

2020

The “Cherry Tree Rebellion”: Jefferson’s Controversial Addition to the Washington Memorial Landscape, 1936 - 1939

Meredith Barber

William & Mary, mdbarber@email.wm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/ugra>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barber, Meredith, "The “Cherry Tree Rebellion”: Jefferson’s Controversial Addition to the Washington Memorial Landscape, 1936 - 1939" (2020). *Undergraduate Research Awards*. 4.
<https://scholarworks.wm.edu/ugra/4>

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the William & Mary Libraries at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Research Awards by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

The following is the second chapter of my honors thesis, “Jefferson’s ‘Marble Mausoleum’: Incongruence in the Historical Memory of Thomas Jefferson, 1936-1945.” The first chapter covers the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission’s formation and situates the commission’s memory of Jefferson into the political and economic landscape of the time. The third chapter explores the incorporation of Jefferson as an “abolitionist” into the memorial and determines how memory of early American slavery influenced the memorialization of Jefferson. It also focuses on African American perceptions of the memorial.

The “Cherry Tree Rebellion”: Jefferson’s Controversial Addition to the Washington Memorial Landscape, 1936 - 1939

Introduction: The “Cherry Tree Rebellion”

“Cherry trees caused more excitement today than they have since, it was said, young George Washington whacked one down,” reported *The Daily Boston Globe* on November 19, 1938.¹ The newspaper recounted the “Cherry Tree Rebellion,” a term coined by Washington, D.C. newspapers to describe the 150 women who chained themselves to Japanese cherry trees around the Tidal Basin.² These women intended to prevent the trees from being removed for the construction of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. One of the cherry tree rebels angrily told a reporter from *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, “this is the worst desecration of the Capital since the British burned the White House.”³ The women made headlines around the country. “Washington Women Fight to Save Cherry Trees” was the front page story of the November 19, 1938 *Hartford Courant*. The article explained that the women were “grabbing shovels from astonished workmen” and “started refilling the holes left gaping by the uprooted flora.”⁴ Later in the day, as

¹ “Women Defend Cherry Trees,” *Daily Boston Globe* (Boston, MA), November 19, 1938, 1.

² The phrase “Cherry Tree Rebellion” was used in *The New York Times*, “Roosevelt Curbs Tree 'Rebellion,’” *New York Times* (New York, NY), Nov 19, 1938, 19.; the women at the rebellion were described in the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, “Women Vanquish Police in Battle of Cherry Trees,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Chicago, IL), November 19, 1938, 2.

³ “Women Vanquish Police in Battle of Cherry Trees,” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Chicago, IL), November 19, 1938, 2.

⁴ “Washington Women Fight to Save Cherry Trees,” *The Hartford Courant* (Hartford, CT), November 19, 1938, 1.

The New York Times reported, “rain brought an armistice.”⁵ The “Cherry Tree Rebellion” was the culmination of a long controversy over the site and design selection of the Jefferson Memorial, which President Franklin D. Roosevelt deemed “the worst case of flim-flamming” that Washington D.C. had faced in a long time.⁶ How did this “flim-flamming” catch the attention of the president, the Washington public, and newspapers around the nation?

Years of negative press coverage regarding the Jefferson Memorial preceded the Cherry Tree Rebellion, which indicated a rift between the Washington public and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission (TJMC) over the proposed site and design. The fluctuating historical memory of Thomas Jefferson and changing perceptions of how the government should use public land lead to disagreement over the memorial plans. The controversy revealed incongruent interpretations of Jefferson’s legacy: the TJMC viewed Jefferson as a symbol of Americanness and founder of the democratic party, but the Washington public remembered him as an unpretentious advocate for the people. The tension over the design for the memorial revealed contention over the meaning of Jefferson. The TJMC insisted upon a classical, non-utilitarian memorial similar to the Lincoln Memorial.⁷ Washingtonians largely disagreed.

Washington-based papers, including *The Washington Post*, published articles and editorials that expressed not only the qualms the press had with the memorial site and design, but

⁵ “Cherry-Tree Truce is Forced by Rain,” *The New York Times* (New York, NY), November 20, 1938, 3.

⁶ Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines flim-flam as “deceptive nonsense.” See, *The Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, s.v. “flimflam (*n.*),” accessed November 25, 2019, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/flimflam>. Franklin Roosevelt used the phrase at a press conference. See, Five Hundred and First Press Conference, November 18, 1938, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Samuel I. Rosenman, (New York: Random House, 1938-1949), 7, 605.

⁷ I use the phrases “utilitarian” and “non-utilitarian” throughout this chapter because they were consistently used by both Washingtonians and the TJMC in congressional hearings and newspaper articles. I am not referencing architectural “Utilitarianism” that was popularized in the twentieth century, but rather the usefulness and practicality of a structure. I specify a “utilitarian” memorial as one with a function other than as a space of memory, such as an auditorium or stadium.

also the concerns of some members of the Washington public. The Washingtonians who had the loudest opinions about the memorial were middle-to-upper class whites, including the 150 women who participated in the Cherry Tree Rebellion. The women were members of Washington women's clubs, which women used in the mid-nineteenth century as a forum for women to discuss and advocate for their political views.⁸ The Cherry Tree Rebels felt entitled to protest the construction of the memorial because they viewed themselves as part of the culture of the capital. The women felt they were protecting the interests of the Washington people.

These Washingtonians' protests were not taken seriously by the president or the TJMC because of the Roosevelt administration's hostile relationship with the Washington press, who voiced the concerns of the people.⁹ The recent big-government changes of the New Deal had attracted negative press coverage and editors of *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* did not have amicable relationships with President Roosevelt. Reporters often disapproved of Roosevelt, a face of the TJMC, due to his dismissive demeanor at press conferences. Washingtonians' concerns warranted serious consideration by the TJMC and Roosevelt because they consistently and forcefully expressed their disquietude through several outlets. Washingtonians were present at congressional hearings, wrote to members of the TJMC, and protested at the site of the Jefferson Memorial, but the TJMC persisted with their plan for a classical, non-utilitarian memorial at the Tidal Basin site. The president and the TJMC blamed the push back against the plans for the Jefferson Memorial on the press coverage it received and did not give the people's protests, including the Cherry Tree Rebellion, merit.

⁸ Joyce Appleby, Eileen Chang, and Neva Goodwin, *The Encyclopedia of Women in American History* (2002), "Women's Club Movement." (Armonk, NY: Routledge), 455.

⁹ Because the Washington Press consistently voiced the concerns the Washington public had with the memorial site and design, I will use "Washingtonians" to refer to the like-minded elements of the press and vocal citizens.

Most of the Washington public's resistance to the memorial plans related to their distaste for the classical design and ideas of how public land should be used. To them, it was important to have a useful building and to preserve the beauty of West Potomac Park, which surrounded the Tidal Basin. The cherry trees at West Potomac Park were essential to Washington's economy because they brought considerable income to the city through tourism and many Washingtonians feared a change would result in income loss. Washingtonians did not see a purpose in building another classical memorial in the Capital because the Lincoln and Washington memorials already dominated the landscape of the mall. In addition, memorialization trends were not in favor of the Jefferson Memorial. Architectural historian Kirk Savage explained in *Monument Wars* that the "hero monument" had lost popularity and "victim monuments" like the Lincoln Memorial and the 1931 World War I monument were created.¹⁰ The World War I monument included a bandstand, making it a "living memorial," or a utilitarian one.¹¹ Living memorials were favored over statue monuments after the First World War.¹² The Washington public largely turned to the press to voice their concerns with the plans for the memorial site and design.

The TJMC felt an urgency to silence the press because they associated the creation of a non-utilitarian, classical memorial (comparable to George Washington's and Abraham Lincoln's) with the validation of the Democratic party. The Democrats viewed the Jefferson Memorial as their imprint on the Washington memorial landscape, as the Lincoln Memorial was for the Republicans.¹³ Roosevelt and the New Deal Democrats used Jefferson as a face of their

¹⁰ Kirk Savage, *Monument Wars* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009), 244.

¹¹ Savage, *Monument Wars*, 241.

¹² Savage, *Monument Wars*, 241.

¹³ Kirk Savage articulated this argument, writing that "Franklin Roosevelt and the Democrats saw it as a way to put their imprint on the Capital's monumental core, which, until then, had been dominated by Republican plans and Republican heroes." See, Savage, *Monument Wars*, 244.

party, and often asserted that their policies were “Jeffersonian” because of their progressiveness and flexible interpretation of the Constitution.¹⁴ Because of their party’s reverence for Jefferson, they saw their administration as the only one capable of memorializing him.¹⁵ The Commission’s conception of Jefferson as akin to Washington and Lincoln was inflexible because of the political importance New Deal Democrats placed on Jefferson. In contrast, the Washington public had a dynamic conception of Jefferson that changed as portions of the plan for the memorial were released. They interpreted Jefferson as a figure to defend their positions on the memorial and invoked him differently throughout the memorial’s creation. Themes of Jefferson as simple and forward-looking rang through their changing interpretations of the figure.

The TJMC’s conception of Jefferson as an “apostle of freedom” that needed a classical, non-utilitarian memorial at the Tidal Basin did not resonate with Washingtonians because his position in American memory was in a state of change.¹⁶ Scholars including Merrill Peterson, Francis Cogliano, and Andrew Burstein have considered the status of Jefferson’s reputation in the mid twentieth-century. Peterson, who wrote the primary work on Jefferson’s legacy, asserted that during this time Jefferson’s reputation was essentially a blank slate. As the United States underwent the Great Depression and the New Deal reforms, Americans were forced to reassess what “Jeffersonian” meant. Burstein noted in *Democracy’s Muse* (2015) that throughout

¹⁴ Merrill D. Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind* (Charlottesville, VA: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation: University Press of Virginia, 1998), 355-359.

¹⁵At his 501st press conference, Roosevelt asserted that the Democratic administration’s revival in 1933 was the reason why the TJMC was established in 1936, Five Hundred and First Press Conference, November 18, 1938, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, 7, 605; The chairman of the Memorial Commission, New York Senator (and Democrat) John J. Boylan, blamed his failure in his first attempt to pass a resolution to memorialize Jefferson on the Republican Administration, stating “our good friends the Republicans were in power, and they did not pay any attention,” U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 75th Cong., 1st sess., 1937, H. J. Res. 337, serial 180738, 57.

¹⁶ Roosevelt called Jefferson an “apostle of freedom” at the dedication for the memorial. See, Address at Dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, April 13, 1943, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin*, 12, 162.

“Jefferson’s twentieth-century makeover,” it was the “Democrats who ‘owned him.’”¹⁷ New Deal Democrats replaced Thomas Jefferson’s association with defined political principles such as states rights, free trade, and “least government.”¹⁸ Jefferson became a symbol of progressive thought, democracy, and freedom, rather than a political ideology. The New Deal Democrats emphasized Jefferson’s idea that “the earth belongs to the living” and presented him as a figure that would support the changes they made to the American government.¹⁹ This did not fully resonate with the people of Washington. As the United States faced major changes, Jefferson’s reputation did as well. Therefore, interpretation of Jefferson and how he would be memorialized was susceptible to controversy.

The moment of the Jefferson Memorial’s creation is unique because it provided an opportunity for members of the Washington public to discuss their perception of Jefferson in public forums. Historians of Jefferson’s legacy have analyzed the creation of the Jefferson Memorial as a reflection of the revival of Jefferson’s reputation, but have not acknowledged the significance of the resistance the TJMC faced. Historians are often critical of newspapers as a reflection of public opinion because of the many bias-holding individuals involved in writing and publishing them, but the newspaper articles and editorials about the Jefferson Memorial controversy are legitimate reflections of prominent Washingtonians’ interpretations of Jefferson. Their ideas were consistent and re-asserted at congressional hearings, protests, and through letters to congressmen. Washington newspapers best capture the controversy surrounding the memorial because they were seen by Washingtonians as the primary outlet to express their qualms with the memorial. The editorial boards were often populated with Washingtonians who

¹⁷ Andrew Burstein, *Democracy’s Muse* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 7.

¹⁸ Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*, 358-359.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 356.

pursued a similar agenda regarding the memorial. Interpreting the newspaper sources as a legitimate reflection of how Jefferson was remembered by Washingtonians gives historians the chance to understand how people without government or scholarly roles understood an influential, yet controversial early American.

Jefferson's reputation frequently undergoes changes. Understanding the points of change can remove the layers of historical memory that Jefferson hides under. In the mid-twentieth century, memory of Jefferson moved away from focus on his political ideas and towards a more abstract association with American morals. This shift impacts Americans and historians today, as they grapple with the paradox of Jefferson: a symbol of freedom, but also a slaveholder. The Jefferson Memorial does not reflect Jefferson as a man or leader. It represents the specific image of Jefferson that was in the minds of members of the TJMC. It does not reveal Americans' or Washingtonians' perception of Jefferson. Instead, it reflects a sense of urgency that the members of the TJMC held - that Jefferson needed to be vaunted in memory alongside Presidents Lincoln and Washington.

"The Worst Case of Flim-Flamming": The TJMC and the Press

The tension between the TJMC and Washington newspapers reached its height when Roosevelt called the press coverage of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial "a complete deception of the public" at a press conference on November 18th, 1938.²⁰ That same week, a member of the Memorial Commission wrote to an editor of *The Washington Post*, requesting that he cease publishing such negative coverage on the memorial.²¹ Washington newspapers continued to

²⁰ Five Hundred and First Press Conference, November 18, 1938, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, 7, 605.

²¹ Jefferson Randolph Kean to Felix Morely, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 30, 1938), University of Virginia Small Special Collections Library, Correspondence and Records Regarding the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, 1917-1943, box 1.

publish articles with headlines including “Memorial Flimflam,” “More Readers Protest: Stop This Vandalism” and “Women Vanquish Police in Battle of Cherry Trees.”²² The tense relationship between the Washington Press and the Roosevelt Administration created an environment that led the TJMC to blame the memorial controversy on the press rather than take the public’s concerns seriously. Shifting this blame allowed the TJMC to maintain its conception of Jefferson as a Democratic hero despite its incongruence with the public’s indistinct idea of him.

The Washington Post was the loudest voice against the memorial. Eugene Meyer, the owner of the paper and a Republican financier disapproved of “unlimited and careless spending of public funds” and the *Post* often took stances against the New Deal government.²³ Felix Morely, the editor of the editorial page, published letters that highlighted the position of *The Washington Post*’s readership against the site and design of the memorial. Washingtonians frequently wrote to the editors of the *Post* because they recognized saw the paper as the primary outlet to express their thoughts on the memorial. The TJMC and President recognized the paper as a threat to their memorial plans and saw them as influential over their Washington readership.

The Roosevelt Administration’s tense relationship with Washington news outlets extended to the Washington bureau of *The New York Times*, who often published news about the Jefferson Memorial. Both Washington reporters and President Roosevelt recognized the *Times* as an essential Washington paper.²⁴ In 1936, sociologist Leo Rosten polled 127 Washington

²² Jack Stearns Gray "More Readers Protest: 'Stop this Vandalism'," *The Washington Post*, Nov 18, 1938, 1; Fred Huddleston, "The Memorial and the Cherry Trees," *The Washington Post*, Nov 19, 1938, 8; "Women Vanquish Police in Battle of Cherry Trees," *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Chicago, IL), November 19, 1938, 2.

²³ Chalmers Roberts, *The Washington Post: The First 100 Years* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977), 205.

²⁴ Donald Ritchie, *Reporting From Washington: The History of the Washington Press Corps* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 7.

correspondents, asking them to list “the three newspapers which give the most fair and reliable news.”²⁵ He also asked them to note which ones were “the least fair and reliable.”²⁶ In Rosten’s study, *The New York Times* was listed first most often for “most fair and reliable” and not on the list of “least fair and reliable.” Even with that “unbiased” reputation, they had a complicated relationship with the Roosevelt administration. The Washington bureau of the *Times* was run by Arthur Krock, who was considered “THE Washington Correspondent” by other reporters.²⁷ Krock suggested that the Roosevelt Administration had “more ruthlessness, intelligence and subtlety in trying to suppress legitimate unfavorable comments than any other I have known.”²⁸ Krock’s importance in the network of the Washington press meant that his ideas about Roosevelt influenced other reporters.

Roosevelt’s habit to suppress “unfavorable comments” was especially evident during his press conferences. In Rosten’s study, he explained that Roosevelt had an amicable relationship with the Washington press correspondents until around 1935, when the correspondents began to feel irritated with Roosevelt’s “calculated” presence at press conferences.²⁹ He wrote that “newspapermen began to feel that the exercise of presidential wit to evade a question was less of a novelty than an irritant.”³⁰ The tension between the Roosevelt Administration and Washington Press that culminated in the Cherry Tree Rebellion built for years before 1938. Blaming the press for the memorial controversy allowed President Roosevelt and the TJMC to be unreceptive to the

²⁵ Leo C. Rosten, *The Washington Correspondents* (New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937), 194.

²⁶ Rosten, *The Washington Correspondents*, 194.

²⁷ Ritchie, *Reporting From Washington: The History of the Washington Press Corps*, 13.

²⁸ Rosten, *The Washington Correspondents*, 57.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 53-57.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 57.

needs of Washingtonians and let their vaunted conception of Jefferson persist through the creation of the memorial.

Roosevelt's 501st press conference on November 18th, 1938, provides a glimpse into how the TJMC and president approached the press. It was the first time Roosevelt was asked about the "Cherry Tree Rebellion" and he called it "one of the most interesting cases of a flim-flam game being started by the owner of a paper."³¹ Roosevelt did not address any problems the public had with the memorial other than the destruction of the cherry trees and he blamed the public's uproar regarding the trees on the coverage from Washington news sources. At the end of the conference, a reporter interjected, "of course this is serious to some of us newspaper men. Women are going down there to chain themselves to these trees."³² Roosevelt interrupted him with, "we will move the tree and the lady and the chains, and transplant them to some other place," to which the conference responded with laughter.³³ Roosevelt did not take the reporter seriously, exemplifying Arthur Krock's suspicion that Roosevelt worked to silence the press' dissent regarding his decisions.

At the same press conference, Roosevelt said, "I don't suppose there is anybody in the world who loves trees quite as much as I do."³⁴ He went on to attempt to satisfy the press by telling them that the 88 cherry trees removed would be replaced with 1,000 more surrounding the Tidal Basin.³⁵ John J. Boylan, the chairman of the TJMC, used this same method to appease the public more than a year earlier, at the hearings for the site of the memorial on April 23rd, 1937.

³¹ Five Hundred and First Press Conference, November 18, 1938, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, 7, 605.

³² *Ibid.*, 607.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 606.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

Boylan expressed, “no one has a greater love for trees and flowers and shrubs than I have.”³⁶

Boylan may have claimed that he was the greatest tree-admirer, but President Roosevelt apparently felt otherwise. How did the controversy surrounding the Jefferson Memorial become a forum to brag about loving cherry trees more than most? Boylan and Roosevelt’s statements were their way to dismiss the public’s concern over the memorial as only related to the trees. Calling themselves tree-lovers was a snide way for them to put off the real issues people had with the memorial, which were related to Jefferson’s legacy. The press, especially *The Washington Post*, poked fun at their assumptions. One editorial asked, “If ‘Franklin D.’ does cut down the cherry trees with his little hatchet, will he deny doing it, or will he tell his mother the truth?”³⁷

The hostile relationship between the TJMC and the press was exacerbated when the TJMC made efforts to stop the press’ articles about the destruction of the cherry trees by contacting Felix Morely, an editor of *The Washington Post*. Both Boylan and Roosevelt considered *The Washington Post* to be one of the most influential sources on the public’s position regarding the memorial.³⁸ Jefferson Randolph Kean, a presidential appointee to the TJMC and descendant of Jefferson, wrote to Morely on behalf of the TJMC on November 18th, 1938. Kean requested that the *Post* cease publishing negative articles about the memorial site

³⁶ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 58.

³⁷ Zack Spratt, letter to the editor, *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 17, 1937.

³⁸ At Roosevelt’s 501st press conference, he stated “I don’t know whether I should be polite as to what was done by Washington newspapers or not, especially two newspapers in Washington,” see Five Hundred and First Press Conference, November 18, 1938, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, 7, 605; At the congressional hearings for the memorial, New York Senator John J. Boylan blamed newspapers for the controversy when he said, “suddenly there was a great outcry in some of the papers that we were going to destroy the cherry blossoms,” U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 59; cross referencing these two statements with TJMC member Jefferson Randolph Kean’s letter addressing the *Post*’s coverage on the memorial reveals that the commission thought of *The Washington Post* to be an extremely influential source over the Washington public’s opinion regarding the memorial. See Jefferson Randolph Kean to Felix Morely, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 30, 1938), 2.

choice, especially regarding the cherry trees.³⁹ Felix Morely responded a few days later, “it is not a matter of the uprooting of a few dozen cherry trees, which we have certainly never stressed as vital in our editorials.”⁴⁰ In his letter, Morely explicitly explained his stance on the design of the memorial. Morely wrote his “humble opinion” that the proposed memorial would be “less rather than more appropriate with the passage of time” because of the classical design.⁴¹ Classical architecture was associated with Jefferson’s era of American history, not the mid-twentieth century. Kean responded curtly, writing, “your objection to the site selected is that you do not like classic monuments in parks - this is a question of taste and there is a [sic] old classic saying that matters of taste are not subjects for dispute.” Kean continued, “so in a matter like this in which every one has an interest and each also a right to his own opinion, you will, I am sure, agree with me that there is no occasion for passion or for the ascription of unworthy motives.”⁴² The correspondence between Morely and Kean not only reveals the tension between the *Post* and the TJMC, but also indicates what was at stake for each side of the controversy.

The “Subjects for Dispute”: A Classical Jefferson Memorial

The hostility between the Washingtonians and the TJMC was driven by different ideas of how Jefferson should be memorialized. The classical, non-utilitarian design held political significance to the TJMC. The Washingtonians considered the memorial in the context of the city, and felt the design was not fitting to the landscape. Both sides invoked Jefferson’s legacy

³⁹ Felix Morely to Jefferson Randolph Kean, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1938), University of Virginia Small Special Collections Library, Correspondence and Records Regarding the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, 1917-1943, box 1, 1.

⁴⁰ Felix Morely to Jefferson Randolph Kean, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1938), 1.

⁴¹ Felix Morely to Jefferson Randolph Kean, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1938), 2.

⁴² Jefferson Randolph Kean to Felix Morely, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 30, 1938), 2.

when defending their position on the memorial. These discussions of Jefferson reveal his complicated position in American memory at the time.

Jefferson Randolph Kean's desire to preserve the TJMC's plan and quiet the *Post* stemmed from the political importance the commission rested on the memorial. It was to be a Democratic memorial that placed Jefferson on the same pedestal as Republican presidents memorialized in the capital city. A *New York Times* article from April 16th, 1938, reported "the capital is divided today in a debate over the relative virtues of elegance of the Pantheon and simplicity of the White House. The center of the controversy is the Thomas Jefferson Memorial."⁴³ The article was sure to indicate "the president likes the pantheon. So do Representative John Boylan of New York, who is chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, and Dr. Fiske Kimball of Philadelphia, a member of the commission, who helped in the restoration of Monticello."⁴⁴ TJMC presented a unified front against Washingtonians' suggestions for the memorial. The conflict over the classical, non-utilitarian design of the memorial was central to the controversy.

The TJMC was hesitant to change their position on the design for the Jefferson Memorial because they wanted it to be viewed similarly to the Lincoln Memorial, which was dedicated to the "Republican hero" in May of 1922.⁴⁵ The idea that few presidents were worthy of a classical, non-utilitarian memorial in Washington was articulated at the hearings for the memorial: "there are three men who are in a class by themselves - Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

Washington was the father of our country, Lincoln saved it, and Jefferson made it a democracy,

⁴³ Blair Bolles, "Jefferson Memorial a Storm Center," *New York Times*, Apr 17, 1938.

⁴⁴ Blair Bolles, "Jefferson Memorial a Storm Center," *New York Times*, Apr 17, 1938.

⁴⁵ Savage, *Monument Wars*, 244.

which it was not before.”⁴⁶ Creating a classical, non-utilitarian memorial for Jefferson would assert his position as one of the greatest American presidents. The TJMC knew the Jefferson memorial would be compared to the Lincoln and Washington memorials. In a review of a Fine Arts Commission report on the design for the memorial, one design was regarded as “inadequate in comparison with the importance of the ponderous mass of the Lincoln memorial.”⁴⁷ The review stated that “even though these two memorials are considerable apart as to location, a comparison would be inevitable.”⁴⁸ At the hearings, there was extensive discussion about how the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorial would compare in terms of placement and design. For instance, John J. Boylan, the TJMC’s chairman, mentioned criticism that the Jefferson Memorial would “dwarf the Lincoln Memorial.”⁴⁹ Royal H. Carlock, a Washingtonian artist, suggested a change to the site at the hearing. He asked “Why should we steal the beauty and grandeur that belong to Washington? Why should we destroy the beauty and grandeur that enshroud Lincoln?”⁵⁰ The three memorials were bound to be compared. The TJMC felt the memorials should be equal in stature because of their association between the American figures and their political parties. Lincoln’s memorial represented success of the Republican party and the TJMC wanted the Jefferson memorial to assert the Democrats’ similar historical prominence.

The Washington public saw a classic, non-utilitarian memorial as inappropriate to Jefferson’s legacy and were concerned about the design’s fit in the Washington landscape. Felix Morely ignored Kean’s requests to stop negative coverage on the memorial and asserted in the

⁴⁶ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 124.

⁴⁷ Otto Eggers to Stuart Gibboney, (Letter, New York, N.Y., March 11, 1939), University of Virginia Small Special Collections Library, Correspondence and Records Regarding the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, 1917-1943, box 1, 1.

⁴⁸ Otto Eggers to Stuart Gibboney, (Letter, New York, N.Y., March 11, 1939), 1.

⁴⁹ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 60.

⁵⁰ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 104.

Post's editorial section that the design of the memorial was central to the public's opposition.⁵¹

The day after Morely received the letter from Kean, the *Post* published a letter to the editor from a Washingtonian named Gladys Atbee that was written on November 28th, 1938. Atbee asked, "Why should he have a tomb of classic inutility?"⁵² Atbee's position was one many other Washingtonians held. It is significant that the *Post* published Atbee's criticism of the memorial so shortly after the exchange between Felix Morely and Jefferson Randolph Kean because she explicitly disapproved of the non-utilitarian, classical design. Morely and the *Post* chose this piece because Atbee expressed that cared about the type of memorial that was to be created rather than the well-being of the cherry trees. The headline "More about the Jefferson Memorial" was bound to catch the eye of Kean.

Many Washingtonians felt classical memorials were out of style and they argued that the design was not complementary to West Potomac park. This sentiment was asserted in *The Washington Post* editorials and reinforced at congressional hearings. Washingtonians explained how they remembered Jefferson while defending their position on the memorial. The writer of *The Washington Post* editorial "No Case for the Memorial," called Jefferson an "apostle of simplicity," and said Jefferson himself would oppose a classical memorial because of his "frugality and unpretentious Americanism."⁵³ It continued, "Everything about the memorial project runs counter to the spirit of the man who chose as his last resting place the simple hillside vault amid the woods of Monticello."⁵⁴ Another Washingtonian expressed in a letter to the editor, "I do not approve of memorials in marble! A cold awe-inspiring spectacle - not commensurate to

⁵¹ Gladys Atbee, Letter to the editor, *The Washington Post*, Dec 01, 1938.

⁵² Gladys Atbee, Letter to the editor, *The Washington Post*, Dec 01, 1938.

⁵³ "No Case for the Memorial," *The Washington Post*, Apr 23, 1937.

⁵⁴ "No Case for the Memorial." *The Washington Post*, Apr 23, 1937.

the humanity so typical of the living Jefferson!”⁵⁵ The Washingtonians had broader support from papers other than *The Washington Post*, including the *St. Louis Dispatch*, *Washington Evening Star*, and *New York Times-Herald*, which published that the design was “suitable to the Versailles of Louis XIV but totally alien to everything for which Jefferson stood.”⁵⁶ At the congressional hearings for the memorial, members of the public expressed their distaste for the classical design. One woman urged the commission to consider the “memory of Jefferson” before they “permit the Jefferson Memorial Commission to destroy the life of a single cherry tree, to drain a drip of water from the Tidal Basin, to blast a single rock for this Pope-Ietinos design.”⁵⁷ A classical memorial to Jefferson did not resonate with the Washington public because they viewed Jefferson as a representation of simplicity. Their thoughts about memorialization were shaped by their experience of the Great Depression and they viewed Jefferson as an advocate for the people.

Classical monuments were also unappealing to experts in design, including many American architects. They were familiar with both Jefferson’s architectural work and contemporary architecture, so they felt strongly about the design for the memorial. Much like the

⁵⁵ Jack Stearns Gray, letter to the editor, *The Washington Post*, Nov 18, 1938, 1.

⁵⁶ An article published in the *New York Herald-Tribune* described the memorial design as “a pile of Roman architecture at variance with Jefferson’s simplicity and his contribution to developing a modern native architecture.” See “Art Battle on in Washington Over Memorial to Jefferson,” *New York Herald-Tribune* (New York, NY), April 8, 1937. A piece published by the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* remarked that people protesting the marble memorial “have pointed out that Jefferson was a free spirit, a hater of shams and pretenses and frauds, practicing his own life an almost Spartan simplicity and holding to the belief that the mark of high civilization was not its public monuments but the well being of its people.” See Marquis W. Childs, “Proposed Jefferson Memorial in Washington Stirs Storm Equal to that Over Like St. Louis Project,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (St. Louis MO), March 14, 1937. An article in the *Washington Evening Star* summed up the controversy surrounding the memorial and stated, “patriot’s fame grows while modern capital suffers from spirited controversy over form of his memorial and selection of site.” It asserted that the TJMC’s existence was in danger and that Washingtonians’ desired a memorial that would “take a mold more appropriate to the twentieth century.” See, William A. Millen, “Should Old Inspire New?,” *Washington Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), May 08, 1938, C-5.

⁵⁷ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 98.

TJMC and Washington public, architects manipulated memory of Jefferson to fit their ideas about the new structure in Washington. While the TJMC cast Jefferson as a classical architect and intended to memorialize him in the same style as Washington and Lincoln, architects focused on Jefferson's forward-looking designs and considered him a progressive architect.⁵⁸ In March of 1937, the Designers of Shelter in America indicated their stance on the memorial, "the proposed design has nothing whatsoever to do with the idealism of Thomas Jefferson, or with the idealism of America today. The proposed design is contrary to that very idea of a living American culture for which Jefferson fought during his entire life."⁵⁹ In April 1937, Henry Churchill, a prominent member of the American Institute of Architects, wrote, "Thomas Jefferson? Were the gentleman alive today he would be first to scorn the stupid erudition mistaken in his honor and, abreast of the advanced thought of today, as he was leader of the advanced thought of his own time, he would probably condemn both the folly and the waste."⁶⁰ Architects generally wrote that the design for the memorial was outdated and did not reflect what

⁵⁸ The president of the League for Progress in Architecture, Henry Churchill, wrote a letter to *The New York Times* after they published an article about the design for the memorial. Churchill said, "The argument that Jefferson was a classicist does not hold water. Of course he was. It was the spirit of his time and culture. But what a classicist- how fresh his interpretation, how charming and alive." See, U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 28.; One young architect wrote to President Roosevelt, "we find the design a perpetuation of that expensive frozen tastelessness that has long been characteristic of our public buildings." See, Morris B Sanders to Franklin D. Roosevelt, (Letter, Washington, D.C., April 1st, 1937), Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University, League for Progress in Architecture Records, box 1.; The Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians stated that the memorial was "impractical, esthetically [sic] weak, and contrary to the true Jeffersonian spirit." See Rose Levine to Henry Churchill, (Letter, New York N.Y., March 25, 1937), Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University, League for Progress in Architecture Records, box 1.; The American Federation of Arts wrote that they were "opposed to the erection of the proposed Jefferson Memorial" because "the approved design for the memorial does not express Jefferson's ideals, philosophy, or manner of living." See F.A. Whiting, American Federation of Arts (Washington, D.C., April 23, 1937), Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University, League for Progress in Architecture Records, box 1.

⁵⁹ Walter Sanders, Public Affairs Committee, Designers of Shelter in America to TJMC, (Letter, New York, N.Y., March 24, 1937), Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University, League for Progress in Architecture Records, box 1.

⁶⁰ Henry S. Churchill, (April, 1938) Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University, League for Progress in Architecture Records, box 1.

Jefferson represented to them. They believed that the memorial should have been a progressive or modern design, as Jefferson was a forward-thinking leader and architect.

Washingtonians, architects, and members of the TJMC based their arguments about the classical design for the memorial on different interpretations of Jefferson. While the TJMC defined Jefferson as a figure that surely needed a classical memorial, the public did not. While asserting their position against the classical design for the Jefferson Memorial, some people argued that Jefferson was a simple man (which is somewhat surprising considering the design of Monticello) and some that he valued progressive architecture above all else. These ideas stood out as common between Washingtonians, but they did not present a unified idea of what Jefferson meant to them or how he should be memorialized. They especially did not have the same conception of Jefferson that the TJMC did. While the public's conceptions of Jefferson were not necessarily negative, they contrasted with the TJMC's conceptions of him.

The "Subjects for Dispute": A Non-Utilitarian Jefferson Memorial

The Washington public not only disapproved of the classical design, but also of the non-utilitarian nature of the Jefferson Memorial. The TJMC believed it was important for Jefferson to be memorialized in a non-utilitarian design because Washington and Lincoln had non-utilitarian memorials. The Washington public did not hold Jefferson to that standard and valued a utilitarian structure more than a shrine to the memory of Jefferson. Washington was recovering from a point of economic turmoil and many people did not see a use in constructing a memorial to Jefferson, especially in a spot that already brought the city money through tourism.⁶¹ They felt that it would make more sense to create an auditorium, library, or other utilitarian

⁶¹ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 99.

memorial. Washingtonians invoked their memory of Jefferson as an advocate for public interest while defending their stance on what fit into the landscape of Washington at the time.

The Washington Post's editorial section included a vast number of criticisms of the non-utilitarian design choice as well as suggestions for utilitarian spaces. An article titled "Another Mausoleum," published in *The Washington Post* on February 21st, 1937, (three days after the plans were released) reflected the position of the *Post* on the memorial. The article, which named no author, explained that "the memory of Jefferson is cherished today, not so much because he was a scholar, a president and author of the Declaration of Independence, but because he was a leader who trusted the common man." It went on, "That is why many citizens hoped that the Jefferson Memorial Project would be combined with the movement to provide a useful auditorium in the capital city."⁶² On April 17th, 1937, Washingtonian C. L. Woosley wrote that he disdained a memorial that shouted "look at me. I am the finest yet" and that it "hardly seems a fitting tribute to the great and democratic Jefferson." He went on, "But a Jefferson Memorial Planetarium, erected elsewhere, could be made a marvel of beauty as well as a perpetual means of advancing knowledge."⁶³ In a "Letter to the Editor," a Mable Fern Faling of Washington noted, "We all associate a library with the name of Jefferson." Faling suggested that "various sections of Washington seem to be badly in need of libraries. Why should not a beautiful Jefferson library be built in some needed section. That would be another choice for a fitting memorial."⁶⁴ Other individuals suggested the construction of a school, a scholarship for students

⁶² "Another Mausoleum," *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), February 21, 1937.

⁶³ C. L. Woosley, letter to the editor, *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 17, 1937.

⁶⁴ Mable Fern Faling, letter to the editor, *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 13, 1937.

to attend the University of Virginia, or a patent museum.⁶⁵ The public expressed in *The Washington Post* that they did not see a point in a non-utilitarian memorial. The construction of a new building through government funds allowed them to brainstorm public buildings they believed were needed in Washington. The *Washington Evening-Star* re-emphasized the ideas that were submitted to the *Post*, calling the design a “useless pile of marble.”⁶⁶ The Washingtonians used Jefferson’s legacy to defend their choices, like in the case of the design of the memorial.

Washingtonians asserted their stance on the non-utilitarian memorial at congressional hearings and reiterated their ideas that were published in *The Washington Post*. At the hearings, Washingtonians described their needs regarding public land, but the TJMC was not receptive. A woman representing a Washington citizen’s association passionately stated, “if you [Boylan] and the Congress should autocratically disregard the earnest entreaties of the thinking people of our country... Thomas Jefferson will look coldly down upon your futile efforts,” and presented the couplet: “Your temple by the Basin’s brim, A pile of stone will be to him.”⁶⁷ Instead of a pile of stone, she suggested that the funds for the Jefferson Memorial be put towards an auditorium.⁶⁸ A congressman from Nebraska followed her statements with a comment that, “this lady represents a local organization... perhaps she in some way reflects the ideas of people who are citizens of

⁶⁵ “Two Citizens Groups Oppose Shrine at Basin,” *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 13, 1937; Mable Fern Faling, letter to the editor, *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 13, 1937; Josephine C. McCormack, letter to the editor, *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 17, 1937.

⁶⁶ An article wrapped up the proposals of Washingtonians regarding a utilitarian memorial and stated that Washingtonians wanted the TJMC to “give the public something that is sorely needed instead of erecting a useless pile of marble.” It went on, “some would like to see a great auditorium,” and “others would have the Thomas Jefferson Memorial take the form of scholarships to deserving young women and men in consideration of Jefferson’s own great love for learning and his keen interest in education,” and finally, “there are yet others who would like to see the Federal Government take over Monticello.” See William A. Millen, “Should Old Inspire New?,” *Washington Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), May 08, 1938, C-5.

⁶⁷ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 99.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

Washington.”⁶⁹ Her ideas were considered valid by other people present at the hearings, including a representative of the Cleveland Museum of Art, who stated “I am absolutely opposed to spending millions of dollars on a great pile of masonry which can serve no useful end.”⁷⁰

Washington clubwomen, the same women who participated in the Cherry Tree Rebellion, presented their stance against the non-utilitarian memorial at the congressional hearings. Mrs. Ernest William Howard represented the District Federation of Women’s Clubs at the hearings for the memorial. She presented the stance of the 6,000 women that were members of Washington women’s clubs: “could Thomas Jefferson speak he would beg the Commission to construct a memorial which will prove of great use to the people of these United States, and not be a mere pile of brick, stone, and mortar.”⁷¹ The clubwomen opposed a non-utilitarian memorial, and suggested the construction of an auditorium, which would serve as a “lasting memorial to a great and wise leader who cared, above all things, for the welfare of all the people.”⁷² Memory of Jefferson as an advocate for the people was a consistent theme through Washingtonians’ defense of a utilitarian design. The women’s opposition to the memorial plans originated in their disapproval of the non-utilitarian memorial and culminated in the Cherry Tree Rebellion. Their distaste for the memorial was rooted in their ideas about the government’s use of public land and

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ At the hearings for the site of the memorial, I.T. Frary of the Cleveland Museum of Art stated, “I am absolutely opposed to spending millions of dollars on a great pile of masonry which can serve no useful end.” A representative of a citizens association explained her stance that “there not enough palpable necessity for useful projects in our Capital that we must devote labor and taxes to a ‘mere memorial’ We need badly, among many other buildings, a comprehensive and efficient national employment bureau, a benign and scientific institute of human adjustment, Vocational schools, better hospitals, libraries, a national stadium, and especially a national auditorium.” Another representative of a Washington citizens association suggested “the acquisition of the property described above for the erection of a main public library building, or of a senior high school, or of a civic auditorium, or for some other useful project to honor the name of the man to whom this country owes so much.” See U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 57, 98, 99, 124.

⁷¹ U.S. Congress, House, *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*, April 23rd, 1937, 101.

⁷² *Ibid.*

they invoked memory of Jefferson while defending their stance. The Cherry Tree Rebellion was not simply a case of “flim-flamming,” like President Roosevelt stated.⁷³ The Washington clubwomen’s stance on the Jefferson Memorial was one that they maintained for more than a year before they tied themselves to cherry trees at the site of the construction for the memorial.

Conclusion: Jefferson’s “Marble Mausoleum”

The rift between the Washington public, press, and the TJMC that led to the Cherry Tree Rebellion stemmed from an incongruence in the interpretation of Jefferson, whose reputation was in a state of change. Until the mid-twentieth century, Jefferson was closely associated with his political ideology and was not an essentially American symbol, but the Great Depression and changes from the New Deal transformed American thought and Americans began to consider Jefferson differently. The mid-twentieth century shift in Jefferson’s legacy made his memory vulnerable to contrasting interpretations during the creation of the Jefferson memorial, such as those of the TJMC and Washington public. The TJMC closely associated Jefferson with the Democratic Party and remembered him as one of the greatest American presidents. They approved of the classical, non-utilitarian memorial design because they felt the Jefferson Memorial should compare to those for Presidents Washington and Lincoln. Washingtonians had a less defined memory of Jefferson. As they learned more about the memorial plans, their opinions regarding its site and design changed and they invoked Jefferson differently to support their positions. Jefferson represented progressive thinking, simplicity of design, the voice of the people, or all three at the same time. Rarely did the public’s conception of Jefferson align with the TJMC’s idea of Jefferson as an “apostle of freedom” to be memorialized with a “marble

⁷³ Five Hundred and First Press Conference, November 18, 1938, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, 7, 605.

mausoleum.”⁷⁴ The conflict over the memorial design was a result of the Washingtonians’ and TJMC’s contested memories of Jefferson. The TJMC dismissed dissent regarding the memorial design because of the political significance they rested on the memorial. The unfriendly relationship between the Roosevelt Administration and the Washington press made the press an easy target for the TJMC to blame for the memorial controversy. The TJMC condensed the public’s uproar into distress over the destruction of the cherry trees around the Tidal Basin, even though many Washingtonians made it clear through news articles and speeches at congressional hearings that they were not as concerned with the cherry trees as they were with the classical, non-utilitarian design.

The creation of the Jefferson Memorial is a valuable moment in historical memory of Thomas Jefferson because it gave individuals with diverse experiences the chance to directly state what Jefferson meant to them, or how he should be memorialized. The dispute over the memorial was passionate. The mid-twentieth century has been understood by historians of Jefferson’s reputation as a point where his legacy was restored, but the controversy over the memorial revealed that there was no unified understanding of Jefferson. Today, as Jefferson remains a controversial figure, it is important to acknowledge that there is not a precise or completely accurate interpretation of Jefferson. His legacy has been molded by historical memory to mean anything from division to democracy.

⁷⁴ At the dedication of the memorial, Roosevelt said in his speech, “We dedicate a shrine to freedom. To Thomas Jefferson, apostle of freedom, we are paying a debt long overdue.” See, Address at Dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, April 13, 1943, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin*, 12, 162. Felix Morely dubbed the memorial a “marble mausoleum,” See Felix Morely to Jefferson Randolph Kean, (Letter, Washington, D.C., November 26, 1938), 2.

Federally funded sites of memory such as the Jefferson Memorial do not tell a comprehensive story of public memory. Instead, they uncover ideas individuals in power held about historical figures or events. Memorials influence public consciousness by framing history in a concise and often oversimplified way. The TJMC viewed Jefferson as an embodiment of American morals and memorialized him with a “great shrine” that asserted his position in American memory as equal to Presidents Washington and Lincoln.⁷⁵ The Memorial Commission had incredible power over Jefferson’s legacy. Despite the public’s resistance, the commission permanently placed Jefferson on the pedestal of Washington’s memorial landscape and his status as one of the three greatest presidents was set in stone.

⁷⁵ President Roosevelt called the memorial a “great shrine.” See, Cornerstone Laying of the Jefferson Memorial, November 15, 1939, *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin Roosevelt*, 8, 578.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Correspondence and Records Regarding the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, 1917-1943, box 1-3. Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia Library. Charlottesville, V.A..

Berla, Julian E.. League for Progress in Architecture Records, 1937-1939, box 1-2. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C..

NEWSPAPERS

“Another Mausoleum.” *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), February 21, 1937.

“Art Battle on in Washington Over Memorial to Jefferson.” *New York Herald-Tribune* (New York, NY), April 8, 1937

Atbee, Gladys. Letter to the editor. *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), Dec 01, 1938.

Bolles, Blair. “Jefferson Memorial a Storm Center.” *New York Times* (New York, N.Y.), Apr 17, 1938.

“Cherry-Tree Truce is Forced by Rain,” *The New York Times* (New York, N.Y.), November 20, 1938.

Childs, Marquis W.. “Proposed Jefferson Memorial in Washington Stirs Storm Equal to that Over Like St. Louis Project.” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (St. Louis MO), March 14, 1937.

Faling, Mable Fern. Letter to the editor. *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 13, 1937.

Gray, Jack Stearns. Letter to the editor. *The Washington Post* (Washington D.C.), Nov 18, 1938.

Huddleston, Fred. “The Memorial and the Cherry Trees.” *The Washington Post* (Washington D.C.), Nov 19, 1938

McCormack, Josephine C.. Letter to the editor *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 17, 1937.

Millen, William A.. “Should Old Inspire New?” *Washington Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.),

May 08, 1938.

“No Case for the Memorial.” *The Washington Post*, Apr 23, 1937.

“Roosevelt Curbs Tree 'Rebellion'.” *New York Times* (New York, N.Y.), Nov 19, 1938.

Spratt, Zack. Letter to the editor. *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 17, 1937.

“Two Citizens Groups Oppose Shrine at Basin.” *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 13, 1937.

“Washington Women Fight to Save Cherry Trees.” *The Hartford Courant* (Hartford, C.T.), November 19, 1938.

“Women Vanquish Police in Battle of Cherry Trees.” *Chicago Daily Tribune* (Chicago, I.L.), November 19, 1938.

“Women Defend Cherry Trees.” *Daily Boston Globe* (Boston, M.A.), November 19, 1938.

Woolsey, C. L.. Letter to the editor. *The Washington Post* (Washington, D.C.), April 17, 1937.

PUBLISHED PRIMARY SOURCES

Rosten, Leo C.. *The Washington Correspondents*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1937.

Roosevelt, Franklin D., and Samuel I. Rosenman. *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, with a Special Introduction and Explanatory Notes by President Roosevelt*. New York: Random House, 1938-1949.

U.S. Congress. House. *Site for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial*. April 23rd, 1937, 75th Cong., 1st sess., 1937. H. J. Res. 337, serial 180738.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Burstein, Andrew. *Democracy's Muse*. Charlottesville, V.A.: University of Virginia Press, 2015.

Cogliano, Francis. *Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Peterson, Merrill D. *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*. Charlottesville, VA.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation: University Press of Virginia, 1998.

Savage, Kirk. *Monument Wars*. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press, 2009.

Roberts, Chalmers. *The Washington Post: The First 100 Years*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977.

Ritchie, Donald. *Reporting From Washington: The History of the Washington Press Corps*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Appleby, Joyce, Chang, Eileen, and Goodwin, Neva. *The Encyclopedia of Women in American History* (2002), "Women's Club Movement." (Armonk, NY: Routledge), 455.