict, which was characterized in terms of battle. "What the Civil War added to the ideological mix was the capability for

---

[85] Bernstein, *Draft Riots,* 191-192.

[86] Richard Slotkin, *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800-1890* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1998), 286.

transferring the categories of racial animus and savage war to a struggle of whites against whites, and of one civil society of class against another."[87]

Changes were made in and around Tompkins Market Armory to improve military proficiency. In 1866, the State Legislature authorized the use of Tompkins Square Park across the street as a military parade ground, and two years later, the Seventh added a rifle range in the basement of the armory.[88] Yet, as it had in the past, the Seventh Regiment would call on its service during the 1860s as it sought new and better headquarters. Agitation for a new armory first began in March of 1868, as Tompkins Market began what would be a rapid decline, and as that part of the population represented and defended by the Seventh Regiment increasingly moved uptown. As it considered itself a public institution—committed to the defense of property and the maintenance of public safety just like the police—the Seventh considered a plot of city-owned land for its new headquarters: Reservoir Square at 42nd Street and Fifth Avenue. Reservoir Square, in fact, had a military history: it had served as a Union encampment during the Civil War. Perhaps for this reason, it was the site of violence during the Draft Riots and the Colored Orphan Asylum, also attacked and burned in 1863, was located across Fifth Avenue. Even earlier, three companies of the Seventh put down the Croton Water Riots there. It bears repeating that in its previous search for a site after the Astor Place Riots, the Seventh considered a lot at Astor Place. The regiment may again have been attempting to reclaim a contested site, imposing order and ensuring control of this contentious space. Nonetheless, adjacent property owners vociferously objected, claiming

[87] Ibid., 286, 304.

[88] Clark, *History* II 148, 168.

an armory would lower their real estate values.[89] The plan was abandoned, and would lay dormant for several more years.

By the early 1870s, Tompkins Market was in deplorable condition. The city was responsible for the militia's facilities. For most volunteers, the city paid rent for their spaces, but since the Seventh owned its space, municipal authorities were required to provide for upkeep and maintenance. Letters in the regimental archive indicate that through spring and summer of 1873, Clark corresponded with the City Comptroller, Andrew Haswell Green (1820-1903), repeatedly requesting repairs. As early as February, a consulting city architect had deemed the top floor structurally unsafe for drills.[90] Frustrated, Clark wrote to William Henry Vanderbilt inquiring about a potential sale of two unused sites owned by the Harlem Railroad.[91]

---

[89] As the regiment had with Tompkins Market Armory (and would do again with the Park Avenue site), a petition was forwarded to the state legislature, with the signatures of hundreds of individuals and companies supporting the Seventh's claim for the site. In a private circular, Clark noted "The number of names is important as well as the character of the signers." Emmons Clark "Petition," February 10, 1873, Seventh Regiment Records, box 9, folder 4; and Emmons Clark, "Private Circular" February 7, 1873, box 7, folder 2, Seventh Regiment Records, MS 556, The New-York Historical Society (hereafter, NYHS). Legislation for the Reservoir Square site received approval in the state senate, but failed in the assembly. See Clark, *History* II, 160, 171. On the Croton Riots, see Clark, *History* I, 276.

[90] On May 9th, Clark wrote to Green that the Seventh's rooms had been flooded that morning. (Earlier letters indicate an ongoing issue with the roof.) Still by June 25th, a repair had not been made and Clark requested a new roof. Repairs were apparently underway in July, when one of the workers started a fire. According to Clark, the "frescoed walls and furniture of the rooms" along with members' uniforms were "seriously injured" and the armory remained with a temporary roof for more than a year. Emmons Clark to Andrew Green, May 9, 1873, Letter Book, Colonel Clark, 1867-1875, NYHS; and Clark, *History* II, 224-5. Disgust with a crumbling facility was not specific to the Seventh. According to Lisa Keller, other regiments complained in similar terms about the inappropriateness of their facilities for military purposes, and the lack of safety this produced. Keller, *Triumph of Order,* 191-2.

[91] The sites were at 26th -27th Street between Madison and 4th Avenue; and at 33rd-34th St between 4th and Lexington Avenue. Emmons Clark to William Henry Vanderbilt, July 1, 1873 Letter Book, Colonel Clark 1867-1875, NYHS.

The tides would turn in the regiment's favor, though. The bill for Reservoir Square failed, but it contained a compromise of sorts requiring the city's Board of Supervisors to provide the Seventh a site, by lease or purchase, not below 23rd Street in a reasonable amount of time. In a letter of September 13th, Clark urged the board to select a location, claiming he had "good reason to believe that the taxpayers of the city are in favor of affording to this regiment suitable and convenient accommodations for military excise, at any reasonable expense."[92] In October, Clark canvassed the regiment, collecting addresses of residences and places of business for each officer, non-commissioned officer and private for the purposes of making a map and in January of 1874, called a meeting of the Committee on the Site for the New Armory, presumably to discuss the survey's findings.[93] By February, the Seventh's leadership had honed in on a site much farther north than had been previously considered but one with which it had a long connection: Hamilton Square. The Seventh applied for legislative authorization for the city to lease land, and it was approved in April 1874.

An unoccupied entire-block site bound by Lexington (then called 4th Avenue), Park, 66th and 67th Streets, city-owned Hamilton Square had first been used by the Seventh as early as 1827, and in 1831 and 1834, it served as the unit's summer encampment. (In the 1860s, there had been much discussion over utilizing the square as a military parade ground, but nothing came of this plan.)[94] Clark noted with humor that in

---

[92] Emmons Clark and Seventh Regiment Board of Officers to New York City Board of Supervisors, September 13, 1873, Letter Book, Colonel Clark, 1867-1875, NYHS.

[93] Emmons Clark to Company Captains, October 25, 1873; and Emmons Clark to Members of Committee on the Site for the New Amory, January 21, 1864. NYHS.

[94] See "The Matter of a Parade Ground," *The New York Times*, May 9, 1863 and "State Legislature; Senate; Assembly," *The New York Times*, February 10, 1865.

the 1830s the area was three miles out of town but it would be considered "central" in just forty years.[95] He recycled the rationale for appropriating Reservoir Square, arguing that the lot was small and close enough to Central Park that it would not represent a significant loss of public green space. Further, it was uptown and would be convenient for the regiment whose ranks were increasingly moving north. There was also the issue of value. During the period from 1855-68, the 19th ward (which included Hamilton Square) saw assessed values rise from $8 million to $53.6 million. Prior to 1859, lots in the area could be purchased for less than $600, but by 1871, three lots at 79th Street and 5th Avenue commanded $275,000. The *Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide* notes that between 1868 and 1873, the worth of vacant land above 59th Street "seemingly increased fully 200 percent, and some 300 or 400 percent."[96] With the Panic of 1873, prices crashed, but New Yorkers had weathered such downturns before, and reduced prices of the mid-1870s undoubtedly provided motivation for optimistic buyers not limited by the credit freeze. The Seventh would not technically own the land—it would take an extended lease from the city—but being in such a desirable neighborhood would have been enormously important to this regiment. It not only meant that they would be headquartered in an enviable locale, but that they would be at the forefront of a real estate boom when the economy inevitably revived.

Significantly, the same reasons that made Hamilton Square convenient for the Seventh's members made it strategically located from a military perspective, situated at a

---

[95] Clark, *History* II, 159, 213-217.

[96] Quoted in Eugene P. Moehring, *Public Works and Patterns of Urban Real Estate Growth in Manhattan, 1835-1894* (North Stratford, NH: Ayer Co. Publishers, 1981), 285.

crossroads of elite housing on Fifth Avenue and the working-class waterfront district that figured so prominently in the Draft Riots. As Eugene P. Moehring's study has shown, there was no police presence in what was a booming neighborhood. During the 1870s, downtown had a "blanket of protection" but uptown, the "gaps grew larger" and the police could not keep up with their legal requirement to patrol regularly.[97] Further, the uptown district was becoming what historian Kenneth Scherzer called a "symbolic community." Even in the antebellum period, spatial class-based segregation was a growing phenomenon: 1855 census records indicate that native-born New Yorkers were more prone to self-segregation than new immigrant groups, and particularly in the postwar real estate boom, undifferentiated patterns of residence gave way to "well-ordered social space."[98] Scherzer uses this term to describe a process of sorting and segregation, but it certainly also applied to "order" in contrast to the growing sense of anarchy and all-out class war fueled by the Draft Riots. In this context, the Seventh's presence one block west of 3rd Avenue—where it had stationed pickets in 1863—served both a physical and symbolic function, marking the area with an emblem of elite authority while the Seventh actively enforced civic harmony.[99]

---

[97] In 1858, there was one station between 2nd and 3rd Avenues at 59th Street; between 2nd and 3rd at 113th; and between Lexington and 3rd at 127th Street. On the West side, one station between 9th and 10th Avenue at 127th street rounded out the entire "uptown" police presence. Ibid., 152-161.

[98] Kenneth A. Scherzer, *The Unbounded Community*: *Neighborhood Life and Social Structure in New York City, 1830-1875* (Durham: Duke University, 1992), 55, 133.

[99] Interestingly, Scherzer roots growing awareness of symbolic space in the yellow fever epidemic of 1822, which linked Irish immigrants and poor living conditions, by extension linking disease to residence, neighborhood to social status. Ibid., 142; Similarly, the 1865 "Report of the Council of Hygiene and Public Health of the Citizens' Association of New York upon the Sanitary Condition of the City," a ward-by-ward report on sanitary conditions, analyzed each district in detail. According to Bernstein, the comments for this ward "bear out the conclusion that the uptown middle-island district was very different in social constituency and tone from the uptown waterfront neighborhoods. The report divided this area into three districts: the upper-class

The Tweed Ring and "Taxpayers"

The Seventh's involvement with city government in an uptown real estate matter created a particular challenge in the early 1870s as details came to light of Mayor William "Boss" Tweed's pilfering of city coffers. Tweed came to power in the immediate wake of the Draft Riots, and his administration was intimately associated with an Irish Catholic constituency. City government had long been the sole domain of wealthy, educated elites and Tweed offered a voice to many who had historically been disenfranchised. Tweed's Tammany Hall "machine" turned persistent urban disparity to its advantage, mediating tension through real estate development and infrastructure projects, particularly in the uptown districts that saw the most significant improvements.[100] These improvements also enriched the Tweed Ring who had embezzled many millions through graft and gross overpayment for contracts and services. Over the summer of 1871 the enormity of Tweed's extensive theft was gradually revealed in *The New York Times*, and as Lisa Keller's analysis illustrates, overpayment for armory rent was the second largest expenditure of the city budget ($300,000) after judicial salaries ($700,000).[101] An exasperated headline from early August noted that the military's facilities were crumbling, with nothing to show for the millions that had purportedly been

---

zone west of Third Avenue, a zone of "artisans and craftspeople" from 3rd to 1st Avenues, and the laboring class east of 1st, which were viewed as the most dangerous. See Bernstein, *Draft Riots,* 265. As head of the city's Health Department, the Seventh's commander, Emmons Clark, would have been intimately familiar with such reports.

[100] Scobey, *Empire City,* 203-207.

[101] The ex-Tammany sheriff James O'Brien disclosed a series of secret accounts, the details of which were published regularly in *The New York Times.* Clark, *History* II, 189; Michael A. Gordon, *The Orange Riots: Irish Political Violence in New York City* (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1993), 228; Keller, *Triumph of Order,* 192.

spent.[102] Writing after the project was complete, Clark confirmed the regiment was mindful that its reputation not be sullied by association with city government's "extravagance . . . and the immense sums it expended upon public buildings."[103] The Seventh would need to carefully navigate such treacherous waters, and in a series of interrelated events during the early 1870s, it was fortuitously given the means to do just that, reframing the debate over citizenship, while further legitimizing its claim to use and regulate the city's public space.

The Orange Riots of 1870 and 71 were nothing like the violence of 1863, but as a continuation of racially motivated violence and disorder, they presented a view of class conflict that was unending (Fig. 1.7). The city's Orangemen paraded without much incident in 1870, but in light of recent Tweed scandal, their request was initially denied in 1871, so as not to incite protest (and likely violence) by the city's Irish.[104] The denial was viewed as "an obsequious and humiliating surrender to ignorance and religious prejudice," and so in a telling and undoubtedly strange display, fewer than 100 Orangemen commenced their annual parade flanked on three sides by five of the city's militias with five companies of the Seventh leading the way.[105] According to the *Times*, more than 800

---

[102] "The Armories Again. Further Exposition of the Ring Frauds," *The New York Times,* August 2, 1871.

[103] "History of the New Armory," in *The Knapsack* (journal of the New Armory Fair) Monday, November 17, 1789.

[104] The Orange Order or Orange Lodge, a Protestant fraternal association, is named for William of Orange, who defeated the Catholic James II at the Battle of Boyne in 1690. Historians of the Order assert it was of minimal significance in nineteenth-century U.S. politics, other than inciting violence in the Riots of 1870-71. The Order is committed to maintaining British influence in Ireland. See Eric P. Kaufmann, *The Orange Order: A Contemporary Northern Irish History* (New York: Oxford University, 2007).

[105] Clark, *History* II, 193.

police and 2,000 militia were called out, while the *Herald,* which had been predicting a melee, "ominously reported that of all the regiments ordered on duty, only the Seventh was trained in street firing."[106] In fact, the Seventh was the only militia authorized to fire at will, which it did intermittently along the route as it and its charges were pelted with stones and bricks from the roofs of adjacent buildings. Chaos broke out behind the Seventh though, as other regiments opened fire on the hostile crowd. In the end, fifty-four people were killed or mortally wounded included a number of bystanders and three members of the Ninth Regiment.[107] Despite this outcome (or perhaps because of it), the militia was again praised by the press and its supporters as upholding law and order, and even regiments responsible for indiscriminate firing escaped any negative consequence.

The Orange Riots represented a "loss of innocence" about civic displays, which became quieter, private and domestically focused in subsequent years. The great democratic tradition of public assembly was being replaced by private meeting, transparency supplanted by secrecy.[108] For the Seventh, civic parades that were so prominent a component of its antebellum schedule were now much less frequent. Colonel Clark later recalled with irony that the tradition of July Fourth parades ended in the Centennial year of 1876. Noting that Manhattanites increasingly chose to escape to the country during the summer, Clark also referenced the growth of the city and tellingly, "the change in its population," alluding to immigrants for whom the national holiday presumably held little significance. The patriotism of Independence Day was shifted to

---

[106] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 232; Gordon, *Orange Riots*, 90.

[107] In the chaos, a member of the Seventh was shot by a member of the 9th, but was apparently not seriously injured. Clark, *History* II, 195; Gordon, *Orange Riots*, 116.

[108] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 232-4.

Decoration Day (now called Memorial Day) and was decidedly more private in nature and quieter in tone, as it entailed the decoration of Civil War soldiers' graves. The Seventh was affected by the shift indoors, too. Thought it had briefly returned to outdoor drills with the designation of Tompkins Square Park for that purpose, with the new armory, its military maneuvers would henceforth be conducted inside, behind fortified walls of brick and stone.

There were also more immediate repercussions as elite New Yorkers—previously divided on nearly every front—now overcame differences to unite under the banner of "reform." In one totalizing narrative, all the city's ills were lumped together under the broad umbrella of Irish Catholicism, fusing the Tweed Ring's corruption with the Irish community's long history of violence in the city, most recently evidenced in 1871. "Dirty government" became associated with Irish Catholicism and, in response, prominent New Yorkers sought to restore "respectability" to city and government by limiting Irish influence while fusing republicanism, capitalism and evangelical values into justification for a "new social order with no room for otherness."[109]

The self-appointed Committee of Seventy became the symbol and strong arm of the reform movement. Convened in early September 1871, its formation followed closely after the Orange Riot of July 12th and the first extensive revelation of Tweed's fraud in late July. The committee's initial resolution announced as its aim a *unified* effort that crossed party lines "to obtain good government and honest officers to administer it." Rather than Republican or Democratic (members of both parties were damningly referred to as "political prostitutes"), the new movement was conceived as a "complete union of

[109] Gordon, *Orange Riots*, 4, 14, 188.

all citizens upon one reform ticket."[110] Though characterized as a broad coalition, its members were Manhattan's most successful and influential businessmen, and they staged their own uprising. Dubbed "The Insurrection of the Capitalists," the city's best men refused to pay taxes until municipal finances were remedied, strangling city coffers.[111] The committee characterized political and economic reform in moral terms, drawing a parallel between armed disorder—"treason that is bold and armed"—and Tweed's deceit —"the meaner, fouler treason that makes the ballot a farce, law an instrument of fraud."[112] The committee ingeniously re-framed public debate by mobilizing the term "taxpayer" to transcend ethnic boundaries, insinuating those to whom the term applied were more legitimately citizens that those to whom it did not. In an era when only property was taxed, most citizens were not, in fact, taxpayers. Thus, the committee subtly but unmistakably defined its membership and its audience as economically elite.[113]

The Seventh's enlistment class for 1870 was larger than in any other year since the Civil War, with 170 new members added. The year 1871 was similarly prosperous with 175 new enlistments—again "from the very best class of young men in the city"—and the regiment was flush financially. With more than $20,000 in the treasury the

---

[110] "Address at the Meeting of the Committee of Seventy at Cooper Institute, New York, November 3, 1871," reprinted in Joseph Hodges Choate, ed., *American Addresses* (New York: The Century Co., 1911), 63, 65-66.

[111] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 272 and Gordon, *Orange Riots*, 188. The Committee included Robert Lenox Kennedy, William R. Vermilye, Royal Phelps, Jackson S. Schultz, Joseph Hodges Choate, John A. Dix, William M. Evarts, Edwards Pierrepont, Samuel B. Ruggles, Samuel J. Tilden, William F. Havemeyer and George W. Varian. See. "Gigantic Frauds of the Ring Exposed" *The New York Times* [special supplement] July 29, 1871.

[112] "The Committee of Seventy. Important Meeting Sunday—Committees on Law and Legislation," *The New York Times*, September 25, 1871.

[113] Ryan, *Civic Wars*, 274-5.

Seventh had "reached a degree of prosperity unknown in its existence."[114] And yet the men's military proficiency suffered: its swelling ranks exceeded the building's capacity, and the men were not afforded sufficient practice for want of space. In preparation for a trip to Boston, Clark reminded his men that their reputation was at stake and that the city's military critics would not excuse deficiencies just because the Seventh had inadequate facilities.[115] The need for a new building became more pressing, but the project was progressing. In September 1874, the field officers signed a twenty-one year lease with the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund for the Hamilton Square site and began to plan a new armory.[116]

The Seventh faced a choice in funding the building—raising the money privately or requesting an appropriation from the city—and the men apparently contemplated both alternatives from the outset. General Alexander Shaler, commander of New York City's militias, asserted that requiring regiments to fund their own armories was equal to requiring the police to build their own station houses and weighed in strongly *against* private funding, reasoning that it set an impossible precedent for other regiments. Clark held that the Seventh's attempt to gain public funding was supported by all its friends and ex-members and adopted Shaler's justificatory rhetoric, maintaining that as members of a public institution, the Seventh's men should not be responsible for the cost of the

---

[114] Clark, *History* II 190, 200, 226, 237.

[115] In anticipation of a forthcoming excursion, Clark penned a humorous circular to his captains warning, "I am aware that the defects in the marching of this Regiment in column of fours and of companies can be accounted for by the fact that we have had no suitable drill room during the past winter. But this apology cannot be made to military critics in Boston." Emmons Clark to Regiment Captains, May 15, 1875, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[116] Clark, *History* II, 222.

building.[117] A committee was formed to apply for legislative appropriation for the entire amount of the structure. The field officers were authorized to secure plans and cost estimates, and again hired Charles W. Clinton, who submitted an estimate of $400,000.

The state appropriation request soon proved to be moot, as a January 1875 amendment to the city's military code outlined a series of procedures by which regiments could request money for new facilities. In a telling reaction to the Tweed Ring, the process required an application, and a tiered structure involving oversight by several boards and the approval of architectural plans and specifications before the request would even be considered. If the project were approved, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment would raise the necessary funds by taxation. With the new legislation, the Seventh essentially started the process over from scratch, but with Mayor William H. Wickham (1832-1893) as an ally, the approval process went smoothly and by September of that year, $350,000 was appropriated in addition to the use of the Park Avenue site.[118] The project soon came to an "abrupt and unexpected halt," however, as the Board of Estimate refused to levy the necessary taxes.[119] Like the increased bureaucracy and new level of fiscal transparency, the Board's decision was likely motivated by a desire for fiscal austerity and reform, post-Tweed. On the advice of counsel, the regiment took the case before the State Supreme Court, but by late 1875, it had tired of the legal battle. Writing in confidence to the company captains in January of 1876, Clark questioned

[117] Emmons Clark to Hon. W.W. Braman, Albany, February 15, 1875, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1867-1875, NYHS.

[118] Clark, *History* II, 226, 229-233.

[119] Wickham and one alderman were in favor of the appropriation, but another commissioner, and the Comptroller, Andrew Green, would not agree to its approval. Ibid., 236.

whether a legal victory would count as victory at all if the public were not supportive of the Seventh's efforts.[120]

At a Board of Officers meeting that month, the Seventh adopted a resolution to abandon plans to fund the armory publicly and instead raise money by subscription—first, from active and veteran members of the regiment, and then from the "liberal citizens, business men and taxpayers" of the city.[121] The New Armory Fund was officially organized with ex-Colonel Washington R. Vermilye, Royal Phelps and Robert Lenox Kennedy as trustees. Despite sounding a tone of resentment (pointing out that the regiment was not, in fact, required to pay for its own building under the terms of the lease as some had asserted), the Seventh published the resolution in local papers on January 18th. Its efforts were rewarded that very day with a $500 check from prominent businessman Royal Phelps enclosed in a letter of support. On the 20th, $1,000 checks from John Jacob Astor III (1822-1890) and Frederick Schermerhorn (1844-1919), both veterans of Company K, were likewise received.[122] The *Herald* echoed approval of the Seventh's efforts (characterized as a "siege on the citadel of capital") and urged property owners, bankers, insurance and trust companies—"those who represent property"—to

[120] It appears that Clark first proposed the idea of self-funding in this letter, scheduling a special meeting with the officers to decide whether to proceed or abandon the site. Emmons Clark to Seventh Regiment Captains, January 14, 1876, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[121] Clark, *History* II, 238.

[122] Clark reprinted Phelps's letter and circulated it to company captains. In it, Phelps states, "I don't know where I can place $500 more to my satisfaction, than in aiding [the regiment] in keeping up its organization. I know what the citizens of New York owe to the 7th Regiment for the past, and I feel how useful it may be in the future." Clark's letter book contains his notes of thanks in receipt for the donations. Private Circular, Emmons Clark to Seventh Regiment Captains, January 19, 1876; Clark to John Jacob Astor; and Clark to Frederick Schermerhorn, January 20, 1876, Colonel Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

consider the Seventh's past service in times of unrest.[123] By May 1st, over $80,000 had been raised, more than half from the Seventh's officers and members.[124]

The Seventh approached its fundraising with tactical skill befitting a military offensive or political campaign. A series of committees was immediately formed with the field officers (who were the site's leaseholders) constituting an umbrella group called the Committee on Plans for the New Armory. They were responsible for submitting plans, specifications and estimates to the board of officers—a fact that suggests that the earlier materials submitted to the city had been amended.[125] A committee was also organized for each company that reported to the board of officers. Together the company committees comprised a general committee, and there was also a committee representing the Seventh's Veteran organization.[126] In a letter of January 24, 1876, Clark outlined the tiered structure in exacting detail and made explicit that the most prominent and influential men should be involved in the effort. He suggested that "some well-known and wealthy banker like Vermilye" (the Seventh's former commander) should be treasurer, while the building committee should include "men who are well known in New York, and whose names would inspire entire confidence." Clark was insistent that active members be the first to donate, followed by veterans, and only then by a solicitation of the public, but he fully expected that a canvass of wealthy citizens would yield more than

[123] "The Seventh Regiment Armory," *New York Herald,* January 25, 1876.

[124] Clark, *History* II, 240.

[125] Clinton's initial estimate was $400,000; he may have revised plans when the city appropriated only $350,000.

[126] Clark, *History* II, 238-9

what the regiment could raise, and suggested a committee of three prominent men from each business or trade to importune funds from their peers.[127]

The regiment also began a very calculated public relations campaign transferring tactics that had previously been used for self-promotion while calling on the new coded language that linked "taxpayers" and "reform." In past efforts, the Seventh's leadership had proven adept at advancing its interests through both public and private maneuvering. Tompkins Market Armory required City and State Legislative approval, and though the men had failed in their attempt to appropriate part of Reservoir Square, that experience laid the groundwork for a later, successful push for Hamilton Square. Even beyond its private campaigns, the Seventh counted one of *the* great political operatives of the post-Civil War era as a member, and thus had an able exemplar close at-hand. As both Sarah Burns and Wendy Wick Reaves outline, Thomas Nast's (1840-1902) satirical cartoons for *Harper's Weekly* played a crucial role in bringing down the Tweed regime, and launched Nast on a national stage. Nast wielded incredible power through skillful portrayals of contemporary events amplified by the vast mouthpiece afforded him at *Harper's*. Tweed blamed the cartoonist for his downfall but Nast played kingmaker too, backing the successful 1872 Presidential campaign of Ulysses S. Grant (1822-1885).[128]

---

[127] Letter, Emmons Clark to ["My Dear Colonel"] January 24, 1876; Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[128] Sarah Burns, "Party Animals: Thomas Nast, William Holbrook Beard, and the Bears of Wall Street," *American Art Journal* 30, no. 1/2 (1999): 9-35; Wendy Wick Reaves, "Thomas Nast and the President," *American Art Journal* 19, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 60-71; For broader studies of Nast, see Albert Bigelow Paine, *Thomas Nast: His Period and His Pictures* (Broomall, PA: Chelsea House, 1997); and Lynda Pflueger, *Thomas Nast, Political Cartoonist* (Berkeley Heights, NJ: Enslow Publishers, 2000).

Nast's disturbing images of the ravenous "Tweed Tiger" (Fig. 1.8) and the Seventh's armory promotion operated from far ends of a continuum—one illustrating destruction, the other, a promise of order—but worked in tandem towards a common goal of civic reform.[129] The Seventh by no means utilized satirical cartoons, but Clark extensively promoted the armory effort in the press, the backing of which he had been assured. In a January 1876 letter in which the nascent fundraising campaign was outlined, the commander explained to a prominent veteran "it is proposed to acknowledge all subscriptions in the daily papers . . . and the press has pledged its powerful support to the movement."[130] Interestingly, in private circulars Clark referred to subscribers as "citizens" and "wealthy and influential gentlemen" but in external communiqués and announcements—particularly those penned by the press—the descriptive "taxpayer" was intoned.[131]

Yet even more than the insistent usage of this term, the subscribers and trustees themselves implicitly linked the Seventh's efforts with reform initiatives made earlier in the decade. Bernstein has mapped the bitter debates over the Civil War, documenting the key partisans and their affiliations. Broadly speaking, the abolitionist Republican cause

---

[129] According to Burns, Nast's Tiger (and Beard's Wall Street bears) called on longstanding European graphic traditions in which wild animals were representative of political upheaval, but Nast's and Beard's conflation of the grotesque with heightened naturalism in the wake of Darwin aroused "suspicions that the border between animal and human, already crumbling beyond repair, would inevitably collapse, releasing the fearsome beast within that civilization had attempted in vain to control." Burns, "Party Animals," 11.

[130] Letter, Clark to ["My Dear Colonel"] January 24, 1876. Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[131] In an internal circular of January 1876, Clark called the initial subscribers "wealthy and influential gentlemen" and noted the approval of New York's "citizens." See Private Circular, January 22, 1876, box 7, folder 2, NYHS. For the use of "taxpayer," see "The Seventh Regiment-Its Proposed New Armory," *The New York Times*, January 23, 1876.

was represented by Frederick Law Olmsted's circle at the Union League Club, founded in 1864, while Democrats who opposed these efforts (including abolition) were organized around financier August Belmont (1813-1890).[132] Robert Lenox Kennedy (1822-1887) was a founding member and benefactor of the Union League Club, the nephew of James Lenox, founder of the Lenox Library (Kennedy served as President of the Library), and son of David S. Kennedy, a very successful New York banker.[133] The younger Kennedy was educated as a lawyer but made a vast fortune, as his father had, in finance. He was involved in a dizzying array of civic and charitable causes and was himself a noted collector of fine art and rare books. Though Jackson S. Schultz (1819-1891) was not a founding member, he played a leading role in the Union League and served as President in 1870. Like Kennedy, Schultz was involved in dozens of organizations and achieved great wealth and renown in conjunction with his leather-goods business.[134] William B. Astor, industrialist Peter Cooper, statesman William M. Evarts, William F. Havemeyer and "Commodore" Cornelius Vanderbilt were all also considered allies of this cause.[135]

---

[132] The entire study deals with these issues, though they are the particular focus of Chapter Two, "The Two Tempers of Draco," and Chapter Four, "Merchants Divided." See Bernstein, *Draft Riots.*

[133] Irwin, *History of the Union League Club*, 20.

[134] Schultz invented a process for leather treatment and achieved renown as a tanner. He served leadership positions with the New York Hospital; was Director of the National Park Bank; the first President of the Board of Health; and served as U.S. Commissioner to the World's Exposition in Vienna. See "Jackson S. Schultz Dead. A Prominent New Yorker Passes Away," *The New York Times,* March 2, 1891.

[135] Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 139, 157. Astor, Vanderbilt, Cooper and Havemeyer are well known figures whose biography needs little explication. Evarts (1818-1901) was a noted lawyer who served in various capacities in the Johnson, Grant and Hayes Administrations including Attorney General and Secretary of State. He was a U.S. senator during the late 1880s; a founding member and first president of the New York City Bar Association; and chair of the American Committee for the Statue of Liberty. The Judiciary Act of 1891, named for Evarts, created the U.S. Court of Appeals. See Chester Leonard Barrows, *William M. Evarts: Lawyer, Diplomat, Statesman*

Meanwhile, the Belmont circle included Edwards Pierrepont (1817-1892), Royal Phelps (1809-1884), General John A. Dix (1798-1879) and Prosper Wetmore (1798-1876), the former leader of the Seventh. According to Bernstein, these men

> […] wielded economic and political power in rare combination, with immediate access to the presidential ear in Washington, European capitalists, the New York merchant and banking community, and the Democratic politicos in the city government.[136]

Pierrepont served as superior court judge in Manhattan, was appointed attorney general in 1875 and served as U.S. minister to Great Britain for a decade. He and Dix were appointed by President Lincoln to try war criminals in 1862.[137] Dix, known as "general" because of role as adjutant general for New York's state militia, was a well worn politician, having been elected secretary of state for New York, a U.S. senator, and later governor. He was serving as secretary of the treasury early in 1861, but left his post and was made a major general in the Army. Dix achieved fame during the Draft Riots when he replaced the ineffectual General Wool as commander of New York City's forces. He attained great wealth as the President of the Mississippi and Missouri Railroad during the early 1860s and was President of Union Pacific as the Transcontinental Railroad was

---

(Chapel Hill, NC: the University of North Carolina, 1941); and Yasmin Sabin Kahn, *Enlightening the World: The Creation of the Statue of Liberty* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2010).

[136] Bernstein, *Draft Riots,* 129, 136.

[137] See "Death of a Noted Jurist. Edwards Pierrepont Career Brought to a Close," *The New York Times* March 7, 1892; and "Edwards Pierrepont Biographical Sketch," Edwards Pierrepont Papers. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University.

being constructed.[138] Phelps was a successful merchant and, like his peers, enjoyed leadership roles in a number of philanthropic and civic organizations.[139]

Though they had been staunchly opposed on political grounds, partisans from both sides joined together to form the Committee of Seventy. In its first coverage of the group, the *Times* listed the Committee's executives as Havemeyer, Schultz, Dix, Lenox Kennedy, Pierrepont and Phelps. Henry Stebbins was president of the committee; Havemeyer, vice president. Both executives were Union Leaguers and served on a sub-committee for legislation along with Pierrepont and Dix of the Belmont Circle. Schultz was prominently listed as one of three members of the Law Committee. Other recognizable names included Washington R. Vermilye, Joseph H. Choate and George Varian, commanding officer of New York State militia.[140] All of these men would contribute substantially to the Seventh's New Armory Fund, and their names would figure prominently in the Seventh's promotional material.

In 1876, Royal Phelps would have the distinction of being the first outside contributor to the New Armory Fund. Other early donors included Robert Lenox Kennedy ($500); John Jacob Astor and veteran member William Waldorf Astor ($1,000 each); William H. Vanderbilt ($500); Washington R. Vermilye ($1,000); and veteran

---

[138] See Morgan Dix, ed., *Memoirs of John Adams Dix* 2 vols, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883); and on Dix's role in the Civil War, Margaret Leech, *Reveille in Washington, 1860-1865* (New York: New York Review Books, 2011).

[139] These included trustee of Royal Insurance Company; president of New York Eye and Ear Infirmary; trustee and vice president of The Roosevelt Hospital. He served one term in the state legislature. See entry for "Royal Phelps," in Henry Hall, ed., *America's Successful Men of Affairs An Encyclopedia of Contemporaneous Biography*, (New York: The New York *Tribune* Company, 1895), 503-504.

[140] "The Committee of Seventy. Important Meeting Saturday," *The New York Times*, September 5, 1871.

George Kemp ($1,000).[141] Phelps's subscription was received on the same day the subscription drive announcement was made public, and in fact, before the Seventh convened an organizing committee or trustees to manage the funds. In a private communication, Clark worried that the Seventh would not be able to confidently accept checks (and importantly, that checks would not be made out correctly) without trustees. Marshall Lefferts, Clark's predecessor, suggested Phelps, Vermilye and Kennedy fill this role, and all three accepted. When Vermilye died in December, 1876, William W. Astor was named trustee in his stead.[142]

It is beyond the scope of this study to trace the political affiliation of every contributor to the New Armory Fund, but as the identities and affiliations of the early donors and particularly the trustees make clear, like the Committee of Seventy, the Seventh's initiative crossed party lines and indeed functioned similarly to the committee. Robert Lenox Kennedy and Royal Phelps acted as outside advisers; they had no previous official affiliation with the Seventh. Both men were standard-bearers for New York's banking and mercantile communities, and their combined presence illustrated the Seventh's initiative as a non-partisan, but class-specific, effort. Vermilye was directly linked with the Seventh through his former Colonelcy, but as his death in 1876 suggests,

---

[141] Importantly, the Seventh had already raised more than $40,000 internally. "The Seventh Regiment Armory Fund. Official Statement of the Amounts Thus Far Subscribed," *The New York Times,* February 29, 1876.

[142] The subscription drive was announced on January 19, 1876, and Phelps's check was received that day with a note of praise for the Seventh. See Letter, Clark to Captains, January 19, 1876. As late as February, trustees had still not been announced, though Phelps had already accepted this role. Letter, Clark to Lefferts, February 7, 1876. Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS. Astor stayed on as trustee long after the subscription drive wound down. He formally resigned from the post in 1882, in a letter from Rome, citing his extended absence from the city. Letter, William W. Astor to Col. Clark, November 18, 1882, box 4, folder 9, NYHS.

he had long been retired from active service. Like Phelps and Kennedy, Vermilye was a financier and even served as president of the New York Stock Exchange. According to one biography, Vermilye's name and business practice were "above all suspicion" and associated with loyalty and integrity.[143] The Seventh skillfully publicized these and other notable names in its ongoing efforts, recognizing that the credibility and renown of its supporters gave credence to the armory project, linking it with earlier reform efforts.

Their support was essential in advancing the project, and at a May 8, 1876 meeting of the general committee, Clinton's plans and specifications were adopted. A building committee composed of Jackson S. Schultz, William Laimbeer, William A. Pond, Major George Moore Smith and Private Leonard Beckwith was organized.[144] The Seventh continued its public relations campaign in the New York press, publishing frequently updated lists of prominent donors alongside the amounts of their gifts. The lists were not only amended to reflect new subscriptions, but were arranged in varying formats, undoubtedly gauged according to the publication and its intended audience. In some summary lists, citizens' subscriptions appear first; in others, businesses receive top billing. Further, the lists appear to be alphabetical at first glance, but are, in fact, arranged to highlight the most recognizable names or particularly large gifts (Fig. 1.9).

During 1876, any effort to raise money publicly was abandoned due to lingering effects of an economic downturn, and intense political uncertainty surrounding the upcoming presidential election.[145] Little progress was evidenced. A fence was erected

---

[143] Entry for Washington Romeyn Vermilye in *America's Successful Men of Affairs,* 693.

[144] Clark, *History* II, 240.

[145] See Roy Morris, *Fraud of the Century: Rutherford B. Hayes, Samuel Tilden, and the Stolen Election of 1876* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003); William H. Rehnquist, *Centennial Crisis:*

around the site, and about thirty-five "shanties" were torn down, their inhabitants ejected. The Seventh resolved unanimously to withdraw its public fundraising campaign; however, the building committee did engage contracts for excavation and foundation work, mainly so that progress could be claimed on the project.[146]

Yet again, members and leaders of the Seventh had skillfully navigated the contentious and rapidly shifting terrain of post-bellum politics, cementing allegiances with powerful elites and positioning themselves as a the standard-bearers of urban peace and order. The regiment was distanced from any association with the Tweed "Ring" by Colonel Clark's decision to privately fund the armory project, along with his choice of prominent lawyers and financiers as overseers, and the degree of publicity with which the effort was carried out. The Seventh's fundraising campaign thus acted as a corollary to "reform" efforts of the Committee of Seventy, and offered supporters an opportunity to directly participate in ongoing political debates.

From Great Strikes to "A Great Fair"

The Seventh weathered the financial storm and political uncertainty of 1876, but in the summer of 1877, tensions erupted again. After a series of wage cuts and work reductions, a general strike was enacted by workers on the Baltimore and Ohio (B&O) line which eventually unfolded nationwide, paralyzing rail transportation for more than a month. Much as with the Draft Riots, violence escalated as the strike spread. Strikers not only stopped work, but began to destroy rail cars, lines and depots. For the Seventh, this

---

The Disputed Election of 1876 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004); and Michael F. Holt, *By One Vote: the Disputed Presidential Election of 1876* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, 2008).

[146] Clark, *History* II, 252, 255.

was largely a non-event militarily. The closest violence occurred in Pennsylvania, and while a riot was fully expected in New York, none materialized.[147]

Historians compare the events of 1877 to the earlier Draft Riots. David O. Stowell refers to the Great Strikes as "one of the most spectacular and frightening episodes of collective violence in American history, notwithstanding the New York City Draft Riots of 1863."[148] Lisa Keller similarly connects the two episodes, crediting the strikes with a sense of "great fear" that "raised the specter of bringing New York to its knees, or worse, convulsed in flames, much as it had been during the Draft Riots of 1863."[149] Yet one key event transpired that would distinguish public discourse in the late 1870s: the 1871 Paris Commune. Significantly, Col. Clark's account of that summer includes the first reference in the regiment's history to "communists" and indeed, according to Larry Isaac, the Commune changed American perception of working-class crowds.[150] The earlier emphasis on ethnicity was subsumed into much more sweeping generalizations whereby "the distinction between 'good worker' and 'bad worker' began to dissolve in fear that the whole working class was becoming insurrectionary rabble."[151] The national scope of the riots was particularly troubling as was the initial response of local militia, who

---

[147] A riot in Tompkins Square was rumored and the Seventh, along with the 12th, 22nd and 71st Regiments were ordered to be at the ready. Clark reports "exaggerated and highly colored reports" of goings-on, but concludes, "It is but just to the workingmen of the city to state that they did not generally sympathize with the dangerous assemblage of communists and disreputable characters." The Seventh received catered "rations" from Delmonico's and was dismissed at midnight on June 27th. Ibid., 258-260.

[148] David O. Stowell, ed. *The Great Strikes of 1877* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 2008), 2.

[149] Keller, *Triumph of Order*, 185.

[150] Clark describes the offenders as "largely recruited of late from Europe." Clark, *History* II, 258.

[151] Isaac, "To Counter the Very Devil," 364.

refused orders and in some cases fraternized with the strikers. Stowell recounts that in Pittsburgh, site of some of the worst destruction, local militia members refused to take up arms against their neighbors and co-workers.[152] In fact, a member of New York's Sixty-Ninth Regiment (popularly known as the "fighting Irish") announced his group's sympathy with "fellow oppressed workingmen."[153] The strikes were finally put down by federal troops and proved to be a "major turning point" for the nation's militia, who saw increased funding and a heightened emphasis on professionalization and training, resulting in "increased militarism in the social and physical life" of the city.[154]

The Seventh's fundraising campaign had been suspended the previous year, but Clark immediately seized on the opportunity provided by the strikes. In a regular meeting on August 1st, he noted "recent occurrences" (without referencing the strikes directly) and urged the immediate resumption of the subscription effort, hopeful that the entire outstanding sum could be raised by the coming spring.[155] Three days later, the Seventh successfully recommenced its public appeal to the citizens of New York. The previous year, Royal Phelps's $500 contribution launched the efforts of *individual* subscribers. Now the campaign resumed with $2,000 checks from Mutual Life and Equitable Life Assurance Society.[156] As Phelps had done earlier, Mutual Life's Finance Committee

---

[152] Stowell, *Great Strikes,* 5.

[153] Reinders, "Militia and Public Order," 92-93.

[154] Isaac, "To Counter the Very Devil," 370.

[155] Meeting Minutes, August 1, 1877; Ledger Book, Board of Officers/Council of Officers Meeting Minutes, 1870-1880, Seventh Regiment Armory Collection, Park Avenue Armory, New York (hereafter, PAA).
.

[156] Mutual Life and Equitable Life were the first two, donating $2,000 each. See Clark, *History* II, 261.

included an endorsement with its donation, and in fact, utilized language remarkably similar to that used earlier by Phelps. Alongside its resolution, the committee noted the Seventh's past service and the company's "large and important" "assets and property" that would require protection in the city. The resolution was reprinted in the *Times*, which added that these sentiments were widely held in the business community.[157] Indeed, in January of 1876, just after the subscription drive was first announced, the *Herald* referenced individual property owners, but presciently emphasized that "bankers, insurance and trust companies"—interests "who represent property"—had a particular motivation for supporting the Seventh's cause.[158] The strikes newly clarified the accuracy of this assertion, as the strikers not only stopped work, but intentionally destroyed tracks, stations and depots.

Dramatic illustrations of flaming buildings and riotous mobs were included in the press coverage, but after the strikes were put down, these images were used as graphic examples of what New York had been spared (Fig. 1.10). Overwhelmingly, the Seventh was credited with the avoidance of violence. One newspaper account of July 26th noted that preparations were being made for a much-hyped (and feared) workingmen's meeting in Tompkins Square. The congregants were mockingly described as "various members of the committees appointed in Mr. Schwab's saloon" who "preferred their beer with a Communistic flavor" and were witnessed loudly debating "in unknown tongues, with vehement gestures the questions of the day," constructing an opposition between "foreigners" and English-speaking natives. According to the report, the men had "spoken

---

[157] "The Seventh's New Armory," *The New York Times*, September 15, 1877.

[158] "The Seventh Regiment Armory," *New York Herald*, January 26, 1876.

with especial [*sic*] bitterness of the Seventh Regiment."[159] As with the Astor Place Riot, the Seventh was singled out. The men gathered in Schwab's saloon resented the presence of the militia—the very thing that gave comfort to New York's elite. In late July, the *New York Journal of Commerce* pondered how the city's "great debt of gratitude" to the National Guard would be repaid. The *Journal* considered it a point of civic pride that national troops had been unnecessary "because the militia were our sure and trusted defenders":

> […] It is our duty and privilege to exhibit in some fashion our sense of gratitude to the men who have saved the Commonwealth from the losses and shame which have fallen on those States where the authorities had not the nerve or the power to stay the riots.[160]

The *Observer* was yet more explicit, heaping lavish praise exclusively on the Seventh Regiment as "not only the pride of the city . . . but in all cases of threatened disturbance, it is looked to first and with most confidence for protection against the enemies of law and society." Readers were reminded of the Seventh's Civil War service; that it was generally credited with New York's avoidance of "trouble" during the Strikes; and of the regiment's new armory initiative. The *Observer* persuasively concluded:

> There is no more direct way in which our citizens can contribute to public and private defence [*sic*] against mobs or external violence than by aiding to put this favorite regiment in a condition of still greater efficiency.[161]

Other press outlets echoed the *Observer.* In mid-August, the *Commercial* predicted success for Clark's recent appeal as New York's wealthy citizens were "now, more than

---

[159] "New York Says Stop. A Very Orderly Meeting Last Night, Thanks to Precautions." Newspaper clipping dated July 26, 1877; Scrapbook, 1879-1886, NYHS.

[160] "A Debt to the National Guard," *New York Journal of Commerce*, July 30, 1877.

[161] *The New York Observer,* August 23, 1877; Scrapbook, 1879-1886, NYHS.

ever" appreciative of the militia's role in preserving order and protecting property.[162] On the same day, the *World* devoted a lengthy write-up in praise of the Seventh, explaining to wealthy citizens that contributions should be considered a debt of gratitude. The *World's* reporter noted the common practice by which New Yorkers, when abroad, vaunted the Seventh as a prized institution, suggesting "the most prosperous and influential of our citizens now have an opportunity to prove precisely how much they are proud of its courage, its discipline and its efficiency."[163] The *Evening Express* departed from a typical format by including a lengthy description of the building, its amenities, and a list of its officers, but noted (as had the other accounts) that New York's taxpayers owed the Seventh a debt of gratitude.[164]

Thanks to the media attention and an influx of funds, on October 13th, the armory's cornerstone was laid. By the end of December, the Seventh Regiment had more than $150,000 in the New Armory Fund, including $3,300 in strike pay contributed by active members.[165] Work was suspended during each winter until the building was enclosed, but by the end of 1879 the structure was almost finished and a committee was appointed to contract and oversee work on the interior decoration. Companies likewise organized committees, and most had adopted designs and signed contracts by the end of

[162] *New York Commercial,* August 15, 1877; scrapbook, 1879-1886, NYHS.

[163] *New York World,* August 15, 1877; scrapbook, 1879-1886, NYHS.

[164] "The Seventh Armory. How the Boys Have Worked to Get It." *New York Evening Post,* August 8, 1877.

[165] Clark, *History* II, 263. An article in the *New York World* similarly referenced the donation of strike pay to the New Armory Fund. *New York World,* August 15, 1877; scrapbook, 1879-1886, NYHS.

the year.[166] The Seventh continued to raise funds as the armory rose—at the end of 1878 more than $190,000 was in-hand—but in 1879 the decision was made to take out a bond for $150,000 to complete construction of the huge new facility.[167]

In April 1879, a committee was created to organize the final fundraising push—a fair that would take place that November. Its purpose would be to complete and furnish the new armory, including the regimental and company rooms. Civil War hero and banker, Lieutenant-Colonel Louis Fitzgerald chaired the committee, aided by wealthy businessman and prominent veteran, Edward Kemp.[168] Once again, the Seventh's men deployed their extensive administrative talents and social connections, organizing a series of committees, soliciting volunteers, selecting and receiving donated goods to be sold, inviting dignitaries and important guests, and coordinating a gallery of fine art. A newspaper, *The Knapsack,* was published daily during the run of the fair. On November 17th, the ceremonies were officially opened by the president of the United States, who had come to New York expressly to preside over the event.[169]

---

[166] Clark, *History* II, 264, 274.

[167] The Seventh made concerted attempts to avoid this fate. In April 1878, a ball at the Academy of Music generated almost $16,000. The regiment also petitioned the state to allocate money set aside for uniforms to the armory, as the Seventh proudly supplied its own, but the request was denied. By the terms of the bond, the field officers were authorized to use the leased site and incomplete building as collateral; Commissioners of the Sinking Fund were directed to extend the lease for as long as the Seventh existed as a military organization; $15,000 in city funds would be provided annually (in lieu of armory rent) to pay interest and principal of the bonds; the Board of Estimate and Apportionment (who had originally denied the Seventh funds) was required to assess additional taxes to cover yearly heating and lighting expenses for the new building and for sidewalks; and finally, the city Comptroller would purchase the furniture and fixtures at Tompkins Market Armory, to be used by another regiment. Ibid. 269-272.

[168] Ibid., 274-5. Kemp will be discussed more fully in Chapter Three.

[169] "Opening the Great Fair. The Seventh's New Armory Crowded," *The New York Times*, November 18, 1879.

The vast ground floor drill hall was elaborately decorated with a forty-five-foot-tall central "floral temple," surrounded by booths for each of the individual companies. The booths were staffed entirely by women—wives and lady friends of the regiment or the companies who, according to the *Art Amateur,* had challenged one another to "a tournament of taste"[170] (Fig. 1.11). A majority of the companies had selected "exotic" themes for their displays: the Third Company's was Turkish; the Sixth's, Moorish; the Seventh's, Chinese; the Eighth's, Egyptian; and the Ninth's, "Oriental."[171] They were competing for more than good taste, however. Each was vying to be the most profitable in disposing of items donated for sale or offered on commission, and they were urged on by a silver punch bowl contributed by Brooks Brothers that awaited the victor.[172] Twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of Gorham silver was available for purchase at Company G's booth while the English Gothic Pavilion of Company D boasted a $2,500 billiard table—an award-winning design at the recent Philadelphia Centennial.[173] Shirley Dare, the *Art Amateur* reporter, wrote at length of the dazzling coloration and light effects of the overall scene and the artistic nature of goods and their arrangement but cautioned, lest readers think only "lady-work" was in evidence: "one can buy there . . . a yacht, diamonds, cases of lovely crystal, or sweeten himself with all of Colgate's essences."[174]

---

[170] Shirley Dare, "Scenes from the Armory," *The Art Amateur* 2 no. 1 (December 1879): 2.

[171] "Sightly Architecture," *The Knapsack,* Monday, November 17, 1879.

[172] "View in the Armory," *Harper's Weekly.* The *Times* noted that some items were offered on commission. "Disposing of the Prizes," *The New York Times,* December 9, 1879.

[173] "The Seventh Regiment Fair," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* (special supplement), December 6, 1879, 2.

[174] Dare, "The Seventh Regiment Fair," 2.

First-floor rooms of the administration building served as reception space and housed other profit-making diversions such as an "aesthetic grocery" (offering canned fruit with painted labels; French plums; bottles of Heidsieck champagne), an old curiosity shop, and an "Oriental" tea room (Chinese canopies, parasols and lanterns). Company rooms on the second floor entertained visitors with a stereopticon, a Punch and Judy show, and a children's toy shop. More refined tastes could likewise be satisfied there by an extensive and varied display of loan objects including a collection of Peruvian antiquities; a bejeweled sword donated by Kemp; a piece of chintz given by Lafayette to Mrs. Washington; and a fine jewelry display lent by Tiffany & Co.[175]

The third floor accommodated a fine art exhibition that, according to the *Times,* included "only the best pictures" selected by the Seventh's Art Committee.[176] Edward Strahan's coverage for the *Art Amateur* effusively praised the gallery as a public service, bringing together rich and poor to overcome social difference but, like the rest of the fair, it was profit-minded: visitors had to pay an additional fee to enter the third-floor galleries.[177] Though Strahan critiqued a lack of consistent quality throughout, he nonetheless singled out the display as unequaled in the city.[178] Standout pictures included Mihály Muncácsy's "Pawnbroker's Shop" of 1874, lent by Catherine Lorillard Wolfe,

---

[175] Ibid., 2-3.

[176] "The Seventh Regiment Armory. Arrangements for the Grand Fair—the Opening To Be on Monday," *The New York Times,* November 14, 1879.

[177] The art exhibition is estimated to have brought in more than $10,000 on its own. "The Seventh Regiment Fair. A Reception Last Evening by the Art Committee," *The New York Times,* December 5, 1879.

[178] Edward Strahan, "Art at the Seventh Regiment Fair," *Art Amateur* 2 no. 1 (December 1879): 4-5.

and Alexandre Cabanel's "Venus," lent by John Wolfe.[179] Works could be seen by William-Adolphe Bouguereau, Léon Bonnat, Jules Joseph Lefebvre and Charles-François Daubigny; William Merritt Chase, Thomas Hicks, George Inness and John Sartain rounded out the American showing.[180] Though Strahan may have rightly focused on inconsistencies in the quality of the pictures, their lenders were at least as significant. Commercial galleries were represented but many of the city's most prominent collectors parted with their treasures for the week, and the generous connections extended even beyond the confines of the city. Local lenders included Mrs. Alexander T. Stewart, Mrs. Robert L. Stuart and John Jacob Astor. Two full rooms were occupied by James L. Cleghorn's print collection from Philadelphia, while fellow Philadelphian Fairman Rogers lent at least two pictures. [181]

The Seventh's conception of the fair as a profitable artistic entertainment was clearly indebted to the recent Philadelphia Centennial which the men attended as a group, but both events—the fair and the centennial exhibition—share common ancestry in the United States Sanitary Commission's Sanitary Fairs. The title of the Seventh's event was undoubtedly a reference to these relief efforts organized in the wake of the Civil War, and

[179] On Catherine Lorillard Wolfe as a collector and patron, see Margaret Laster, "Catherine Lorillard Wolfe: Collecting and Patronage in the Gilded Age," Ph.D. dissertation, City Univeristy of New York Graduate Center, 2013.

[180] Strahan, "Art at the Seventh Fair;" "The Seventh Regiment Fair," *The New York Times.*

[181] Strahan notes "Mr. Astor" lent a Vibert painting, *La Musique Sacrée au Couvent*. The Archives Director for The History of Collecting in America confirms that John Jacob Astor IV (1864-1912) owned a Vibert. Mrs. A.T. Stewart and Mrs. R.L. Stuart are mentioned by the *Times;* Rogers's contribution is referenced by Strahan. The Cleghorn Collection is mentioned by Dare. See Strahan, "Art at the Seventh Fair;" Frick Art Reference Library Online Archive: http://research.frick.org/directoryweb/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=6237; accessed October 4, 2012; "The Seventh Regiment Fair," *Times;* Dare, "The Seventh Regiment Fair."

the parallel was not lost on observers.[182] The goals of these two initiatives—raising funds for military men—were somewhat analogous, as was their organization: both were conceived and planned by men, but largely carried out by women.[183] The Brooklyn Sanitary Fair of 1864 featured a museum of art, "curiosities," and an art exhibition and sale, all documented in a daily paper, the *Drum Beat.*[184] The New York Metropolitan Fair, also of 1864, included an elaborate display of arms and trophies (including an exhibit of swords by Tiffany & Co.), an old curiosity shop, and an extensive top-lit art gallery; goings-on were likewise documented by a daily newspaper.[185] Indeed, even the spatial organization and interior decorations of the Seventh's Fair recalled these earlier efforts. The Seventh's "floral temple" was suggested by swags of greenery in the Academy of Music's cavernous "Knickerbocker Hall;" while the Metropolitan Fair included an *actual* floral temple as the centerpiece around which booths were organized representing neighboring cities and counties (Figs. 1.12; 1.13).

---

[182] Dare hailed the Seventh's as on "a scale of brilliance and social consequence unsurpassed since the Sanitary Fair of blessed memory." Similarly, a reporter for *Harper's* asserted "something of the same enthusiasm" animated both efforts. See Dare, "The Seventh Regiment Fair;" and "Views in the Armory," *Harper's Weekly,* reprinted in *The Knapsack*, Friday December 5, 1879.

[183] The Sanitary Commission published a pamphlet targeted specifically to women, urging the creation of societies that would collect goods and/or money for the relief effort. See *To the Loyal Women of America*, (New York: Sanitary Commission, 1861). The *Times* noted preparation for the Seventh's Fair had taken "many hours of labor and much anxiety" by the members and their friends, "particularly their lady friends." "Opening the Great Fair," *The New York Times,* November 18, 1879.

[184] Issues were bound in a single volume after the fair. See R.S. Storrs, Jr., ed., *Drum Beat* (Brooklyn: Published by the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair for the Benefit of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, 1864).

[185] The aims and organization of the fair were outlined in *Metropolitan Fair in Aid of the United States Sanitary Commission* (New York: Charles O. Jones Printers, 1864). Matthew B. Brady documented the fair building and its interiors and his photographs are now housed in the National Archives: Series: Matthew Brady Photographs of Civil War-Era Personalities and Scenes (Record Group 111), Still Pictures Record Section, Special Media Archives Division (NWCS-S).

In conception and execution, the Seventh Regiment Fair seamlessly melded artistry, entertainment, patriotism and philanthropy in a three-week-long spectacular. Clark had hoped it would generate $150,000 to finish and furnish the armory. The Brooklyn Sanitary Fair raised just over $400,000 in about two weeks while the Metropolitan Fair, which was much larger and better attended, generated $1.3 million.[186] In light of these numbers Clark's hopes may seem humble but the economic situation of New York in the late 1870s was entirely different from the bonanza of the immediate post-bellum years. Further, the money would not be going to aid in the care of destitute soldiers but would be directed to an elite regiment and the furnishings and interior fittings of a structure that had already cost more than a hundred thousand dollars. Despite these facts, the event was well received by the press, which reported favorably on it almost daily. It was also well attended by the public: single-entry ticket sales alone generated nearly $30,000 and, in fact, over-large crowds and the tightly packed building were a frequent source of complaint.[187] All told, the regiment netted just over $140,000 in profits from the fair.[188] This was not quite as much as Clark had hoped, but the sum would prove more than enough to lavishly outfit the new headquarters.

*** * ***

This exploration of the Seventh Regiment's evolution and development from the early 1800s to the late 1870s illustrates that the built environment both mirrored and

---

[186] See *A Record of the Metropolitan Fair: In Aid of the U.S. Sanitary Commission* (New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1867).

[187] Towards the end of the fair, the *Times* reported: "From 8 to 11pm, the crush was so great that it was almost impossible to promenade through the building." "Close of the Great Fair," *The New York Times*, December 7, 1879.

[188] The companies raised $96,872.39 through ticket sales and items sold at their booths. Total receipts were $158,319.33, expenses totaled $17,769.41, netting $140,549. Clark, *History* II, 284.

shaped a conceptual transformation of civic engagement. Indeed, the typological and spatial specialization at the armory paralleled the growth and evolution of the city itself. Early on, the Seventh drilled outside, and met in non-specific, multipurpose places like city-owned parks and fields. Thus, the spaces that served as training ground for military maneuvers also served social and recreational purposes for urban residents. Even the Seventh was multi-purpose in that its members fulfilled a number of duties. Law enforcement was one, but its most frequent activity was to escort dignitaries in public ceremonies. Yet, as the frequency and severity of urban violence increased, the Seventh sought a succession of newer and better headquarters. Each was larger than the last, and from Centre Market to the final Armory initiative of the 1870s, each represented a new level of exclusivity for its inhabitants. Centre Market Armory's top floor spaces were shared by all of the city's militias; Tompkins Market Armory's, only by the Seventh. With the armory project of the 1870s, the Seventh was the single occupant of what would be an imposing, stand-alone structure.

Militia service offered a direct mode of engagement: volunteers were literally on the front lines of conflict. Yet, the new armory project presented elite New Yorkers with an opportunity to show solidarity through financial backing rather than military service. Indeed, the fundraising campaign for the Seventh's new armory dovetailed with civic "reform" initiatives like the Committee of Seventy. Importantly, rather than operating from within the municipal system, these efforts were extra-governmental, and in fact, functioned as a rebuke to the fiscal mismanagement and fraud of the Tweed "Ring."

Each step in this succession of facilities was increasingly tailored to the Seventh's needs as a military organization, and to its identity as a corps of social and economic

elites. The regiment's increasing proficiency over the course of the nineteenth century was thus made possible by the spaces it inhabited, just as those spaces signified the regiment's elite status.

CHAPTER TWO

The Commission and Design

The Seventh's initiative to secure a site, fund, and construct a new building spanned more than a decade. Agitation for a new armory began in 1868—five years after the regiment's return from a final Civil War muster, when the men were called back to New York to quell the Draft Riots—and the building was officially opened with great fanfare in December 1880, though the interiors were not complete until the spring of 1881. During that nearly ten year period, the building's architectural design underwent several transformations and the plan increased in size. Its evolution also reflects stylistic shifts from the late 1860s to the mid-1870s, but most significantly, the scale and design can be understood as direct responses to the increase in frequency and intensity of civic disorder in the post-bellum years. As threats of all-out class war circulated in the popular press, and as armories and arsenals were attacked, raided, and in some cases destroyed, designs for the Seventh's Armory became significantly more fortified and imposing.

Changes in the architecture may be tracked through a series of design proposals for the building. While no such records exist for the interiors, it is safe to say that the design of these spaces changed in scale and grandiosity as well—at least in the regiment's thinking in terms of what high-style interiors for its elite members would look and feel like, and who would design them. Conceptions of interior environments changed substantively during this period as the nation was swept by a veritable craze for all things "artistic." This shift was intended to be a corrective to the cluttered, overstuffed Victorian interiors of a previous generation. Clarence Cook's influential 1881 publication *House Beautiful* argued in favor of harmony, simplicity, and utility in the furnishing of a home,

as did Charles Lock Eastlake's *Hints on Household Taste*.[1] Tellingly, though, both Cook and Eastlake were writing for the middle class and dealing specifically with domestic space. Elite patrons like the Seventh called on a new generation of design professionals to do this work, and while the desire for a harmoniously conceived environment united householders and the rich, the Seventh's "artistic" interiors evinced sumptuousness rather than the simplicity advocated by reformers like Cook and Eastlake.

For the men of the Seventh, elite masculine identity was facilitated and symbolized as much by these lavishly appointed, high-style interiors as it was by muscularly fortified architecture. To twenty-first century observers, this seeming contradiction mirrors a discrepancy between the overtly defensive quality of the armory's exterior and the somewhat domestic nature of its interior spaces, and yet in the 1880s, these qualities were not viewed as conflicting. This study uncovers new information about the armory's interiors, asserting a greater role for the architect than has previously been understood. Indeed, Clinton was not only responsible for the design of the structure itself, but had a hand in the armory's interior decoration as well—a fact that suggests a greater degree of continuity between these two components than is perceived today. My research also uncovers important social and professional connections between the project's patrons and designers that informed key aspects of this commission. These too have thus far remained a point of speculation. Finally, and most significantly, this analysis foregrounds linkages between professionalization and socio-economic prestige that were central to the transformation of the design professions during the late nineteenth century. This had much to do with education and international travel: both were

[1] Clarence Cook, *House Beautiful: Essays on Beds and Tables, Stools and Candlesticks* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881); Charles Lock Eastlake, *Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, Upholstery and Other Details*, 7th ed. (Boston: The Riverside, 1883).

prerequisites for "professional" status as an artist or architect, and both required substantial financial resources that effectively excluded members of the lower classes from this rank. Through the late 1870s and early 80s—exactly contemporaneous with the armory's construction and furnishing—a wave of work-stoppages and strikes by cabinetmakers and allied building trades brought the distinction between tradesmen and professionals glaringly to the fore.

The Building Proposals

An engraving in the regiment's archive illustrates an early design of the armory at Reservoir Square (Fig. 2.1).[2] The Seventh first proposed this site in 1869 but public outcry over the use of park space for military purposes forced the men to abandon that plan. By 1873, the regiment had still not found a viable alternative, and the Reservoir Square plan was revived out of desperation. Records indicate that Colonel Clark paid to run the engraved image (called an "advertising petition") in no fewer than ten New York papers early that year.[3] P.R.B. Pierson, a highly regarded engraver, was retained to execute the view.[4] An accompanying perspective was undoubtedly intended to emphasize

[2] The engraving is undated. It is included in an archival scrapbook covering the years 1872-1878 and the caption beneath the "West Side Elevation" references the Common Council's authorization to lease the Seventh "the above site" (Reservoir Square) or another site "not below Twenty-Third Street." This language was specific to 1873 legislation. However, the architectural style of the building is much more in keeping with the Seventh's Renaissance Revival Tompkins Market Armory than with subsequent Armory designs of the early 1870s, suggesting this design corresponded to the initial 1869 proposal of Reservoir Square as a potential site. "View of Reservoir Square with Armory for Seventh Regiment, N.G.S.N.Y.," undated engraving, Scrapbook, 1873-1878, NYHS.

[3] Advertisements were placed with the *Herald, Times, Tribune, Sun, World, Post, Commercial, Mercury, Telegram* and *Brooklyn Union* at a cost of nearly $900. Record of Expenditures dated March 10, 1873, box 10, folder 7, NYHS.

[4] Pierson is called "one of the most celebrated of wood engravers" in a British horticultural journal and "one of the most celebrated wood engravers this country has produced" in a history of Tarrytown, New York. *The Gardener's Chronicle: A Weekly Illustrated Journal of Horticulture*

the amount of park space left untouched by the armory, as, according to the caption, the issue was just then being considered by the legislature.[5] Nevertheless, the large size and scale of the structure is apparent.

The drawing "Front on 42^{d} Street" illustrates the administration building's physical proximity and relationship to the Croton Reservoir. The building is Italianate in character and detail. According to Charles Lockwood, French Second Empire influences began to be felt in New York architecture during the late 1860s and the combination of Italianate elements with a mansard roof in this early proposal reflects such an evolution. The emphasis on a unified streetscape is apparent in the continuity between the reservoir and its neighbor: stringcourses on the first and second level of the armory façade form a continuous line with the base cap and termination, respectively, of the Reservoir.[6] Interestingly, the building's main entrance is located on the north side of the site, facing 42nd Street. That its primary façade was oriented to the north confirms the Seventh's 1873 assertion that its leaders and members were increasingly located in the uptown districts, and thus would approach the building from that direction.[7]

---

and Allied Subjects 26 (July – December, 1899): 222; Isaac de Groff, *The Heart of the American Rhine* (Tarrytown, NY, Tarrytown Press-Record, 1902).

[5] The caption under the West Side Elevation reads "the Act now before the Legislature in respect to a site for a new Armory for the Seventh Regiment, authorizes the Common Council to lease to the regiment the above site, or, in case the Common Council should deem that inexpedient, provides for the lease or purchase of a suitable site elsewhere, not below Twenty-third Street."

[6] See Chapter 4, "Italianate, Anglo-Italianate and Second Empire Styles" in Charles Lockwood, *Bricks and Brownstone: The New York Row-House, 1783-1929* (New York: Rizzoli, 2003).

[7] In October 1873, Col. Clark wrote to his captains requesting they immediately forward him the residence and business addresses of every member for purposes of making a map. Clark to Captains, October 25, 1873; Col. Clark Letter Book, 1867-1875, NYHS. Two years later, Clark recalled wrangling over the site, noting the map "proved that more than one half of the members at that time were nearer to an armory at 66th Street than they were to the present armory

Objections had scuttled an earlier plan for Reservoir Square and not surprisingly opposition resurfaced in 1873. Previously, owners of adjacent property protested that an armory would decrease their land values. That rationale was not revived in all likelihood because the Seventh demonstrated (through the advertising petitions) that it was building a fine structure. Now outcry over the loss of public green space—a rare commodity in the crowded city even then—defeated the Seventh's proposal.[8] Though it was to be provided a lease (on approval of the Common Council) and though there were contingencies for inaction by civic authorities, another legislative initiative was necessary to move forward. In April 1874, a lease was authorized for Hamilton Square, and in September, the lease was finally signed. It too was for a city-owned park, but its proximity to the recently opened (and much larger) Central Park meant this loss would not have significant impact on the city's green space.

With the lease in-hand, the Seventh's field officers were authorized to represent the regiment in future building-related transactions, and they hired Charles W. Clinton, architect and veteran of the Seventh, to "draw preliminary plans."[9] Clark presents these events as straightforward; however, Board of Officers' records indicate that the regiment considered other designers. At the same 1874 meeting where the field officers were

---

[Tompkins Market Armory] at 6th Street." Clark to "My Dear Colonel," January 24, 1876; Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[8] Though Mayor Opdyke delivered a passionate "panegyric" to the State Assembly in support of the effort, a bill to grant Reservoir Square to the Seventh for an armory was objected on the grounds that the women and children of the city who found "healthful recreation and breathing spaces" in an increasingly crowded and over-built city. See "Reservoir Square Surrendered," *The New York Times,* April 13, 1873. The topic was taken up with great interest by a number of local churches. Thus, the Seventh found itself in the unenviable position of being on the wrong side of the city's religious leaders. See "Reservoir Square. Meeting of Citizens Opposed to the Erection of an Armory," *The New York Times* February 17, 1873.

[9] Clark, *History* II, 226.

organized to represent the Seventh in acquiring a lease, another committee was appointed to investigate "securing plans and estimates from the best architects of the city." The new building was next discussed at a special meeting called in October of that year when Clinton's plans were presented. Another committee was then appointed to move the effort forward, presumably based on his plans.[10] Tompkins Market Armory, the Seventh's then-headquarters, had been badly damaged in a fire that July, and its members and leaders were motivated to advance the initiative as quickly as possible. They may not have even pursued other firms, or the men may have decided that hiring Clinton was the most expedient approach as he was intimately familiar with the men's requirements and wishes, and had already contributed a design proposal to this effort.

The architect's initial estimate was $400,000—a bill its members expected the city to foot. As outlined in the previous chapter, Clark held that the Seventh originally intended to fund the building by subscription, but it was dissuaded by a strong minority who believed that it was a building for public purposes and should be built at public expense. Even so, the plans and cost estimate would indeed prove to be "preliminary." At the Seventh's urging, a new military code was enacted by the State Legislature early in 1875 authorizing New York City's common council to approve or deny applications for new armories by the city's various volunteer regiments. In case of approval, money for construction would be appropriated through a tax levy, while the president of the Board of Aldermen and the Commissioner of Public Works would select an architect and oversee progress on the work. The Seventh was essentially starting over, but with Mayor

[10] Meeting Minutes, Board of Officers Regular Meeting, May 1, 1874; Meeting Minutes, Board of Officers Special Meeting, October 10, 1874. Ledger, Board of Officers/Council of Officers Meeting Minutes, 1870-1880, PAA.

Wickham as an ally, the project proceeded smoothly on essentially the same course. By July 1st, the Board of Aldermen passed a resolution designating the previously agreed upon site as the home of the Seventh with a $350,000 appropriation to follow in that year's tax levy. Within weeks, Clinton was again appointed architect—this time by the city—and again is reported to have produced plans and specifications.[11] To compensate for the $50,000 discrepancy between Clinton's initial estimate and the city's proposed assessment, the architect reduced the use of granite trim on the building, and Clark was confident that the slow economy would further stretch the Seventh's budget.[12]

A second design proposal most certainly dates from this phase of the armory project (Fig. 2.2). When the Seventh's Reservoir Square proposal was up for legislative approval in 1873, its leaders attempted to cement public support by circulating views of the building which Clark called "advertising petitions." As it had earlier, the regiment again turned to P.R.B. Pierson in February 1875 to engrave views of the building.[13] Like the earlier drawings, this too is site-specific (in this case, to Hamilton Square) and includes a perspective view, as well as front and side elevations of the building. In this later proposal, however, floor plans are included and room uses are indicated, confirming

[11] Clark, *History* II, 229, 233.

[12] In a January 1876 letter to Col. Lefferts, Clark acknowledged that even $350,000 was a large sum, but noted the original estimate and that Clinton had lessened the use of granite to reduce the price. He thought with "the decline in the price in labor and materials and men" the estimate should be closer to $330,000. Letter, Clark to Lefferts, January 31, 1876, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[13] An archival record dated February 17, 1875, references payment to Pierson for "drawing and engraving views of Armory," box 7, folder 16, NYHS.

a more fully developed program that was further along in the planning process than the Reservoir Square proposal had been.[14]

Clinton's design as advertised in 1875 would again prove to be "preliminary." As the previous chapter made clear, the Great Strikes that swept the nation over the summer of 1877 were a boon to the Seventh's fundraising campaign. Vivid coverage of the strikes brought horrifying tales and images of destruction to urban audiences, and when violence was predicted but avoided in Manhattan, the Seventh was singled out as the city's savior. When the strikes finally died down, press coverage shifted to the armory campaign, and just as the building's cornerstone was laid that October, new images of an even more imposing, fortified building began to circulate publicly (Fig. 2.3).

A side-by-side comparison of the three proposals is telling. Now able to fill an entire-block site, the size of the structure grew substantially though the basic layout and spatial relationship of the main components— front administration wing and rear drill hall—remain unchanged. For this aspect of the project, then, an ideal solution was arrived at early on and no reason to alter it arose. Similarly, all three designs include corner towers and a taller central tower on the primary façade of the administration wing. However, changes in architectural style are significant. While this should be expected in a project whose planning stage spanned nearly a decade, the building's evolution in this regard should be understood not merely as a shift from Italianate in the late 1860s to Italianate influenced by French Second Empire in the early 1870s to rusticated

[14] In fact, there are discrepancies in the earlier drawing set: in the perspective view, the fenestration on the administration building's first and second stories is treated identically, while in the elevation, it varies. That the discrepancy exists between the two views highlights that this was a conceptual or schematic rendering rather than a fully detailed set of drawings. It is reasonable that the Seventh would not have gone to the expense of procuring detailed plans until a definite site had been secured. Further, it suggests that the plan and elevation were carried out separately from the perspective view.

Romanesque of the late 70s. Rather, the alterations—particularly in the final two proposals for Hamilton Square—are functional as well as stylistic.

In the final design drawing (which corresponds to what was built), the entire base has been raised and is heavily rusticated; the windows are smaller and raised off the sidewalk, thus more defensible. Windows throughout are much narrower. Similarly, the main entry approach has been reoriented so the front doors are protected by a high wall, rather than left open to the street beyond. The delicate iron railing running between the first and second floors has been replaced with a simple stringcourse; along the roofline, open ironwork is replaced by a crenellated parapet, signaling a telling change in function from walkway to lookout. In the second proposal, the towers have been made more prominent. Those on the corners are no longer topped by a mansard roof but are blocky and imposing. The central tower is also much taller. Its arcades, which had been open on the second and top levels, now feature narrow windows. The clock, a civic gesture to passersby, has been replaced with slit windows for marksmen.

These changes reflect the turbulence outlined in the previous chapter and illustrate the increasing need for a facility that was truly secure. In the 1830s, the state arsenal yard (where state-owned weapons and munitions were stored) was protected by a wooden fence. During the Election Riots in 1834, rioters stormed the yard and gained control of weapons, but laid them down mostly without incident when the militia appeared. There were no casualties. During the Draft Riots thirty years later, military and police facilities (not to mention business and private residences) were ransacked and in many cases burned. Arms were again at the center of one dispute but rather than a non-event, the fight for control of a weapons factory saw some of the bitterest hand-to-hand combat of

the riots. The crowd was initially repelled but later returned burning down a neighboring police station, a draft office, and the factory whose upper floors contained a drill room rented by some regiments.[15] The violence and destruction of the Draft Riots in 1863 and the Great Strikes in 1877 clarified the need for these types of buildings to not only *look* formidable but to actually be defensible—single-occupant, stand-alone structures on whole-block sites with restricted access at street level, limited exposure on the upper floors, and appropriate facilities to support a corps of men.

According to historian Robert M. Fogelson, armories were one of several new nineteenth-century building types that like train stations and public libraries had no architectural precedent on which to call.[16] Aside from programmatic requirements, architects were free to choose from any number of historical styles so long as a building's design in some way related to its function. Writing in 1881, the architect Leopold Eidlitz (1823-1908) argued in a similar vein that architects must consider a structure's function—what he called "the fundamental idea" of the project—so that its form, construction and ornament all worked in concert to "supply a need and answer a purpose."[17] For this reason, the medieval castellated style was particularly appropriate for armories: crenellations and battlements announced the armory's military function and the style worked well in an urban context alongside other rusticated Romanesque buildings. Further, unlike American military forts or stockades that were crude and unrefined, the

[15] Cook, *Armies of the Streets*, 68-71; Bernstein, *Draft Riots*, 38.

[16] Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 151.

[17] Leopold Eidlitz, *The Nature and Function of Art, More Especially of Architecture* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivingtonm 1881), 57.

medieval style's association with castles and the nobility meant it was better-suited to elegance on the interior.[18]

Some critics pointed to the glaring disparity between the methods of contemporary warfare and the tactics that would supposedly be employed in defense of armories. Considering medieval elements as purely symbolic, writers like Montgomery Schuyler disparaged their use. Yet as Fogelson rightly points out, to the guardsmen, the defensive architecture of the armories was not symbolic: "afraid that the armories would some day be attacked by the mob, they [militiamen] insisted on defensible as well as formidable structures."[19] These facilities were not designed to withstand attack from other well trained and well equipped forces; rather, they were designed with rag-tag mobs in mind. Further, as Matthew Johnson's study of medieval castles makes clear, the line between function and symbolism is often arbitrary. That author established that while typically considered exclusively in terms of fortification of defensibility, the castles' architectural design, ornamentation and spatial sequencing was simultaneously a vehicle for the self-fashioning of its inhabitants.[20] Castles—both in the medieval context and certainly for their urban descendants in the late nineteenth century—formed stage settings or backdrops in front of and through which elite identities were performed. According to

[18] Fogelson, *America's Armories*, 155-6. Shirley Dare, who reported on the armory's opening in *Art Amateur*, went further, claiming "armories and factories are the only buildings which have sprung out of the needs of the nineteenth century proper." Dare, "The Seventh Regiment Fair," 2.

[19] Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 158.

[20] Matthew Johnson, *Behind the Castle Gate: From Medieval to Renaissance* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).

Johnson's analysis, these structures "played a part in defining and renegotiating unstable social identities."[21]

The Architect

Clinton is first mentioned in conjunction with the *new* armory in 1874 and his involvement with the project was in keeping with the regiment's practice of calling on its own members in their particular fields of expertise. James Bogardus, well known for his work in commercial cast iron structures, shared credit for the design of Tompkins Market Armory with Colonel Marshall Lefferts (1821-1876), a highly regarded engineer and the Seventh's commander from 1859 to 1864.[22] Clinton was responsible for designing the interior layout for regimental spaces of the earlier armory, including the upper-floor drill room, which featured a column-free interior. No credit was given by the Seventh for the Italianate Reservoir Square design, but because of Clinton's involvement with the regiment—earlier at Tompkins Market and later at the new armory—it is highly likely that he was responsible for that design as well.[23]

Clinton was a native New Yorker who trained in the office of Richard Upjohn (1802-1878). According to Judith S. Hull's study of Upjohn and his office, Clinton began

---

[21] Ibid., 9.

[22] See Turpin C. Bannister, "Bogardus Revisited. Part I: the Iron Fronts," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 15 no. 4 (December 1956): 12-22. On page 22, the author misidentifies Bogardus's Tompkins Market co-designer as "Lafferty," however Lefferts's role in the design has been documented elsewhere. See Robert A.M. Stern, Thomas Mellins and David Fishman, *New York 1880: Architecture and Urbanism in the Gilded Age* (New York: Monacelli, 1999), 240. Lefferts was a civil engineer and, like many of his successful Gilded Age peers, translated knowledge in his field into a number of important business ventures and enormous financial success. He served as chief engineer for the American Telegraph Company, was involved with Western Union, and served the Gold and Stock Exchange Telegraph Company as president. Clark, *History* II, 124-126.

[23] Stern attributes this design to Henry D. Casey, but provides no documentation for this claim and I find no reference to Casey in the regiment's archive. Stern, *New York 1880,* 244.

with the architect in 1847.[24] He left sometime in the 1850s, forming subsequent partnerships with Anthony B. McDonald and Edward Tuckerman Potter, but from 1862 until 1891, Clinton practiced alone.[25] In 1891, he established a partnership with William Hamilton Russell (1856-1907), a New Yorker who attended Columbia School of Mines before entering his great uncle, James Renwick's (1818-1895), practice.[26] Clinton & Russell designed a number of projects for the Astor family, including the Astor Apartments, Astor Hotel, and Graham Court Apartment, and according to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, it "was the architectural firm of choice for many of the early skyscrapers constructed in the downtown financial district."[27] The firm also capitalized on Clinton's earlier work with the Seventh, designing the Seventy-First Regiment Infantry Armory (located on Park Avenue between East 33rd and East 34th Street) in 1904-5.[28]

The trajectory of Clinton's career points to important developments in architectural education and practice of the mid-to-late-nineteenth century. Upjohn was an early leader in his field: he served as the first president of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), and was thus instrumental in shaping the professionalization of the

[24] Judith S. Hull, "The 'School of Upjohn': Richard Upjohn's Office," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 52, no. 3 (September 1993): 281-306.

[25] Hull dates Clinton's departure from the Upjohn office in 1852, while a New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission report asserts he left in 1858. Nevertheless, Clinton managed his own practice for more than thirty years. Ibid., 304; and, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, *Beaver Building Designation Report* (New York, NY: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1996), 2.

[26] See *Clinton & Russell, Holton & George* (New York: Architectural Catalog Company, 1911).

[27] *Beaver Designation Report,* 2.

[28] Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 157. The design of the Seventy-First is credited to Lieutenant Colonel J. Hollis Wells, a staff member in Clinton's firm. It replaced an earlier building that had been destroyed by fire in 1902, and was itself demolished in 1971.

practice. According to Hull, positions in his office were highly coveted. Many of the most well known of his trainees came from prominent families and many already had college degrees, suggesting that "class and the education which accompanied it became important in defining the mid-nineteenth-century architect." Mary Woods also discusses Upjohn in the context of mid-century professionalism, noting that the AIA, as reorganized in 1857, "became an exclusive gentleman's club."[29] Like Richard Morris Hunt (1827-1895), Upjohn asserted his status as a professional, insisting, for example, on his rate of pay and the right to retain ownership of drawings. Yet Upjohn emphasized sound building and thorough knowledge of construction techniques over the Beaux-Arts design principles advocated by Hunt. According to Hull, "Whereas Hunt received a gentleman's education . . . Upjohn was schooled in the trades and hard knocks of the Anglo-American building world."[30] In his native England, Upjohn was apprenticed to a cabinet-maker, and this training in fabrication and construction methods surely contributed to his insistence that his architectural apprentices master those very necessary skills. Hull's comparison is misleading, however, as the two men were not contemporaries: Hunt was a full generation younger than Upjohn, but Hunt and Clinton *were* near contemporaries: Clinton entered Upjohn's office in 1847, just a year after Hunt entered the Parisian studio of Hector Lefuel, and their respective careers offer a more reliable point of comparison.[31] Hunt is primarily remembered today for his contribution

---

[29] Hull, "School of Upjohn," 299; Woods, *From Craft to Profession,* 30-36.

[30] Hull, "School of Upjohn," 302.

[31] See Paul R. Baker, *Richard Morris Hunt* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT, 1980); and Susan Stein, ed., *The Architecture of Richard Morris Hunt* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1986).

to Gilded Age domestic design, not for structural or technological innovation. In contrast, Clinton, whose practice was based in New York, was the designer of the Apthorp, then the world's largest apartment building, and the Hudson Terminal, the largest office building (calculated by floor area), considered a technological marvel and a precursor to the original World Trade Center.[32]

It is worth noting that the Seventh chose Clinton to design the armory at the exact same time its leaders were working with Hunt on another important commission, the Seventh Regiment memorial. First proposed in 1867, the sculpture would honor the Seventh's Civil War dead. Hunt designed a granite base for the memorial that would support a single bronze figure designed by John Quincy Adams Ward (1830-1910). The memorial was unveiled in July 1874, and still stands on the western edge of Central Park (Fig. 2.4). As with the armory project, a committee was organized to manage and oversee the process. Ward was hired to design and fabricate the bronze figure, which depicted a private on sentinel duty. A total of $25,000 was raised from the active members. Central Park commissioners granted the Seventh a site adjacent to Warrior's Gate at 7th Avenue and 110th Street, but the men objected to this location on the grounds that it was too far north and unfavorably situated in front of a rock promontory, blocking it from view. The project was nearly derailed the following year, when it was determined that Hunt's base

[32] Stern confirms that Hunt's great contribution were urban residences for wealthy New Yorkers. His student, George B. Post, "dominated the city's commercial work." Stern, *New York 1880,* 22; Sarah Bradford Landau similarly asserts that "houses were the mainstay of his practice." Sarah Bradford Landau, "Richard Morris Hunt, the Continental Picturesque and the 'Stick Style,'" *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 42 no. 3 (October 1983): 278; On the Apthorp and Hudson Terminals, see New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, *Apthorp Designation Report* (New York, NY: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1969); David W. Dunlap, "Another Ghost from Ground Zero's Past Fades Away," *The New York Times,* October 26, 2008.

would cost almost $50,000—more than twice the amount already spent on the $23,000 bronze figure. Hunt's design was described in 1869 as "elaborate and appropriate" but the episode caused such a stir within the Seventh that the bronze statue sat complete at the foundry for three more years as the monument association's activities were suspended during that time. When referenced again in 1872, the base is referred to as "extravagant in its proportions, and in the expenditure required." The association was re-manned that year and its new members, motivated to finalize the long-dormant project, obtained what they considered to be a more suitable site (at 69th Street on the west side of the Park), and a new, less extravagant design from Hunt. Within six months, contracts were signed for construction. The memorial was finally inaugurated in June 1874, at a total of more than $40,000.[34]

The Seventh Regiment memorial was an exact contemporary of the proposed new armory and sheds light on the headquarters commission: both were first proposed in 1868, and the Seventh was engaged in site negotiations with the city for both projects in 1869—over the so-called Warrior's Gate for the statue and Reservoir Square for the armory building—and again in the early 1870s. In fact, the regiment's success in obtaining a more favorable site for the memorial may have emboldened its leaders to revive the Reservoir Square initiative in 1874.

Despite the fact that the Seventh had hired a highly regarded architect and sculptor, and despite the enormous cost of the undertaking, the memorial was not the resounding artistic success for which it was hoped: it was deemed merely "good" in the

[34] For the statue see Clark, *History* II, 155-6, 168, 175, 211, 224.

press.[35] Kirk Savage's insightful study tracks the proliferation of Civil War soldier monuments, but unlike the majority of Savage's examples, which were commissioned decades later, the Seventh's was conceived just two years after the close of the conflict. The author asserts that these later "common soldier" monuments represented an effort to "rehabilitate and modernize the seminal figure of the citizen-soldier" who had been stripped of agency by the newly mechanized nature of warfare in the 1860s. Further, Savage holds that this particular type of memorial had no precedent in European tradition.[36] Thus, the Seventh's very early example of this type may be considered experimental, and Hunt and Ward's lack of success with it, somewhat understandable.

It may be that Hunt's association with what was for the Seventh a slow and expensive undertaking left the regiment's leaders with a negative impression of the architect. Clark may have wanted to start the new armory project fresh, free of the animosities that can develop during a construction project, especially one with such overruns. The regiment also must have questioned Hunt's ability to meet budgetary constraints, based on the experience of the memorial and the new level of fiscal responsibility demanded in post-Tweed New York. Even the Metropolitan Museum of Art shied away from the architect when the young institution's budget was limited initially. It was only in the 1890s when the museum was in much better financial standing

[35] "Pro Patria et Gloria," *New York Herald,* June 23, 174. The *Herald* noted that "in entrusting this important commission to Mr. J.Q.A. Ward, no experiment was tried." The final assessment, however, was that "although it cannot be pronounced a great work of art, it is the next best thing—a good one."

[36] Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Architectural, 1997), 167, 174.

that its trustees sprung for a "grand statement" designed by Hunt.[37] More importantly, that Clinton had been a member of the Seventh meant that he intimately understood the functional requirements and aesthetic preferences of the group. Clinton marched and drilled in an older building; he attended meetings and was sequestered during riot duty and thus intuitively understood the specific needs and wants of this client in a way other architects without comparable military experience would not. Finally, as a loyal member, Clinton would have been much more open to input from Colonel Clark than Hunt would have been. At the time of the commission, Clinton served as secretary of the Veteran Association and thus was still an active participant in the regiment.[38] Hunt famously ran afoul of Frederick Law Olmstead and Calvert Vaux over his controversial proposal for the Central Park gates, and as Mary Woods points out, Hunt was known in and beyond architectural circles as "venomous" when crossed—a formidable defender of his professional standing and litigious when necessary.[39] The Seventh could not afford debate or further complication with the armory—an already complex and controversial project.

The Seventh's published history confirms that the armory design was a collaborative process. Clinton is recognized for the "architectural beauty . . . [of the] exterior and interior," but Clark is credited with "the original and general plan." It is likely that Clark laid out programmatic requirements based on features of the Seventh's

---

[37] Morrison H. Hecksher, "The Metropolitan Museum of Art: An Architectural History," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series 53, no. 1 (Summer 1995): 21, 30-34.

[38] "Military Gossip," *The New York Times*, January 26, 1873.

[39] Mary Woods, *From Craft to Profession:* 104. According to Woods, Charles McKim credited Hunt's ferocity for his firm never having to sue clients; On Hunt's proposal for the gates, see Stern, *New York 1880*, 98, 102-104.

previous quarters (which Clinton had worked on and would have been intimately familiar with) as well as on other facilities he had seen, with Clinton translating these ideas into a set of detailed architectural plans and specifications.[40]

Through 1876 and 1877 the regiment was engaged with the subscription drive, raising funds and publicizing its progress. As detailed in the previous chapter, the organization of the new armory fund, the high level of transparency with which it was managed and the men chosen to oversee it were a direct reflection of the political climate in post-Tweed New York. The regiment approached various aspects of the armory commission with organizational strategies similar to those of the fund. The general committee on the new armory acted as liaison between trustees of the fund (who were, by design, not members of the Seventh) and the regiment. The building committee oversaw aspects of the architectural design, including soliciting bids and drawing up contracts for foundation work, the structure and mechanical systems. Several committees were organized in conjunction with the November 1879 New Armory Fair, whose purpose was to raise money for the interiors. Just a month before the fair, the sub-committee on fitting up rooms in the new armory was organized to deal specifically with the building's interior appointments and furnishings. Thus, with the architectural design finally settled and construction proceeding under Clinton's careful supervision, the Seventh's members and leaders turned their attention to the furnishing and decoration of their new headquarters.

[40] Clark, according to this account, "was familiar, from long experience and observation, with the wants and requirements of the organization for its military accommodation." Clark, *History* II, 299.

The Interiors

As planned by Clark and Clinton, the armory's administrative front wing accommodated a variety of regimental functions in grand, ceremonial spaces (Fig. 2.5). The rectangular structure is divided into quadrants by a pair of wide corridors that intersect at the center of the building. After passing through iron-gated six-inch-thick oak doors fronting Park Avenue, visitors enter a wide vestibule and ascend a few steps to stand inside the foyer (Fig. 2.6). On the far side of the north-south axis a monumental split stair leads to the upper floors. The entry corridor, passing between and under the stairs, terminates at double doors leading to the drill hall. Regimental rooms unfold off of the north-south axis. The four largest rooms occupy the west side of the building fronting Park Avenue: the reception room and board of officers room to the south; the library and veteran room to the north (Figs. 2.7-2.10). The board of officers room occupies the southeast corner of the administration building. Its main point of entry is from the long corridor, though pocket doors also connect to the reception room. Pride of place (the "corner offices," so to speak) was given to the board of officers and veteran rooms. At the outside corners of the building fronting Park Avenue, both have window exposure on two sides, though because of the corner tower elements overhead, these spaces were less-than-perfectly square, necessitating creative treatment of the irregular space of the outside corners.

Clark served as project manager for the design and construction process of these spaces over the summer of 1879 as the New Armory Fair committee met and planned. The first floor regimental spaces fell under the umbrella of an interiors sub-committee, while the veteran room was the responsibility of that group and was contracted separately

from the rest. Similarly, upstairs company rooms were contracted on an individual basis so that the companies essentially acted as ten independent clients, selecting firms to design and outfit their spaces. Within the constraints of the budget, space and programmatic requirements, they had been given free rein to design and furnish their upstairs locker rooms as they saw fit, and according to Clark, there was "considerable quiet rivalry to secure the most artistic designs and the best mechanical execution."[41] The company rooms at Tompkins Market Armory had similarly been a source of pride (and competition) for company members, and though Clark had urged expediency thus far on *this* project, with the armory's success now assured, he urged the captains to proceed with care and much consideration, as there was still plenty of time. "It is very desirable" he noted, "that each company room should be entirely satisfactory to those who are to occupy it."[42]

With the exception of the veteran room, the first floor spaces represented the entire regiment and thus required a different management approach from the upstairs company rooms. During the summer of 1879, in the lead-up to the New Armory Fair, there was much discussion (and apparently some confusion) over the design and contracting of these spaces. Board of officers meeting minutes confirm that upstairs company rooms were planned independently of what the Seventh called "regimental rooms" on the first floor—the board of officers, colonel's, field and staff, adjutant, non-commissioned staff, library and reception rooms—and that company rooms were planned prior to those downstairs. In a board of officers meeting in early June 1879, Clark

[41] Clark, *History* II, 285.

[42] Letter, Clark to Captains, May 19, 1879, Col. Clark Letter Book 1875-1880, NYHS.

reported that money would run out before both the first and second floor interiors were begun, necessitating funding these spaces purely through fair proceeds. For this reason, it was decided *not* to "fit up" first floor rooms prior to the fair, "as the public would not be as likely to contribute if they found everything finished and nothing more to do." Under protest, company captains agreed to forestall further work in their rooms until after the fair as well, despite the delay this represented. Meanwhile, the regimental rooms were not contracted until January of 1880, after the fair.[43]

Given the number of individuals, boards and committees involved in the process, it is no surprise that confusion arose over authority and responsibility for space on the first floor. On August 18, 1879, Clark intervened, informing members of the establishment of a sub-committee on fitting up rooms in the new armory. Clark also requested the presence of company captains for a building committee meeting at veteran Edward Kemp's office to examine plans "which have been offered to the committee by several of the leading houses of the city."[44] By September 1st, the sub-committee had officially been formed with William Kipp, David Appleton, and William G. Dominick as its members; George Moore Smith was named Chairman in October.[45] At the same meeting, the sub-committee was authorized to "procure plans and estimates" for the regimental rooms.[46]

---

[43] Board of Officers Minutes, June 7, 1879; January 3, 1880; Board of Officers/Council of Officers Minutes, 1870-1880, PAA.

[44] Letter, Clark, to Captains, August 18, 1879, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[45] Letter, Clark to Captains, September 1, 1879. Smith is named in Letter, Clark to Captains, October 4, 1879. Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[46] Board of Officers, meeting minutes, Special Meeting, August 30, 1879. Board of Officers/Council of Officers Minutes, 1870-1880, PAA.

The lack of surviving documentation renders certainty about the armory's interior commissions impossible. Business records, receipts and company archives no longer remain.[47] Similarly, neither the regiment's published history nor its unpublished archive offers specifics on how the commissions were handled or the rationale for hiring one firm over another. Penned by Colonel Clark, *The History of the Seventh Regiment* actually suggests that with the exception of the veteran room and library, Clinton designed the interior appointments entirely.[48] A number of sources support this claim. In early October of 1879, George Moore Smith, chairman of the sub-committee for fitting up the rooms, reported that the architect was then drawing up designs for "trim" including "lockers, cases, wainscoting and mantels" for the board of officers, reception and colonel's rooms. At that time, designs for the field and staff, non-commissioned staff and adjutant's rooms were not yet complete, but would be submitted at a future date. In this communication, Smith outlines various woods that Clinton had specified for each space—selections that

---

[47] Of the firms and individuals who contributed to the design and construction of the armory, only the firm of McKim Mead & White has surviving archival material. Pottier & Stymus's famously detailed record system was presumably lost in a fire that destroyed the company's showroom and factory in 1888. George C. Flint & Co., fabricators of millwork in the main stair and hallways, similarly lost their showroom (and presumably their records) in a fire in 1882. Scholars have often lamented the lack of records for Herter Brothers and Associated Artists; attribution of the former is often based on speculation and cases of clear provenance are rare. As for Louis C. Tiffany & Co., Associated Artists, historians have only very recently reconstructed the actual business structure of this very important firm. See "Flames in West Street. George C. Flint & Company's Furniture Storehouse Burned," *The New York Times*, April 25, 1882; Hanks, "Pottier & Stymus Mgf. Co.," 84-90; Herron, "The Modern Gothic Furniture of Pottier and Stymus," 762-7; Roberta A. Mayer and Carolyn K. Lane, "Disassociating the Associated Artists: The Early Business Ventures of Louis C. Tiffany, Candace T. Wheeler, and Lockwood de Forest," *Studies in the Decorative Arts* 8, no. 2 (Spring-Summer, 2001): 2-36.

[48] "The designs adopted by the Building Committee were the work of Charles W. Clinton, architect, and to his genius and admirable artistic taste the regiment is mainly indebted for the architectural beauty of the building, exterior and interior, and for the complete construction and finish of every part of the immense structure." Clark, *History* II, 300.

indeed conform to those that remain today.[49] Further, Clark reported that in 1880, Smith, acting as committee chairman, "accepted designs by . . . Charles W. Clinton, for the regimental rooms and contracted for the cabinet-work and furniture.[50] More detailed documentation reveals that Smith presented plans "from the architect for the several [regimental] rooms" at a board of officers meeting in November 1879. At the same meeting, it was resolved to approve said plans for those spaces subject to officer approval, to have the plans finalized and estimates made, all to be submitted at a subsequent meeting. At that meeting, in January 1880, it was reported that Clinton had been ill and unable to finalize estimates. To avoid delay, the interiors committee was authorized to contract for "fitting up and furnishing" the rooms anyway, provided the money spent would not exceed that on hand for such purposes.[51] Thus, the records strongly suggest that Clinton was responsible for designing the regimental spaces and, had he not fallen ill, would have provided cost estimates for the work as well.

Clark's assertion about Clinton's primary role in the interior design is further supported by elements in the building itself. Colonel Clark wrote to company captains during the summer of 1879, reminding them that whatever the scheme inside their spaces, all doors facing the common hallways had to match (in material and design) those

[49] Report, Maj. George Moore Smith on behalf of the Committee in Fitting up and Furnishing Regimental Rooms in the New Armory to Board of Officers; October 4, 1879; box 9, folder 9, NYHS. Wood species are outlined as follows: board of officers, mahogany; reception and toilet rooms adjoining, maple; colonel's room, light and black walnut; field and staff room, mahogany; adjutant's room, ash; non-commissioned staff, oak.

[50] Clark, *History* II, 285.

[51] Board of Officers Meeting Minutes, November 1, 1879; January 3, 1880. Board of Officers/Council of Officers Minutes, 1870-1880, PAA.

specified by Clinton throughout the rest of the administration wing.[52] Establishing a cohesive design along the main thoroughfares of the building ensured continuity along and provided a unified backdrop for the variation in décor that occurred in the individual rooms on both floors (Fig. 11). As outlined in the introductory chapter, the company rooms are not a focus of this investigation; however, this component of their design is germane to my analysis. Millwork in the company rooms—carved wood trim, baseboards, door and window surrounds and lockers—exhibit a remarkable degree of stylistic consistency for rooms in which "competition" for unique design was a motivating factor. In fact, in most cases the distinguishing characteristic in the second floor spaces (that remain intact) is the treatment of the ceiling. The design of this surface plane was a key element of the total Aesthetic interior but in the Seventh's second-floor company rooms, it is the ceiling treatment that more than any other single element most distinguishes one room from another (Figs. 2.12-2.15). The company captains revisited the earlier decision to halt construction work in their spaces prior to the fair. Concerned about how to securely store their belongings while also not wanting to project a "rough" or unfinished appearance, a compromise was reached allowing an appropriation for lockers to be constructed according to "plans accepted by the architect of the new Armory."[53] The correspondence of the lockers confirms that this was part of Clinton's scope of "trim" work, and that he designed this standard element without substantial variation from one

[52] Letter, Clark to Captains, May 18, 1879, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[53] Board of Officers meeting minutes, June 7, 1879. Board of Officers/Council of Officers Minutes, 1870-1880, PAA.

space to the next.[54] Emphasis on the ceiling plane and the high degree of variation in that specific area suggests it was the place where creativity could be exercised.

The same design strategy is evidenced on the first floor as well. Visually linked by the prominent main stair, the first and second floor corridors exhibit the same surface treatment in finish and design (Fig. 2.16). In the hallways, narrow-plank, dark-stained oak covers the floor. A high baseboard marks the transition from floor to wall plane, forming the foundation for wood paneling punctuated with rectangular insets, all capped by projecting molding. This treatment runs continuously through the long hallways, interrupted at regularly spaced intervals by doors leading to the individual rooms beyond. The carved door surrounds are massive, capped by a projecting cornice that reaches nearly to the thirty-eight-foot-high ceiling. Carved impost blocks mark the intersection of the wall paneling and the door surround, and elongated, fluted imposts support the pedimented, over-door cornice. The horizontality of the wall paneling is balanced by the vertical emphasis of the door surrounds. Similarly, the visual weight of the dark, carved woodwork solidly anchors the expanse of hallways as the staggered rhythm of voids (the doors and surrounds) marks spatial progression along the length of the hall.

Paneled walls and carved ornamental wood trim were a mainstay of nineteenth-century interiors, as illustrations in *Artistic Houses* and other publications will attest. The armory's examples are remarkable today mainly in their impressive scale, though one

[54] Only Company K's lockers depart much from the standard. Its men hired one of their members, Sidney V. Stratton (at that time, employed by McKim, Mead & White) to design their space, rather than hiring an outside firm. See "The Seventh Regiment Armory," *The Decorator and Furnisher* 6, no. 2 (May 1885): 44.

contemporary critic thought the treatment was lacking in effect.[55] Mitchell C. Vance supplied the wrought-iron and glass light fixtures in the hallways. Their glowing lace-like delicacy provides a point of contrast with the solid severity of the millwork below.

The veteran room and library on the first floor are the only rooms (of those that remain substantially unchanged from the original design) that significantly depart from the millwork design of the hallways and stair (Figs. 2.17). The reception room's maple millwork is the lightest in color of any in the building, and the pattern of its burled wood paneling, delicate (Fig. 2.18). The paneling in the reception and board of officers rooms is more intricately carved than that of the hallways. The fluted pilasters and dentilled cornices are elements specific to Classical architecture, and these elements are not found in the halls. However, in the reception and board of officers rooms, the height of the paneling corresponds exactly to that in the hall, and the overall design details are fairly consistent (Fig. 2.19; 2.20). In both rooms, the general disposition of the hallway paneling is maintained: a high baseboard anchors rectangular inset paneling, which is capped by projecting trim.

Based on stylistic consistency, Clark's and Smith's assertions, and the example of the company rooms, it seems certain that Clinton indeed designed the "trim" in all of the first floor rooms, excepting the veteran room and library. That other firms were paid for services in these spaces is established by the regiment's bill books. What *exactly* they did is not specified. Their work, when listed, is described broadly and it is clear that the bill

[55] "The main staircase is a most substantial and generous piece of work . . . being done by George C. Flint & Co., as was likewise that in the halls. In the latter the treatment is not so satisfactory, for the reason that it lacks the appearance of solidity in the wainscoting and other cabinet work that appears to be demanded by the surroundings." Ibid., 43.

book is incomplete.[56] As evidenced by Smith's account, Clinton specified wood species to be used in each room; he also undoubtedly provided detailed design proposals—annotated and dimensioned drawings —to maintain continuity between the hallways and various rooms. Millwork in the hallway, stairs and in the regimental rooms would then be fabricated by an outside vender, and the room would receive further decorative treatment and furnishings, designed and fabricated by the various firms listed in the archival bill book.

Divvying up responsibility between various decorators and fabricators was, for a project of this size and level of complexity, common practice in the Gilded Age. In the early 1850s, Andrew Jackson Downing held that a villa designed by an architect was typically also furnished by him; but for "villas of considerable importance," an interior decorator could be called in "to complete the whole, as the builder leaves it."[57] In the post-Civil War building boom, "important" projects were typically the work of multiple hands. Mosette Broderick has attributed this practice to diplomacy. The decorators preferred by the families of both husband and wife could be called in to work on a

[56] The only surviving documentation of expenditures is an archival cash book, for the New Armory Fund. It is clear that firms were issued payment based on bills submitted to the fund, however these entries lack specificity. The most detailed outlines payment to Herter Brothers on October 18, 1880 "for curtains for Board of Officers, Colonel's and Reception rooms, tinting walls of Dressing rooms, Walnut clock case in Colonel's Room as per bill Octo[ber] 4th $1275." A much more typical entry from September 13, 1880, documents payment to "Louis C. Tiffany and McKim Mead & White, check 292-294 for and on account of contract for the cabinet, trim, bookcases, decorations etc. for the Library. Check #292, $3,500 as above; #293, $3,000 as above; #294, $2,000." George C. Flint was paid for the "balance of their cabinet work" in August 1880, suggesting a previous bill, though no bill or payment is referenced. Cash Book, New Armory Fund, NYHS.

[57] Downing's explanation of the decorator and his or her duties makes clear that the profession was largely unknown at this time. See Andrew Jackson Downing, *The Architecture of Country Houses; Including Designs for Cottages, Farmhouses and Villas* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1852), 405.

commission, and though familial accord was maintained, interiors executed according to this approach were often *not* harmonious.[58] (The fashion among elite patrons for themed rooms—a Moorish smoking room, for example, or a Japanese parlor—similarly undermined total stylistic cohesion). This contradiction between the Aesthetic emphasis on unity and wildly divergent environments encountered within a single project may also be attributed to the conflicting advice of taste-makers. Charles Lock Eastlake's influential treatise advised that the house should be uniform in style and not divided by room, whereas Clarence Cook, writing in *House Beautiful*, held that "each room ought to be considered by itself, no matter if it be only nominally separated from another."[59]

Yet as Broderick outlines, during the mid-to-late 1870s, most architects were averse to taking on interiors work, so Clinton's involvement with this component of the armory commission was somewhat atypical for a project, at least in this immediate period.[60] By the mid-80s, architects like Stanford White and Richard Morris Hunt still contracted with outside vendors and fabricators, but played an increasingly prominent role in the conception of interiors. At the armory, Clinton's expanded role lent a degree of consistency to the spaces that may otherwise have been lacking. Further, that he had a hand in designing both the structure and its decoration suggests that the character of these

---

[58] Mosette Broderick, *Triumvirate, McKim Mead & White: Art, Architecture, Scandal and Class in America's Gilded Age,* (New York: Random House, 2010), 94.

[59] Eastlake, *Hints on Household Taste,* 71; Cook, *House Beautiful,* 333.

[60] The author uses the example of Stanford White who took over Henry Hobson Richardson's interiors work as well as the firm's sketching—two things the elder architect "did not do naturally or easily." See Broderick, *Triumverate,* 68; The Union League Club serves as another example. An almost exact contemporary with the armory, the Peabody-and-Stearns-designed structure was decorated by John La Farge, Tiffany, and Frank Hill Smith. See Mary Gay Humphries, "Novelties in Interior Decoration," *The Art Amateur* 4, no. 5 (April 1881): 102.

components, which seem somewhat contradictory to contemporary viewers, was not viewed in the same way in the late 1870s.

The Firms

It is curious that for such a significant and highly publicized project, the Seventh did not advertise, or in most cases even acknowledge, its decorators. In the Seventh's history, they are called "the leading firms" while its archive references "the leading houses." The regiment's bill book lists payment to a number of firms that were indeed premiere houses in the 1870s and early 80s: Herter Brothers, Pottier & Stymus, Kimbel & Cabus, Leon Marcotte and Alexander Roux. In fact, other than the architect Clinton, only Louis C. Tiffany is mentioned specifically.[61] The other firms were well established and to upper-class New Yorkers these were household names. Why was the newcomer the only one mentioned? It is difficult to know with certainty. The Seventh was inconsistent with record keeping, as evidenced by the bill book and this inconsistency undoubtedly carried over to other types of documentation. In some instances in the regiment's published history, names have been left from written records because they were not particularly significant at the time of writing, though this is not the case with these firms: they were the premiere decorators of the period. Some, like Marcotte and Roux, had been in business for many years already. Herter Brothers and Pottier & Stymus were more recent, but were widely considered the most prestigious.[62] Given this, it would seem that Tiffany,

[61] "The designs of Louis C. Tiffany for the decorations, furniture, and fixtures of the library and Veteran room were accepted, and the work was entrusted to that artist." Clark, *History* II, 285.

[62] Voorsanger notes that even in the early 1850s, Alexander Roux was well established in New York. Voorsanger, "Gorgeous Articles of Furniture: Cabinetmaking" in *Art and the Empire City: New York, 1825-1861* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000), 318; Similarly, Leon Marcotte had been in business since the late 1840s. Nina Gray, "Leon Marcotte: Cabinetmaker and Interior Decorator," *Chipstone*, http://

the young upstart who had yet to amass a lengthy client list, would have been the one omitted by the Seventh, not the only one included.

However, as has been well established in other studies, Louis C. Tiffany was *not* unknown and in fact his family name may have been one of his best business assets. As his former student and biographer, Hugh McKean has asserted that his name was immediately recognizable—associated with a famous father and a retail establishment that was distinguished for its stylish, high-quality offerings.[63] Indeed, in 1873 when the Seventh's members honored Colonel Clark for his leadership and dedication, the men presented him with a three-piece silver "testimonial," custom-designed by Tiffany & Co., including a punch bowl and two companion pieces (Fig. 2.21). The design was hailed as "a new idea in military testimonials" and featured metal in a satin finish, which Tiffany & Co. was credited with inventing. According to one newspaper account, it did "credit alike to the judgment and taste of the committee who selected it, and to the house which conceived and executed this splendid specimen of the silversmith's art."[64]

It has been speculated that Tiffany was selected to design the veteran room and adjoining library because of his personal connection to George Kemp (1826-1893). Kemp was a veteran member of the Seventh who made a great fortune as a dealer in

---

www.chipstone.org/publications/1994AF/index1994gray.html; accessed November 15, 2011. Gray asserts that Marcotte "was among the upper echelon of cabinetmakers that included Herter Brothers, Alexander Roux, and Pottier & Stymus."

[63] According to McKean, there were several important contributing factors to Tiffany's success: his father's money; that he moved in the same social circles as his clients; and that his name was instantly identified with the highest quality products. Hugh McKean, *The "Lost" Treasures of Louis Comfort Tiffany* (New York: Doubleday, 1980), 35, 102.

[64] The set, its ceremonial presentation to Clark and the attendant festivities were recounted in the press. "Presentation to Colonel Clark," *The New York Times*, December 28, 1873. An undated newspaper clipping in the regiment's archive includes a detailed description and engraving of the set. "Tiffany's Clark Testimonial," Scrapbook, 1873-78, NYHS.

pharmaceuticals, and his salon of 1879 was one of several Tiffany-designed rooms in his home that were included in D. Appleton & Company's 1883 publication *Artistic Houses.*[65] That it bears a striking resemblance to the veteran room will be more fully explored in the following chapter. It is relevant here as a very early commission for Associated Artists. In fact, several scholars assert that Kemp's was the very first project of Tiffany's fledgling venture. Charles Tiffany, the founder of Tiffany & Co. and Louis's father, was a personal friend of Kemp's and it is assumed that this was the connection between the aspiring designer and the wealthy patron.[66]

Edward Kemp (1831-1902), George's brother and business associate, was also a veteran of the Seventh—both men belonged to Company F—and was actively involved in spearheading the veteran's effort with the new armory. In fact, in many instances, Edward Kemp acted as a liaison between the veterans and the active members; his position and expertise were clearly held in high regard. Clark corresponded with Kemp during the subscription drive, and his letters make clear that while Clark (himself well connected) was well aware of potential subscribers, Kemp was the Seventh's liaison to

[65] *Artistic Houses: Being a Series of Interior Views of a Number of the Most Beautiful and Celebrated Homes in the United States, with a Description of the Art Treasures Contained Therein* (New York: Printed for Subscribers by D. Appleton & Co., 1883).

[66] In his essay on the artist's decorative work, historian Neil Harris holds that the friendship between the elder Tiffany and Kemp cemented Louis's early commission. Hugh McKean claims that the Kemp commission was the first for Associated Artists. Mayer and Lane, in a thorough documentation of Associated Artist's early work, similarly posit that Kemp was Associated Artist's first commission. They specifically refute the position earlier taken by Robert Koch who believed that Associated Artists received the Kemp commission because of the firm's work at the armory. See Neil Harris, "Louis Comfort Tiffany: The Search for Influence" in Alastair Duncan, ed., *The Masterworks of Louis Comfort Tiffany* (New York: Abradale, 1993); McKean, *Lost Treasures*, 5; Mayer and Lane, "Disassociating," 7.

the high-powered business world.[67] His judgment was also valued in non-business matters. Kemp served on the committee that oversaw the reception and inaugural ball—the public unveiling of the new facility—and was authorized to make selections and award contracts for printed invitations and programs.[68] It bears repeating that when the interiors sub-committee met to review proposals submitted from "leading firms" in August of 1879, they did so at Kemp's office.[69] Finally, Kemp was the one member who served on both the regimental committee and the veteran committee for the interiors. Since the veteran room and adjoining library were contracted separately, Kemp was once again a connecting link between the two entities.[70]

While the elder Tiffany very well may have introduced his son to Kemp, there are several other important factors that are of at least equal importance in establishing

---

[67] In one example, from early October 1877, Clark wrote to Kemp urging him to publicly refute rumors then circulating that the new armory foundation was unsound. Clark also suggested several potential subscribers to Kemp (including how much they should give)—prominent men whose omission from the subscription lists rankled Clark: "Charles Roome, formerly Captain of 4th Co[mpany] is now President of Manhattan Gas Light Co. and should give $5,000 or $2,000 at least." Clark updated Kemp on his own efforts regarding the subscription, but promised not to overstep his bounds, assuring Kemp "we will be careful not to interfere with your movements in the matter." Letter, Clark to Kemp, October, 1877; Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS.

[68] For example, committee records indicate that Kemp submitted designs for "Orders of Dancing" to be used in the Inauguration Ball. Minute Book, Committee on Reception and Inaugural Ball, November 20, 1880, 18, NYHS.

[69] Based on information in a contemporary trade journal, Mayer and Lane hold that "Tiffany was clearly engaged in the design of the salon . . . by the summer of 1879." Mayer and Lane, "Disassociating the Associated Artists," 7. Though Kemp's business address is listed as 70 William Street in the circular, it is elsewhere listed at 68 William, the location of Lanman and Kemp from 1870 to 1900. See Letter, Clark to Interiors Sub-Committee, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1875-1880, NYHS; Minute Book, Committee on Reception and Inaugural Ball, 1880, NYHS; Lanman & Kemp-Barclay & Co., Inc. online history. http://www.lanman-and-kemp.com/history.htm, accessed October 12, 2012.

[70] As already noted, Kemp served a leadership role in the regimental committee for the armory. He also served on the Ways and Means Committee for the Veteran Association, which was responsible for the veteran room commission. *The Veteran Room, Seventh Regiment Armory* (New York: Privately Printed, 1881).

Tiffany's credentials as a highly qualified and innovative designer. The first is Louis C. Tiffany's own residence at the Bella Apartments. Tiffany moved his young family into a penthouse on East 26th Street in 1878, and his highly inventive designs were published to acclaim in January 1880, just as the Seventh was at work on its interior commissions. The reporter John Moran described Tiffany's "large flat, with its many rooms and devious corridors" as exuding "Oriental splendor," noting that the artist had been "uninterruptedly engaged in beautifying his home" for two years and was still at work perfecting the project. The exoticism and architectural inventiveness of the space and its many contents were noted, including what may be the first reference to Tiffany's experimentation with colored glass.[71] Moran concluded that the space was "a veritable house beautiful" and that he was "loath to leave."[72] The article, from the series, "New York Studios," appeared in D. Appleton & Company's *Art Journal*. Daniel Sidney Appleton (1824-1890), one of four Appleton brothers who carried on their father's (also named Daniel) successful New York-based publishing company, was a captain in the Seventh Regiment and a member of the Special Committee for Fitting up the New Armory.[73]

---

[71] The reporter described a window, opposite the main entrance, "on which Mr. Tiffany has from time to time daubed the scrapings of his palette with a view to the achievement of accidental effects . . . from this design . . . the artist is having a stained-glass window made." John Moran, "New York Studios III" *The Art Journal for 1880* 6 (January 1880): 3-4. This description corresponds to a stained-glass window, also opposite the front door, visible in the 1883 *Artistic Houses* photograph of his entry hall. See Arnold Lewis, James Turner and Steve McQuillan, *The Opulent Interiors of the Gilded Age: All 203 Photographs from "Artistic Houses"* (New York: Dover Publications, 1987), 42.

[72] Moran, "New York Studios," 4. Moran's article included only a vignette of Tiffany's studio, though the rest of the space and many of its contents were described.

[73] In a handwritten letter of September 1, 1879, Col. Clark wrote to Appleton and two other officers (Captain William H. Kipp, and Lieutenant William G. Dominick) informing them of their membership on the Committee. Box 9, folder 9, NYHS.

Bella was not only the family home, however. As indicated in the *Art Journal* coverage, the space also functioned as Tiffany's studio. Though it was only reproduced in print in early 1880, Tiffany's friends and potential clients would have visited the space as early as 1878 when the artist moved his family there and gave up his previous studio quarters at the YMCA.[74] Studio visits were a common activity for artistically inclined New Yorkers of the period (as evidenced by a column dedicated to New York studios in the *Art Journal),* and for Tiffany, who was not only a fine artist but also pursuing a business in interior design, the studio would have been even more significant as a space for self-promotion.[75]

The second connection was of even greater significance to the Seventh's interiors commission, though it is one that has thus far been overlooked. Just after Bella was published in the *Art Journal,* the Madison Square Theatre opened in New York—in fact, both were included in the *Journal's* year-end compilation of its individual 1880 issues. The Theatre was an innovative design experiment and represented a radical departure from earlier examples of the type. It has been called "the most influential American theatre [built] during the last quarter of the nineteenth century" and was highly praised in the *Journal's* coverage.[76] Its proprietor, James Steele MacKaye (1842-1894), was an

---

[74] According to Mayer and Lane, Tiffany gave up his YMCA studio on East 23rd Street "some time after May 1878." His business address was then listed at Bella, 48 East 26th Street. Mayer and Lane, "Disassociating," 7.

[75] On the role of artist's studios, see Sarah Burns, *Inventing the Modern Artist: Art and Culture in Gilded Age America* (New Haven: Yale University, 1999).

[76] The theatre featured a double-tier stage (that dramatically sped the process of scene changes), an active ventilation system, and the orchestra was placed above the stage, rather than in a pit below it. See J.A. Sokalski, *Pictorial Illusionism: The Theatre of Steele Mackaye* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University, 2007); "A Model Theatre," *The Art Journal for 1880,* 139-141.

important American playwright and dramatist who revolutionized theatre practice and design in the late nineteenth century.[77] MacKaye hired Tiffany to work on the interior for the new theatre, including an enormous stage curtain (Fig. 2.22). The curtain is known through a surviving color image, but as the theatre was demolished and most other images focus on the stage mechanism and stage sets, little is known about the rest of the space. (The *Art Journal* did provide a lengthy description and several vignette sketches.) The Madison Square Theatre was enormously successful, and the commission was followed in 1885 by another theatre, the Lyceum, which MacKaye managed with a partner. Yet another theatre project may have been in the works when MacKaye introduced Tiffany to Oscar Wilde in 1882. According to Doreen Bolger Burke, MacKaye and Wilde discussed an "ideal theatre" that never materialized. Given Wilde's public praise for the "master hands" of the Madison Square Theatre curtain, it is certain the men had Tiffany in mind for the project.[78]

The relationship between Tiffany and MacKaye has only been briefly discussed. Burke explored Tiffany's early artistic training with George Inness at Eagleswood Military Academy in New Jersey. Sally Promey has also noted Tiffany's friendship with MacKaye at Eagleswood, though her analysis focused on Inness' pedagogical approach and its relationship to Swedenborgian philosophy of the period.[79] As Burke outlines,

---

[77] See Percy MacKaye, *Epoch: The Life of Steele MacKaye* (New York: Boni & Liveright, 1927); and David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1990).

[78] Doreen Bolger Burke, "Louis Comfort Tiffany and his Early Training at Eagleswood, 1862-1865," *American Art* 19, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 29-39.

[79] Sally M. Promey, "The Ribband of Faith: George Inness, Color Theory, and the Swedenborgian Church," *The American Art Journal* 26, no. 1-2 (1994): 44-65.

Tiffany and MacKaye were together at Eagleswood in the 1860s: Tiffany was a student of Inness, and MacKaye was married to Jennie Spring, daughter of Eagleswood's founder, Marcus Spring.[80] Both men were influenced by the painter, and both studied art in Paris—MacKaye with Jean-Léon Gérôme in the late 1860s, and Tiffany with Jean Bailly in the same period—but only MacKaye continued to build upon this early military training.[81] MacKaye enlisted with the Seventh Regiment and served in the Civil War. In fact, MacKaye was the model for the Seventh's Civil War Memorial designed by Ward and Hunt.[82] Thus, MacKaye was not only an important early patron for Tiffany's decorating venture, but a much earlier and more direct connection to the Seventh than Edward Kemp.

Tiffany and the Artistic Interior

The most important clue to Tiffany's involvement in the armory project *is* disclosed, ever so subtly, in the Seventh's official history: "and the work was entrusted to that artist."[83] Other than his famous name, Tiffany was known early on for his work in oil and water color and by the mid-1870s, he was a highly regarded painter. As Robert Koch recounts, he was the youngest member admitted to the Century Association, and along with Inness, Colman and La Farge, was a founder of the Society of American Artists,

[80] Burke, "Louis Comfort Tiffany at Eagleswood," 36; Promey, "Ribband of Faith,"47.

[81] Burke, "Louis Comfort Tiffany at Eagleswood," 36. On Tiffany's training and early influences, see Robert Koch, *Louis Comfort Tiffany: Rebel in Glass* (New York, NY: Crown Publishers, 1982), 7.

[82] Lewis I. Sharp, *John Quincy Adams Ward: Dean of American Sculpture* (Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware, 1985), 173, 175.

[83] Clark, *History* II, 285.

established in 1877.[84] He was elected an Associate National Academician in 1871, and reached full status in 1880.[85] His father's fortune freed him to travel, and his many Atlantic crossings were noted in the press.[86]

Tiffany famously asserted that he was going after the money to be had in decorating.[87] He recognized the business potential in this nascent field, and because of his extensive network of contacts and associates in various crafts, offered clients a highly diversified range of services. Yet, the distinguishing characteristic of his practice was his unique expertise as an artist. In the wake of the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, increasing emphasis was given to the "artistic" interior. Tiffany and his sometimes rival John LaFarge were on occasion referred to as artist-decorators, a title that no doubt capitalized on the Gilded Age craze for all things "artistic" but also spoke to specific expertise—with color, tone and texture certainly—but also depth of field, the arrangement of objects and spatial relationships within a constructed composition—qualities called "having a good eye." These were exactly the skills called for in this new conception of the interior environment. This was true for Tiffany and also for his collaborator on the veteran room

[84] Koch, "Medieval Castle Revival," 8.

[85] "National Academicians" National Academy Museum and School; http://nationalacademy.org/national-academicians/biographies/?char=T; accessed November 1, 2011.

[86] One reporter offered "Few American artists have traveled more." "Tiffany's *Among the Weeds*," *The Art Journal* 5 (June 1879): 161.

[87] Tiffany wrote to Wheeler in 1879 that he "had been thinking a great deal about decorative work, and I am going into it as a profession. I believe there is more in it than in painting pictures." Quoted in Koch, *Rebel in Glass*, 11.

and library, Stanford White (1853-1906), who considered a career as a fine artist before deciding instead on architecture.[88]

In fact, Tiffany had already proven his merit to the Seventh in this regard. He and his friend and fellow artist, Samuel Colman (1832-1920), contributed paintings to the third floor art gallery of the Seventh's New Armory Fair, and were responsible for arranging "bric-a-brac" that included examples of their own decorative work.[89] Thus, when Tiffany was awarded the veteran room and library commission in the following year, he was by no means an unknown entity to the Seventh. On the contrary, he and Colman had been responsible for artfully arranging one of the most often-commented-upon features of the hugely successful fair.

In emphasizing the *artistic* nature of the venture, Tiffany and his associates distinguished themselves from the field of furniture-makers who tackled increasingly ambitious commissions, including whole-house interiors and, in at least one example, an architectural one as well. As Diana Strazdes documented in her study of the 1875-76 Leland Stanford commission, through the 1860s and 70s, furniture-makers like Pottier & Stymus gradually expanded their businesses to include a variety of non-furniture services, tackling every aspect of complex interiors projects. In Stanford's California mansion, the firm was responsible for the design, fabrication and installation of interior décor including furniture, built-in millwork, lighting and a decorative painting scheme with

---

[88] Samuel G. White and Elizabeth White, *Stanford White, Architect* (New York, NY: Rizzoli, 2008), 7.

[89] "There will be bric-a-brac, including fine specimens of color from the collections of the painters Samuel Colman and Louis C. Tiffany . . . and the arrangement of bric-a-brac will be in the hands of Messrs. Samuel Colman and Louis C. Tiffany." *New York Herald,* November 14, 1879.

"allegorical and symbolic pictorial references" to Stanford, his railroad companies and the prosperity that would be visited upon of the state of California thanks to his ventures. Pottier & Stymus may even have consulted on the architectural layout of the house.[90] One of the most well known commissions of the 1880s was the Fifth Avenue mansion of William H. Vanderbilt (1821-1884). Though assigning credit (or blame) to a specific individual for the project is a subject of debate, the fact remains that Vanderbilt hired the Herter Brothers firm as designers.[91] No doubt biased, the *American Architect and Building News* nevertheless surmised that if the house was in fact the result of hiring decorators for an architectural project, "it is hoped the experiment may not be repeated."[92] According to Mary Dutton Boehm, Herter Brothers was "unfamiliar with manipulation of space on a large scale, and used ornamentation to compensate for inadequacies in the design."[93] Thus, despite the fact that post-1876 interior décor was supposed to emphasize coordinated, unified environments, artistically conceived and harmoniously integrated, even the most high-style furniture makers (including furniture-

[90] Interestingly, on p. 215, Strazdes notes that despite the attention garnered by the house and its interiors, Pottier & Stymus was never explicitly recognized as the designer. Strazdes, "The Millionaire's Palace," 238.

[91] An essay that accompanies photos of the Vanderbilt House points to problems in attribution. A number of individuals were associated with the design, including Charles B. Atwood, an employee of the firm. Atwood and architect John B. Snook took out the building permit, but Herter Brothers insisted on receiving credit for the design, asserting that Atwood was just an employee. Lewis, et al., *Opulent Interiors,* 114.

[92] *American Architect and Building News,* May 21, 1881.

[93] Boehm, *Herter Brothers and the William H. Vanderbilt House*, 19.

maker/decorators) still relied on overly ornate surface effects and were often criticized for this approach.[94]

Though it has been asserted that Tiffany's decorating venture began with furniture, accounts of his interiors work stressed that he was *not* a furniture-maker, or "upholsterer" as the trade was sometimes called.[95] One review explained:

> The draperies and colors of the Madison Square Theatre, instead of falling, according to the usual plan, into the hands of conventional upholsterers, were placed under the direction of Mr. Louis C. Tiffany, the artist, and as a result, we have not only something entirely new, but absolutely a revelation in beauty.[96]

Tellingly, the Seventh Regiment veterans described their space in nearly identical terms, boasting that:

> Clearly enough it is not a jaunty New York parlor, and there has been somewhat [*sic*] done in it, which the upholsterers alone are not used to doing. Of distinctive upholsterers' work there is indeed, the very least. . . . From the general features, it will abundantly appear that the Veterans have steered clear of conventionalisms in the ornamentation of their quarters. [97]

The account summarized the design strategy as a "drift away from ordinary prettinesses [*sic*]" appropriate to the martial function of the room.

The above quotes highlight the fact that both the Seventh's veterans and James Steele MacKaye, the proprietor of the theatre (and a trained artist himself), sought out the *unconventional* by hiring an artist, rather than an upholsterer, as a designer of these

---

[94] Strazdes notes that Pottier & Stymus "had earned a reputation for ornament to the point of drawing criticism for depending too much on rich carving for effect." Strazdes, "Millionaire's Palace," 234.

[95] Mayer and Lane assert that when Tiffany formally established his company in 1880 it was to "specialize" in furniture. Mayer and Lane, "Disassociating," 10.

[96] "A Model Theatre," 142.

[97] *The Veterans' Room,* 11-13.

respective interiors. As its elder statesmen, the Seventh's veterans clearly aimed to differentiate their space from the rest of the armory's interiors just as they themselves were distinguished from the active men by longer service and, importantly, by providing crucial support throughout the building's planning process. In fact, in a subsequent dispute between the veterans and the regiment's leadership, the veteran corps took credit for much of the armory initiative. According to one missive, it was the veterans who first conceived of a "National Guard Hall" and a veteran member, George Moore Smith, who proposed the Hamilton Square site. The veterans donated nearly $30,000 directly, but as the statement rightfully held, they were responsible for "securing very large subscriptions from corporations and wealthy members of the community."[98] The importance of these men was not only clarified by the generous size and prominent placement of their quarters—it was billed by Clark as "one of the largest and finest rooms"—but by the funds expended. Clark and the Seventh's leadership originally agreed to divert $15,000 from New Armory Fair proceeds to the veteran room, but because of the fair's extraordinary success, increased the sum to $20,000, making the veteran room the most expensive of the administration building by far.[99] The adjoining library, at $10,200 was the next most costly. By comparison, nearly $26,000 was spent on the other five first-

[98] Typescript of untitled, undated pamphlet; box 73, PAA. Tensions between veteran and active members had flared occasionally since the Veteran Corps founding in the late 1850s, but the so-called "Veteran Controversy" of the mid-80s was by far the most severe. Some of the veterans had taken up the practice of publicly referring to one another by military rank, which they had not, in fact, achieved. They also paraded independently, and some were wont to wear outlandishly flashy "uniforms" much to the dismay of the active men. Because the Seventh was a chartered institution, the dispute was taken up in court. By 1886, a new *un-uniformed* veteran group was officially organized with a revised charter and tellingly, a badge as the only outward symbol. See Clark, *History* II, 363-4; *The Veteran Controversy* (New York: Privately Printed, 1884).

[99] Clark, *History* II, 363-4.

floor regimental rooms *in total* while each company received $6,000 for its second-floor space.[100]

Just as the Seventh's architect, Clinton, called on well qualified specialists to consult on the building's structure and engineering, so, too, Tiffany enlisted the talents of specialists for his portion of the building's interior: Samuel Colman for color; Candace Wheeler for embroideries (now lost); and Stanford White for input on interior architectural arrangement. Tiffany also supervised the work of other fine artists, further clarifying that his role was both creative and managerial. Francis David Millet (1846-1912), a Harvard-educated, Antwerp Royal Academy-trained artist collaborated on the veteran room's prominent frieze (Fig. 2.23). As Barbara Weinberg outlines, Millet was well traveled and his work evinced a proclivity even early on for exotic and historical costumes. The young artist assisted John La Farge on the decorative scheme for Boston's Trinity Church and beyond his connection to La Farge, socialized with White and his Parisian circle during the 1878 *Exposition Universelle*.[101] According to Mosette Broderick, Millet was an integral member of "the old gang," a circle of intimates surrounding Stanford White and Charles Follen McKim.[102] Interestingly, Millett covered the Russo-Turkish War as a correspondent for both the *New York Herald* and the *London Daily News* and though Weinberg holds that these reporting expeditions are "of little interest to the art historian," they, undoubtedly, provided inspiration for the veteran's

[100] These calculations exclude the $5,500 payment to Roux (which includes no location) and are based on bills and payments recorded between June 1879 and January 1880 in Cash Book: Seventh Regiment New Armory Fund, PAA.

[101] H. Barbara Weinberg, "The Career of Francis David Millet," *Archives of American Art Journal* 17 no. 1 (1977): 2-18.

[102] Broderick, *Triumverate,* 111.

bellicose frieze.[103] George Henry Yewell is even less remembered today, but he shared credit for the frieze with Millett.[104] Yewell trained with Thomas Hicks and Thomas Couture, was a member of the American expatriate community in Rome and, in the 1870s, settled in with a circle of artists at the Tenth Street Studio Building. Like Millet, Yewell was interested in the exotic and was particularly acclaimed for his interior scenes.[105]

Lockwood de Forest (1850-1932) also had a role in the design, though the exact nature of his involvement is unclear. De Forest was a member of the New Armory Fair Art Committee and so was involved with planning that event, but as Mayer and Lane outline, he was simultaneously planning his own wedding. The artist married in early November of 1880 (about a week prior to the fair's opening) and subsequently left for what would be a year-and-a-half stay in India.[106] While he may not have been present to consult on the veteran room and library, a number of Indian elements in those spaces (including elaborately carved printing rollers inventively repurposed as column capitals

---

[103] William C. Brownell, "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory," *Scribner's Monthly* 22 (July 1881): 370, 374-77; Weinberg, "Francis David Millet," 6. Weinberg discusses the frieze briefly and notes William C. Brownell's characterization of its "archaeological erudition." In October 1880, Millet gave a lecture course at the School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston on costume. See "Lecture," *The American Art Review* 1 no. 12 (October 1880): 550. Millet went on to play a central role as director of design for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. He perished on board the *Titanic* in 1912. See Broderick, *Triumverate,* 349-351, 384.

[104] See Humphries, "Novelty in Interior Decoration," 102.

[105] According to one assessment, "Mr. Yewell is more successful in his interiors than in his figure-pieces." *New York Tribune*, April 28, 1887. Reprinted in Natalie Spassky, *Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, vol. II (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art in Association with the Princeton University, 1985), 330.

[106] Mayer and Lane, "Disassociating," 15; Also see Roberta A. Mayer, "The Aesthetics of Lockwood de Forest: India, Craft and Preservation," *Winterthur Portfolio* 31, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 1-22; For his involvement with the fair, see "The Seventh Regiment Fair. A Reception Last Evening by the Art Committee," *The New York Times*, December 5, 1879.

surrounding the veteran room fireplace and as support for the massive oak table) attest to his presence, albeit indirectly (Fig. 2.24).

As his fellow artist-decorator John La Farge had done earlier at Boston's Trinity Church—one of the most highly acclaimed decorative schemes of the era—Tiffany assembled and directed a team just as a musician would plan and orchestrate a composition, with himself as conductor and head designer: a partner-in-charge whose organizational approach in the late 1870s reflected and shaped the increasingly stratified world of architectural design.[107] In the mid-1880s Tiffany would abandon interiors in favor of further specialization in glass, yet his role in assembling a team of consulting experts in projects like the armory foreshadowed the organizational model of the most successful architectural firms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as it mirrored the business practices of corporate magnates who patronized them.

A final, crucial point must be brought to bear on the armory's interiors commissions: for Pottier & Stymus, Herter Brothers, Kimbel & Cabus, Alexander Roux and the rest of the furniture-makers, connections with clients were professional, whereas for the members of Associated Artists, the connections were social and in some cases, familial. It is impossible in the context of this study to trace the myriad points of association between the thousands of active and veteran members of the Seventh and the close friends and relatives of the artist-decorator, the young architect and their collaborators. Mosette Broderick's firm biography of McKim, Mead & White offers an admirably thorough map of such points of contact as does Franklin Hill Perrell and

[107] On the Trinity Church commission, see H. Barbara Weinberg, "John La Farge and the Decoration of Trinity Church, Boston," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 33 (December 1974): 323-53.

Constance Schwartz's *Louis Comfort Tiffany, Stanford White and their Circle.*[108] Taken together, these publications offer a picture of a New York upper-crust society that was exclusive and tight-knit. Yet, in failing to acknowledge the class tension so prevalent in New York during this period, these studies gloss over its impact on wealthy New Yorkers as both patrons and emerging professionals.

Judith Hull's comment regarding Richard Upjohn's applicant pool points to the broader phenomenon of professional specialization mirroring socio-economic privilege, but this was not new to the post-bellum era. As Dell Upton's study makes clear, the project of crafting a professional identity was, even in the early 1800s, bound up with differentiation between architects as educated thinkers and builders as tradesmen. According to Upton (and Magali Sarfatti Larson, upon whose work he depends), architects had to overcome the lack of a tangible end result. Their products were ideas, thus specialized training and standards of behavior and practice came to define architects and other "market professions" (physicians and lawyers) as well as to distinguish them from would-be claimants without the requisite qualifications. Education was central to this project, and while its attainment fed into popular democratic notions of a classless society, it was in fact "based on access to an institution not open to most people in nineteenth-century America."[109] Fogelson confirms that by the late 1800s, class animosity was particularly strong: an architect's clients were upper class, and by the

---

[108] Broderick, *Triumverate;* Franklin Hill Perrell and Constance Schwartz, *Louis Comfort Tiffany, Stanford White and Their Circle* (Roslyn Harbor, New York: Nassau County Museum of Art, 1999).

[109] Dell Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860" *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn 1984): 112; See also Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California, 1977).

1870s architects had come to see the building trades as "the bane of the construction industry."[110] Despite the architect's notoriously long hours and relatively poor pay—working conditions that might have engendered empathy for laborers and the building trades—architects increasingly distanced themselves from these members of their own industry. According to Woods, architectural journals ridiculed immigrant laborers, presenting "only the professional architect [as] a social peer and trusted adviser" to his clients.[111]

Though furniture-makers like Pottier & Stymus and Herter Brothers were well established and highly regarded in New York, the fact remains that they came from a very different social class than their wealthy patrons. They were removed from the world of education and leisure travel that not only served as a training ground for men like Tiffany, Colman and White, but also cemented their social and professional connections (including with potential clients) that today would be called a network. Their expertise originated in furniture-making and cabinetry—a trade rather than a profession—and this distinction was brought glaringly to the fore in the 1870s.

The Furniture-Makers Strike

Historians of the Eight-Hour Movement typically focus on the late 1880s and '90s, but agitation for the eight-hour day began at least a decade before.[112] Through the

[110] Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 165.

[111] Woods, *From Craft to Profession,* 153.

[112] These analyses tend to focus on the realization of labor demands (which *did* begin in the late 1880s) rather than the process by which they were won. See W.J. Shaxby, *An Eight-hours Day: The Case Against Trade-union and Legislative Interference* (London: The Liberty Review Publishers, 1898); Sidney Fine, "The Eight-Hour Day Movement in the United States, 1888-1891" *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 40, no. 3 (December 1953): 441-462; Thai Jones, *More Powerful than Dynamite: Radicals, Plutocrats, Progressives and New York's Year of Anarchy*

summer of 1872, New York City's cabinet-makers and various related trades went on strike for an eight-hour day and other wage-related demands. In one early report from mid-May, press coverage emphasized the overwhelmingly German makeup of New York cabinet-makers' shops, pointing out that "about 12,000 Germans are employed at this trade in this city." The union's twelve hundred members were not yet on strike, but gave audience to a delegation of carpenters and joiners who were.[113] By the 26th, the men had gone on strike and the *Times* reported that sofa- and lounge-makers had joined the efforts of cabinet-makers, wood-carvers "and others employed in the cabinet-making trade." A "mass meeting" to take place in both German and English was tentatively scheduled in City Hall Park, and a delegation was being organized to visit Boston and coordinate efforts there. To date, the men had been successful in forcing over one hundred firms to accept their demands.[114] A week later, two additional firms had conceded but workers still held out, spurred on by news that their peers in Pittsburgh and Providence were also

---

(New York: Walker & Co., 2012). One early twentieth-century analysis rightly situates the genesis of the movement in the immediate post-Civil War years, blaming labor's poor organization with its being overlooked in this era. See George Gorham Groat, "The Eight Hour and Prevailing Rate Movement in New York State" *Political Science Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (September, 1906): 1-15. It may also be that labor strikes in the Northeast during the summer of 1873 (and thus the push for an eight-hour day as a nascent movement in the 70s) have been overshadowed by events of greater national and international importance that unfolded through the late summer and fall. The Coinage Age of 1873, which established a gold standard (rather than both silver and gold) had a disastrous effect on American silver operations and the national economy more broadly. The depression in silver prices and resulting inflation were followed closely by the collapse of Jay Cooke & Company in September. The resulting depression (called the "Great Depression" until it was surpassed in 1929) lasted until late in the decade. See Irwin Unger, *The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1968); and John M. Lubetkin, *Jay Cooke's Gamble: the Northern Pacific Railroad, the Sioux, and the Panic of 1873* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 2006).

[113] "The Cabinet-Makers in Council—Another Strike Impending," *The New York Times,* May 15, 1872.

[114] "The Cabinet-Makers," *The New York Times,* May 26, 1872.

striking for the eight-hour day, and in Boston a similar movement was brewing.[115] By early June, the *Times* reported a "general strike" and though the paper sounded a somewhat conciliatory tone towards the labor effort, it referenced a forthcoming demonstration predicted to draw more than 40,000 men. The police and fire departments had been put on notice, as had General Shaler, head of the militia's First Division, which included the Seventh Regiment.[116] On the 15th, the strike turned violent. Armed fighting broke out at the Steinway piano factory at Lexington Avenue and Forty-Second Street, and another factory was seized by the mob, but the police were generally successful in quelling the event. In its aftermath, established furniture-maker/decorator Alexander Roux was forced to capitulate to the eight-hour workday; Pottier & Stymus agreed to a wage advance, but held firm on the ten-hour day.[117]

It is beyond the scope of this analysis to trace the development of the labor movement in Gilded Age New York, but it is worth noting that of the thirty-one participating unions listed in the early July demonstration, the most populous by far was that of the cabinet-makers. Five thousand strong, the union counted a thousand more members than the next-largest group, the carpenters. Overwhelmingly, strikers were employed as furniture-makers or in construction and its allied trades, and the numbers speak to the fact that when united as a group, these men held the power to shut down the

[115] "The Cabinet-Makers, Wood-Carvers and Upholsterers," *The New York Times*, May 31, 1872.

[116] This report was uncharacteristic in its sympathizing tone, asserting "Men who have millions of dollars in capital are not so easily drawn into the current which now sets in favor of the working men." "The Labor Issue. Efforts Being Made for a General Combination of the Strikers," *The New York Times*, June 9, 1872.

[117] The strike was not limited to furniture-makers. A number of other trades in Manhattan, Brooklyn and Jersey City participated. "The Strike Trouble. Violent Demonstrations by the Eight Hour Men," *The New York Times*, June 16, 1872.

city's building industry. And their economic reach went even beyond their own trades, as strikers demanded that businesses post signs in favor of the eight-hour day or lose the patronage of the workers.[118]

Some workers received concessions on wage advances (as at Pottier & Stymus) and others on the workday (as at Roux) because the process was not yet standardized and demands were dealt with on an employer-by-employer, union-by-union basis. The system of demand-and-concession was continually challenged and renegotiated, and late in the decade devolved into another strike. The example of the Herts Brothers firm (not to be confused with the better-known Herter Brothers) is exemplary of the New York furniture industry's hyper-specialization—cabinet-makers negotiated separately from upholsterers, carvers and varnishers—but this example also highlights the leverage that compartmentalization provided. One hundred and twenty-eight of Herts's cabinet-makers walked out for ten days during a high point in the production schedule. When management finally gave in, the other 150 employees sent in a petition and had demands met without striking.[119]

By February of 1880, the *Times* suspected "strike fever" due to the disparate nature of the trades represented and wondered about the presence of "agitators." A German furniture-maker, Henry Hermann, was foregrounded in the dispute, though house

[118] The unions' enrollment is as follows: cabinet-makers: 5,000; carpenters: 4,000; blacksmiths: 3,000; Singer's Sewing Machine employees: 2,500; brick layers: 2,000; horseshoers: 2,000; carriage upholsterers: 1,500; blacksmiths: 1,500; stone-cutters: 1,500; polishers: 1,400; carvers: 1,000; piano-makers: 1,000; varnishers: 800; coach painters: 800; picture-frame makers: 700; early closing association: 700; pattern-makers: 600; gilders: 600; desk-makers: 500; brownstone cutters: 500; house frame makers: 500; sewing machine box makers: 500; masons: 400; confectioners: 400; showcase makers: 300; general woodworkers: 300; stair builders: 300; sash and blind makers: 250; coffin-makers: 200; wood turners: 200; coach trimmers: 200. Ibid.

[119] "Cabinet-Makers Strike," *The New York Times*, October 31, 1879.

and fresco painters, journeymen tailors and shoe makers struck as well.[120] Hermann came to an agreement with his employees and the strike's end was heralded in the press.[121] Employees of Pottier & Stymus received a 10 percent advance on wages; at Herter Brothers, the work week was reduced from fifty-five to fifty-three hours with a raise of $1 per week.[122]

Ironically, the success of these men inspired cabinet-makers and others to air their grievances and less than two months later a much more extensive strike took place across the trades. This time, bosses joined forces in an offensive, demanding of their workers no less than sixty hours per week and a resolution was signed to that effect. The cabinet-makers' union demanded their members strike in response and according to the *Times,* "most of the large furniture houses are affected by it." A number of German firms were listed including Schrenkheisen (where the dispute started), and Diehl & Co., but the workers at Herter Brothers, who had received concessions in April, were against participating in the work stoppage.[123] According to the *New-York Tribune,* Herter had agreed to a rate increase only for its most senior workers but the junior men acted in solidarity and rejected this compromise.[124]

---

[120] "Strikes Among Artisans," *The New York Times,* February 24, 1880.

[121] "Closing Scenes of the Strike," *The New York Times,* March 30, 1880.

[122] "Successful Labor Agitation. Weber's Piano-Makers to go to Work Today—Wages Advanced and Hours Reduced in Other Trades," *New-York Daily Tribune,* April 1, 1880.

[123] "Cabinet-Makers and Piano Men. A Strike for the Reduction of the Hours of Labor—The Contract System," *The New York Times,* June 6, 1880.

[124] "Local Miscellany. A Masterful Set of Workmen," *New York Daily Tribune,* June 5, 1880.

In the post-bellum era, the New York press was dominated by stories of striking workers both locally and across the country. (This was the case to such an extent that the *Times* appears to have stopped covering strikes altogether during the period.[125]) Unlike the railroad strikes or the Draft Riots, disputes between these tradesmen and their bosses were confined to work stoppages; strikers generally did not engage in violent or destructive behavior and did not seek to damage their workplaces, showrooms nor their employers inventory. Rather, these men brought business to a standstill. Their actions immediately and dramatically impacted their employer's profitability, but also injured the firm's standing in that contracts were left unfulfilled and construction schedules were thrown into disarray.

Striking furniture-makers would have had little direct impact on the Seventh in the early 1870s, but work stoppages well may have affected the armory commission. The *Park Avenue Armory Drill Hall and Interiors Guide,* a contemporary promotional pamphlet, curiously mentions that the reception room, one of three ground-floor rooms decorated by Herter Brothers, is "the only one in which they [Herter Brothers] did not design the woodwork."[126] In fact, it is impossible to determine from archival records *exactly* what was carried out by which firm, but records do establish that at least two of

[125] Strikes were covered in the *Times* until 1875. References to "strike" or "strikes" do not appear again until a Syracuse salt mine strike in 1884. Both the *Sun* and the *Daily Tribune* continued their coverage. A search of New York papers from 1870 to 1885 in the "Chronicling America" newspaper directory returns more than 12,500 results for that fifteen-year period alone.

[126] I use the term "decorated" intentionally. As this chapter has established, attributions of "design" on the armory's interiors are problematic but it is without question that the Herters played a role in the conception and execution of surface treatments in both the reception and adjoining board of officers rooms. The third space, the colonel's reception room, was significantly altered in the 1930s. See *Park Avenue Armory Drill Hall and Interiors Guide;* http://www.armoryonpark.org/downloads/ArmoryInteriorsGuide.pdf, accessed October 7, 2012.

the first floor regimental rooms included furniture or cabinet work executed by firms that were *not* credited as designers. That Roux was responsible for some portion of the first floor spaces is confirmed by a $5,596.50 payment for "cabinet work and furniture" on July 21, 1880, but this is the only payment in the Seventh's bill book for which a location is not specified. Leon Marcotte, too, supplied furniture for the board of officers and colonel's reception rooms, as evidenced by a payment of $3,872.25 on August 23rd 1880.[127]

As I asserted earlier, it is entirely likely that Clinton, the architect, played a greater role in the design of these spaces than has previously been recognized. If Clinton indeed designed the millwork paneling for the regimental rooms (excepting the library), it would have mattered little which firm actually manufactured the specified design, but it is curious that various firms worked *within the same rooms* on different aspects of the commission. It is reasonable to assume that Herter's shop was so busy with other projects (notably, the William H. Vanderbilt commission) that it sub-contracted with comparable firms who had some slack in their schedules, but is also highly likely that Herter's striking workers had an impact on the firm's ability to deliver on its contracts. Of New York's few high-end firms, Pottier & Stymus was the only other mentioned in coverage of the strikes during 1880-1881; Roux and Marcotte were absent from such accounts.[128] Herter Brothers received payments during the summer and fall of 1880, and thus was in-process with the regimental rooms just as its workmen were striking for higher pay and fewer hours.

---

[127] Cash Book, Seventh Regiment New Armory Fund, PAA.

[128] Roux was mentioned in the early 1870s, but the firm's name did not appear in any subsequent accounts.

Detailed documentation of other furniture and interiors commissions from this period is scarce, but Phillip M. Johnston's analysis of an earlier project, Samuel Colt's Hartford home, "Armsmear," sheds light on the impact work stoppages would have had in the 70s. Delays or unexpected changes were anathema for businessmen like Colt—entrepreneurs whose success was predicated on the timely execution of legally binding contracts. Melody Deusner's recent study of Aesthetic patronage similarly highlights the myriad points of connection between business practice and the design and execution of coordinated interiors, clarifying that the administrative skills and business acumen that fueled Gilded Age fortunes not only guided dealings in the boardroom but carried over into other realms.[129] It is worth emphasizing again that clients largely came via word-of-mouth recommendations (through familial and social connections), and so a firm's ability to meet scheduling and budgetary constraints had a significant impact on future business prospects. In 1877, Mark Twain penned one such commendation for cabinetmaker Leon Marcotte to the superintendent of construction for the Connecticut State capitol. Twain recognized that New York was full of "bastard furniture-constructors and decorators," but vouched "we have three rooms in our house which will prove to anybody that Marcotte knows his business."[130]

Though the strikes obviously placed the proprietors of Herter's and others in a management position—in one sense, on the capital side of labor/capital conflict—they were nonetheless directly implicated in the disputes. Clients (or potential clients) would

[129] Phillip M. Johnston, "Dialogues between Designer and Client: Furnishings Proposed by Leon Marcotte to Samuel Colt in the 1850s," *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, no. 4 (Winter, 1984): 257-275; Melody Barnett Deusner, "A Network of Associations: Aesthetic Painting and its Patrons, 1870-1914," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Delaware, 2010).

[130] Quoted in Gray, "Leon Marcotte."

rightfully have questioned whether contracting with them was a wise choice, given that their workers were prone to walkouts. In the preceding decades furniture-makers had become arbiters of taste, progressively taking on more complex and comprehensive projects but I believe these strikes played a significant and heretofore unrecognized role in ending their ascendancy. Certainly, here socio-economic privilege, specificity of training and education, social connections and business practice clearly come together, for though there was a hierarchical divide *within* the firms—between the owners or managers and workers—men like Christian Herter and Auguste Pottier still had risen through the ranks of the factory system themselves. Further, in contracting with one of these firms, a client was tied to that firm and to any potential instability there.

Meanwhile, the artist-decorator, designer or architect operated with a greater degree of independence. These professionals had offices or studios rather than retail showrooms. In contrast to the furniture-maker who offered a one-stop-shop, the designer was free to select items from a variety of suppliers. It would be logical for designers to develop a working relationship with a particular fabricator, and this may have been the case for Tiffany, but even so, the independent designer had a much greater degree of flexibility than a furniture-maker/decorator who was necessarily reliant on his own workforce.[131] Clients were thus not only afforded a broader range of choices stylistically,

[131] In their study, Mayer and Lane note that both Tiffany and his sometime collaborator Lockwood de Forest worked with a New York cabinetmaker named John Spielberg. It is logical that both artist-designers used the same shop, for both employed a similar aesthetic of Islamic-inspired carving that was entirely distinct from the output of the furniture-makers at this time. The authors also hold that Tiffany employed a "head designer" who was hired away by Herter Brothers with an offer of more money, and infer from this that Tiffany also had "a large design staff." However, it does not necessarily follow that a head designer necessitates a large staff. Further, the documentation cited for this claim is, as the authors point out, problematic. The letter from de Forest to Tiffany is undated and incomplete. See Mayer and Lane, "Disassociating," 15.

but also more competitive pricing. As the example of the Seventh illustrates, when the architect designed a coordinated scheme, drawings and specifications could be sent for bid to multiple firms. A unified aesthetic would not depend on a single entity completing every component in a room (or an entire commission), but rather on oversight and management by an outside party. As White wrote to his client Joseph Pulitzer in 1902, "It would really make no difference whether Herter, Baumgarten, Marcotte, Allard, or Davenport did the work, as it would be done in the minutest details from our drawings and under our supervision."[132]

As Upton's analysis makes clear, the "noble ideal" of the dispassionate expert interested only in his client's (and by extension, the public's) good was a critical component of professionalization in the nineteenth century.[133] Though the so-called "market professions" had to navigate the commoditization of that expertise alongside the intangibility of the services they offered, in the case of design professionals, an added degree of remove from actual products validated (rather than problematized) professional claims. In his work for the Seventh, Clinton's motivations were programmatic, aesthetic and budgetary requirements, not the goods he would sell. As noted earlier, had Clinton not fallen ill in early 1880, he would have submitted estimates for the fabrication of his designs to the Seventh's leadership. His role was not limited to design, but he also acted as a manager, collecting bids from the various shops and presenting the options to his client. He may also have functioned as an adviser, vouching, as Twain had earlier, for a firm with whom he had had a positive experience, or warning of problems that had arisen in past commissions. Clinton was, to use Upton's word, "dispassionate." The motivation

[132] Quoted in Howe, "An Introduction to the Herter Brothers," 77.

[133] Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism," 112.

of furniture-makers, on the other hand, could be suspect because of their relationship to the products being sold: was the recommended carpet the best choice for the client or outdated inventory? Was the client receiving the best price? Clients could and did shop around for themselves, but the architect or designer, acting as an independent consultant, freed customers from this arduous task.

It is worth re-emphasizing that of the individuals and firms responsible for the armory design, only Clinton and Tiffany were acknowledged by the Seventh; the other firms were largely unacknowledged. Newspaper accounts that tracked the commission's progress referenced the other firms by name, but the regiment did not. As I speculated earlier, this could have been a simple case of oversight, but given the Seventh's calculated public image and its adeptness at self-promotion it is just as likely that the "leading firms" were listed as such purposefully. As an elite regiment charged with maintaining order and explicitly heralded as the savior of affluent New York, its leaders would understandably have sought to minimize their connection with striking workers, all the more so, as patrons of those striking. After all, the Seventh's fundraising campaign functioned as a referendum of sorts, a corollary to the Committee of Seventy and other reform efforts, and an even more direct mode of civic participation (insurance even) for New York's elites. In that context, expending funds from friends and allies on workers striking for more pay and fewer hours was highly problematic.

In this instance, Tiffany, working in the late 1870s, is exemplary of the arrangement White would reference in his correspondence to Pulitzer nearly thirty years later. Tiffany and White were paid a total of $10,200 for their work in the library, $9,000

of which went to cabinetwork, trim, bookcases and "decorating."[134] The men contracted with a cabinet-maker who was obviously highly skilled. Neither White nor Tiffany was a fabricator, and neither had a factory or shop for this type of work, but they hired a person or firm as a sub-contractor and paid for fabrication services out of their fee. (No other firm is listed in connection with the library, and the total sum is in keeping with amounts spent on other rooms when the complexity of the built-in shelving is taken into account.) Indeed, payments detailed in the regiment's bill book highlight White's and Tiffany's streamlined approach in contrast to that of the cabinet-making firms. The men were paid just three times: an initial sum of $500 in late August to initiate the project, a substantial payment of $8,500 mid-September and a final check for $1,200 four months later when the work was winding down. Tiffany's personal wealth meant that he was not reliant on client payments to move forward with work, and he and White designed only the one regimental room, whereas other firms worked on several. However, the library was more a much more complex commission than the other regimental spaces, despite its proportionally smaller size. Beyond the intricacy of the two-level built-in bookshelf system and the barrel-vaulted ceiling (complex from a structural and construction standpoint), it included a far greater diversity of materials and thus a more extensive cadre of suppliers, fabricators and installers.

It is fruitful to return once more to the idea of the "artistic." The Seventh consciously (and rightly) emphasized Tiffany as an artist and his work in the armory as an *artistic* endeavor. This expression distanced Tiffany and other artist-decorators from

[134] An initial payment of $500 was made on August 23, 1879, to Tiffany for cabinetwork and decorating in the library. On September 13, an $8,500 check was issued to Louis Comfort Tiffany and McKim Mead & White for cabinets, trim, bookcases and decorations. The final $1,200 payment was made to Tiffany on January 15th 1880 for the library chairs, table and chandelier. See Cash Book, Seventh Regiment New Armory Fund, PAA.

furniture-makers—both in terms of the former's conception of the interior as a work of art, and importantly, in dissociating from the furniture-making trade at this important moment. It also undeniably lent caché to Tiffany's fledgling venture, and as I have asserted elsewhere, capitalized on the post-Centennial craze for all things thus described. Artistic interiors also fed into the Seventh's status as a group of elites. The regiment had long counted esteemed members of the artistic community among its ranks and continually played the role of artistic patron through myriad issues on which taste and style were brought to bear, from uniforms to architectural commissions.[135] By emphasizing the artistic nature of the armory alongside the assertion, long-held by the Seventh that it was a public institution, the regiment implicitly claimed the role of beneficent patron. Through the early 1880s, this strategy would similarly be utilized by a number of individuals likewise presenting their private commissions as acts of civic largesse.

[135] In a June 1861 attempt at humor, *The Crayon* wondered if the artists of the Seventh, then stationed in the unfinished hall of representatives could "have forced some good art on the government at the point of the bayonet." The article specifically referenced Corporal Gifford and Captain Shumway. Sanford Robinson Gifford, the esteemed landscape painter, served in the Seventh's initial Civil War muster. Henry C. Shumway, little known today, was an early member of the National Academy of Design and a famous miniature painter. "Domestic Art Gossip," *The Crayon (*June 1861): 133; "Sanford Robinson Gifford," in *American Art Review* 1 no. 12 (October 1880): 551; "Funeral of Colonel Shumway," *The New York Times*, May 9, 1884.

CHAPTER THREE

Influences and Assessment

> "The country, at this moment, is just beginning to be astonishing"—
> Edward Strahan [Early Shinn][1]

The advancing state of American cultural sophistication was thus gauged by the chronicler of Gilded Age luxuriance, Earl Shinn. Published in the introduction to his multivolume *Mr. Vanderbilt's House and Collection* of 1883-4, Shinn's assessment referenced William Henry Vanderbilt's palatial Fifth Avenue abode, recently completed, whose construction costs totaled nearly $1.8 million but was nevertheless described as "a typical American residence." Shinn's statement noted a country "re-cemented by the fortunate result of a civil war, endowed as with a diploma of rank by the promulgation of its centenary, it has begun to reinvent everything, and especially the house."[2]

The domestic environment looms large in the history of nineteenth-century art and architecture, yet recent scholarship in this area highlights the fact that the domesticity lavishly chronicled by Shinn and others was not in fact confined to the home. Although she focuses on middle-class interiors, Katherine C. Grier's exploration of nineteenth-century parlors points to the fluidity of that term. In fact, she uses the phrase "commercial parlor" to describe spaces which legitimized exchange, elevating the behavior of some consumers just as they made new modes of travel socially acceptable for women and families by linking railway cars, steamships and the public spaces associated with these

[1] Edward Strahan [Earl Shinn], *Mr. Vanderbilt's House and Collections,* quoted in Lewis, Turner and McQuillen, *Opulent Interiors*, 17.

[2] Lewis et al, *Opulent Interiors*, 17.

functions to the domestic milieu.[3] Grier goes so far as to characterize the Victorian era as "a world full of parlors," pointing to continuity (rather than disjunction) between the commercial parlors of first-class hotels, steamers and rail lines, and the residential parlors of the "best men" of New York and Boston.[4]

This chapter outlines the various precedents that informed the architectural and interior design of the Seventh's Armory, and as such it offers an exploration and analysis of the parlor's fluidity in the Gilded Age. During that period, new types of buildings—grand hotels, railway stations, museums, and private clubhouses—began to evolve towards a greater degree of architectural specificity, and yet nearly all contained parlors or parlor-type spaces. Today, the word "parlor" suggests the private domesticity of home and family life, and yet even in Victorian residences, the parlor was transitional: the most formal of a family's rooms, prized possessions were displayed there, and the space was used for the entertainment of guests. In fact, as early as the 1850s, domesticity and the parlor had become unhinged. Increasingly theatrical and fantastic, spaces like Grier's "commercial parlors" had become "so elaborate that [their] original relationship to domestic parlors . . . became blurred."[5]

Parlors (alongside the notion of domesticity itself) were adaptable precisely because of the lack of architectural specificity in the metropolis, mid-century. Even elite institutions like the Union League Club and the Metropolitan Museum of Art first occupied former residences. In both cases, these structures were admittedly grand in style

[3] Grier, *Culture and Comfort*, 23, 29-31, 62; (quote on 62). According to Grier, patrons like George Pullman recognized that investing in elegant interiors was money well spent as such spaces tended to inspire elevated behavior in even the most unrefined customers.

[4] Ibid., 61, 31.

[5] Ibid., 62-63.

and scale, but they were nonetheless originally domestic spaces that were then transformed into a private clubhouse and a museum of art, respectively.[6] Indeed, it is the performative quality of such spaces that should be emphasized much more than a connection to a specific building type, be it public, private or institutional. For elite patrons like the Seventh, even as the parlor was reconstituted in a non-domestic setting, the ideas of self-fashioning and display remained intact. The commission offered these men the opportunity to craft a persona, communicating their elite status, and affirming shared values with peers even outside the ranks of the Seventh. In fact, the armory interiors are one part of a body of work that collectively established a shared stylistic vocabulary. This language—consistently employed across projects that were otherwise geographically and typologically disparate—mirrored a newly unified elite identity. Aestheticism, then, functioned here as more than merely a decorative style, but as a corollary to class consolidation in the Gilded Age.

Aesthetic Patrons and Parlors

As Grier demonstrates, the parlor was mutable and shifting in conceptualization and as such was an appropriate symbol of the activities of those so-called "best men." In their introduction to the 1987 reprint of D. Appleton & Co.'s *Artistic Houses* (a broad survey comparable to and contemporaneous with Shinn's monograph), the authors Arnold Lewis, James Turner and Steve McQuillen admirably attempt to remedy a glaring

[6] The Metropolitan Museum's first home was a Fifth Avenue brownstone that had been erected in 1855. Prior to housing the museum, it had been leased to the Dodworth Dancing Academy. Within two years, the young institution had outgrown this space, and in 1872, moved to a former residence on West 14th Street, described as "one of the grandest of New York's private houses." Similarly, the Union League Club first met in what had been the Parish residence on East 17th Street. It was described as "the most elegant in the City in its day." See Hecksher, "The Metropolitan Museum of Art: An Architectural History," 7; and Fairfield, *The Clubs of New York*, 106.

omission in the original 1883-4 publication: the homeowners' occupations, or more accurately, their "sources of wealth," as a number of those included were not actually employed. Lewis, Turner and McQuillen document the primary activities of this illustrious group of patrons, noting that the "house owners were quite varied in occupation, representing most of the major sources of substantial wealth" during the period, including railroads; cloth, clothing and raw materials manufacture; trade (dry goods specifically); banking, brokerage and insurance; real-estate investment; publishing; law and politics; and medicine. Yet the authors discovered these classifications to be problematic and overly simplistic. The most successful homeowners were involved in multiple interconnected ventures such as real estate investment, banking and railroads. Further, many shifted the focus of their activities during their lives or went in completely new directions. Lewis concludes that "many of Sheldon's subjects achieved substantial wealth in one field, but then increased it by activity in two or three others."[7] These entrepreneurs continually reinvented themselves through a variety of business ventures and activities.

Thus, at the very moment that, according to Shinn, America was reinventing everything "especially the house," the parlor was uprooted from its traditional place in the home and reconstituted in a variety of non-domestic settings by patrons who themselves defied easy or clear-cut categorization. High-style parlor-type environments were used by travelers at railway stations and steamer terminals, visited at exhibitions

[7] Lewis et al, *Opulent Interiors*, 2-3. The persistence of such linkages in the late nineteenth century—geographic, professional, social, artistic—has been well documented in recent scholarship on network theory and has been applied to the art world specifically. Melody Barrett Deusner's recent dissertation, for example, connects the business practices of wealthy patrons like the industrialists Charles Lang Freer and Frederick R. Leyland with tenets of Aesthetic practice. Melody Barrett Deusner, "A Network of Associations."

like the Philadelphia Centennial (obliquely referenced by Shinn), and experienced in a broad array of non-residential contexts including theatres, photography parlors and artists' studios and finally emulated back home by a middle-class public ever-desirous of being up-do-date and fashionable. According to Grier, these were "new kinds of places," without precedent, that mingled functions and showed that sharp distinctions were not drawn between public and private space.[8]

Such a circuitous path of influence and emulation complicates any tidy characterization of nineteenth-century domesticity, problematizing a reading of the domestic interior as a separate, isolated realm of refuge from the increasingly commercialized world outside. Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859), erudite commentator on life and habits in the early Republic is to be credited with the notion of "separate spheres"—a phrase that spoke as much to distinct gender roles as it did to ideas of publicity and privacy rooted in a particular place.[9] Tocqueville's characterization of the nineteenth century persisted well into the twentieth—with Walter Benjamin's "private individual" (male in the text) whose place of dwelling was opposed to his place of work, or in Kathleen Pyne's more recent study of embattled Gilded Age elites who sought refuge from radical social change in private interior worlds.[10] Yet since the 1980s, scholars from a range of academic disciplines have been engaged in a project to

[8] Grier, *Culture and Comfort*, 31.

[9] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Eduardo Nolla, ed., James T. Schleifer, trans. (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2012).

[10] Walter Benjamin, "Louis Philippe, or the Interior" in *The Arcades Project* Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin, trans. (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap, 1999), 8; Kathleen A. Pyne, *Art and the Higher Life: Painting and Evolutionary Thought in Late Nineteenth-Century America* (Austin: University of Texas, 1996).

dismantle the concept and the binaries bound up with it that conflate male/public/commercial on the one hand, and female/private/domestic on the other. Writing in *American Literature,* Cathy Davidson pleaded, "No More Separate Spheres!" and a number of other scholars have sought to transcend these limitations.[11]

While these writers have focused on gender issues implicit in the concept of separate spheres, art and architectural historians have begun a similarly recuperative effort to broaden our understanding of its spatial implications. Like Grier, Linda Docherty documented strategies by which American artists intentionally blurred the lines between home and work. For her analysis of the painters William Merritt Chase and Edmund C. Tarbell, Docherty coined the term "domesticated studio" to designate a place (and artistic subject matter) that "conflated the painter's workplace and the private sphere of home and family."[12] A.K. Sandoval-Strausz and Daniel Levinson Wilk use the phrase "commercial hospitality" to describe changing notions of the hotel as an architectural and social form, and Molly Berger's work on the same topic likewise challenges an "either-or" approach by analyzing the continuity between New York's Gilded Age mansions and luxury hotels, categories of housing that "eliminated analytical boundaries between

[11] Cathy N. Davidson, "No More Separate Spheres!" *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (September 1998): 443-463; Myra Marx Ferree, "Beyond Separate Spheres: Feminism and Family Research," *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52, no. 4 (November 1990): 866-884; Deborah L. Rotman, "Separate Spheres? Beyond the Dichotomies of Domesticity" *Current Anthropology* 47, no. 4 (August 2006): 666-674; Linda Kerber's thorough essay tracks separate spheres from Tocqueville to opposition of the concept in contemporary scholarship. See Linda K. Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 1 (June 1988): 9-39.

[12] Linda J. Docherty, "Model Families: The Domesticated Studio Pictures of William Merritt Chase and Edmund C. Tarbell" in Christopher Reed, ed., *Not at Home: The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), 51.

private and public and between production and consumption."[13] Indeed, often it was only size that distinguished luxury residences from hotels. They shared designers, materials and methods of construction and commercial-grade technologies. Both "encoded identical social divisions" of race, class and gender, and importantly, both functioned as stage sets against and through which identity was enacted. According to Berger, New York's socio-economic elite "created public spectacles that were at once exclusionary and extended to the public realm."[14]

We should thus question the notion of a traditionally understood "domestic interior," even in the context of private homes—particularly for patrons like Vanderbilt and others documented in the pages of *Artistic Houses,* similar vanity publications of the era, and the nascent architectural press. Though D. Appleton sold these gilt-covered tomes by limited subscription (a run of 500 for *Artistic Houses*), their circulation was undeniably a form of public address, even among an admittedly limited public. Lewis, Turner and McQuillen confirm that for Gilded Age elites the decoration of their homes and the artful arrangement of the *objects* contained therein were indicators of fine character, and in publicizing the best examples these men and women were understood to be performing a civic duty. Indeed, the authors assert that "Vanderbilt intended a public

[13] A.K. Sandoval-Strausz and Daniel Levinson Wilk, "Princes and Maids of the City Hotel: The Cultural Politics of Commercial Hospitality in America" in *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 25, The American Hotel (2005): 160-185; and Molly W. Berger, "The Rich Man's City: Hotels and Mansions of Gilded Age New York" in *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 25, The American Hotel (2005): 46-71; quote on p. 48.

[14] Berger, "Rich Man's City," 68.

statement when he asked Shinn to inventory his rooms. And Sheldon consistently stresses the house as a revelation of character and not as a private educator."[15]

By promoting their private commissions as civic improvements, wealthy patrons like Vanderbilt and his peers could justify unprecedented expenditures on what was, in fact, private property, and in doing so perhaps ward off accusations of materialism while ennobling the urban landscape. Vanderbilt's bound volumes also acted as souvenirs of friendship or favor for the lucky few who received them. These types of publications and the spaces they represented thus constituted a shared experience in a sense. In distributing these volumes, Vanderbilt figuratively threw open his doors and welcomed "guests" into his impressive home. Books like Sheldon's were undeniably meant to astonish, but in a larger sense, their creation and circulation speaks to the existence of a community of like-minded patrons on whom Vanderbilt's good taste and largesse would not be lost.

This justification was employed by the Seventh Regiment, which considered itself a "public" institution. In fact, with a fair degree of consistency a number of other elite institutions followed a path nearly identical to that of the Seventh. Initially utilizing rented, non-specific buildings as headquarters, by the early 1880s, affluent organizations like the Union League Club and the Metropolitan Museum of Art were housed in stand-alone, purpose-built structures that had been designed by prominent architects, and no matter the makeup of the organization, like the Vanderbilt residence, they were considered *civic* monuments.

One of the guiding questions of this project has concerned the development of the armory type in this example, and this chapter explores some of the precedents that had

[15] Lewis, et al, *Opulent Interiors*, 18.

the greatest bearing on it. Though this investigation endeavors to be thorough, the goal is not so much an exhaustive archaeological expedition. Rather, my aim here is to show that the armory was part of larger transformations of the urban built environment in the post-bellum age. This evolution was composed of interrelated and overlapping shifts—enabled by the professionalization tracked in the previous chapter—including new building typologies designed to facilitate new urban activities and institutions, and a concomitant expansion of scale and complexity in structures and building technologies. The armory was designed by a team of professionals who brought diverse experience and expertise to bear on this commission. They incorporated aspects of other specifically military facilities including local examples, but these men also integrated features of building types and functions that, like the American armory, were new. Railway station design contributed most to the spatial layout and organization of this and earlier armories, but because the railway station's head-house and train shed were considered two distinct structures and were thus planned by two different entities, the armory's designers looked to other precedents as models of stylistic cohesion. The work of Philadelphia architect Frank Furness provided important inspiration in this regard, and I will outline the points of connection between Furness's work for clients in his city and Seventh's nearly contemporary commission.

Like the exterior architectural form, the armory's internal layout and appointments are eclectic in inspiration and style, and, as such, are typical of many late nineteenth-century *au courant* interiors. As Mosette Broderick asserts, awarding commissions for such projects was typically done with diplomacy in mind first, and often at the expense of a completely unified interior, and that is certainly the case in this

example.[16] Though broadly grouped under Aestheticism, in reality there are two discernible approaches. In Chapter Two, a distinction was drawn between furniture-makers and the artist-decorator as differences in skill and training and in the socio-economic privilege underlying those distinctions, and in this chapter I will make the case that this differentiation may be understood spatially as well.

It is important to remember that these firms had no control over the architectural plan—the distribution of rooms; their doorways and windows; the hallways and stairs. These aspects of the commission were under Clinton's purview, and he conceived of and organized them in a way that was entirely appropriate for a secure facility in an urban context. The architect did not utilize a new, flowing spatiality of the kind White (and his mentor Richardson) was developing in contemporaneous projects, but in the veteran room and library, White and Tiffany *did* make use of interpenetrating, sculptural volumes within the constraints of these rooms. Herter Brothers, by way of contrast, approached rooms as a series of flat planes to which decoration and surface treatments were applied. Though my analysis foregrounds these two firms, their work at the armory is remarkably consistent with other projects of this period and thus these spaces may indeed be considered representative of a larger oeuvre for each firm. In fact, this uniformity in approach exists to a surprising degree, suggesting that clients had preconceived notions of a firm's style when they commissioned interiors projects, and more significantly, that these patrons knowingly participated in a shared language of forms and spaces.

[16] According to Broderick, interiors commissions were awarded so that the decorators favored by each member of a family might be employed. See Broderick, *Triumverate,* 94.

A Team of Professionals

Besides this commission, the architect Clinton's other work from this period remains unknown. In the regiment's official *History,* two other men are referenced in connection with the building and their inclusion is telling. Charles Macdonald, president of the Delaware Bridge Company, is credited with the "designs and plans for the large iron trusses and other iron-work of the drill room building." R.F. Hatfield, an architect, consulted on the working plans, the properties of building materials specified, and "the construction of the building in its various parts."[17] Macdonald was, according to a biographer, one of the leading engineers in the world in his day. In the mid-1860s he was employed by the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad. By 1875 the firm he had subsequently formed (Delaware Bridge Company) functioned as the design arm of Cooper, Hewitt and Co. Macdonald-designed bridges were used by the Delaware and Lackawanna Line, and his Point Street Swing Bridge in Providence, Rhode Island of 1871 was published internationally.[18] Much less is known about Hatfield. Elizabeth Collins Cromley's study of early New York apartment buildings credits him with the design of the Bedford on Eighty-Second Street and Tenth Avenue, completed in 1880, which was described as being innovative for its genteel affordability.[19]

---

[17] Clark, *History* II, 300.

[18] Interestingly Macdonald also had a military background. He enlisted with a Pennsylvania infantry in June of 1863 as Robert E. Lee's Confederate forces were invading that state. Macdonald was captured and held as a prisoner until the battle of Gettysburg, when he was released. For Macdonald's biography see Frank Griggs, Jr., "Charles Macdonald," *Structure Magazine: Journal of the American Society of Civil Engineers* (January 2009): 45-7.

[19] Elizabeth Collins Cromley, *Alone Together: A History of New York's Early Apartments* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1990), 101.

Despite what little is known about Clinton's work from this period, he was an ideal candidate to design the Seventh's facility; Macdonald's role is similarly not surprising. It is curious, however, that Hatfield, an architect whose work is largely forgotten today, was involved with such important aspects of the project: the working plans, building material specifications, and what seems to have been a supervisory role in construction. Yet Cromley's study makes clear that the apartment building was another new type that posed particular challenges for designers. This partly stemmed from technological complexities, but the fact that multi-family residences were negatively associated with the tenement—the lowliest form of urban housing—posed problems as well. Architects thus created a design vocabulary in order to "convey meanings about who lived where" and to render this new form acceptable for the middle and upper classes. Cromley concludes that here architecture "straddled the line between the familiar forms of public and private" so that the "boundaries and meanings of public and private were always in negotiation."[20] Hatfield's role in designing an innovative early example suggests that he understood large-scale construction projects and possessed the ability to render a new building type aesthetically acceptable by developing a design vocabulary of building materials and architectural elements that communicated the inhabitant's middle- or upper-class status.

Architectural Precedents

As a new building type that necessarily mediated the poles of public and private, the urban apartment building was one important model for the armory's design. Purpose-built private clubhouses were also significant sources of inspiration, at least in terms of

[20] Ibid., 2-3.

the amenities they offered to their members. Like apartment buildings, clubhouses straddled the public/private divide, and further complicate the definition of domesticity in the late nineteenth century. Writing in 1873, Francis Gerry Fairfield remarked that it was, in fact, a kind of domesticity that distinguished club life in New York and London from that in other great cities: "[I]n London and New York . . . a man's club is his home. It is there that he sees his friends, writes his letters, dines, and spends the greater part of the day." Members did not *live* at the club, for as the author humorously noted, "most clubs consider they have had quite enough of your company during the day and done enough for you to be exempt from your society at night." Yet, aside from sleeping quarters, "the club comes to your rescue in all the remaining amenities of stylish living."[21] The author's description of New York's most prominent club facilities highlights that a number of amenities were common to all, including libraries, smoking rooms and finely outfitted reception rooms; the most grand of these houses, including the Union League Club and the newly completed Manhattan Club, included art galleries and other "artistic" rooms.[22] The armory was remarkably similar to private clubs like the Union League and Manhattan in a number of ways. Both types of facilities were private: they were intended to be used primarily by members (and on occasion, guests) and both provided amenities such as "artistic" rooms for socializing and leisure pursuits. Like the facilities chronicled by Fairfield, the Seventh's Armory did not include residential quarters per se—the armory lacked even separate facilities for dining—but the men could be ably accommodated when stationed there in times of riot or unrest.

[21] Fairfield, *The Clubs of New York,* 26-28.

[22] Ibid., 50, 73, 116.

The Seventh Regiment Armory also related to earlier New York state and city arsenals and armories. Hints of the new armory can be discerned in the massing and detail of both the arsenal in Central Park and an earlier downtown arsenal. Both had been used by the Seventh. The State Arsenal located at Elm and White Streets was, according to Clark, in use in the 1830s and 40s.[23] Its blocky mass, slightly battered walls, narrow slit windows, corner towers and crenellations are indicative of its military function (Fig. 3.1). With the exception of its towers, the later State Arsenal of 1849-1851 (which remains in Central Park) lacked a specifically martial character, though the placement of the central bay and flanking towers coupled with its monumentality illustrated a magnitude of scale and variation in massing more appropriate to a whole-block site (Fig. 3.2).

Brooklyn's Twenty-third Regiment Armory was also an important precedent. Though only organized in 1861, the Twenty-third was the elite unit of Brooklyn and attempted to fund and build an armory immediately after war's end. Interestingly, the goal of this early initiative was a market armory, but the effort seems to have been the pet project of one colonel, and without widespread support the endeavor waned. Finally in 1873, the project came to fruition with a purpose-built, single-occupant armory paid for by the regiment in what is now the Clinton Hill section of Brooklyn. The Twenty-third featured a column-free drill hall and three floors of administrative space for the regiment including company rooms, squad drill rooms, rooms for the Council of Officers, colonel, adjutant and the Veterans Association. It was described in terms nearly identical to those

[23] Clark wanted an image of the arsenal included in the Seventh's official history, noting that "it was a prominent figure in the history of New York militia." Undated Letter, Clark to J. Davis, Clark Correspondence box 81, PAA.

the Seventh would use, as "magnificently furnished" and "one of the best-appointed and completely equipped" facilities of its kind.[24]

The Twenty-third may have influenced the Seventh's proposals from this date. The Brooklyn facility's three-towered façade and combination of Italianate elements with an iron-crested mansard roof clearly relate to the Seventh's proposals of the early 70s (Fig. 3.3). And yet aspects of the design were not ideal. Beyond aesthetic issues, there were also difficulties with the plan, as the Twenty-third was organized so that the main entry opened directly into the drill hall. According to the published description, regimental spaces were located on the upper floors and accessed via galleries that overlooked the open hall. These galleries thus functioned as hallways and corridors, and while the rooms opening off of them well may have been "magnificent," the primary circulation through the space was rather inelegant.[25]

In fact, some of the armory's most significant models were the grand passenger train stations of the early 1870s. In his pioneering study of the type, architectural historian Carroll L.V. Meeks outlined the evolution of passenger rail travel and the increasingly complex structures designed to facilitate it.[26] The first rail lines of the 1830s based their organizational practices on those of stagecoach lines. Similarly, the first structures designed specifically for rail passengers called on the preexisting form of the turnpike system tollhouse. "For millennia," according to Meeks, inns served this mode of

---

[24] See Morris B. Farb, "America's Crack Regiments: 'Ours,' the Twenty-third of Brooklyn," in *The American Magazine* 9, no. 1 (November 1888): 75-93. The building is described on p. 89.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Carroll L.V. Meeks, *The Railroad Station: An Architectural History* (New York: Dover Publications, 1995 [Reprint of New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1956]).

transportation "as departure points, as relay stations, and as terminals and restaurants."[27] The first train sheds (at Liverpool in 1830 and in Lowell, Massachusetts in 1835) were simple affairs, intended to protect passengers from the elements on what had become a longer walk outside due to the increase in size from a coach to a train car.

In this early phase, there were no agreed-upon best practices; experimentation in architectural form and spatial organization resulted in a diverse array of designs. Yet as the size of train cars continued to increase along with the volume of passenger travel, the complicated programmatic requirements of station planning eventually congealed into standard types. Of these, the head-type station plan "in which all passengers entered and left through the head building across the end of the lines" proved to be "the most long-lived scheme for terminals."[28] Through the 1870s and 80s, the head house became incredibly grand. Separate waiting rooms for different classes of passengers had long been a prerequisite, though in Europe's most significant urban stations, a first-class hotel outfitted lavishly with the most up-to-date amenities accommodated the original functions of the tollhouse and the inn, again mingling the quasi-domestic and the commercial.

The architect was the author of the head-house and his conservatism in its design was inversely proportional to the structural and material innovation of the iron-trussed, glass-roofed train shed—immediate descendant of London's 1851 Crystal Palace and similarly the province of the engineer who competed with his peers for daring spans and

[27] Ibid., 27.

[28] Ibid., 33.

heights.[29] Thus, like the multi-family apartment buildings of the 1870s and 80s, designs of train station head-houses necessarily mediated novelty through a design that clothed new forms and functions in historicist masonry designs.

One of the most significant stations of the period—indeed, according to Meeks it represents "one of the greatest achievements of the century"—was London's St. Pancras Station of 1863-65, designed by the engineers W.H. Barlow and R.M. Ordish. The train shed measured 243 feet wide, 100 feet high and almost 700 feet long, and offered an ingenious structural and aesthetic solution in springing its iron ribs directly from the floor rather than from supporting columns (rib ends were tied out of sight below the tracks and platforms), dissolving the traditional distinction between wall and ceiling planes.[30] Ribs resolved at the apex of the shed in a slightly pointed arch, a happy coincidence for architect Sir George Gilbert Scott (1811-1878), who designed the adjoining Midland Grand Hotel in a Victorian Gothic mode (Fig. 3.4).[31]

According to Spiro Kostof, Americans of means visiting London after the Civil War had an array of luxury hotel choices at their disposal, though "the largest . . . would have been the just completed Midland Grand."[32] Americans were already at the forefront

---

[29] Ibid., 83, 92. According to the station historian Christopher Brown, there was not only competition between engineers, but also between nations—particularly France and England—for supremacy in station design, though the two countries had different criteria: in France, lighter, narrower sheds were favored, whereas in England, a 3:1 width-to-height ratio was the proportional ideal, resulting in wider, lower sheds. Christopher Brown, *Still Standing: A Century of Urban Train Station Design* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 2005), 2.

[30] Meeks, *Railroad Station*, 85.

[31] In Scott's *Recollections,* he stated, "The great shed-like roof had already been designed by Mr. Barlow, the engineer, and as if by anticipation its section was a pointed arch." Quoted in Meeks, *Railroad Station,* 96.

[32] Kostof, *A History of Architecture,* 635.

of luxury hotel design, but the combination of architectural showpiece (the head-house) and engineering marvel (the train shed) proved an important precedent for the boom years of the American post-bellum era.[33] Boston's Park Square Station, designed by Peabody & Stearns in the early 1870s was the first stateside imitator of St. Pancras (Fig. 3.5). Like Midland/St. Pancras, it was Gothic in style, featuring rose windows and pointed arches in the train shed trusses and in the exterior fenestration. The Boston example was smaller in scale and less profusely ornamented than its British forebear, though it did feature a prominent clock tower and a polychrome roof.[34]

Members of the Seventh traveled by rail to Boston in 1875 for the Bunker Hill celebration and would have had the opportunity to see the new station then, though an equally pertinent example rose closer at hand.[35] Starting in 1869, "Commodore" Cornelius Vanderbilt's massive Grand Central Depot began to take shape on 42nd Street. The Depot was not Gothic in style like St. Pancras or Park Square. Below the cornice line, its primary façade was Italian Renaissance rendered in red brick and white-painted iron; above, bulbous, slate-covered mansard roofs capped its three pavilions, lending a French Second Empire flavor to the composition. This lack of stylistic cohesion at the head-house (and the awkward intersection of the head-house and the shed) was a departure from both the London and Boston examples and was criticized by contemporaries.

---

[33] On American hotel design, see Molly Berger, *Hotel Dreams: Luxury Technology and Ambition in America, 1829-1929* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2011); and A.K. Sandoval-Strausz, *Hotel: An American History* (New Haven: Yale University, 2007).

[34] On the Park Square station, see Meeks, *The Railroad Station,* 87, 101, and figs. 100, 122, 123.

[35] The veterans and active members traveled separately. The active members took a steamer to Newport and traveled by rail to Boston. The veterans traveled by rail the entire way. See Clark, *History* II, 230-231.

However, the train shed itself (designed by Isaac C. Buckhout and John B. Snook) stuck more closely to the much-admired London example. Unlike Boston's Park Square, Grand Central's arched trusses sprang directly from the floor terminating in a gently pointed arch at the apex; the roof also included extensive glazing (Fig. 3.6).

Grand Central Depot would have been intimately familiar to the well-traveled members of the Seventh and further, the Vanderbilt men had been involved in the armory project since at least 1873, when Colonel Clark wrote to William Henry inquiring about the potential purchase of a site for the new armory from among the Harlem Railroad land holdings. William and his brothers had also generously contributed to the New Armory Fund.[36] The Seventh's Drill Hall is clearly indebted to train shed design of the period and, specifically, to Grand Central's (Fig. 3.7). In fact, the armory's trusses are recognized as a structural improvement over those employed at the depot.[37] Yet the relationship between the *overall* design of the Seventh's new facility—the so-called head-shed plan—and the design of stations has not been sufficiently explored.[38]

---

[36] See Letter, Clark to Vanderbilt, July 1, 1873; BV, Letter Book, Col. Clark, 1867-1875, NYHS. William was a $1000 subscriber to the New Armory Fund, while his brothers and father contributed lesser amounts, and there are innumerable points of connection between the Seventh's leadership and that of Vanderbilt's rail lines.

[37] According to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) report, the iron trusses at Grand Central Depot "had a uniform distance between top and bottom chords" whereas those at the armory have "intrados and extrados springing from a different center" giving extra strength. See *Seventh Regiment Armory Designation Report*, 19.

[38] Writing in 1923, after the boom in armory and rail station construction, the critic A.D.F. Hamlin noted that the head-house/train shed "embodies many of the elements of the armory problem and furnished obvious precedents for drill-shed design." Quoted in Koch, "The Medieval Castle Revival," 24. Similarly, the LPC report—to date, the most thorough investigation of the armory—notes that the Drill Hall's iron truss system represents "one of the first buildings in the United States not associated with a railroad to incorporate this structural system, which was often used in railroad stations." *Seventh Regiment Armory Designation Report*, 3.

This plan type was appropriate for the Seventh's facility for the same reasons it had come to be favored by railway companies in the preceding decades, for the two building types are remarkably similar from the standpoint of functionality. Both had two opposing programmatic requirements to accommodate: smoothly moving large numbers of people through appropriately stylish spaces, and the housing of heavy machinery. The head-shed plan provided separate, but linked, spaces for each activity and clothed each in garb expressive of the functions that took place within the interior. The glazed iron shed—an engineering feat on its own—spoke to the technological and material ingenuity of steel tracks and steam engines. The head-house was a monument in the urban landscape whose grand scale and elegant design spoke to its purported civic function.

For the Seventh, the administration building contained elegant spaces for official meetings and sociable mingling. With larger regimental rooms on the main floor, company rooms on the second and service-related spaces on the top, the head-house here was spatially organized in a domestic manner (i.e., with more formal spaces for occupants—and their guests—on the primary floor, smaller-scaled private quarters above, and service spaces in the uppermost story). In the design of luxury hotels, these two functions were necessarily more proximate, but according to Meeks, this was also the horizontal distribution of the grand railway station head-houses, with lavishly appointed waiting rooms and concourses at street level topped by smaller administrative spaces above to house an ever-increasing number of clerical staff.[39] In the rail station, the train shed facilitated a chaotic ballet of crowds, luggage and steam-powered trains while the armory's ground-floor drill hall accommodated the synchronized movement of more than

[39] According to Meeks, "already the record-keeping mania had begun to clog our civilization with tons of carbon-smeared paper." Meeks, *Railroad Station*, 81.

1,000 men and their artillery.[40] The elongated rectangular orientation of the plan type also proved well suited to the typical Manhattan block of the same shape.

Several aspects of these stations (and particularly of the shed's ancestor, the iron and glass exhibition hall) however were decidedly *not* appropriate for a secure military facility from the standpoint of function and expression. The transparency of the shed's extensive glazing and the ready accessibility of the public head-house were antithetical to the functional requirements of an armory. Yet, the need for fortification and defensibility actually helped resolve the question of how to stylistically unite the two disparate entities (shed and head-house), which remained unresolved in the earlier railway examples. As Meeks outlines, the two elements were designed separately—the head-house by an architect and the shed by an engineer—and in most cases, the two were not built simultaneously.[41] At the armory, the administration building was, in fact, started earlier than the drill hall, but importantly, both were planned in concert by the architects *and* consulting engineer from the beginning. Since it had to be as impenetrable as the administration building, the drill hall received the same heavy masonry treatment. It was, of course, merely a wrapper, since the iron structural system was self-supporting, yet the consistent application of the red brick and granite along with the continuation of

[40] In direct response to the Orange Riot of June 1871, the Seventh formed a separate Howitzer Section in the early months of 1872, dedicated to the operation of its two guns of that make. While their use is not specifically blamed, it should be remembered that in the early summer of 1872 consulting architects declared Tompkins Market Armory unsafe for battalion drills until the floor of the structure could be strengthened. See Clark, *History* II, 201, 203; According to artillery historians, the type of Howitzer used by the Seventh (an example remains on display in the armory) fired a twelve-pound cannon ball and was the last cast-bronze gun used by an American army. See James C. Hazlett, Edwin Olmstead and M. Hume Parks, *Field Artillery Weapons of the American Civil War* rev. ed., (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1983), 88. The Howitzer, then, was sufficiently maneuverable for use in urban combat, but heavy enough to merit redesign in a lighter, less costly material.

[41] Meeks, *Railroad Station*, 92.

architectural elements and design details around the building's entirety yielded a new degree of stylistic cohesion and a high degree of continuity among all four elevations (Fig. 3.8). Again, Grand Central Depot would not have provided insight on how to successfully integrate the two components stylistically.

That this undertaking proved such a challenge for architects of the period is evidenced by two important Philadelphia projects designed by Frank Furness (1839-1912): the Philadelphia First City Troop Armory of 1874, and the near contemporaneous Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art Building, completed for the Centennial celebration of 1876. In that it was a military facility, the Philadelphia Armory was an incredibly important precedent for the Seventh's members and leaders in a number of ways and yet the academy building presented a more fully worked out solution for the head-shed dilemma.

The elite volunteer group of Philadelphia, the Fist City Troop was comparable to New York's Seventh: it could boast of similar distinctions in military pursuits and counted the most prominent members of Philadelphia society among its ranks. Though much smaller in number, the troop had a longer history than the Seventh—in fact, it claims to be the country's oldest independent military group—and this engendered competition between the two.[42] In 1874, the Philadelphia men marked their group's 100-year anniversary by adding to a parade shed that had been completed ten years prior. According to historian Michael J. Lewis, the troopers had previously rented their space but much like the Seventh, they returned from Civil War service desirous of better, more

[42] The precursor to the group (which is still in existence), the Light Horse of the City of Philadelphia, was organized on the evening of November 17, 1774, at the first meeting of the Continental Congress's Committee of Correspondence. *History of the First Troop Philadelphia City Cavalry 1948-1991*, (Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1991), 1.

permanent quarters. Their parade shed of 1864, a "simple brick block" (Fig. 3.9), had been constructed with future expansion in mind, and in early 1870 under the direction of its leaders, brothers Fairman and Edward Rogers, the troop commissioned fellow cavalryman and local architect Frank Furness to complete the facility with a new administrative wing fronting the existing shed.[43]

Furness's eclectic design was never constructed. According to Lewis, it failed to excite the troopers and the project languished for lack of money despite a persistent fundraising campaign and cost-cutting measures.[44] As the troop's 1874 centennial approached, the plan for a new building was revived but Furness was unsatisfied with his earlier proposal and went back to the drawing board. The plan remained largely intact, but the architect substantially re-worked the façade. The original design drawing of 1870, only recently located, is instructive for Lewis as it contrasts so markedly with Furness's second design, illustrating the architect's stylistic maturation over the course of just four years.

According to Lewis, Furness submitted sketches for the first design scheme on April 11, 1870, developing a full set of plans and specifications by early July. An elevation of the façade was engraved and used by the troop in its fundraising (Fig. 3.10). This effort was not abandoned until at least December of 1870 so the image would have been in circulation until that time.[45] Coincidentally, July of that year found the Seventh Regiment in Philadelphia, having been invited by the city's mayor and its "many

---

[43] Michael J. Lewis, "Frank Furness at Thirty: The Armory of the First City Troop," *19th Century* 28, no. 2 (Fall 2008): 3.

[44] Ibid., 5.

[45] Ibid.

distinguished citizens." The Seventh's military escort through the streets of Philadelphia included the First Pennsylvania Regiment (to which belonged the troopers) and the parade route that day passed within a few blocks of the troopers' facility.[46]

The Seventh did not travel to Philadelphia again prior to the 1876 centennial. As a group, it would not have seen the re-designed First City Troop Armory completed in 1874, though individual members very well may have. The Seventh did host a Pennsylvania regiment that included the First City Troop in 1872, and paraded with troopers in Boston for the 1875 Bunker Hill Centennial. In the earlier encounter, both regiments—the Seventh and the troopers—were at a standstill with their respective plans, but by the time both were in Boston, in 1875, the troopers had successfully completed their project. As friends and business associates, members of both groups must have discussed the successes and failures of their respective armory projects, and the troopers' accomplishment undoubtedly inspired the Seventh and informed its building campaign.[47]

In addition to the building project, troopers celebrated this milestone with an official publication of the group's history. While recounting military heroics from the American Revolution to the Civil War, the authors necessarily devoted attention to the new building, outlining the evolution of its commission and design, describing the

---

[46] According to Col. Clark, the men took a ferry from New Jersey suggesting they traveled up the Schuylkill River to Philadelphia. Once there, they "proceeded up Walnut, Third, and Chestnut Streets" and went as far west as Eighteenth Street, though the exact route is not recounted. The trooper's facility is on Chestnut and Twenty-Third. See Clark, *History* II, 182-3.

[47] Even without direct contact, the Seventh's men could stay abreast of such developments since, as the elite unit of neighboring Philadelphia, the First Troop was covered in New York City papers. Its centennial received mention in two *New York Times* articles in November 1874, one of which referenced a celebration for 2,000 guests at the troop's armory. The *Times* did not mention Furness or the design, though both the architect and his project received praise in the Philadelphia press. See "The Philadelphia City Troop," *The New York Times*, November 17, 1874; *Philadelphia Inquirer*, November 17, 1874.

formation of committees to address various aspects of the building and the inaugural celebration, and disclosing financial expenditures for the new structure, its furnishings and fixtures. The author included lists of troop members and Philadelphia citizens who had contributed financially to the new armory, even calling out the amounts of their donations.[48] Leaders of the Seventh would follow a nearly identical path in the late 1870s and it is highly likely that their project was modeled directly on the efforts of the First Troop as the Seventh had not utilized those strategies previously with Tompkins Market Armory.

When the Seventh visited Philadelphia in 1870, its own armory plans were stalled. The previous year, the regiment had lost out on a bid to acquire part of Reservoir Square, and the project was very much in limbo. In late 1874, just as the troopers inaugurated their new headquarters, the Seventh's situation was in some ways even more dire than it had been in 1870. For the first four months of that year, the Seventh's commander, Colonel Clark, had been fully engaged in spearheading the campaign to secure a site. Once the state passed legislation authorizing the lease of a site, he spent months urging city leaders to actually draw up the contract, and as late as October, he had to plead with the city's legal counsel to approve and execute the document.[49] Meanwhile, the Seventh's current facilities were literally crumbling. For several years, Tompkins Market Armory had been in disrepair.[50] In July of 1874 as a workman attempted to patch a leak in the

[48] *History of the First City Troop,* 129-34.

[49] Letter, Col. Clark to Delafield Smith, Counsel to the Corporation [of the City of New York], October 1, 1874, Col. Clark Letter Book, 1867-1875, NYHS.

[50] Though the Seventh co-owned this building, the city was responsible for maintenance and repair of the structure. This was a standard arrangement, intended to encourage volunteer militias by relieving them of potentially costly building upkeep.

building, a fire was ignited, destroying the roof. A temporary roof had been installed by early fall, but it was insufficient to keep moisture out and the space became so damp that fireplaces could not be lit that winter. The Seventh began the 1874 indoor drill season unable to use its drill room, once again renting space elsewhere and sharing use of the state arsenal with other units—exactly the scenario it was hoping to alleviate with a new headquarters. In October, the Seventh celebrated its semi-centennial in a rented room at Irving Hall. In contrast, Philadelphia's First City Troop celebrated its one hundred-year anniversary the following month in a new, purpose-built structure and accounts of the festivities were covered in the New York press (Fig. 3.11).[51]

Prominent Philadelphian Fairman Rogers (1833-1900) was intimately involved in the First Troop commission. He is remembered today as a horseman through his early association with Eadweard Muybridge at the University of Pennsylvania (where Rogers was a faculty member) and he was memorialized in Thomas Eakins's 1879 painting, *May Morning in the Park* (also known as *Fairman Rogers Four-in-Hand)* yet Rogers was acclaimed in his own day as a civil engineer. According to his brother-in-law and biographer, Horace Howard Furness, Rogers traveled through Europe in the 1850s (ostensibly on a honeymoon trip), determining a course of travel "by his eagerness to examine the most famous works of modern engineering skill."[52] After the First Troop commission, Rogers served as Chairman of the Committee for the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art building, and in the same capacity for the Philadelphia Union

---

[51] Clark, *History* II, 227.

[52] Horace Howard Furness, *F.R.* [Fairman Rogers] (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Privately Printed, 1903), 8.

League Club building commission.[53]

Lewis suggests a stylistic relationship between the 1863 riding shed and Rogers's model stable, published in 1870 in *The American Gentleman's Stable Guide*, even speculating that Rogers may have been the designer of both structures (Fig. 3.12).[54] However a more convincing comparison may be made between the Italianate riding shed and train station designs of the same period. Indeed, as Meeks details, the Italian villa was the predominant architectural expression for train stations in the mid-century to such an extent that it became known simply as the "railroad style":

> For the designer of stations, the Italian villa style and its cousins offered the opportunity to build cheaply and impressively; there were hardly any rules to hamper him. A bell, to announce the arrival of trains, and a clock were normal station equipment, and they justified the expense of a campanile. It was not difficult to group picturesquely the necessary buildings and train-shed around a tower . . . arcaded loggias, so adaptable for platform covers and train-sheds, were an integral part of the style.[55]

Notable examples of this type abounded in the 1850s as Rogers toured Europe in search of modern engineering skill. Francis Thompson, architect for the North Midland Railway designed a number of small Italianate stations, while his Derby Trijunct Station of 1839-41 exemplified its use on an expanded scale—in this case, with a shed more than 1,000 feet long. Other examples included Thomas Turner's London Bridge Station of the mid-1840s, notable for its use of an asymmetrically placed campanile, and several in Germany.

---

[53] Ibid., 28.

[54] Lewis, "Frank Furness at Thirty," 4. In note 4, p. 7, Lewis points out that no architect was listed for the riding shed and that Fairman Rogers's brother Edward was a member of the building committee.

[55] The author goes on to note during this early phase of railroad development, station architects were sufficiently challenged by practical planning requirements and chose to focus on those rather than inventing a new style. Meeks, *Railroad Station*, 44.

Further, the so-called railroad style was not limited to Europe. According to Meeks, "there were enough stations in this style, both in Europe and America, to justify the claim that this was an international . . . style."[56]

The correlations between the Philadelphia and New York Armory projects are telling. In the Furness designs of 1870 and 1874, as with all three armory proposals explored in the previous chapter, the footprint of both the New York and Philadelphia buildings remains substantially unchanged over the course of several design revisions, through which—again, in both city's examples—an Italianate villa gradually evolves into a castellated structure that is solidly imposing.[57] Following the pattern of many rail stations, the Philadelphia Armory was constructed in two phases, and Furness's rear elevation of the final, built design makes clear that like many other designers, he too failed to integrate the original shed with the new head-house (Fig. 3.13). Rather than the synthesis of these two parts, his most significant design achievement was the head-house, and there, the primary façade.

Furness resolved this issue in his design for the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art, completed in 1876 (another project undertaken with Fairman Rogers). Here, the railway head-shed plan type was reincarnated as an art gallery, further illustrating its flexibility for large-scale facilities. Its primary façade is a riotous mélange of architectural detail rendered in various materials, textures and colors, though the

[56] Meeks, *Railroad Station*, 46.

[57] Lewis notes that though the two Furness-designed facades look "radically different," in actuality, the plans were "virtually identical." Lewis, "Frank Furness at Thirty," 5. As I outlined previously, this stylistic shift towards fortification reflected a number of dramatic strikes and riots that took place during the early 1870s, and culminated in the Great Strikes of 1877.

restlessness of the façade is quieted slightly in the sweep of the side elevation with its heavily rusticated base, blind arcade of red and black diaper-patterned brick echoing narrow blind niches above which rhythmically punctuate the long elevation (Fig. 3.14).

Lewis holds that Furness was no more than a "paper architect" until the Philadelphia Armory and its near-contemporary, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Art, and finds in the other buildings designed around 1873 (Guarantee Safe Deposit and Trust; Philadelphia Warehouse Company; 310 Chestnut Street) a similar boldness of execution the author likens to "waging architecture."[58] Interestingly, Lewis credits George Hewitt, Furness's then-partner, with the bold coloration and stylistic flourishes of the Pennsylvania Academy exterior. Meanwhile Furness was responsible for the "vigor and organization" of the plan—a "spatial sequence of expressive power" indebted to the young architect's Beaux-Arts-based training with Richard Morris Hunt.[59] Certainly Hunt's *École* experience and his Parisian projects would have provided Furness with appropriately grand civic models, though one wonders to what degree Fairman Rogers played a part here. In a posthumous testimonial issued by the academy's board of directors, Rogers is credited with the building's design in nearly identical terms to those describing Clark's role at the new armory: "In its internal design and arrangement much that is admirable and best is owing to his careful and earnest thought."[60]

The Seventh Regiment celebrated July 4th of the centennial year at an encampment in Fairmount Park. The trip was marred by the death of prominent veteran

---

[58] Michael J. Lewis, *Frank Furness: Architecture and the Violent Mind* (New York: Norton, 2001), 51.

[59] Ibid., 95.

[60] Furness, *F.R.* [Fairman Rogers], 28.

and former regimental commander, Marshall Lefferts who expired suddenly on the train to Philadelphia. The local crowd, undoubtedly occupied with the centennial, followed the Seventh's goings-on with less attention than the men were used to receiving—a source of great dissatisfaction attributed by some members to the "jealousy of its great rival" (the First Troop)—and the weather was oppressively hot. In fact, the ceremonial parades and drills that were typical on such excursions were canceled on account of the heat and the men spent two entire days of unanticipated free time exploring the sights and sounds of the exhibition.[61]

Thus, the men saw significant examples of Furness's design—not only the armory and the Fine Art building but the others sprinkled throughout a city that, according to Lewis was a "showplace" for the architect's work.[62] Furness was a Civil War cavalry hero, an admirable figure whose work undoubtedly made an impression on members of the Seventh as they planned their own new headquarters. Over the five preceding months, more than $80,000 had been subscribed through the New Armory Fund, and the project would have been very much on their minds that summer. Furness's contribution was to illustrate the architecturally expressive potential of the unified head-shed plan, solving

[61] According to Clark, most other regiments pulled out of the celebration due to exorbitant expense in travel and accommodation. It was with great pride that the Seventh maintained their plan, sending 644 men from their ranks, even ordering new tents for the excursion. The men arrived on July 1, and marched from their disembarkation point through the fairgrounds to their camp at the park's edge. Viewed by a small crowd who "carefully hid their admiration" the soldiers nevertheless "stole hasty and wondering glances at the numerous and superb buildings of the exhibition." Clark, *History* II, 242-9.

[62] Lewis, *Frank Furness*, 137.

the "crisis of legibility."[63] Like the urban apartment house and train station, these discernible forms designed by Furness stood out from the surrounding landscape.

The Interiors: Plan and Space

Like the head-shed plan type and the structure that enclosed it, so, too, the armory's interiors called on a variety of interrelated sources and precedents. As explained in the introductory chapter, my analysis here is focused primarily on the intact first floor regimental rooms—the reception, board of officers and veterans rooms, and the library—and the circulation spaces that link them. Other rooms on the primary floor have been significantly altered since their inauguration in 1880 (and continue to be reworked in the armory's ongoing renovation project), as have nearly all of the second floor company rooms. While this approach precludes foregrounding some of the important firms who worked in the armory (Pottier & Stymus and Kimbel & Cabus being two examples), my aim is not an exhaustive documentation nor an attempt at recreating these environments as they originally existed. Rather, my goal is to analyze the spaces, their surface treatments, materials and finishes to understand how the interiors here fit into contemporary dialogue and practice at a moment when both were, as suggested by Shinn in the opening quote, being reinvented.

Focusing selectively still allows a cross-sectional view, however. While these rooms were to some degree considered in concert—originally, all were linked in continuous *enfilade* along the north-south axis of the head-house—they were designed by different firms, fabricated by still others, and importantly, carried out for different

[63] Ibid., 132.

clients.[64] Three of the four rooms under investigation were regimental—that is, they served the entire group in some capacity.[65] The board of officers room was the site of official regimental business. The board, the Seventh's governing body, held its meetings there and the individual companies could reserve the room for their business meetings as well. While the companies each had individual rooms upstairs, they were primarily for secure storage, changing into and out of the men's uniforms, and smaller-scale social gatherings. (Many originally contained a piano.) They could not seat one hundred men. Similarly the library was available for use by any active or veteran member. Not surprisingly, it contained military subject matter including training and tactical manuals.

During the planning and funding phases of the facility, the reception room was also referred to as a regimental space. It was linked to both the entry and board of officers room via large double pocket doors on the north and south sides, and open to the main hall on its east elevation. Arguably the most parlor-like in functionality, non-member guests visiting the armory would be received there, and it was undoubtedly utilized by members waiting to be called into official meetings. Similarly, the library was originally linked with surrounding circulation space on two sides (the entry and main hall) and communicated via double pocket doors with the veteran room, which occupied the building's northwest corner. As I detailed in Chapter Two, the veteran room was, like the company rooms upstairs, contracted separately from the first floor regimental spaces.

It is important here to re-emphasize the distinction between three-dimensional space and the two-dimensional flat surfaces of wall planes which is, as I will assert, the

[64] Portals that connected the main entry to the library (on the north side of the entry) and the reception room (on the south) have subsequently been enclosed.

[65] They were not, however, designed to accommodate the entire regiment simultaneously. Only the drill room was so intended.

primary distinction between the work of furniture-makers and the architect-designer. Herter Brothers and other furniture-makers approached a room (or series of rooms) as flat planes to which wood paneling and other decorative surface treatments were applied. The veteran room and adjoining library are often singled out as the most innovative, interesting and unique of the armory's many remarkable rooms. However, descriptions and analyses have focused almost exclusively on the exoticism of decorative surface treatment and materials, neglecting the volumetric treatment of space subtly evidenced there. Contemporaneous projects suggest this was Stanford White's contribution. Tiffany was similarly engaged in creating dynamic, non-cubic spaces, but his experiments in this area were primarily carried out in his own home, and not for his clients. Tiffany's contribution was instead to apply a sophisticated elegance to White's flowing volumetric spaces, creating formality and refinement appropriate for a high-style commission in an urban setting.

The spatial organization of the administration building in its entirety was not revolutionary. Its horizontal distribution of space conforms to long-established patterns of domestic planning that were also utilized in railroad station designs of the period. Indeed, the layout of individual rooms and the method by which they are accessed are exemplary of a domestic arrangement Robin Evans called the "corridor plan," with dedicated spaces for circulation separated from those for other uses. Evans's analysis establishes the genesis of this plan type in mid-seventeenth-century houses for the English elite. An early example designed in the 1650s by Sir Roger Pratt contained a through-passage running as a central spine along the entire length of the building; rooms on either side of the spine were internally connected, their portals aligned in *enfilade.* As Evans outlines, this layout

both facilitated and symbolized the hierarchical arrangement typical of elite domestic life, predicated as it was on the presence of servants, and increasingly calculated to maintain a family's sense of privacy despite their presence. At the same time, the arrangement divided the house into two types of space: "an inner sanctuary of inhabited rooms and unoccupied circulation space" which then made it "difficult to justify entering any room where you had no specific business."[66]

According to Evans, the corridor-type plan was codified by the architect Robert Kerr, and disseminated in *The Gentleman's House* of 1864. Because Evans is concerned with analysis of circulation space to support a particular thesis (and in broadly establishing plans with separate circulation as a type distinct from those without), he overlooks important subtleties in Kerr's text.[67] According to Kerr, the corridor was "contrived for passage only—it is a thoroughfare proper and no more" where the gallery "adds a degree of stateliness." The domestic gallery, derived from the great hall of the medieval plan, was related to the corridor, though it "assumed the character of a grand artistic question, apart from mere accommodation and convenience."[68] Kerr's gallery could function as a lounge during the summer, a "public apartment" for receptions, a picture gallery for the display of portraits, or even a "very convenient" ballroom for

---

[66] Robin Evans, "Figures, Doors, Passages," *Architectural Design* 4 (1978): 267-278; quote on 273.

[67] According to Evans's introduction on p. 267, the study examines the house in relation to human affairs: "It is concerned exclusively with the issue of access and distinguishes between two extreme types, the matrix of connected rooms and the corridor plan, suggesting that each is the format for a distinctive way of life."

[68] Robert Kerr, *The Gentleman's House; or How to Plan English Residences from the Parsonage to the Palace*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: John Murray, 1865), 168-9. On p. 165, Kerr makes the clarification, "A corridor is a wide and stately passage: a wider and more stately corridor is a gallery."

entertainment. A family room rather than merely a passage, its entry door should be tucked to one side, he decreed.. Similarly, the staircase should not divide the gallery in half, "but ought to be withdrawn to a position more calculated to secure . . . privacy for both the gallery and itself [the stair]." To this end, the stair might be divided from the space by a screen, and a fireplace might likewise be included for comfort and warmth. Finally, Kerr summarized, "a prevailing air of importance, and an amplified purpose of . . . artistic effect become likewise essential objects of design."[69]

As Vincent Scully noted, Kerr's artistic gallery with fireplace and screened stair served as the basis for "a new kind of spacious planning" in the early 1870s.[70] That decade, according to the author, saw "profound and sweeping changes in American architecture" and Scully foregrounds Henry Hobson Richardson as the central figure of that transformation. Richardson experimented with "a new kind of open interior space" first evidenced in the early 1870s (in the Codman House outside Boston and the F.W. Andrews House in Newport of 1872) and fully realized in the William Watts Sherman House of 1874, which laid the groundwork for further developments of the decade (Fig. 3.15). While his study highlights materials and methods of construction, Scully asserts that the interwoven basketry of timber framing and cladding then evolved into "that sense

[69] Ibid., 169-70.

[70] Scully also credits the British architectural journal *Builder* with publishing examples of the gallery (which Scully calls the living hall) through the late 1860s. Vincent Scully, Jr. *The Shingle Style: Architectural Theory and Design from Downing to the Origins of Wright,* (New Haven: Yale University, 1955), 9.

of the interweaving of spatial areas so important in the achievement of the early eighties."[71]

The corridor plan type, though based on seventeenth-century domestic arrangements, was appropriate for a secure facility where sensitive business was to be conducted. The layout was formal and axial, creating spaces of purposeful rather than leisurely habitation. Rooms could be opened and closed to varying degrees as dictated by necessity without isolating whole segments of the interior from other functions. Whether intentional or not, the hierarchy inherent to the plan was fitting for a client with a highly systematized chain of command.

After passing through the armory's main entry doors, visitors faced an oak-clad split stair straight ahead. According to Clark, it was "the feature of the interior."[72] Like that in many high-style Gilded Age spaces, the stair was an architectural element with high potential for visual impact. Diagonal lines of handrails and banisters added dynamism and movement to the interior composition, bridging the horizontality of floor and ceiling planes and the verticality of the stair shaft. The split design was sculptural—both massive and weightless—but also central to the space's function: its generous dimensions accommodated men and equipment, and served as a viewing platform for guests at ceremonial receptions (Fig. 3.16). Before the elevator revolutionized vertical transportation, monumentally scaled stairs were necessary for moving large crowds through public buildings, and yet as private residences for the very wealthy exploded in

[71] In particular, see Scully's Introduction "Romantic Rationalism and the Expression of Structure in Wood: Downing, Wheeler, Gardner and the 'Stick Style,' 1840-76," xxiii-lix; and Chapter One, "The Stick Style Reviewed: H.H. Richardson and English 'Queen Anne,' 1869-1876," 1-18; quotes on 3, 4, lviii.

[72] Clark, *History* II, 293.

scale in the 1870s, the stair and surrounding entry hall became a site for similarly expanded architectural elaboration, rather than being merely functional.

In his treatise, Kerr spoke of the stair as an architectural element worthy of the designer's "best endeavors after artistic effect."[73] Indeed, the armory stair conforms to Kerr's directive that a square, open newel design with half- or quarter-space landings was ideal. Potential for "stately and attractive" effect may be achieved by splitting the stair, given sufficient space and practicability with the rest of the plan.[74] Yet, despite being hailed as "the feature" of the interior, the armory's iron-framed oak-clad stair recalls the design of other similarly scaled facilities of the period. The Seventh's entry foyer and stair bear striking resemblance to Peter B. Wight's earlier 1863-65 design of the same elements at the National Academy of Design. The split layout and carved underside paneling also recall a comparable treatment at Château-sur-Mer, part of Richard Morris Hunt's early 1870s re-design of the house (Figs. 3.17, 3.18).[75]. Thus, though the corridor plan was based on centuries-old domestic arrangements, the formality and hierarchy inherent to this arrangement made it well suited for other large-scale interiors that were not necessarily domestic.

---

[73] Kerr, *The Gentleman's House,* 178.

[74] Ibid. Kerr preferred a central flight at the primary floor with divided upper flights above to the reverse arrangement that exists at the armory: side flights on the primary floor converging at a landing into a central flight. His objection was that the exposure of the underside was not pleasing and that the arrangement was complicated from a construction standpoint. Kerr's ideal arrangement would not have worked at the armory, however, as the entry hall did not terminate at the stair, but continued on under and through it to the drill hall. Further, the structure of the stair here was iron, a material unlikely to have been used in the domestic projects the author was analyzing in the mid-1860s.

[75] Between 1869 and 1863, Hunt substantially re-worked this part of the house, enlarging and reconfiguring the original design of 1851-2. See "Château sur Mer (Wetmore House)" Historic American Building Survey No. RI-313, 3.

Stanford White and a New Type of Space

The stair and corridors here were part of a compositional layout that was, appropriately, formal and axial. The armory's overall design does *not* call on the innovative experiments of the period outlined by Scully—the flowing, interpenetrating space of Richardson and White. Historian James D. Kornwolf confirms that of the significant stylistic contributions internationally, a new conception of space most distinguishes the Aesthetic Movement in America, and while it is the most difficult aspect to account for, the author asserts that the new spatiality can be traced through the medieval great hall and Asian interiors, culminating in three important Newport commissions of the period: the William Watts Sherman House of 1874, the Kingscote Dining Room of 1880-81, and the Isaac Bell House of 1883 (Figs. 3.19, 3.20).[76] The common denominator between all three of course is Stanford White, and Kornwolf credits the young architect (along with British Queen Anne influences) with "the first clear indication of quite a new American style."[77]

The armory's interiors *as a whole* do not exhibit the interpenetrating volumes and flowing spatiality that were the Aesthetic Movement's distinct manifestations in this country. Openness and visual transparency were inimical to the operations of a secure facility. However, two of the first-floor regimental rooms *do* exhibit the qualities outlined by Scully and Kornwolf and they are the only two spaces in the facility in which Stanford White had a hand. White's sculptural manipulation of space—his treatment of interiors as volumes rather than planes—was combined with Tiffany's innovative decorative

[76] James D. Kornwolf, "American Architecture and the Aesthetic Movement," *In Pursuit of Beauty*, 350-6.

[77] Ibid., 350.

approach to produce rooms that have consistently been called the most remarkable of those at the armory.[78] The veteran room and library are, in fact, unique among White's numerous projects of the period, in that they are perhaps the only non-architectural commissions. Contemporaneous projects were all either new constructions or additions—that is, projects like Kingscote, where White's interiors were also part of a new structure he and his partners designed.

White's personal and professional life has been well documented, and it is known that even in the mid-1870s—the earliest years of his career—he was intimately involved with some of the most significant architectural projects of the period.[79] After training with Henry Hobson Richardson (1838-1886), White set off for further study in Europe, and the letters to his family back in the States reveal an ambitious itinerary undertaken in the company of like-minded peers and mentors. Augustus Saint-Gaudens' (1848-1907) Paris quarters served as White's home base there, though the men he met up or traveled with included Charles McKim, his friend and soon-to-be partner; Robert Lenox Kennedy, Lenox heir and trustee of the New Armory Fund; and Sidney Stratton, later of McKim Mead & White and designer of the Company K room at the armory. One of White's first stops in July of 1878 was the *Exposition Universelle*, where he may have seen the Herter

[78] Stern, for example, holds that "no other room in the armory matched the sumptuousness bordering on hedonism that was the particular pleasure of the veterans' room and the library. In fact, of all the other spaces, only the very different . . . drill room was memorable." Stern, *New York 1880,* 248.

[79] White assisted Richardson on Trinity Church in Boston and the New York State Senate Chamber in Albany, as well as the William Watts Sherman House in Newport. See Wayne Craven, *Stanford White: Decorator in Opulence and Dealer in Antiquities* (New York: Columbia University, 2005); Samuel G. White, *Stanford White, Architect* (New York: Rizzoli, 2008); and Richard Guy Wilson, *McKim, Mead & White Architects* (New York: Rizzoli, 1983). On White's notorious biography, see Paul R. Baker, *Stanny: The Gilded Life of Stanford White* (New York and London: Free Press, 1989).

Brothers-designed displays for Tiffany & Co., or viewed the oil paintings sent by Louis Comfort Tiffany.[80]

While traveling through Fontainbleau, White noted that the country châteaux there looked to him "more like public buildings than places to live in"—an apt characterization of the palatial abodes his firm would design starting in the mid-1880s.[81] Yet, even though White returned to the States with an encyclopedic visual reference of both historic and contemporary European architecture, his projects of this period exhibit a remarkable degree of stylistic consistency. Further, they do *not* exhibit what Robert A.M. Stern characterizes as the diagrammatic precision of the firm's "strictly classical" phase ushered in with the Villard Houses of 1885.[82]

Scholars have noted the breadth and diversity of White's design sources in this early period of his career, along with a high degree of aesthetic consistency among his projects. Scully went so far as to say that the firm's masterpieces of the early 1880s demonstrate "the . . . ascendancy of White's free, spatial and painterly vision."[83] Caitlin

---

[80] Clair Nicholas White, ed., *Stanford White's Letters to his Family Including a Selection of Letters to Augustus Saint-Gaudens,* (New York: Rizzoli, 1997), 32, 43; Richardson quote on p. 84. White's itinerary is too lengthy to be recounted here, but he traveled extensively—to the major and minor monuments of France, Italy, England and Belgium from mid-July 1878 until he departed via Liverpool in late August 1879. For the full itinerary, see p. 75. On Tiffany's showing at the Parisian *Exposition,* see Koch, *Rebel in Glass,* 9**.**

[81] White, *Stanford White's Letters*, 48.

[82] Stern points to the Charles Tiffany mansion of 1882-85 as the last of the firm's inventive Queen Anne phase. Stern et al., *New York 1880,* 631. Of the years between 1876 and 1882, Scully finds in architectural theory and practice "two divergent general approaches": "antiquarian and academic, and on the other, free and creative ones." The two paths merged during this period, but divided after 1883 with the academic approach eventually "usurp[ing] the whole." This is an accurate assessment of McKim Mead & White's work during the period. Scully, *The Shingle Style,* 35.

[83] Scully, *The Shingle Style,* 58.

Emery's study of the Kingscote dining room analyzed materials and decorative motifs used there, finding specific precedent in English, Japanese, Moorish, Classical, American Colonial and Aesthetic (English Reform) sources, while noting the remarkable similarity between the King commission and many of the nineteen others designed by McKim Mead & White in and beyond Newport between 1879 and 1884, including the Newport Casino; Isaac Bell House; Samuel Tilton House; the Newcomb House in Elberon, New Jersey; the Alden Villa in Cornwall, Pennsylvania; and at the veterans' room in New York(Figs. 3.21-3.26).[84]

Even the most cursory survey of these contemporaneous projects reveals a language of forms, materials and details consistently applied but inventively re-worked in each new setting. That language included pierced and carved panels featuring English and Islamic forms used as screening devices; glass blocks and colored glass windows of abstract patterned design; basket-weave paneling—executed in wood as interior partitions and in plaster as ceiling decoration—relieved with applied medallions in metallic finishes; nail heads applied as geometricized waves and starbursts to built-in furniture and paneling; scroll-like metalwork as door and furniture hardware; among others (Figs. 3.27-3.30). Besides these motifs and the inventive combination of wood and metal with unconventional materials like cork, reed and glass blocks, there was of course the spatiality described earlier by Scully: flowing, interpenetrating volumes that melded inhabited space with circulation areas, replacing the formal vistas of the *enfilade* with

[84] The Seventh's library is not mentioned. Caitlin Emery, "Colonial Lineage and Cultural Fusion: Family Identity and Progressive Design in the Kingscote Dining Room" (M.A. thesis, University of Delaware, 2009), 36, 43; An otherwise admirable study, Emery surmises that White's use of Islamic elements during the period resulted from seeing the Tunisian pavilion at the *Exposition Universelle* in 1878 and from his contact with Lockwood de Forest, completely neglecting Tiffany's use of Islamic subject matter in the 1860s and of Islamic decorative motifs in the 1870s and 80s.

irregularity and permeability. Indeed, sculpted volumetric space was a hallmark of these interiors as well, and White's manipulation of spatial sequencing—compression and expansion of scale—is consistently evidenced. This is particularly the case in domestic projects. The majority of these were in resort or suburban settings where relaxed informality was desired, but the same quality is also evidenced in larger-scale projects for institutional clients such as the auditorium of the Newport Casino, and, to a lesser degree, the veteran room and library at the armory, where White's work was confined to preexisting spaces. For the veterans, White exploited the building's irregularly shaped outside corner (the result of the projecting corner tower), inserting a balcony accessed by a partially hidden stair. In the library, White utilized a barrel-vaulted ceiling to impart dynamism to an otherwise cubic space—a strategy used to similar effect in the Alden Villa entry, and in smaller-scaled versions (as built-in millwork) at the Bell and Tilton Houses and at Kingscote.

Herter Brothers and the Artistic Environment

That this remarkable degree of stylistic cohesion is constant for a range of project types and locations from resort houses to urban institutions suggests that McKim Mead & White's early patrons recognized in the firm's output a unique aesthetic and sought out the firm for that reason. The same case may be made for the other armory firms. Under the broad "aesthetic" heading—never entirely codified anyway—each is remembered for a particular stylistic approach. As Katherine Howe notes, the New York market was large enough to support a variety of tastes from conservative styles (i.e., historicist revivals) to progressive (British reform). John Taylor Johnston, an example of the former, preferred the Louis XV and XVI mode of the French émigré Leon Marcotte, whereas Herter

Brothers worked through the 1860s in French Second Empire and was among the first American firms to adopt tenets of English Reform in the mid-70s.[85]

As with White, a great degree of consistency is evidenced in Herter Brothers' high-style work of this period. The firm's earliest interiors and freestanding furniture were executed in historicist revival modes and relied on exuberantly carved and sculpted surfaces. The Portland, Maine, residence of Ruggles S. Morse (now the Morse-Libby Mansion) is representative of this approach. Morse's dining room featured wood paneling with geometric insets and framing pilasters; a coved ceiling with alternating brackets and swags; and highly carved oak furniture decorated with acanthus leaves, fruits and nuts (Fig. 3.31). The walls and ceiling of the Morse drawing room were executed in plaster, but were also highly sculptural. A matching suite of rosewood furniture is similarly treated with three-dimensional figures, gilt bronze mounts and intricate inlay (Figs. 3.32). Other projects of the period include residences for LeGrand Lockwood in Norwalk, Connecticut (1868-70); Darius Ogden Mills in Millbrae, California (1869-71); Milton Slocum Latham in Menlo Park, California (1872-3); and the White House Red Room for the Grant Administration (1877). Archival images of these interiors reveal a consistently applied aesthetic of classically derived forms and motifs, heavily carved paneling, furniture with intricate inlays and applied gilt ornament.

By the mid-1870s, a subtle change can be discerned in the firm's work for James Goodwin (1803-1890). Goodwin was first involved with a stagecoach line which later evolved into the Hartford and New Haven Railroad. He parlayed this success into a more substantial fortune through the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company as well as

[85] Katherine Howe, "An Introduction to the Herter Brothers" in *The Herter Brothers,* 69-75.

through banking, manufacturing and real estate endeavors.[86] Goodwin's Hartford, Connecticut house was designed by his son Francis who, according to Ann Claggett Wood, was an amateur architect with an extensive photograph collection of European architectural and interiors projects. Francis was aided in the endeavor by the English architect Frederick Clarke Withers who, before emigrating to the United States in the early 1850s, collaborated with noted British designer E.W. Godwin. The Goodwin house plan was characterized as an "innovative open design," organized around a "great hall, dominated by a massive fireplace and grand staircase" off of which the principal rooms opened.[87]

An archival photograph of the Goodwin parlor and conservatory evince a sparer, simplified aesthetic than what had been employed in previous Herter Brothers commissions. While still making use of profuse patterning on floors, walls and upholstery, the planarity of the wall surface is maintained, rather than broken up by heavy carving or additive architectural features. Decorative motifs are classicizing but restrained. Similarly the Goodwin furniture is executed in a lighter manner. Three-dimensional carving has largely been replaced by shallow incising called out in gold. Marquetry is still utilized though decorative motifs are now flat and stylized, and confined to bands delineated by simple geometric outlines. Furniture forms themselves are simplified to the point of attenuation, and their component parts are integrated (Fig. 3.33).

The Herter firm had been reorganized in 1870, with younger brother Christian taking over sole leadership from Gustave who retired and returned to their native

[86] Ann Claggett Wood, "Woodlands, the James Goodwin Residence" (catalogue entry), in Howe, ed., *Herter Brothers,* 166.

[87] Ibid., 166-7.

Germany. One wonders to what degree this shift in the firm's work of the early 1870s is due to Christian's newly prominent role and how much credit may be assigned to the influence of Francis Goodwin and Frederick Clarke Withers. Whoever was responsible for this aesthetic change, the firm's furniture designs from this point forward increasingly reflect the influence of British design reform and Asian motifs as interpreted by the British. According to Katherine Howe, "Japanese influences seem to have come by way of Europe . . . through the adoption of decorative motifs more than of furniture form."[88]

By the late 1870s, Christian Herter was employing a new design formula, replacing that used earlier by his brother with an updated aesthetic. He applied it more or less consistently even for the most illustrious of his patrons. The drawing rooms of J. Pierpont Morgan, Oliver Ames and William Henry Vanderbilt exhibit a remarkable degree of affinity with one another (Figs. 3.34-3.36). In these interiors, the surface treatments and materials have at last caught up with the lightness and delicacy of Herter's furniture forms from earlier in the decade. In each, the wall plane has been simplified. A low wood wainscot with decorative panels supports an expanse of wall surface subdivided by shallow attenuated pilasters. In the Ames and Morgan houses, framed paintings punctuate the surface alongside plush draped portieres. Above the continuous decorative frieze a prominent elongated cove provides a transition to the ceiling plane in nearly identical bands of swags and garlands. Both ceilings are bejeweled with a dense floral mosaic.

How this formula may later have evolved will forever remain a point of speculation, as Vanderbilt's Fifth Avenue home was the last of Christian Herter's notable commissions. The design aesthetic of the interior and the furnishing that remain evince a

[88] See Howe, "An Introduction to the Herter Brothers," 48-9.

return to the classically inspired forms and motifs of the 1860s, though executed in the lighter manner and with the glittering surfaces of the mid-70s (Fig. 3.37). Ghiberti's *Gates of Paradise* were famously recreated by Ferdinand Bardedienne for Vanderbilt's entry, and the Renaissance-inspired swag garland was an organizing principle of the interior reinterpreted in a variety of materials throughout the house and on the furnishings (Fig. 3.38).[89] According to Howe, the firm had come full circle. From the Anglo-Japanesque designs, here Herter returned to "Parisian classicism"—a return attributed to the perpetual need for new ideas and sources of inspiration. According to Howe, Paris, "still a bastion of French revivals, offered interesting, grander alternatives to Anglo-Japanism."[90]

The Appeal of the East

Like the work of Herter Brothers and Stanford White with whom he collaborated, Louis Comfort Tiffany, too, evolved a uniquely discernible approach in his projects of the period. Indeed, in their introduction to *Opulent Interiors*, Lewis, Turner and McQuillin describe the artist's work as exceptional among a field of others "surprisingly similar" in appearance. Tiffany's distinctive approach—his "decorative energy" according to the authors—was the result of foregrounding surface treatment rather than individual objects within the interior: "The result is a mosaic of shapes held together tenuously in a plane, conveying an implication of flux" not found in the other "opulent"

[89] In the Vanderbilt library, mother-of-pearl swags were inlaid into bookcases, the fireplace surround, and in the rosewood table now in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

[90] Howe, "Introduction to the Herter Brother," 53-4.

interiors.[91] The surface quality those authors are attempting to describe is the result of tension between the planarity of the wall itself—its surface treatment of multiple abstract patterns that are sub-divided into geometric divisions—and the shimmering quality of the metallic highlights, which essentially dissolve the wall into a plane of light. (It should be noted that Tiffany would eventually find the most fruitful artistic medium to be colored glass.)

Tiffany's first design experiments were undertaken for his own residence and studio at the Bella Apartments in 1878, and shortly thereafter for James Steele Mackaye's Madison Square Theatre. It is remarkable that Tiffany's first documented project, Bella, was represented by four plates in Sheldon's *Artistic Houses* and singled out by twentieth-century commentators as exceptional.[92] Unlike White, Tiffany had no training specific to architectural design; unlike the Herters, no long-established practice. His early—indeed immediate—success in this field points to the prime role artistic training played, alongside intimate familiarity (through travel and his father's business) with the principles and practice of high-style design.

---

[91] Lewis, *Opulent Interiors,* 27. Indeed, the authors provide an accurate catalogue of the typical late nineteenth-century high-style interior: "partially covered parquetry floors; three-part walls consisting of a strong dark wainscoting, a middle neutral ground of paper, brocade or leather, and a decorated frieze at the top; ceiling usually paneled in dark wood but sometimes finished in painted plaster; brass sconces and chandeliers; centered, self-supporting over-mantels with tiles below; fine woods and superior wood carving; exquisite hangings of plush and velvet; heavy embroidered portieres; firm but appealing colors . . . stamped leather chairs in the dining room; Oriental and Moorish accents; bric-a-brac from the world over . . . and on the walls original oil paintings by familiar names of the modern . . . schools."

[92] In fact, the first project described in the multivolume publication is "Mr. Louis C. Tiffany's Rooms."

According to Lewis, Turner and McQuillen, the innovative quality of Tiffany's interiors sprang from dynamic flatness of the wall plane.[93] As American expatriate artists James McNeill Whistler (1834-1903) and Mary Cassatt (1844-1926) used the shallow space and close cropping of Japanese woodblock prints in their work, so, too, Tiffany utilized abstract Japanese papers and decorative motifs extensively in these early projects. In the Bella dining room, the expanse of wall over the dado is sub-divided by simple battens, its surfaces applied with cloud and leaf motifs stylized in the Japanese manner (Fig. 3.39). In the library, Tiffany seems to have compensated for a more conventional all-over leaf design by breaking the wall surface up into smaller and smaller panels, again delineated by simple battens (Fig. 3.40). Despite being reproduced in black and white, the metallic sheen of surfaces is apparent and this, too, was a hallmark of Tiffany's decorative treatment.

Converse to space-denying treatment of the wall plane were space-*making* strategies within open volumes, and this critical aspect of the Bella design was not commented upon by Lewis, Turner and McQuillen. It is important to remember that Bella was a speculative apartment building. Like other tenants, Tiffany and his family moved into an architectural shell whose spaces were already laid out. Within the confines of preexisting rooms, Tiffany added architectural features to enliven the space, rather than focusing exclusively on furniture and finishes. A carved portal bisects the drawing room, creating a more intimate scale near the fireplace. A similarly carved architectural portal (hung with embroidered *portieres*) divides this room from the volume beyond (Fig. 3.41). Likewise the entry hall was treated in an unconventional manner. Beside the seemingly haphazard display of weapons, studded wall surfaces and a swirling colored glass

[93] Lewis, *Opulent Interiors*, 43.

window, a series of pine rafters forms a gable, greeting visitors at the main entry. This was clearly not a part of the building's original design as rafters have been notched out to accommodate the cove and ceiling molding which pass awkwardly behind them (Fig. 3.42). These are subtleties to be sure, but they make clear that Tiffany was not thinking about pattern, color and light purely in terms of surface treatment and decoration. Like White, Tiffany conceived of space in terms of three-dimensional volumes, creating architectural interiors from a standard cubic arrangement of forms.

Emphatic flatness of the wall plane, unconventional cropping and framing and shimmering surfaces ornamented in stylized, abstract patterning were vital components and indeed the distinguishing characteristics of Tiffany's design practice, placing him at the forefront of such strategies in the late 1870s. Certainly, some of the more significant aspects of Tiffany's design work are attributable to his artistic education. Interest in the effects of color and light were undeniably part of George Inness's training. [94] Similarly, Samuel Colman introduced Tiffany to the exotic subject matter for which both were known. Writing in June 1879, the *Art Journal* described Tiffany as a "well-known painter of Algerian and North African buildings and inhabitants" who, in the course of numerous Atlantic crossings, had familiarized himself with "medieval and ancient architecture in Egypt, Algeria and Morocco." While noting that the artist had of late turned his attention to interior decoration, the reporter assessed "Mr. Tiffany has an eye sensitive to the picturesqueness of old buildings, markets, booths and alley-ways . . . his treatment of these subjects has made his name known throughout the country."[95]

[94] See Promey, "Ribband of Faith."

[95] Of his many travels, the reporter offered "Few American artists have traveled more." "Tiffany's *Among the Weeds*," 161.

Tiffany & Co.'s design director, Edward C. Moore (1827-1898) was yet another source of influence and like Colman, his interests were decidedly exotic. Moore was almost single-handedly responsible for Tiffany & Co.'s success as a manufacturer of high-end art silver and is credited with the firm's use of Japanese and Japanesque motifs in the early 1870s. Moore was awarded gold medals for designs shown at the 1867 Paris Exposition and at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial. He received another gold medal at the Paris Exhibition of 1878 alongside Charles Tiffany who was made a member of the French Legion of Honor. Moore traveled extensively, amassing a collection of more than 4,000 objects. Nearly half of these were bequeathed to the Metropolitan Museum of Art upon his death in 1891, along with more than five hundred books on art, some of which were described as "very rare." Saracenic metalwork was a particular strength of Moore's extensive holdings.[96]

In looking beyond traditional Western subject matter, Tiffany was well within larger patterns of late nineteenth-century fine art and decorative design. What is significant is that unlike most other Americans, he was not looking to Asian culture as it had been interpreted by the British, but instead to Islamic architecture and design based on direct contact. Whereas Christian Herter traveled to England to study British reform, Tiffany went to Morocco and North Africa, experiencing the wellspring of these designs

---

[96] "The Edward C. Moore Collection," *The Collector* 3, no. 13 (May 1, 1892): 199. The reporter preferred "not to attempt anything like a classification of objects," focusing instead on some of its highlights, which the Saracenic pieces were considered. In 1907, the MMA reinstalled the Moore Collection. Writing at that time, its primary holdings included "Saracenic, Japanese and Chinese metalwork . . . Greek, Spanish, Persian and Japanese pottery" as well as glass, carvings, lacquers and jewelry. Moore's "Saracenic metalwork" was singled out as an exceptionally strong component of the collection, and the article was illustrated with four Persian Mosque lamps described as "among the more valuable things in the collection." Conrad Hewitt, "The Edward C. Moore Collection," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 2, no. 6 (June, 1907): 105-6.

firsthand. Within the historiography of the nineteenth-century interior, much has been made of such exoticism. Eastern-themed rooms have been analyzed as facilitating male escapist fantasies or as markers of "distinction" and it would be easy to dismiss the veteran room (along with much of Tiffany's other work) as an example of this tendency.[97] Tiffany and his early patrons were undeniably socio-economic elites who favored the exotic. In their "endless drive for novelty" in artistic subject-matter and interior decoration, these men likewise conform to Bourdieu's characterization of men of distinction as being naturally inclined to "the objects, places or activities rarest at any given moment."[98]

However, recent scholarship has problematized both lines of inquiry as overly reductive.[99] For Tiffany, specifically, this aesthetic operated in a number of ways. As a painter interested in effects of light and color, the intricately detailed architecture of Egypt and North Africa would have offered particularly rich subject matter, and as Marilynn Johnson notes, the orient proved "highly profitable" in Tiffany's first shows.[100] The young artist also had the example of Moore's success with Tiffany & Co. Tiffany

---

[97] John Sweetman, *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture, 1500-1920* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University, 1988); Roger Benjamin, *Orientalist Aesthetics: Art, Colonialism, and French North Africa, 1880-1930,* (Berkeley: University of California, 2003); Celik Zeynep, *Displaying the Orient: Architecture of Islam at Nineteenth-Century Worlds' Fairs* (Berkeley: University of California, 1992). The term "distinction" here refers to sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's critical analysis of taste and socio-economic status. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986).

[98] Bourdieu, *Distinction,* 249.

[99] Deusner argues that narrowly emphasizing escapism neglects the social role Aesthetic pictures and practice played. Conversely, Bourdieu's methodology has largely been utilized to generalize aesthetic patrons, rather than offering close analysis. Deusner, "A Network of Patrons," 30-31.

[100] Marilynn Johnson, *Louis Comfort Tiffany: Artist for the Ages* (London: Scala Exhibitions International, 2005), 23.

would have had convenient access to Moore's incredible collection of designed objects and to Moore's library of rare art books as well. Thus in his earlier fine art and with the example of his father's flourishing business, interpretations of the East had proven highly successful.

Tiffany's own reference library (part of which remains at the Morse Museum in Winter Park, Florida) provides another important piece of the puzzle. Included among landscape treatises and photo books of Indian temples, one finds Jacob von Falke's publication, *Art in the House.* Von Falke, though little-known today, was an important cultural historian, founder and first director of the Austrian Museum of Applied Arts in Vienna. Eric Anderson asserts that Von Falke "contributed as much as any individual" to the late nineteenth-century discourse on the domestic interior.[101] His popular text *Die Kunst im Haus* was translated and distributed in the United States in 1879, just as Louis C. Tiffany was beginning a professional design career.

Art in the House consisted of two parts, the first of which was a concise history of the domestic environment from the medieval to the eighteenth century. The second comprised a critical analysis of the nineteenth-century home. In it, Von Falke argued against the interminable revival of historicist modes. Instead, designers should look to the past for principles of color and form that could then be applied abstractly to present conditions, rather than recreated exactly. According to Anderson, "he sought to formulate a theory of design . . . that would begin to free designers from the burden of history."[102]

---

[101] Eric Anderson, "Beyond Historicism: Jacob von Falke and the Reform of the Viennese Interior," (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 2009), 2.

[102] Anderson, "Beyond Historicism," 7.

It is clear that Von Falke's theories and the practical application that he outlined were enormously influential for Tiffany. Among other things, Von Falke argued that the interior should be the work of one artist and that its decoration and furnishing should never achieve a state of fixity so that nothing could be added or subtracted. He humorously caricatured the "poor modern" who, having created a museum period-piece was then forced to alter his manner and dress to coordinate with it.[103] Importantly, Von Falke asserted that artistic harmony—the ultimate goal for the interior—was dependent above all on unity of color and form, rather than correct and thorough-going application of a particular past style. He outlined principles and best practices for achieving artistic harmony on the interior, delineating in detail (and with numerous illustrations of both proper and poor examples) decorative treatments, materials, finishes and colors for floor and wall surfaces, ceilings, furniture, and the artistic decoration of the table (including table coverings and porcelain). Much of his advice stood in direct contrast to high-style practice, such as the exhortation against richly inlaid tabletops with "whole troops of children and genii under them."[104] Generally, Von Falke argued for plain furniture, wood parquet flooring partially covered in oriental carpets, and flat-patterning in rich colors on the walls. A simple, all-over ceiling treatment was, according to him, preferable to *tromp l'oiel,* though "a network of artistically arranged beams" was also desirable. Interestingly, he hoped that the ancient art of glass painting would be revived to "fill the last void in the decoration of the room and its artistic adornment."[105] Von Falke consistently held ancient

[103] Jacob von Falke, *Art in the House: Historical, Critical, and Aesthetic Studies on the Decoration and Furnishing of the Dwelling* (Boston: L. Prang & Co., 1879), 164, 167-8.

[104] Ibid., 253.

[105] Ibid., 233, 243.

examples in higher esteem than contemporary, singling out "oriental" objects, decorative motifs and principles of design for emulation.

If Moore's work for Tiffany & Co. and Louis Tiffany's own artistic success clarified the popularity and profitability of Eastern exoticism, Von Falke affirmed "the Oriental" on artistic grounds, anchoring his opinion in a thorough historical analysis. He provided a conceptual framework for interior decoration freed from the constraints of historicism, while offering specific (illustrated) advice on exactly how to achieve this end. As Tiffany transitioned into a new line of work, Von Falke's validation would have had an impact on him, and the young artist-turned-decorator found a small group of patrons who shared his enthusiasm early on for the East.

Writing about the bronze *Gates of Paradise* doors reproduced for William H. Vanderbilt's mansion, Katherine Howe mused at the appropriateness of the overt symbolism, calling Vanderbilt "an American Medici."[106] Similar comparisons have been made in reference to other American collectors and patrons who saw themselves as the rightful possessors of Western cultural patrimony. However, not all were desirous of such allusions. For some the East held more allure, and for fewer still, the East was not even a *symbolic* association. George Kemp, an early patron of Tiffany's interiors business is one such example for whom exoticism was a particularly appropriate mode for interior decoration. Kemp's fortune derived from the wholesale drug trade. His firm, Lanman & Kemp, dealt in assorted spices, herbs, pigments, glassware and perfume extracts. They acted as middlemen for international clients, selling among other items books, sewing machines and guns. Lanman & Kemp did significant business in the Southeast Asian raw

---

[106] Howe, "An Introduction to the Herter Brothers," 54.

materials trade, including opium, which was purchased through Turkish companies and distributed worldwide. Correspondence in the Lanman & Kemp archive highlights the firm's truly international nature, establishing communication between the New York headquarters and the London banks that financed the business. Their customers and trading partners were located throughout South and Central America; the Caribbean and Cuba; Western Europe; India; Japan; Hong Kong; Indonesia; and Turkey.[107] Advertisements from this period illustrate that that Lanman & Kemp marketed a variety of items as exotic, even a home-grown one that was their most popular: Florida Water (Fig. 3.43).

Kemp, like his brother Edward, was a veteran of Company F and though much less active in the daily operations of the New Armory Fund and project, was a substantial donor and his name was freely used by the Seventh in its promotion of that initiative. His brother Edward was the acknowledged leader of the veteran's effort and through the late 1870s acted as general emissary and fundraiser extraordinaire for the project.[108] Kemp retired from business in 1867, continuing on as a "special partner" but as with many of his peers, remained active in a number of elite organizations including the Union League Club. Like the businessmen documented by Lewis, Turner and McQuillen, he did not sit idly in his final years, but instead, invested in significant real estate acquisitions.[109]

---

[107] Lanman & Kemp Finding Aid, Lanman & Kemp Collection, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware: 2, Lanman & Kemp International Correspondence is documented on pp. 8-159.

[108] George Kemp donated $1,000 to the fund. See "New Armory Fund" printed flyer, dated January 1, 1878, box 32, folder 3 NYHS.

[109] Entry for "George Kemp" in *America's Successful Men of Affairs*, 364.

The Kemp hall reproduced in *Artistic Houses* was not the visual tour-de-force of Tiffany's own entry at Bella. Rather, the artist-designer concentrated his energies on the Kemp salon (Fig. 3.44). Writing in 1882, A.F. Oakey described it as "an elaborate attempt to assimilate the Moresque idea to modern requirements" noting that "no expense has been spared to attain the most perfect result in every respect."[110] Kemp's salon was much larger than Tiffany's. The designer responded to the larger scale by formalizing the decorative surface treatment, aggrandizing its scale and consolidating the type and design of furnishings to yield a sense of coherence. Further, the Kemp surfaces are more lustrous and the decorative motifs are used with greater consistency through the space than in Tiffany's own interior. A medallioned frieze runs continuously along the upper zone of the wall, terminating at the bay where colored glass panels assume the position of the frieze. The ceiling is ornately treated with an overlapping Islamic star, and this overall geometricized pattern is mirrored by oriental carpets on the floor. In place of Japanese papers, Tiffany covered the wall here in a more conventional damask-like pattern, though he introduced the novel technique of track-mounted movable panels that could be rolled to reveal or conceal delicate recessed étagère shelving.

Tiffany's own drawing room evinced the uniqueness of his approach to freestanding furniture, particularly in contrast to furniture-makers like the Herters. Rather than duplicating forms and motifs from wall and ceiling surfaces (as the Herters had, for example, in the Vanderbilt library), Tiffany utilized seating and tables whose design was independent from that of the architectural surfaces, following principles advocated by Von Falke. Of the five chairs in Tiffany's Bella drawing room, only two are a matched

[110] A.F. Oakey, *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* (April 1882), quoted in Lewis et al, *Opulent Interiors*, 133.

pair; the seating immediately surrounding the fireplace is extremely simplified and attenuated. Of the remaining two, one is of Indian decoration, relating to the carved portals. The other is straight-backed with slightly elaborated horizontal back splats. The draped table is Renaissance in form and decoration. Similarly, the entry hall seating is a simplified Sheraton-type design. The freestanding furniture thus exists independent of specific decorative motifs used in the architectural and surface treatment.

A more closely matched suite of furniture was utilized for the Kemp salon. An upholstered armchair nearly identical to the example in Tiffany's drawing room can be seen in the right foreground and today is part of the Newark Museum's collection (Fig. 3.45). Its pierced carving is replicated in a series of side chairs of slightly varying design, along with a center table and grand piano. Simple, spindle-back chairs also populate the salon, which is illuminated by Islamic lanterns of glass and metal. Lattice-like pierced carving was atypical for the established practice of shallow, gilt incising. Similarly, the use of white holly for the Kemp interior furnishings and trim was highly unconventional and in direct contrast to the prevailing preference for rosewood, though Tiffany utilized this species (and other light-colored woods) at the contemporaneous Bella apartment as well as his subsequent country residences, The Briars and Laurelton Hall (Fig 3.46).

George Kemp's salon exhibits a greater degree of continuity with its near contemporary, the armory's veteran room, than any other of Tiffany's projects of the period. The color palette and surface materials differ between the apartment and the armory, but the general atmosphere as well as specific details and design elements of both are closely related. Kemp's medallion frieze was reinterpreted in the veteran room as an historical survey of weapons and devices, but its general design and placement on

the wall are consistent at both projects. Similarly, Kemp's track-mounted upholstered panels are reinterpreted as colored glass screens of abstract design at the veteran room windows (Fig. 3.47).

Other elements of the veteran room and library are directly attributable to the influence of Stanford White. Though Tiffany made extensive use of Islamic and Indian architectural elements and carved furniture, the design of the veteran room balcony and much of the library wood- and metal-work is clearly related to contemporaneous projects of White's. The *mashraabiya*-inspired screen of the veteran room balcony is nearly identical to screening devices used in the Bell and Tilton Houses and the Kingscote dining room (Figs. 3.48-3.50). White had also used wood paneling inset with metal plates in several commissions of this period, and the design of both veteran room and library fireplaces and surrounds are more closely related to his designs than to the shallow, asymmetrically arranged shelving compositions used up to that point by Tiffany (Fig. 3.51, 3.52).[111]

The veteran room's beamed ceiling and the ponderous iron light fixtures in both rooms are difficult to rectify. White's use of barrel vaults at the Newport Casino and Alden Villa suggests that he contributed a similar treatment to the library design.[112] As noted earlier, Von Falke recommended a network of interlaced beams as a desirable solution for ceiling treatment and Tiffany later used this strategy (with similar metallic

[111] That this was a White characteristic later utilized by Tiffany is suggested by the William S. Kimball Library of 1881-2, where glass blocks similar to those used at Kingscote and the veteran room flank a much more sculpturally treated hearth and surround.

[112] The Alden Villa Entry Hall of 1880-84 includes an Islamic star pattern on the ceiling called out in shallow molding atop a gilt surface with antique mosque lamps suspended from it. I find neither the pattern nor this fixture type in earlier projects, further highlighting the back and forth between the two designers during this period.

stenciling) at the famed "Daffodil Terrace" of his Long Island retreat, Laurelton Hall (Fig. 3.53). [114] Nothing in his earlier work suggests this treatment. White made extensive use of ceilings subdivided by a rectangular pattern of beams as early as the Watts Sherman House, but had never employed beams so dramatically. Similarly, neither designer made earlier use of rustic, over-scaled iron chandeliers. These fixtures, like Tiffany's freestanding furniture, stood in direct contrast to the polished brass-and-glass-globe chandeliers that populate other "artistic" houses, including those designed by White. Tiffany later used nearly identical fixtures in the Laurelton Hall library (Fig. 3.54). They also may be understood in relation to White's inventive use of furniture, door, and other decorative hardware. Sideboards at Kingscote, the Bell House and Alden Villa all feature cabinet pulls and hinges of a similarly floriate design, as does the scroll-work weathervane at Alden Villa (Fig. 3.55).

More than a minute cataloguing of elements and details (which could be carried on *ad infinitum*), the point of this analysis is to illustrate the great degree of continuity between White- and Tiffany-designed projects of an approximately four year period. Viewing the veteran room and library alongside the Newport Casino, Kingscote dining room, Isaac Bell House, Alden Villa, Tiffany's own Bella apartment, and the George Kemp salon makes abundantly clear that the designers were establishing a vocabulary of forms, motifs, materials and details, manipulating a design syntax that was flexible and adaptable for a range of geographic and typological contexts.

The same is true, to a degree, for the Herter Brothers-designed board of officers and reception rooms. The armory spaces are certainly sparer than the Vanderbilt, Ames

[114] Portions of the Laurelton Hall terrace have been re-installed at the Morse Museum in Winter Park, Florida.

and Morgan parlors. As I asserted in the previous chapter, it is likely that Clinton, the armory's architect, designed the millwork that is a predominant feature of these interiors. Herter's work thus would have been limited to wall and ceiling treatments and the freestanding furniture. If this is the case, the jewel-box quality of the residential parlors with their linear delicacy and shimmering encrusted surfaces would not have been an appropriate complement to the solidity of Clinton's geometric paneling. Indeed, Herter seems to have taken the emphatic orthogonals of the paneling and the overall cubic quality of the space as a point of departure for his work here. Rather than the elongated cove that is a hallmark of the other commissions of this period, wall and ceiling planes in the board of officers room meet at right angles, the wall treatment is divided into bands by geometric borders and the ceiling is similarly sub-divided into rectangular zones. Though the surface decoration consists of stylized floral and starburst motifs, the overall feeling of the room is rather somber relative to the residential projects whose shimmering quality is communicated even in black-and-white photographs. These aesthetic adjustments in the Herters's armory work appropriately reflected a differentiation in function and context—this was a board room rather than a parlor—but the changes are in fact subtle. Details and surface treatments have been modified, but the overall form and style have not been radically altered. Again, this has to do with the fluidity of parlor-type environments, but it, too, speaks to a ready vocabulary employed across a range of project types.

Developing a signature aesthetic and employing it more or less consistently was an advantageous working method for these firms. Once the furniture-maker's craftsmen mastered a pattern, be it carving or marquetry, it could be repeated with greater ease and

speed. For surface treatments, too, once a stencil had been cut, it could be re-used. A change in the placement of a pattern, in color, or material would provide differentiation for each client and with every subsequent replication the production process became more efficient and cost-effective. This was also the case for designers like Tiffany and White. The process of hand-drafting intricate details is laborious, but once an element or motif had been worked out, it could be transferred by overlay and traced by the designer or an assistant. For both types of firms, these patterns and motifs acted as a library of sorts, or a kit of parts, from which particular elements could be selected and inventively re-combined to yield results that were consistent but sufficiently varied for each new project. Even from the perspective of the consumer there were advantages. Clients were ensured a degree of certainty about what type of design they could expect from a firm. As Katherine Howe makes clear, firms were known for a particular oeuvre. A client familiar with a firm's particulary style could then work with the designer or furniture-maker to determine an appropriate level of detail and finish depending on preference and budget.

Yet such continuity from one project to the next also begs the question of what it meant for these individuals to inhabit such remarkably similar environments. The Vanderbilt, Ames and Morgan parlors were nearly identical. George Kemp, in the course of his day, could have read the morning paper in his Tiffany-designed salon, been entertained at a Tiffany-designed theatre, passed through a Tiffany-designed vestibule as he discussed politics with fellow Union Leaguers, and socialized with his veteran friends in a Tiffany-designed room at the Seventh. Was Kemp so averse to aesthetic disruption (or variation generally) that he chose to be surrounded by essentially the same

environment in almost every setting, or was there deeper, more meaningful significance to this aesthetic consistency?

This line of inquiry is indebted to recent art historical scholarship that has similarly questioned the significance of such continuity for Aesthetic patrons. Melody Deusner's study focuses primarily on paintings. Though fine art paintings were considered alongside interior environments, the examples of the Kemp salon and the veteran room are not merely related, but are nearly identical. Further, framed paintings (of the type Deusner's study prioritizes) were *not* a significant component of either of these spaces. Not every Gilded Age patron was a collector, and as the two examples above make clear, some of the most significant Aesthetic interiors functioned without Aesthetic paintings. The Seventh's Armory was not a private residence or a public institution; it did not include an art gallery. The interiors were works of art in and of themselves.

For these commissions, a shared formal and stylistic language mirrored and amplified shared identity at the very moment elites came together as a cohesive socio-political entity. In this sense, high-style Aestheticism in late 1870s New York may be understood not as a retreat into cloistered seclusion, but as an affirmation of shared identity among social and economic peers. Further, it suggests a sympathetic link between modernizing cluttered and outdated interiors as advocated by Von Falke and practiced by White and Tiffany, and concurrent initiatives by the Committee of Seventy and other likeminded institutions similarly bent on "reform." Commonality of expression on the interior thus transcended geographic and typological divides. Again, this points to the elasticity of parlor-type spaces. They were applicable in residential, commercial and

institutional settings as well as in contexts that blurred those lines. Further, its characteristic eclecticism meant that Aestheticism as a mode of interior decoration could be flexibly adapted to a broad range of architectural expressions on the exterior.

Yet this phenomenon also highlights the increasing fluidity with which people, ideas and styles traveled during the period. Indeed, if the Seventh's interiors are generally united by a shared visual and formal language, its architecture and plan draw on a set of examples that were diverse, yet interrelated, and were gathered and absorbed first-second- and third-hand, primarily by travel. From European railway stations—seen by Fairman Rogers, employed by Furness at the Philadelphia Armory and Centennial Exposition and experienced by the Seventh at nearby Grand Central Depot—to apartment houses, luxury hotels, private clubs, and even local military facilities, the Seventh's planners skillfully melded the most advantageous properties from each type and example. In doing so, they codified the design of a uniquely American building type that was new and without precedent, establishing a standard that would hold into the twentieth century. In New York City and across the country, this building provided a model for emulation not just by other military groups but by elite patrons in non-military settings as well.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Armory's Impact

> The best armory in the state will not of itself make a good regiment, but the best officers in the state will find it difficult, under the conditions of National Guard service, to make a regiment in a barn.— New York State Adjutant-General Josiah Porter[1]

Friends and supporters of New York's Seventh Regiment were invited to officially open the new building with a fancy-dress ball on December 15, 1880. Chronicled by one local paper under the heading "The Seventh in its Glory," the inauguration was nonetheless poorly timed. Well in advance of the spring social season, the formal event failed to meet "the crush that had been anticipated and that the prestige of the regiment should have attracted." The building received no mention. Floral displays and ladies' fashions were more worthy of note while a Bombay merchant "in full native costume" was the sensation of the evening.[2]

The lackluster turnout must have seemed beside the point for members and leaders of the Seventh, however. For them, the building's completion represented the realization of a dozen years of effort and tireless devotion to an ambitious and, indeed, unprecedented undertaking. The subscription drive, which culminated in the previous year's New Armory Fair, *had* been a resounding success as the building evidenced. Well-attended, the fair was called the "social event of the season" and brought in over

[1] New York State Adjutant-General Josiah Porter, quoted in Robert Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 46.

[2] "The Seventh in its Glory," *The New York Times,* December 16, 1880.

$140,000 that went towards the decoration and furnishing of the interiors; all told, the Seventh's men raised over $450,000 for the new headquarters.[3]

Other volunteers had successfully raised less substantial sums—$20,000 in the case of Brooklyn's Twenty-Second Regiment during the 1860s and $30,000 by the Philadelphia First Troop in the mid-1870s—but according to historian Robert M. Fogelson, no one had attempted in excess of $300,000, "much less to raise it in the midst of the worst depression in the nation's history." The Seventh's audacity (and its high regard among the New York elite) was reflected in a structure that was "by far the largest, most impressive, most elegant armory in the country, as well as one of the most expensive structures in the city."[4]

The event that had proven such a boon to the Seventh's ongoing fundraising campaign, the Great Strikes of 1877, likewise prompted other volunteer regiments to initiate plans for better-equipped, more defensible structures. This pattern continued through the 1880s and early 90s, spurred by the Haymarket Affair in 1886; the Homestead Strike in 1892; and the Pullman and Brooklyn Trolley Strikes two years later. As the labor movement organized in opposition to capital, new armory construction proliferated throughout the United States in response. As the country's elite militia in its most populous city, now housed in the most impressive armory anywhere, the Seventh Regiment provided a worthy ideal for emulation for other members of this class. Volunteers across the state and country modeled their efforts on those of the Seventh,

[3] Net proceeds from the fair were $140,549. The final expenditure totaled more than $600,000; $150,000 was supplemented through issuance of a bond. Clark, *History* II, 284.

[4] Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 50, 55.

adopting comparable justificatory rhetoric, and to the extent that they were able, building castellated fortified armories based on its example.

This chapter is an exploration of the Seventh Regiment Armory's impact—on the evolution of armories, but also on the regiment itself and on the careers of its architect and designers. In both functionality and style, the Seventh's facility newly defined the armory as a building type, albeit with recourse to the other types—railroad stations, the domestic parlor, clubhouses, etc.—on which it was based. It was widely imitated in a subsequent wave of American armory construction, and in that sense it became typical as the head-shed layout and castellated design were extensively emulated. Yet the structure remained a singular monument to the socio-economic prestige of New York's illustrious Seventh. Within a few years, much larger and more heavily fortified facilities were erected. However the armory remained unsurpassed in the opulence of its interior appointments.[5]

The Seventh as Precedent

From 1799 to 1861, twenty-two arsenals or armories were constructed in New York State; over the next forty years, spanning from the end of the Civil War until the turn of the century, that number more than doubled, and was not surpassed even in the subsequent decades that included two World Wars.[6] The Seventh was by no means the first, as a number of state arsenals and armories predated it. These evinced medievalizing architectural elements and, to varying degrees, a castellated aesthetic, yet the Seventh

[5] According to Stern, "The Seventh Regiment Armory set a standard of quality in the care taken with the building itself and especially in the lavish appointments on the interior that was never achieved elsewhere." Stern, et al., *New York 1880,* 242.

[6] These statistics are based on an illustrated survey of armory construction in New York State. See Todd, *New York's Historic Armories,* 9-15.

was instrumental in synthesizing previous precedents into an iconic new expression. Earlier, mixed-use market armories had served as homes for volunteer regiments and these reflected their commercial function more than a martial one. Similarly, the first armories in this area—the Henry Street and Twenty-Second Regiment Armories in Brooklyn—lacked a consistently employed design vocabulary of forms and details to distinguish them as a specifically military building type. It was not until the completion of the Seventh that the head-shed layout rendered in a heavily fortified, castellated style came to be understood as a formula that would then define an armory as a specifically military facility, rather than as a library or market hall.[7] Again, Clinton and Clark did not conceive of, nor were they the first to employ this strategy, but the regiment's renown as the country's elite volunteer force furthered by its high visibility on Park Avenue and its promotion in local and nationwide press, made the building a near-instant icon.

As a model for other volunteer regiments, the Seventh's facility was far-reaching, and in fact began well before the armory was finally completed early in 1881. As outlined in Chapter Three, images of a proposed new armory at Reservoir Square may have circulated as early as 1869. Revised proposals of 1875 and 1877 were likewise disseminated as part of the Seventh's campaign to secure a site and generate financial support for the endeavor. With the announcement of the subscription drive and its immediate success in 1876, the nature of the printed materials began to reflect greater detail in keeping with the project's evolution. Images of the armory at Reservoir Square emphasized the small scale of the structure relative to the surrounding park space left untouched, a central issue in the dispute over that site. When the Seventh was finally

[7] An undated newspaper clipping in the Seventh's archive asserted that "country visitors" to the city often mistook Tompkins Market Armory for nearby Astor Library; quoted in Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 12.

granted an entire block at Hamilton Square, perspective views focused in more closely on the building itself rather than its surroundings. With recently opened Central Park in close proximity, the building could now be foregrounded, rather than diminished in a compensatory gesture as it has been with the Reservoir Square site. A greater degree of detail also reflected an advanced state of planning, and these engravings often included labeled floor plans in addition to the requisite perspective and elevation drawings.

Plans were reproduced in a fairly consistent manner. Typically, the three floors of the head-house were shown enlarged as stand-alone elements separate from the drill hall. These detached plans included the interior partitions that divided the administration building into its constituent rooms and corridors. The level of detail provided varied depending on the scale of reproduction. Often narrative descriptions of the rooms' functions and sizes along with general decorative features (the types of paneling and wood species, for example) were included, and these no doubt oriented readers by way of comparison with spaces familiar to them. One result of these plans was to clarify the Seventh's inner-workings, showing rooms dedicated to the ten individual companies; regimental business meetings; adjudication; and the repair of weapons and equipment. Less detailed overall plans were also included which illustrated the proportions and relationship between the administration building and the drill hall, but typically these did not reproduce the head-house interior partitions. In some cases, enlarged plans of the administration building were foregrounded while in others the entire floor plan—head-house and drill hall together—was the primary focus, yet the drawings clearly worked in tandem. In the former presentation, the effect was to understand the large scale and grand proportions of the administration building only to recognize the extent to which it was

dwarfed by the drill hall; in the latter, the end result was the same—the realization of the drill hall's immensity—a conclusion arrived at by first grasping the extent of the rooms that fronted it.

The drill hall was central to the Seventh's justification for a new headquarters and as images circulated through the New York press that emphasized its predominance within the overall composition, it clarified for supporters and donors that the new armory was first and foremost a military facility. This view was confirmed by the *Decorator and Furnisher* whose well illustrated review focused exclusively on the regimental rooms; nonetheless it explained "all but a *very small* portion of this building is given up to a magnificent drill-room . . . the lesser portion is divided into rooms assigned to the . . . officers and companies."[8] The Seventh was also implicitly expressing confidence—either in the building's foreboding presence, its defensibility, or both—in so broadly publicizing the interior arrangement of its spaces.

Though scholarship specific to armories has been limited, the Seventh's facility is typically credited with establishing the head-shed layout and fortified, castellated style as defining features of the type. In his early study of New York's armories, Robert Koch asserted that the Seventh "stands at the beginning of the development as a highly original work of architecture."[9] More recently, Nancy Todd credited the Seventh with establishing "a new, uniquely American building type . . . the Seventh Regiment Armory was, and still is, the flagship of the building type."[10] Yet just as the significance of the Seventh's

[8] "The Seventh Regiment Armory," *The Decorator and Furnisher* 6, no. 2 (May 1885): 42-46; quote on 43 (emphasis added).

[9] Robert Koch, "The Medieval Castle Revival," 29.

[10] Todd, *New York's Historic Armories,* 2.

myriad precedents has largely been overlooked, so, too, has the role played by print media in the stylistic cohesion of Gilded Age armories.[11] The Seventh need look no further than member Thomas Nast for an example of a successful media campaign, and previous chapters have made abundantly clear that the Seventh's leadership was particularly savvy in utilizing print media for self-promotion. The reproduction of plans, elevations and perspective views was central to the fundraising campaign, but these images also functioned in the same way design pattern books had at mid-century. As Dell Upton analyzed in a domestic context, designs presented in pattern books were typically *not* replicated exactly; rather, they provided a handy basis for emulation and adaptation. Such publications "reinforced the notion that novelty and distinctiveness were desirable" but simultaneously supplied the means by which innovative designs could be replicated.[12] Consciously or not, in publicizing the project to gather support, the Seventh both encouraged and facilitated the imitation of its headquarters. Illustrations of the armory circulated in a number of New York papers, particularly in the wake of the Great Strikes, and appeared through the late 1870s in military and engineering journals as well.[13] Though the Seventh's leaders and planners synthesized the precedents that had the most

---

[11] Neither Koch nor Todd questions the role of print images in the spread of castellated head-shed armories. As both studies are limited to New York, the assumption, while unstated, may be that relative geographic proximity facilitated the dissemination of design ideas across the state. Fogelson's analysis is generally more thorough, but offers one specific instance of direct observation—in this case, a visit to New York by the Massachusetts Armory Commission—to illustrate the widespread adaptation of the castellated style. Fogelson does note, however, that the Seventh was "widely reported on," became the model in a subsequent wave of construction, and its influence was felt even beyond the Northeast. Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 130, 140.

[12] Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism," 150.

[13]Detailed plans and a perspective appeared in *The National Guardsman* October 1, 1877. A perspective section of the drill hall was used to illustrate an article on the lighting system employed in that room in *The Plumber and Sanitary Engineer* of December 1878. Both clippings are preserved in the Seventh's Scrapbook, 1872-1878, NYHS.

direct impact on their building firsthand now even far-flung groups considering new facilities merely needed access to media outlets rather than having to travel themselves. The prestigious Seventh had already done this work. These groups could then utilize plans and perspectives as models, and could even use the New York project as justification for their own efforts.

That the high-style interiors of the Seventh Regiment Armory remained unmatched in subsequent projects clearly speaks to the socio-economic status of this elite regiment and its wealthy supporters. Yet, this part of the commission was disseminated differently than information on the structure itself. Through the fundraising campaign and the construction of the building, floor plans and exterior views predominated; of the interiors, only the drill hall was reproduced, and then rarely. For one thing, the administration building and drill hall could be just justified as central to the regiment's military proficiency and management; lavish interior appointments decidedly could *not*—a fact that may go some way in explaining why this aspect of the commission was shrouded in secrecy. Further, to the extent that these images functioned as fundraising tools, once the building was fully funded (after the fair), their usefulness was limited. Furnishings and decorations were also the last elements to be planned. Logically, only after the administration building interiors were substantially complete late in 1880 could illustrations of them reach a wider audience. In fact, the veteran room (the last to be installed) was not complete until early 1881, after the building's "public" unveiling—that is, after it became a secure military facility with limited access for outsiders.[14]

[14] The Seventh hosted an open house at the end of September 1880 in advance of the formal ball in December but again, visitors would not have seen the building's interiors in their entirety. "Looking at the New Armory," *The New York Times*, October 1, 1880.

In late April 1881, the Veterans officially inaugurated their showplace, considered then and now the most distinctive of the armory's interiors. A reporter from the *Times* devoted considerable space to describing the Veteran Room but noted that while 10,000 had been in attendance at the opening, given New York's vast population, it had in fact been seen by "relatively few persons."[15] Constance Cary Harrison echoed this sentiment, writing for *Harper's* in 1884. Harrison's review focused specifically on Associated Artists' textile work, though she considered the firm's earlier interiors "the first fruits of the American Renaissance." Indeed, for Harrison the "decorative arts craze" of the post-centennial years had been a turning point in American design. Interest in domestic decoration had been at an all-time high, but it had attracted ill-trained, profit-minded amateurs. In contrast, the Associated Artists ushered in a "new era in house decoration" (nonetheless exemplified by non-domestic commissions—Madison Square Theatre, the Union League Club and the veteran room), but the group's efforts had largely escaped the attention of the public, "hurried by the owners from work-room or atelier into jealous seclusion as soon as it was finished."[16]

In fact, the interiors received mixed evaluations (though reviewers overwhelmingly singled out the veteran room), but were given little attention relative to the constant publicity the building garnered throughout the mid-to-late 1870s. Further, reviews of a critical nature were confined to decorative-arts journals. When the interiors were featured in general interest publications like *Scribner's*, images were supplemented

[15] "Veterans Housed Sumptuously. Some Account of an Elegant Room in the Seventh's New Armory," *The New York Times,* April 23, 1881.

[16] [Constance Cary] Mrs. Burton Harrison, "Some Work of the 'Associated Artists'" *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 69 (August 1884): 343-51.

by an explanatory, rather than critical, narrative. Mary Gay Humphries reported on a still-incomplete veteran room for the April 1881 edition of *Art Amateur*, which also examined recent decoration in the Union League Club (including Louis Comfort Tiffany-designed halls). Un-illustrated, Humphries's primary task was describing the space and surface treatments which, according to her, made up "one of the interesting sights of this city." The author was particularly taken with the appropriateness of metal and metallic effects for a military commission and singled out the decorative frieze of weapons as "the most important decoration of the kind yet attempted here."[17]

William C. Brownell was decidedly less enthusiastic. In an illustrated review for *Scribner's Monthly,* he took exception not so much to the room itself as to the idea of the artist-decorator, artistic collaboration generally, and (in a rebuke of Humphries), novel ornament and décor. Like Humphries, Brownell recognized the appropriateness of the scheme for its patrons and praised Tiffany for expressing the function and purpose of the room through its details, but found the effect overwrought. Interestingly, Brownell argued for the architect-designed interior—"not architects like Mr. White, but very professional men," though White had earlier been called "not only an accomplished architect but an artist of known originality and taste." Indeed, the critic's displeasure can be attributed to a preference for more conventional historicist designs. The decoration of interiors was, according to Brownell, "a historic art" which afforded "no opportunity for experimentation." Elsewhere, he disparaged the "deplorable ignorance" of recent stained glass (a pointed critique of Tiffany and his rival, John La Farge). Brownell's assertion that the "right use" had been long-established and further, that his contemporaries were

[17] Humphries, "Novelties in Interior Decoration," 102-3.

unable to improve upon old glass, making any attempt to improve upon it "hopeless." Brownell's displeasure with the veteran room should be no surprise then, given his stated aversion to any attempt at novelty or innovation.[18] Though ostensibly a negative review, Humphries was praising exactly the quality the veterans had been pursuing: lack of convention.

Other reviews were similarly mixed. A.F. Oakey also questioned whether a more historically grounded scheme—"a revival of some fine old medieval guard-room"—might have been more suited to the scale of the veteran room. Curiously, it was criticized for a "multiplicity of . . . detail" yielding "a theatrical expression," yet in the same review, the Kemp salon was lavishly praised for achieving "the most perfect result in every respect." Though the critic felt that here the space was too small for the treatment, the effect was judged to be "a fair example of consistency throughout . . . and it is to this faithful preservation of style, as well as the delicate distribution of color, that the apartment owes most of its charm."[19]

As it had throughout the fundraising campaign, the Seventh's leadership proved itself adept at self-promotion and utilized the new building to further advance its prestige. Even before the structure was complete, it figured into recruiting material published by the regiment—a tactic that seems to have been unprecedented in the Seventh's long history. A pamphlet from 1879, for example, targeted the young men of New York, their

[18] Brownell, "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory," 370-80. Brownell's assessment of stained glass practice is at odds with art historical consensus regarding the innovations of Tiffany and La Farge during this period.

[19] Oakey, "A Trial Balance of Decoration," 736, 738.

parents, guardians and employers.[20] The building was not illustrated—in fact, it was not referenced until the end, though potential recruits were encouraged to visit "and inspect the superior facilities for military exercises and improvement."[21] As a corollary to the benefits touted in print—recreation, physical improvement, patriotic and civic duty and the cultivation of gentlemanly comportment—the headquarters would have been an undeniably powerful inducement. The Seventh was also no doubt responsible for an 1885 issue of *Decorator and Furnisher* dedicated exclusively to the new armory. Narrative descriptions were spare, rendered superfluous by fourteen full-page engraved illustrations of the first floor regimental rooms and those of the ten companies upstairs.[22]

Similarly, the veterans published a pamphlet on their room soon after its completion in 1881. Like the earlier recruitment booklet, it was un-illustrated—undoubtedly intended as a memento for veteran members who had regular access to the space and thus needed no visual cues—but included a lengthy description of the room, its materials and primary features, including an incredibly detailed analysis of the decorative frieze. The specificity of the narrative points to its creators, painters Millet and Yewell, as authors (of at least this portion of the book), and confirms the assertion often made by the veterans that this was a work of exacting historical research and investigation. The frieze alone was the subject of a 1,000-word narrative within the larger publication, pointing to

[20] If the regiment had made use of promotional or recruitment materials prior to the 1879 pamphlet, those materials do not survive in the archive.

[21] "Membership in the Seventh Regiment, NGSNY. Published for the Information of the Young Men of New York and Vicinity, their Parents, Guardians and Employers" (New York: Privately Printed, 1879).

[22] *The Seventh Regiment Armory Illustrated* (New York: The Decorator and Furnisher Magazine, 1885).

its intricacy and the significance of specific references that merited close attention. (This too suggests it was a guide for veterans.) The essay referenced a number of collections from which the frieze's survey of historical weapons and devices was drawn. These included private collections and museums in Berlin, Russia, Copenhagen, Dresden and the British Museum.[23]

The veterans celebrated their new space for the same reasons it was disparaged by Brownell: it was utterly new and unconventional. Echoing other critics, the veterans lauded the design as appropriately militaristic and in a pointed contrast with contemporary practice, noted the lack of "fine furniture . . . frescoes . . . and finest satins." Such trappings were contrary to the Veterans' aims. They praised the work of their designers in understanding "the significance of decorative media, and the power in colors and lines to make an atmosphere in a room . . . that shall be redolent of the aims and purposes and meditative outlooks that belong, or should belong to the occupants."[24]

The Armory Board

Within three years of the completion of the Seventh's facility, the legislature sought to encourage other state militias and instituted an armory board to manage the design and construction of armories throughout New York State. The board was charged with providing "suitable and convenient" accommodations including "an armory, drill-room and place of deposit for the safe keeping of arms, equipments, accoutrements, uniforms, and other military property" for volunteers who met the prescribed requirements. The board then ensured the militia's continued success by funding heating, lighting and the maintenance of arms, uniforms, even storage of the volunteers' records.

[23] *The Veteran Room, Seventh Regiment Armory* (New York: Privately Printed, 1881).

[24] Ibid.

Having submitted a request through the chain of command, groups were then subject to a tiered process of review. In New York City, if the application for a new facility was approved, it was passed to the Commissioner of the Sinking Fund who was authorized to deny or recommend an appropriation. If approved, this amount would be inserted into the coming year's tax levy by the Comptroller and the Board of Estimate and Apportionment; alternately, bonds could be issued to finance the endeavor. The commission and erection of armories, the procurement of furnishings, and any future renovations and/or expansions were likewise to be carried out under the supervision of the board in accordance with contractual procedures governing other public buildings. As a body, it was responsible not just for building, maintenance, repair and expansion of armories built under its auspices, but for those that predated the board's founding as well.[25]

The procedures instituted for approval and funding of New York City armories were clearly based on the course of action attempted by the Seventh during the 1870s, and on accommodations it received from the city (such as gas heat and lighting), but important provisions were written into the armory board's charter ensuring that the Seventh would remain unmatched. First, the title to any property acquired through the board was held by the city. Though the Seventh did not own the land on which its building was located, in 1879 its officers had been allowed to use the lot and the then-incomplete building as collateral against a bond that would fund the completion of the structure. In these negotiations, the land lease was extended indefinitely as long as the Seventh remained a military organization.[26] Most significantly, the board stipulated that

[25] *Proceedings of the Armory Board, 1894-1911* (New York: The Armory Board, 1912).

[26] See Clark, *History* II, 269-272.

no money would be appropriated for decorating armories or facilities rented for volunteers. In distinguishing between "furnishing" and "decoration," the law made clear that furniture such as desks, chairs and lockers were necessary to the operations of the militia while stylish décor was not. Groups could petition for the utilization of funds other than for building and maintenance, though the necessity of the request would be subject to certification by an auditing board.[27] Thus as *truly* public buildings—publicly funded and publicly maintained—subsequent armories would *not* be outfitted in costly, high-style designs extraneous to the actual function of armories and the military proficiency of their inhabitants.

Of the seven other regiments and two batteries that existed in Manhattan in 1884, no other owned its facility. Two met in market armories—the Sixty-Ninth in fact, took over Tompkins Market Armory after it was vacated by the Seventh; the rest utilized structures that had been built by the city on lots that were also city-owned, and in some cases, shared.[28] For these groups then, the new procedures were not a dramatic change from past practice so much as an opportunity for an updated structure designed according to the latest standards. On the day the board was founded, four regiments submitted application for new headquarters. The requirements outlined were consistent among the majority and hewed closely to the specifications of the recently completed Seventh. The Eighth, Twelfth and Twenty-Second regiments all requested a drill room two hundred

[27] *Armory Board Proceedings,* 4.

[28] According to the report, there were seven other regiments and two batteries in existence at that time. Battery E shared quarters with the Twelfth Regiment; the Eleventh Regiment met (as the Seventh had much earlier) in the upper floors of a market. The other regiments met in rented spaces for which the city paid. Rents ranged from $2,750 per year for Battery K to $20,000 per year for the Twenty-second Regiment. Ibid., 5.

feet square; a board of officers room; ten company rooms; two band and drum corps rooms; one room each for adjutant, non-commissioned staff, quartermaster, armorer and janitor; a rifle range twenty by two hundred feet; a magazine room; wash rooms; bathrooms; "and other conveniences."[29] According to its report, Board members toured the city, surveying potential sites and existing armories, devoting as much time to the Seventh as to all other such facilities combined. Writing in 1912, the report explained "the Seventh's was the last word in armories in those days." After the survey, it was determined that an appropriation of $500,000 would cover the land, construction and furnishing for each regiment.[30]

During its first decade of existence, the armory board oversaw the construction of six armories in Manhattan, and after consolidation in 1898, nine more throughout the greater New York metropolitan area.[31] Designed by different architects on sites scattered around the metropolis, the first armories commissioned and overseen by the board were varied in detail and design but nevertheless evince a high degree of consistency as castellated, heavily fortified structures. The Twelfth Regiment Armory of 1886-7 was the first erected by the new armory board, followed closely by the Eighth (1888-9); Twenty-Second (1889-92); Seventy-First (1892-94); Ninth (1894-96); and the massive Squadron A Armory of 1894-5 (Figs. 4.1-4.3). Even those of the 1880s and 90s funded and managed by the separate city of Brooklyn reflect the adoption of the Seventh's layout and architectural design features, as evidenced by the Forty-seventh Regiment Armory of 1883-4; and the Fourteenth, of 91-95 (Figs. 4.4; 4.5).

[29] Ibid., 5-6.

[30] Ibid., 6.

[31] Todd, *America's Armories,* 189-192.

Two armories for Brooklyn's Twenty-third regiment are particularly instructive as points of comparison. As analyzed in Chapter Four, the Twenty-third's armory of 1872-3 was an important precursor to the Seventh. Leaders of the Twenty-third were successful in securing a $160,000 appropriation from the city to fund the structure, establishing a precedent for the Seventh's attempt a few years later. Though not stand-alone, the Brooklyn armory utilized a head-shed layout. At 130 by 180 feet, its column-free drill hall was the largest of this type yet constructed, while a monumental façade dominated its surrounding low-rise streetscape. The organization of the façade elements—prominent central tower flanked by lower bays terminating in subsidiary tower-like elements—was clearly a point of departure for the Seventh, whose primary façade is identically arranged, yet the Twenty-third was more elegant than imposing. Pointed-arch windows and a machicolated cornice (echoed on the façade by a lower band of decorative brickwork) incorporated medieval elements but were overpowered by the prominent mansard roof and oriole windows with scrolled surrounds punctuating the secondary towers. Lace-like ironwork at the roofline and tower of the Twenty-third had been mimicked in earlier proposals for the Seventh, but were dropped during the final design revisions as that structure took on its definitive, imposing form. When the Twenty-third successfully lobbied for a larger, stand-alone armory just twenty years later, the resulting structure was wholly castle-like (Fig. 4.6). Its main entry was flanked by two circular towers, surmounted by a parapet and turrets, and secured via a hydraulic-operated steel portcullis. The composition was dominated by a corner tower 136 feet tall.

Beyond the city, the Seventh's impact was felt—again, even before the structure was complete. The Newburgh and Watertown armories—both of 1879 and both designed

by architect John A. Wood—are, according to Todd, "small-scale replicas" of Clinton's design for the Seventh (Figs. 4.7; 4.8).[32] Indeed, a visual survey of armories constructed upstate before the Seventh (like those in Manhattan and Brooklyn) and those after evince the widespread adoption of the castellated aesthetic. This tendency was further solidified with the appointment of a single architect to oversee state projects. Isaac G. Perry designed nearly thirty armories along with a number of hospitals, asylums and in fact all other buildings funded by the state including the capital in Albany. Perry's armories were necessarily varied in scale according to the size of the town and the regiment it supported, but together the structures evince a consistently applied formula of rusticated stone and brick; crenellated parapets; machicolated cornices, and even in the most diminutively scaled, a prominent tower.[33]

It is beyond the scope and intent of the present study to provide an exhaustive analysis of Gilded Age armories. Nancy Todd's illustrated survey of New York armories is an invaluable resource in providing a visual and chronological catalogue of the building type throughout a state that was at the forefront of armory building. However, the response to labor-capital tensions was not limited to New York and indeed three of largest, most imposing armories in United States were built elsewhere. A substantial castellated armory for Boston's elite First Corps of Cadets was completed in 1897 (Fig. 4.9). It was designed by architect and former member, William Gibbons Preston, was

[32] According to Todd, "no evidence has surfaced to prove that Wood actually consulted with Clinton, but the resemblance between Wood's armories and the Seventh's armory is uncanny enough to suspect that wood must have been privy to Clinton's plans or drawings." Again, that images of the Seventh circulated is not mentioned. Todd, *New York's Historic Armories,* 79.

[33] Ibid., 149.

funded entirely by the corps and built on land owned by the Veteran Association.[34] Burnham & Root designed an exceptionally imposing armory for Chicago's First Regiment. Conceived in the wake of the 1884 Haymarket Affair, the structure was completed in 1890 (Fig. 4.10). This example was unique in its impregnability and suggests that as a nexus of rail lines (historically a site of labor/capital violence), it was important for the Chicago facility to be fortified to an unprecedented degree. Philadelphia built not one but two armories during this period. The Philadelphia First Troop's Furness-designed structure was demolished and replaced by a new facility in 1901. This extant example reflects the increasing preference through the 1890s for entirely rusticated fa**ç**ades—a treatment seen earlier at New York's Seventy-First and Ninth Regiment Armories of the 1890s. Within a year of the Seventh's completion, Philadelphia's First Regiment erected a similarly castellated armory. A comparison of the architect's published drawings and photographs of the completed facility make clear that this building, too, went through a process of refinement and simplification similar to the Seventh's, while plans of the First's armory illustrate the degree to which the Seventh was emulated. Though room locations do not correspond exactly, the first floor of the Philadelphia head-house includes the same room functions, including a veteran room, reception room and library; the second floor contains ten company rooms, lavatories, and spaces for the band and drum corps (Fig. 4.11).

[34] The Boston Corps also published a book in 1890, no doubt to correspond to the start of its fundraising campaign. The Seventh published its history in 1890 as well, but this was nearly a decade after the armory had been complete. For the Boston Corps, the publication no doubt performed the same promotional function as the Seventh's views and descriptions of its Armory project had earlier. *First Corps of Cadets Massachusetts Volunteer Militia* (Boston: Privately Printed, 1890).

The Design Team

Of all the figures responsible for the architecture and interiors investigated here, only the architect designed another armory, though his legacy was undeniably felt in dozens of others based on the example of the Seventh. Clinton parlayed his experience into a commission for the Seventy-fist Regiment Armory, but his future efforts would primarily be occupied with a new building type for the twentieth century, the skyscraper.[35] Similarly, the firms whose work most significantly shaped the building's interiors were either soon disbanded or moved in new directions stylistically. Associated Artists split up in 1883 and Candace Wheeler assumed the firm's name for her textile company. For the remainder of his career Louis Comfort Tiffany focused almost exclusively on work in colored glass. Christian Herter retired after the W.H. Vanderbilt commission and died shortly thereafter. Other firms who played less visible roles as subcontractors at the armory but who were, nevertheless, major figures in New York furniture-making were similarly soon disbanded. Alexander Roux died the same year Auguste Pottier retired from practice, in 1886; Leon Marcotte died the following year. Shortly thereafter, nearly all the furniture-making firms would work as sub-contractors under the supervision of architects.

In fact, only White continued on the same path as a designer of opulent interior spaces, but by the mid-1880s, he and his firm had shifted from the eclecticism of the

[35] Clinton joined forces with William Hamilton Russell (1856-1907) in the early 1890s. According to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), "Clinton & Russell was the architectural firm of choice for many of the early skyscrapers constructed in the downtown financial district . . . in the 1890s and the first decades of the twentieth century." *Beaver Building Designation Report*, 2.

Aesthetic Movement to an "antiquarian and academic" classicism.[36] McKim Mead & White's Villard Houses of 1885 signaled an embrace of order and civic grandeur that would be hallmarks of his firm's legacy. This was certainly exemplified by McKim's involvement with the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893, but even in Newport the picturesque massing and flowing interior spatiality of the 1870s subsequently gave way to a formalized, ordered language of symmetry and axiality.

In a sense, White's later career was a continuation of his earlier working methods in which a set vocabulary was applied with variety and inventiveness, though starting in the mid-1880s, that vocabulary was one of classicism rather than highly eclectic Aestheticism. The veteran room was praised—by critics and by the Seventh's veterans—for expressively encapsulating the unique identity of the veterans in a three-dimensional space. White continued to perform this service for other elite patrons such as the Metropolitan Club, the Century Association and the Players Club.[37] White was known as an inveterate clubman. His association with these elite institutions—as a member and as the designer of their headquarters and spaces—further underscores the connection between a consistently employed stylistic vocabulary (in this case, classicism) and a shared sense of identity (elite) communicated by that language. McKim, Mead & White designed one skyscraper for the burgeoning metropolis, but are remembered today for grand civic and cultural institutions as well as the master plans that transformed the urban environment.[38]

---

[36] Vincent Scully, *The Shingle Style,* 35.

[37] White, *McKim, Mead & White: The Masterworks;* Wilson, *McKim, Mead & White, Architects.*

[38] Broderick, *Triumverate,* 501.

The Seventh was not untouched by the professionalization and increasing specialization that transformed business practice and civic life in the early twentieth century. From the late 1700s the laws that governed the state's militias remained largely unchanged. Amidst military fervor in the wake of the 1898 Spanish-American War, Secretary of War, Elihu Root instituted sweeping changes including effectively repealing previously legislation with the passage of a new Militia Act in 1903.[39] At that time, state militias—now designated the National Guard—were given federal status and required to conform to U.S. Army regulations. The new statutes retained a few key features of the old state militia system, including the expectation that its members would be the first line of response in case of invasion or insurrection, and that they would remain a reserve force, not full-time soldiers. The changes were significant, however. Rather than the previous muster commitment of thirty days maximum, the president was now authorized to call the guard for a period of up to nine months. A further amendment in 1908 removed even this limit, and extended the field of service from the United States to foreign shores as well. In return for increased demands on the guard, Congress raised its funding. Much like the initial Militia Act of 1792, Congressional appropriations for the state's militias had been substantially unchanged through the nineteenth century. In 1808, each state was allotted $200,000 annually to equip its militias; by the late 1880s, this amount had only increased to $400,000. In 1903, funding was increased with a one-time grant of $2 million, but in 1908, that amount was substantially increased to $4 million annually.[40]

[39] The 1903 legislation was also known as the Dick Act, named for Congressman Charles Dick, a longtime officer in the Ohio militia, chairman of the House Militia Affairs Committee. See Reinders, "Militia and Public Order," 101.

[40] Ibid., 95.

For America's volunteer militias, the most significant aspect of the Root reforms was their absorption into the regular army as a reserve force. The National Guard was still intended to be a reserve unit, but the expectation that its members would remain an immediate-response force coupled with the prospect (after the 1908 amendment) of extended duty overseas made it onerous, if not impossible, for volunteers to be citizens and soldiers simultaneously to the extent that they had been in the past.[41] Further, the term "volunteers" no longer truly applied. In return for their services, militias had received equipment and small subsidies from federal and state governments, but these groups were primarily self-funded and attached great significance to their volunteer status. It not only connected them to a long tradition of American militia heroes, but importantly, to larger ideas of autonomy, self-sufficiency and engaged citizenship that were to begin with the very legitimizations of the militia system. Paying the militia for training—something it had long done of its own fruition, under its own management and regulation, and without financial recompense—stripped service of one of its defining characteristics. With the Dick Act of 1903, the title was nationalized along with the service of the volunteers themselves. The legislation of 1903 and 1908 provided for a modernized force appropriate to the United States's new role as an imperial power, and proved a definitive

[41] For example, in 1861, the Seventh was famously the first unit to respond to President Lincoln's call for volunteers. But in their haste to depart, many officers and members left behind unresolved transactions and commercial ventures floundered in their absence. This initial tour was only for thirty days, and while the Seventh would muster into U.S. service twice again during the Civil War, the economic losses sustained during the initial term figured prominently in the regiment's decision not to immediately re-enlist as an entire unit. Instead, the Seventh returned to New York so that members could salvage their businesses and provide assistance to the war effort via fundraising and other local initiatives. The month-long, out-of-town muster was an exceptional circumstance reflective of the extraordinary nature of that conflict, though. With rare exception, the Seventh, like other militias, served in its home city, and was typically engaged for one or two days at most.

step towards the guard's development into a force of professional soldiers. The state militias were incorporated into an expansive military bureaucracy that emphasized consistency and standardization throughout its membership that was entirely contrary to the club-like individuality prized by the most prominent and long-lived volunteer groups like the Seventh Regiment.

The Seventh first adopted the name "National Guard" in 1824 and had exclusive claim to it until 1862, when a new federal militia law appropriated the name for all volunteers.[42] The men's finely tailored Brooks Brothers uniforms, always a source of pride, would now be traded for those of standard issue, and a host of other, less visible details previously decided by the regiment were now under the purview of a much more extensive chain of command. Indeed, most of the outward features that distinguished one regiment from another—from the uniforms and insignia they wore to the armories in which they drilled and socialized—were markers of distinction, chosen as communicative representations of a particular identity constructed and shared by members of that specific group. The new regulations did away with these differences so that just as militias traded sartorial individuality for corporate homogeneity, they were similarly compelled to abandon the history and culture of their cherished institutions for those of the U.S. Army.

As Theda Skocpol has illustrated, popular conceptions of civic responsibility have shifted dramatically since the nineteenth century and the role of the volunteer militia has been supplanted by a range of specialized, professional forces.[43] These changes

---

[42] According to the *Times*, the state "filched" the Seventh's name and identity. "The Seventh Regiment. A Brief History of Its Services" *The New York Times,* October 5, 1874.

[43] Theda Skopcol, *Diminished Democracy: from Membership to Management in American Civic Life* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 2003).

diminished the import of volunteer citizen-soldiers, and likewise had an impact on the facilities that housed them. Armories that survived into the twentieth century increasingly served a social function as clubhouses for members and as multipurpose spaces for the community. Those constructed during the Progressive Era were designed partially for this use from the outset—an ironic turn, given the armory's original conception as a fortified and imposing holdout. Alison K. Hoagland's study, though focused on military architecture in Wyoming, characterizes the evolution of American forces during the late nineteenth century as a process of consolidation, expansion, reorganization and professionalization.[44] Though the function and siting of Western forts and barracks differed from urban armories, the Army's drive to erect better, more permanent quarters paralleled that of the volunteers earlier. According to Hoagland, Root's efforts "resulted in the creation of the New Army, a modernized force capable of international responsibilities in the twentieth century." For the Army, standardized architecture was part of a larger "appreciation for professionalization" that imparted a "monolithic image to the army and a united military presence to the nation."[45] Root expanded West Point and established the Army War College alongside a national infrastructure for management of the force. His drive to modernize the federal Army thus parallels the scientific advancement in architecture and other fields.[46]

---

[44] Alison K. Hoagland, ""The Invariable Model:" Standardization and Military Architecture in Wyoming, 1860-1900" *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57, no. 3 (September 1998): 298.

[45] Ibid., 312-313.

[46] Michael Allsep, "Bridge to Reform: Elihu Root, New York Elites and Army Reform, 1899-1904" (PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, forthcoming). Deusner also made parallels between standardization and artistic practice—again characterized as "a broader

This evolution of military professionalization only intensified in the lead-up to World War I and increasingly the distance between men who engaged in military activities alongside their primary business pursuits and those for whom militarism was in and of itself an occupation widened. Though the Seventh served during both World Wars, its focus was increasingly social, rather than military in nature. The regiment had historically minimized this aspect of membership, but by the 1940s, the armory was referred to prospective members as "your club in town."[47] The Seventh's Armory had been conceived as a fortified stronghold—an impregnable defense against anarchic mobs. That it was openly acknowledged as a social club in the mid-twentieth century speaks to further societal shifts in the intervening decades. According to Robert Fogelson, once volunteers were relieved of their duty to police the city, their relationship to the working class changed. Indeed, the working class itself professionalized in a sense, unionizing and functioning within the capitalist system, rather than trying to upend it. The most threatening menace now came from abroad, focusing the efforts of the U.S. military beyond our shores, rather than within them.[48]

If history is indeed written by the victors, so, too, architectural history is largely understood in terms of the buildings that survive. Many significant precedents that informed the Seventh's architectural and interior design are not extant. The Philadelphia First Troop Armory was soon rebuilt; Grand Central Depot was transformed into Grand Central Station early in the twentieth century; and Brooklyn's Twenty-Third Regiment

---

trend towards standardization in American industry during the 1880s and 1890s" with the example of rail lines and the railroad cars themselves. Deusner, *A Network of Associations,* 310.

[47] Untitled promotional brochure, box 36, folder 2, NYHS.

[48] Fogelson, *America's Armories,* 213-214.

Armory was extensively remodeled in 1911. The changing nature of guard duty, which lessened the volunteer's centrality to urban life in the twentieth century, meant that buildings were not maintained and many have been demolished.[49] Their loss renders the Seventh's facility all the more singular in that the buildings that bear resemblance to it and would thus form a kind of architectural family resemblance have disappeared. In some cases, those that survive have been repurposed as homeless shelters—a great irony given their original intent as holdouts from the poor and oppressed.

In the late 1870s, the Upper East Side was still in the process of developing and I believe that the Seventh's presence there both sped up and facilitated the area's transformation into an elite enclave. Interestingly, the factor that has most greatly ensured this armory's preservation is that the neighborhood has not changed dramatically. In the 1970s and 80s—New York's dark decades of financial insolvency, violent crime and a drug epidemic—the armory's cavernous drill hall served as a homeless shelter.[50] Still, it has resisted the fate of many other armories, which have fallen to the wrecking ball. Today, the armory, re-branded as The Armory on Park, is home to a variety of arts-related programming. The structure is being rehabilitated, and its "period rooms" are undergoing an extensive renovation and restoration.[51]

* * *

[49] The armories of Brooklyn survive at a much greater rate than those of Manhattan. Of fourteen armories built in Kings County from the 1830s to the mid-twentieth century, five have been demolished. Meanwhile, eighteen arsenals or armories were built in Manhattan during the same span, and only seven survive. See Todd, *New York's Historic Armories,* 294-5, 297-299.

[50] Nina Bernstein, "No More Shelter from the Storm. Renovation will Evict Homeless Women from Armory" *The New York Times,* April 11, 2001.

[51] "Old Battle Ax Gets a Facelift," *The New York Times,* October 11, 2012.

This armory's most significant legacy is as a monument to a particular moment in the city's development. In its conception, funding**,** design and construction, the Seventh Regiment Armory was very much a response to unprecedented immigration, labor-capital disputes and the often violent ethnic tension that characterized New York's Gilded Age. As an institution, the Seventh both responded to and actively shaped the debates over these issues just as the initiative to erect a new headquarters acted as a referendum on them, allowing even non-member elites a specific and direct mode of participation. The building was an imposing holdout—a fortified stronghold in this burgeoning elite enclave—and served the very pragmatic function of facilitating military proficiency for the Seventh at a moment when the regiment's protection was clearly cherished by its allies and supporters.

Yet, the armory also communicated the Seventh's status as political, social and economic elites, not only in the legislative initiatives to secure a site, or the enormous expenditures required to erect the structure, but perhaps even more so, in the high-style interiors contained therein. Indeed, these performative spaces were central to elite self-fashioning during this period. As this study has shown, Aesthetic interiors like the Seventh's were more than a stylistic novelty. As a corrective to the disordered excesses of a previous generation, they operated alongside contemporaneous efforts at fiscal and political "reform." More significantly, they concretized a newly unified elite identity. Through these spaces—and indeed, through the overall project itself—the Seventh skillfully negotiated its civic "duty" alongside an elite masculine identity that was believed to be under imminent threat.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Sources:

Seventh Regiment Records, MS 556, The New-York Historical Society.

Seventh Regiment Armory Collection, Park Avenue Armory, New York.

Primary Sources:

"Address at the Meeting of the Committee of Seventy at Cooper Institute, New York, November 3, 1871." Reprinted in Joseph Hodges Choate, ed., *American Addresses.* New York: The Century Co., 1911.

"A Debt to the National Guard," *New York Journal of Commerce*, 30 July 1877.

"A Model Theatre," *The Art Journal for 1880,* 139-141.

"The Armories Again. Further Exposition of the Ring Frauds." *The New York Times.* 2 August 1871.

Artistic Houses: Being a Series of Interior Views of a Number of the Most Beautiful and Celebrated Homes in the United States, with a Description of the Art Treasures Contained Therein. New York: Printed for Subscribers by D. Appleton & Co., 1883.

Beecher, Catherine E. *A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School.* Boston: T.H. Webb, 1842.

Brownell, William C. "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory." *Scribner's Monthly* 22, no. 3 (July 1881): 370-80.

Brace, Charles Loring. *Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them.* New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, 1879.

"The Cabinet-Makers." *The New York Times.* 26 May 1872.

"Cabinet-Makers and Piano Men. A Strike for the Reduction of the Hours of Labor—the Contract System." *The New York Times.* 6 June 1880.

"The Cabinet-Makers in Council—Another Strike Impending," *The New York Times.* 15 May 1872.

"Cabinet-Makers Strike." *The New York Times.* 31 October 1879.

"The Cabinet-Makers, Wood-Carvers and Upholsterers." *The New York Times.* 31 May 1872.

Catalogue of the Loan Art Exhibition, Consisting of Choice Examples of the Modern Foreign and American Schools of Paintings, Rare Etchings, Engravings and other Works of Art at the Seventh Regiment New Armory Fair. New York: Privately Printed, 1879.

"Closing Scenes of the Strike." *The New York Times.* 30 March 1880.

Clark, Colonel Emmons. *History of the Seventh Regiment of New York, 1806-1889.* 2 vols. New York: Privately Printed, 1890.

Clinton & Russell, Holton & George. New York: Architectural Catalog Company, 1911.

"Close of the Great Fair." *The New York Times.* 7 December 1879.

"The Committee of Seventy. Important Meeting Sunday—Committees on Law and Legislation." *The New York Times.* 25 September 1871.

Cook, Clarence. *House Beautiful: Essays on Beds and Tables, Stools and Candlesticks.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881.

"Death of a Noted Jurist. Edwards Pierrepont Career Brought to a Close." *New York Times.* 7 March 1892.

"Disposing of the Prizes." *The New York Times.* 9 December 1879.

Dix, Morgan, ed. *Memoirs of John Adams Dix.* 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883.

"Domestic Art Gossip," *The Crayon* (June) 1861.

Downing, Andrew Jackson. *The Architecture of Country Houses; Including Designs for Cottages, Farmhouses and Villas.* New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1852.

Dare, Shirley. "Scenes from the Armory." *The Art Amateur* 2, no. 1 (December 1879): 1-3.

Duyckinck, Evert Augustus and George Long Duyckinck. *Cyclopedia of American Literature: Embracing Personal and Critical Notices of Authors, and Selections from their Writings. From the Earliest Period to the Present Day; with Portraits, Autographs, and Other Illustrations.* vol. 2. New York: C. Scribner, 1856.

Eidlitz, Leopold. *The Nature and Function of Art, More Especially of Architecture.* London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington 1881.

Eastlake, Charles Locke. *Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, Upholstery and Other Details.*7th ed. Boston: The Riverside Press, 1883.

"The Edward C. Moore Collection," *The Collector* 3, no. 13 (May 1, 1892): 199-201.

"Flames in West Street. George C. Flint & Company's Furniture Storehouse Burned." *The New York Times.* 25 April 1882.

Fairfield, Francis Gerry. *The Clubs of New York.* New York: H.L. Hinton, 1873.

Farb, Morris B. "America's Crack Regiments: 'Ours,' the Twenty-third of Brooklyn." *The American Magazine* 9, no. 1 (November 1888): 75-93.

First Corps of Cadets Massachusetts Volunteer Militia. Boston: Privately Printed, 1890.

"Funeral of Colonel Shumway," *The New York Times.* 9 May 1884.

Furness, Horace Howard. *F.R.* [Fairman Rogers]. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Privately Printed, 1903.

The Gardener's Chronicle: A Weekly Illustrated Journal of Horticulture and Allied Subjects 26 (September 16, 1899): 217-236.

"General Jacob Duryee," *The New York Times.* 30 May 1918.

"Gigantic Frauds of the Ring Exposed." *The New York Times Special Supplement. 29* July 1871.

Groat, George Gorham. "The Eight Hour and Prevailing Rate Movement in New York State." *Political Science Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (September 1906): 1-15.

de Groff, Isaac. *The Heart of the American Rhine.* Tarrytown, New York: Tarrytown Press-Record, 1902.

Hall, Henry, ed. *America's Successful Men of Affairs: An Encyclopedia of Contemporaneous Biography.* New York: The New York Tribune Company, 1895.

Harrison, Mrs. Burton [Constance Cary]. "Some Work of the 'Associated Artists'" *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 69 (August 1884): 343-51.

Hewitt, Conrad. "The Edward C. Moore Collection." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 2, no. 6 (June 1907): 106-106.

"History of the New Armory." *The Knapsack.* Monday, November 17, 1789.

Humphries, Mary Gay. "Novelties in Interior Decoration. The Union League Club House and the Veterans' Room of the Seventh Regiment Armory," *The Art Amateur* 4, no. 5 (April 1881): 102-3.

"Jackson S. Schultz Dead. A Prominent New Yorker Passes Away." *The New York Times.* 2 March 1891.

Kerr, Robert. *The Gentleman's House; or How to Plan English Residences from the Parsonage to the Palace.* 2d rev. ed. London: John Murray, 1865.

The Knapsack [Record of the Seventh Regiment New Armory Fair]. New York: Privately Printed, November 1879.

"The Labor Issue. Efforts Being Made for a General Combination of the Strikers." *The New York Times.* 9 June 1882.

"Lecture." *The American Art Review* 1, no. 12 (October 1880): 550.

"Local Miscellany. A Masterful Set of Workmen." *New York Daily-Tribune.* 5 June 1880.

"Looking at the New Armory." *The New York Times.* 1 October 1880.

"The Matter of a Parade Ground," *The New York Times.* 9 May 1863.

Membership in the Seventh Regiment, NGSNY. Published for the Information of the Young Men of New York and Vicinity, Their Parents, Guardians and Employers. New York: Privately Printed, 1879.

"Military Gossip." *The New York Times.* 26 January 1873.

"The Mob in New York." *The New York Times.* 14 July 1863.

Metropolitan Fair in Aid of the United States Sanitary Commission. New York: Charles O. Jones Printers, 1864.

Moran, John. "New York Studios III." *The Art Journal for 1880* 6 (January 1880): 1-4.

Nicolay, John G. and John Hay. *Abraham Lincoln, a History.* New York: The Century Company, 1889.

Oakey, A.F. "A Trial Balance of Decoration." *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 64, no. 383 (April 1882): 734-40.

"Opening the Great Fair. The Seventh's New Armory Crowded." *The New York Times.* 18 November 1879.

Pater, Walter. *Studies in the History of the Renaissance.* London: Macmillan and Co., 1873.

"The Philadelphia City Troop." *The New York Times.* 17 November 1874.

"The Philadelphia City Troop." *Philadelphia Inquirer*. 17 November 1874.

Poe, Edgar Allen. "The Literati of New York." *Godey's Magazine.* August 1846.

"Presentation to Colonel Clark." *The New York Times.* 28 December 1873.

Proceedings of the Armory Board, 1894-1911. New York: The Armory Board, 1912.

"Pro Patria et Gloria." *New York Herald.* 23 June 1874.

A Record of the Metropolitan Fair: In Aid of the U.S. Sanitary Commission. New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1867.

"Reservoir Square. Meeting of Citizens Opposed to the Erection of an Armory," *The New York Times.* 17 February 1873.

"Reservoir Square Surrendered." *The New York Times.* 13 April 1873.

Riis, Jacob A. *How the Other Half Lives: Studies among the Tenements of New York.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889.

"The Riot Subsiding. A Last Desperate Struggle." *The New York Times.* 17 July 1863.

Ruskin, John. *The Stones of Venice. Volume the First. The Foundations* (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1851).

_____. *Volume the Second. The Sea-stories.* (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1853).

_____. *Volume the First. The Fall* (London: Smith Elder & Co., 1853).

"Sanford Robinson Gifford." *American Art Review* 1, no. 12 (October 1880): 548-552.

"The Seventh Armory. How the Boys Have Worked to Get It." *New York Evening Post.* 8 August 1877.

"The Seventh in its Glory." *The New York Times.* 16 December 1880.

"The Seventh Regiment." *New York Herald.* 26 May 1861.

"The Seventh Regiment. A Brief History of Its Services" *The New York Times.* 5 October 1874.

"The Seventh Regiment Armory." *The Decorator and Furnisher* 6, no. 2 (May 1885): 42-46.

"The Seventh Regiment Armory." *New York Herald.* 25 January 1876.

"The Seventh Regiment Armory. Arrangements for the Grand Fair- the Opening to be on Monday." *The New York Times.* 14 November 1879.

"The Seventh Regiment Armory Fund. Official Statement of the Amounts Thus Far Subscribed." *The New York Times.* 29 February 1876.

The Seventh Regiment Armory Illustrated. New York: The Decorator and Furnisher Magazine, 1885.

"The Seventh Regiment Fair." *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper Special Supplement*. 6 December 1879.

"The Seventh Regiment Fair. A Reception Last Evening by the Art Committee." *The New York Times*. 5 December 1879.

"The Seventh Regiment—Its Proposed New Armory." *The New York Times.* 23 January 1876.

"The Seventh's New Armory." *The New York Times.* 15 September 1877.

Shaxby, W.J. *An Eight-hour Day: The Case against Trade-Union and Legislative Interference.* London: The Liberty Review Publishers, 1898.

"Sightly Architecture." *The Knapsack.*, Monday, November 17, 1879.

Smith, Matthew Hale. *Sunshine and Shadow in New York.* Hartford, Connecticut: J.B. Burr and Co., 1871.

"State Legislature; Senate; Assembly." *The New York Times.* 10 February 1865.

Storrs, R.S., Jr., ed. *Drum Beat.* Brooklyn: Published by the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair for the Benefit of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, 1864.

Strahan, Edward. "Art at the Seventh Regiment Fair." *Art Amateur* 2, no. 1 (December 1879): 4-5.

"Strikes Among Artisans." *The New York Times.* 24 February 1880.

"The Strike Trouble. Violent Demonstrations by the Eight Hour Men." *The New York Times*. 16 June 1872.

"Successful Labor Agitation. Weber's Piano-Makers to go to Work Today—Wages Advanced and Hours Reduced in Other Trades." *New-York Daily Tribune.* 1 April 1880.

Swinton, William. *History of the New York Seventh Regiment during the War of the Rebellion.* New York: C.T. Dillingham, 1886.

Taylor, Asher and John Mason. *Recollections of the Early Days of the National Guard.* New York: J.M. Bradstreet & Son, 1868.

"Tiffany's among the Weeds." *The Art Journal* 5 (June 1879): 161.

The Veteran Controversy. New York: Privately Printed, 1884.

The Veteran Room, Seventh Regiment Armory. New York: Privately Printed, 1881.

To the Loyal Women of America. New York: Sanitary Commission, 1861.

"Veterans Housed Sumptuously. Some Account of an Elegant Room in the Seventh's New Armory." *The New York Times.* 23 April 1881.

Falke, Jacob von. *Art in the House: Historical, Critical, and Aesthetic Studies on the Decoration and Furnishing of the Dwelling.* Boston: L. Prang & Co., 1879.

Wharton, Edith and Ogden Codman, Jr. *The Decoration of Houses.* Boston: B.T. Batsford, 1898.

Wheeler, Candace. *Corticelli Home Needlework: A Manual of Art Needlework, Embroidery and Crochet.* Florence, Massachusetts: Nonotuck Silk Co., 1899.

_____. "Decoration of Walls," *The Decorator and Furnisher* 27, no. 3 (December 1895): 73-76.

_____. *How to Make Rugs.* New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1908.

_____. "Interior Decoration as a Profession for Women." *The Decorator and Furnisher* 26, no. 3 (June 1895): 87-89.

_____. *Principles of Home Decoration with Practical Examples.* New York: Doubleday Page & Co. 1903.

Whitman, Walt. "How Manhattan Drum-taps Led." *Leaves of Grass*, "Deathbed" ed. 2nd Annex. Philadelphia: David McKay, 1891-92.

De Wolfe, Elsie. *Stray Leaves from My Book of Life: A Little Autobiography and Some Fleeting Thoughts by a Famous Woman of the American Stage.* New York: Privately Printed, 1901.

_____. *Elsie de Wolfe's Recipes for Successful Dining.* New York: D. Appleton and the Century Company, 1934.

_____. *The House in Good Taste.* New York: The Century Co., 1913.

Secondary Sources:

Abercrombie, Stanley and Sherrill Whiton. *Interior Design & Decoration* 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson, 2006.

Allen, Thomas. "Clockwork Nation: Modern Time, Moral Perfectionism and American Identity in Catherin Beecher and Henry Thoreau." *Journal of American Studies* 39, no. 1 (April 2005): 65-86.

Allsep, Michael. "Bridge to Reform: Elihu Root, New York Elites and Army Reform, 1899-1904." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, forthcoming.

Anderson, Christy. "Masculine and Unaffected: Inigo Jones and the Classical Ideal." *Art Journal* 56, no. 2. How Men Look: On the Masculine Ideal and the Body Beautiful (Summer 1997): 48-54.

Anderson, Eric. "Beyond Historicism: Jacob von Falke and the Reform of the Viennese Interior." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 2009.

Bacon, Margaret Hope. *Abby Hopper Gibbons: Prison Reformer and Social Activist.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

Baker, Paul R. *Richard Morris Hunt.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980.

____. *Stanny: The Gilded Life of Stanford White.* New York and London: Free Press, 1989.

Bannister, Turpin C. "Bogardus Revisited. Part I: The Iron Fronts." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 15, no. 4 (December 1956): 12-22.

Barrows, Chester Leonard. *William M. Evarts: Lawyer, Diplomat, Statesman.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Beckert, Sven. *The Moneyed Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Benjamin, Roger. *Orientalist Aesthetics: Art, Colonialism, and French North Africa, 1880-1930.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Benjamin, Walter. "Louis Philippe, or the Interior." *The Arcades Project.* trans., Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1999.

Berger, Molly. *Hotel Dreams: Luxury Technology and Ambition in America, 1829-1929.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

_____. "The Rich Man's City: Hotels and Mansions of Gilded Age New York." *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 25, The American Hotel (2005): 46-71.

Bernstein, Iver. *The New York City Draft Riots: Their Significance for American Society and Politics in the Age of the Civil War.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Bernstein, Nina. "No More Shelter from the Storm. Renovation Will Evict Homeless Women from Armory." *The New York Times.* 11 April 2001.

Blanchard, Mary Warner. "Anglo-American Aesthetes and Native Indian Corn: Candace Wheeler and the Revision of American Nationalism." *Journal of American Studies* 27, no. 3 (December 1993): 377-97.

_____. *Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900.* Exh. Rev. *American Quarterly* 54, no. 4 (December 2002): 661.

_____. "Embroidery, Enterprise and the Modernist Vision in Gilded Age America." Exh. Rev. *Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).

_____. *Oscar Wilde's America: Counterculture in the Gilded Age.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Boehm, Mary Dutton. *Herter Brothers and the William H. Vanderbilt House.* M.A. thesis. Cooper-Hewitt Museum and Parsons School of Design, 1991.

Bordes, Marilyn Johnson. "Christian Herter and the Cult of Japan." *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 34, no. 2 Aspects of the Arts and Crafts Movement in America (1975): 20-27.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste.* London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Broderick, Mosette G. *Triumverate. McKim Mead & White: Art, Architecture, Scandal and Class in America's Gilded Age.* New York: Random House, Inc., 2010.

Brown, Christopher. *Still Standing: A Century of Urban Train Station Design.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Brummer, Sidney David. *Political History of New York State during the Period of the Civil War.* New York: AMS Press, 1967.

Burke, Doreen Bolger, Jonathan Freedman, Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen, David A. Hanks, Marilynn Johnson, James D. Kornwolf, Catherine Lynn, Roger B. Stein, Jennifer Toher, and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, with the assistance of Carrie Rebora. *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement,* ed. Polly Horbar, John P. O'Neill, and Amy Cone, with the assistance of Cynthia Clark, Sue Potter, and Mary-Alice Rogers. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986.

Burke, Doreen Bolger. "Louis Comfort Tiffany and his Early Training at Eagleswood, 1862-1865." *American Art* 19, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 29-39.

Burlingham, Michael John. *The Last Tiffany: A Biography of Dorothy Tiffany Burlingham.* New York: Atheneum, 1989.

Burns, Sarah. *Inventing the Modern Artist: Art and Culture in Gilded Age America.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

____. "Party Animals: Thomas Nast, William Holbrook Beard, and the Bears of Wall Street." *American Art Journal* 30 no. 1/2 (1999): 8-35.

Burstyn, Joan N. "Catharine Beecher and the Education of American Women." *The New England Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (September 1974): 386-403.

Cathrens, Michael C. *Great Houses of New York, 1880-1930.* New York: Acanthus Press, 2005.

Cliff, Nigel. *The Shakespeare Riots: Revenge, Drama and Death in Nineteenth-Century America.* New York: Random House, 2007.

Constant, Caroline. "E.1027: The Nonheroic Modernism of Eileen Gray." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 3 (September 1994): 265-279.

Cook, Adrian. *Armies of the Streets: The New York City Draft Riots of 1863.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1974.

Craven, Wayne. *Gilded Mansions: Grand Architecture and High Society.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2009.

_____. "Samuel Colman (1832-1920): Rediscovered Painter of Far-Away Places." *American Art Journal* 8, no. 1 (May 1976): 16-37.

____. *Stanford White: Decorator in Opulence and Dealer in Antiquities.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Cromley, Elizabeth Collins. *Alone Together: A History of New York's Early Apartments.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Cunliffe, Marcus. *Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865.* New York: Free Press, 1973.

Davidson, Cathy N. "No More Separate Spheres!" *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (September 1998): 443-463.

Deusner, Melody Barnett. "A Network of Associations: Aesthetic Panting and its Patrons, 1870-1914." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Delaware, 2010.

Draper, Dorothy. *Decorating is Fun! How to be Your Own Decorator.* New York: Art & Decoration Book Society, 1939.

_____. *Entertaining is Fun! How to Be a Popular Hostess.* New York: Doubleday Duran & Co., 1941.

Duncan, Alastair. *The Masterworks of Louis Comfort Tiffany.* Exh. cat. New York: Abradale Press, 1993.

Duncan, Russell, ed. *Blue-Eyed Child of Fortune: The Civil War Letters of Robert Gould Shaw.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.

Dunlap, David W. "Another Ghost from Ground Zero's Past Fades Away." *The New York Times.* 26 October 2008.

"Edwards Pierrepont Biographical Sketch." Edwards Pierrepont Papers. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University.

Emery, Caitlin M. "Colonial Lineage and Cultural Fusion: Family Identity and Progressive Design in the Kingscote Dining Room." M.A. thesis. University of Delaware, 2009.

Esterlis, Victoria. "The Seventh Regiment Armory: A Social History of a New York Landmark." M.A. thesis. Bard Graduate Center, 2008.

Evans, Robin. "Figures, Doors, Passages." *Architectural Design* 4 (1978): 267-278.

Ferree, Myra Marx. "Beyond Separate Spheres: Feminism and Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52, no. 4 (November 1990): 866-884.

Fine, Sidney. "The Eight-Hour Day Movement in the United States, 1888-1891." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 40, no. 3 (December 1953): 441-462.

Fogelson, Robert M. *America's Armories: Architecture, Society and Public Order.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Frank, Isabelle, ed. *The Theory of Decorative Art: An Anthology of European and American Writings, 1750-1940.* New Haven, Connecticut: Published for the Bard Graduate Center Studies in the Decorative Arts, and New York: Yale University Press, 2000.

Gerson, Noel B. *Statue in Search of a Pedestal: A Biography of the Marquis de Lafayette.* New York: Dodd & Mead, 1976.

Glassberg, David. *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Gordon, Michael A. *The Orange Riots: Irish Political Violence in New York City.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Gray, Nina. "Leon Marcotte: Cabinetmaker and Interior Decorator." *Chipstone* [online journal]. http:// www.chipstone.org/publications/1994AF/index1994gray.html

Grier, Katherine C. *Culture and Comfort: Parlor Making and Middle-Class Identity, 1850-1930.* Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1998.

Griggs, Frank Jr., "Charles Macdonald," *Structure Magazine: Journal of the American Society of Civil Engineers* (January 2009): 45-47.

Hanks, David A. "Pottier & Stymus Mfg. Co.: Artistic Furniture & Decorations." *Art & Antiques* 7, no. 5 (September-October, 1982): 84-90.

Harris, Neil. "Louis Comfort Tiffany: The Search for Influence." In *The Masterworks of Louis Comfort Tiffany.* New York: Abradale Press, 1993.

Haydon, Paul Ballard. "The Seventh Regiment Armory: An Investigation and Analysis of a Herter Brothers Interior." M.A. thesis. Columbia University, 1991.

Hazlett, James C., Edwin Olmstead and M. Hume Parks. *Field Artillery Weapons of the American Civil War.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983.

Hecksher, Morrison H. "The Metropolitan Museum of Art: An Architectural History." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin,* new series 53, no. 1 (Summer 1995): 1+4-80.

Herron, Kristin S. "The Modern Gothic Furniture of Pottier and Stymus." *The Magazine Antiques* (May 1999): 762-67.

History of the First Troop Philadelphia City Cavalry 1948-1991. Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1991.

Hoagland, Alison K. ""The Invariable Model:" Standardization and Military Architecture in Wyoming, 1860-1900." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57, no. 3 (September 1998): 298-315

Holt, Michael F. *By One Vote: the Disputed Presidential Election of 1876.* Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2008.

Horn, Pierre. *Marquis de Lafayette.* New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1989.

Howe, Katherine S., ed. *Herter Brothers: Furniture and Interiors for a Gilded Age.* Exh. Cat. New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, 1994.

Hull, Judith S. "The 'School of Upjohn': Richard Upjohn's Office. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 52, no. 3 (September 1993): 281-306.

Irwin, Will, Karl Chapin May and Joseph Hotchkiss. *A History of the Union League Club of New York City.* New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1952.

Isaac, Larry. "To Counter 'The Very Devil' and More: The Making of Independent Capitalist Militia in the Gilded Age." *The American Journal of Sociology* 108, no. 2 (September 2002): 353-405.

Jackson, Kenneth T., ed. *The Encyclopedia of New York City.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Johnson, Marilyn. *Louis Comfort Tiffany: Artist for the Ages.* Exh. Cat. London: Scala Exhibitions International, 2005.

Johnson, Matthew. *Behind the Castle Gate: From Medieval to Renaissance.* London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Johnston, Phillip M. "Dialogues between Designer and Client: Furnishings Proposed by Leon Marcotte to Samuel Colt in the 1850s." *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, no. 4 (Winter 1984): 257-275.

Jones, Thai. *More Powerful than Dynamite: Radicals, Plutocrats, Progressives and New York's Year of Anarchy.* New York: Walker & Co., 2012.

Kahn, Yasmin Sabin. *Enlightening the World: The Creation of the Statue of Liberty.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010.

Kaufmann, Eric P. *The Orange Order: A Contemporary Northern Irish History.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Keller, Lisa. *Triumph of Order: Democracy and Public Space in New York and London.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Kerber, Linda K. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History." *The Journal of American History* 75, no. 1 (June 1988): 9-39.

Kimbro, Edna E. *The California Commissions of the Herter Brothers, Decorators, New York City.* M.A. thesis. University of California, Santa Cruz, 1986.

Koch, Robert. "The Medieval Castle Revival: New York Armories." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 14, no.3 (October 1955): 29-39.

_____ . *Louis Comfort Tiffany: Rebel in Glass.* New York: Crown, 1982**.**

Kostof, Spiro. *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals.* 2d. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

La Farge, Henry. "John La Farge's Work in the Vanderbilt Houses." *American Art Journal* 16, no. 4 (Autumn 1984): 30-70.

Landau, Sarah Bradford "Richard Morris Hunt, the Continental Picturesque and the 'Stick Style.'" *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 42, no. 3 (October 1983): 272-289.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Laster, Margaret. Catherine Lorillard Wolfe: Collecting and Patronage in the Gilded Age. Ph.D. dissertation, City Univeristy of New York Graduate Center, 2013.

Lears, T.J. Jackson. *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America 1877-1920.* New York: Harper Collins, 2009.

Leavitt, Sarah A. *From Catherine Beecher to Martha Stewart: A Cultural History of Domestic Advice.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Leech, Margaret. *Reveille in Washington, 1860-1865.* New York: New York Review Books, 2011.

Lewis, Adam. *The Great Lady Decorators: The Women Who Defined Interior Design.* New York: Rizzoli, 2010.

Lewis, Alfred Allan. *Ladies and Not-So-Gentle Women.* New York: Viking, 2000.

Lewis, Arnold, James Turner and Steve McQuillen. *The Opulent Interiors of the Gilded Age: All 203 Photographs from "Artistic Houses."* New York: Dover Publications, 1987.

Lewis, Michael J. "Frank Furness at Thirty: The Armory of the First City Troop," *19th Century* 28, no. 2 (Fall 2008):2-7.

_____. *Frank Furness: Architecture and the Violent Mind.* New York: Norton, 2001.

Lockwood, Charles. *Bricks and Brownstone: The New York Row-House, 1783-1929.* New York: Rizzoli, 2003.

_____. *Manhattan Moves Uptown: An Illustrated History.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Lockwood, John and Charles Lockwood. *The Siege of Washington: The Untold Story of the Twelve Days that Shook the Union.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lubetkin, John M. *Jay Cooke's Gamble: The Northern Pacific Railroad, the Sioux, and the Panic of 1873.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.

MacKaye, Percy. *Epoch: The Life of Steele MacKaye.* New York: Boni & Liveright, 1927.

Marra, Kim and Robert A. Schanke. *Passing Performances: Queer Readings of Leading Players in American Theater History.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Mayer, Roberta A. "The Aesthetics of Lockwood de Forest: India, Craft and Preservation." *Winterthur Portfolio* 31, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 1-22.

Mayer, Roberta A. and Carolyn K. Lane. "Disassociating the Associated Artists: The Early Business Ventures of Louis C. Tiffany, Candace T. Wheeler, and Lockwood de Forest." *Studies in the Decorative Arts* 8, no. 2 (Spring-Summer 2001): 2-36.

McKean, Hugh. *The "Lost" Treasures of Louis Comfort Tiffany.* New York: Doubleday, 1980.

Meeks, Carroll L.V. *The Railroad Station: An Architectural History.* New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1995. Reprint, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1956.

Mitchell, Stewart. *Horatio Seymour of New York.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Moehring, Eugene P. *Public Works and Patterns of Urban Real Estate Growth in Manhattan, 1835-1894.* North Stratford, New Hampshire: Ayer Co. Publishers, 1981.

Morris, Roy. *Fraud of the Century: Rutherford B. Hayes, Samuel Tilden, and the Stolen Election of 1876.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003.

Murphy, Kevin. "'Secure from All Intrusion': Heterotopia, Queer Space, and the Turn-of-the-Century American Resort," *Winterthur Portfolio* 43, no. 2/3 (Summer/Autumn 2009): 185-228.

Mushkat, *Fernando Wood: A Political Biography.* Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1990.

Myzelev, Alla and John Potvin. *Fashion, Interior Design, and the Contours of Modern Identity.* Surrey, England and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2010.

"National Academicians" National Academy Museum and School; http://nationalacademy.org/national-academicians/biographies/?char=T.

Nevins, Allan and Milton Halsey Thomas, eds. *Diary of the Civil War, 1860-1865.* New York: Macmillan, 1962.

New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission. *Apthorp Designation Report.* New York, NY: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1969.

_____. *Beaver Building Designation Report.* New York, NY: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1996.

_____. *Seventh Regiment Armory Designation Report.* New York, NY: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1994.

_____. *Twenty-third Regiment Armory Designation Report.* New York, NY: Landmarks Preservation Commission, 1977.

O'Gorman, James. "Review." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 115, no. 1 (January 1991): 134.

"Old Battle Ax Gets a Facelift," *The New York Times.* 11 October 2012.

Paine, Albert Bigelow. *Thomas Nast: His Period and His Pictures.* Broomall, PA: Chelsea House, 1997.

Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art .New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art in Association with the Princeton University Press, 1985.

Park Avenue Armory Drill Hall and Interiors Guide available at : http://www.armoryonpark.org/index.php/photo_gallery/building/.

Peck, Amelia and Carol Irish. *Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900.* Exh. Cat. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.

Perrell, Franklin Hill, and Constance Schwartz, *Louis Comfort Tiffany, Stanford White and Their Circle.* Exh. Cat. Roslyn Harbor, NY: Nassau County Museum of Art, 1999.

Pflueger, Lynda. *Thomas Nast, Political Cartoonist.* Berkeley Heights, NJ: Enslow Publishers, 2000.

Pile, John. *A History of Interior Design.* 2d. ed. London: Laurence King Publishing, 2003.

Promey, Salley. "The Ribband of Faith: George Inness, Color Theory and the Swedenborgian Church." *American Art Journal* 26, no. 1-2 (1994): 44-65.

Pyne, Kathleen A. *Art and the Higher Life: Painting and Evolutionary Thought in Late Nineteenth-Century America.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

Reaves, Wendy Wick. "Thomas Nast and the President." *American Art Journal* 19, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 60-71.

Reed, Christopher, ed., *Not at Home: The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1996.

Rehnquist, William H. *Centennial Crisis: The Disputed Election of 1876.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004.

Reinders, Robert. "Militia and Public Order in Nineteenth-Century America." *Journal of American Studies* 11, no. 1 (April 1977): 81-101.

Revell, Keith D. *Building Gotham: Civic Culture and Public Policy in New York City 1898-1938.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Rotman, Deborah L. "Separate Spheres? Beyond the Dichotomies of Domesticity." *Current Anthropology* 47, no. 4 (August 2006): 666-674.

Ryan, Mary. *Civic Wars: Democracy and Public Life in the American City during the Nineteenth Century.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Saint Bris, Gonzague. *Lafayette: Hero of the American Revolution.* New York: Pegasus Books, 2010.

Sanders, Joel. "Curtain Wars: Architects, Decorators and the Twentieth-Century Domestic Interior," *Harvard Design Magazine* 16 (2002); Reprint In *Imtimus: Interior Design Theory Reader.* Mark Taylor and Julieanna Preston, eds. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 2006.

Sandoval-Strausz, A.K. *Hotel: An American History.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Sandoval-Strausz, A.K. and Daniel Levinson Wilk, "Princes and Maids of the City Hotel: The Cultural Politics of Commercial Hospitality in America," *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 25, The American Hotel (2005): 160-185.

Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America.* Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997.

Schacter, Sophia Duckworth. "The Seventh Regiment Armory of New York City: A History of its Construction and Decoration." M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1985.

Scherzer, Kenneth A. *The Unbounded Community*: *Neighborhood Life and Social Structure in New York City, 1830-1875.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1992.

Scobey, David M. *Empire City: The Making and Meaning of the New York City Landscape.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.

Scully, Vincent, Jr. *The Shingle Style and the Stick Style: Architectural Theory and Design from Downing to the Origins of Wright.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Sharp, Lewis I. *John Quincy Adams Ward: Dean of American Sculpture.* Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 1985.

Sklar, Kathryn Kish. *Catherine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Skopcol Theda. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003.

Slotkin, Richard. *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800-1890.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.

Smith, Jane S. *Elsie de Wolfe: A Life in the High Style.* New York: Athenaeum, 1982.

Sokalski, J.A. *Pictorial Illusionism: The Theatre of Steele Mackaye.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.

Soros, Susan Weber, ed. *E.W. Godwin: Aesthetic Movement Architect and Designer.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Sparke, Penny. *Elsie de Wolfe: The Birth of Modern Interior Decoration.* New York: Acanthus Press, 2005.

"Staple-Gun Decorating in Fort Greene." *The New York Times.* 10 October 2012.

Stein, Susan, ed. *The Architecture of Richard Morris Hunt.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Stern, Robert A.M., Thomas Mellins and David Fishman. *New York 1880: Architecture and Urbanism in the Gilded Age.* New York: Monacelli Press, 1999.

Stowell, David O., ed. *The Great Strikes of 1877.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Strazdes, Diana. "The Millionaire's Palace: Leland Stanford's Commission for Pottier & Stymus in San Francisco." *Winterthur Portfolio* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 213-243.

Streitmatter, Roger. *Outlaw Marriages: The Hidden Histories of Fifteen Extraordinary Same-Sex Couples.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2012.

Sweetman, John. *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture, 1500-1920.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Todd, Nancy. *New York's Historic Armories: An Illustrated History.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America,* ed. Eduardo Nolla. Translated by James T. Schleifer. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2012.

Trachtenberg, Alan. *Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1960.

Unger, Irwin. *The Greenback Era: A Social and Political History of American Finance, 1865-1879.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Upton, Dell. "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860." *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn 1984): 107-150.

Varney, Carleton. *Draper Touch: The High Life and High Style of Dorothy Draper.* New York: Shannongrove Press, 1988.

Voorsanger, Catherine Hoover and John K. Howat, eds. *Art and the Empire City: New York, 1825-1961.* Exh. Cat. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000.

Weinberg, H. Barbara. "The Career of Francis David Millet." *Archives of American Art Journal* 17, no. 1 (1977): 2-18.

_____. "John La Farge and the Decoration of Trinity Church, Boston," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 33 (December 1974): 323-53.

White, Clair Nicholas, ed. *Stanford White's Letters to His Family including a Selection of Letters to Augustus Saint-Gaudens.* New York: Rizzoli, 1997.

White, Samuel G. *McKim, Mead & White: The Masterworks.* New York: Rizzoli, 2003.

White, Samuel G. and Elizabeth White. *Stanford White, Architect.* New York, NY: Rizzoli, 2008.

Wiegley, Russell F. *History of the United States Army.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Wilentz, Sean. *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Wilson, Richard Guy. *McKim, Mead & White, Architects.* New York: Rizzoli, 1983.

____. "Edith and Ogden: Writing, Decoration and Architecture," In *Ogden Codman and the Decoration of Houses*, ed. Pauline Metcalf, 133-184. Boston: the Boston Athenaeum, 1988.

Woods, Mary N. *From Craft to Profession: The Practice of Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Yarnall, James L. "Souvenirs of Splendor: John La Farge and the Patronage of Cornelius Vanderbilt II." *American Art Journal* 26, no. 1-2 (1994): 66-105.

Zeynep, Celik. *Displaying the Orient: Architecture of Islam at Nineteenth-Century Worlds' Fairs.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Zipf, Catherine W. *Professional Pursuits: Women and the American Arts and Crafts Movement.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2007.

Zurier, Rebecca. "American Architecture."*Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 50, no. 3 (September 1991): 328-330.